

Contemporary *Ḥadīth* Studies in Iranian Scholarship: The Reconstruction of Early Textual Sources

Reviewed by Mostafa Bargahi, University of Qom

Introduction

In recent decades, Iranian scholars have developed sophisticated methodological approaches to one of the most challenging problems in Shī'ī *ḥadīth* studies: the reconstruction of early textual sources that, while no longer extant in their original form, served as the foundation for later canonical compilations. This methodological revolution, pioneered by distinguished scholars such as Muḥammad Jawād Shubayrī Zanjānī, has transformed our understanding of the transmission history of Imāmī traditions.

The intellectual genealogy of the Imāmī *ḥadīth* corpus follows a complex trajectory. Early Shī'ī scholars meticulously compiled traditions, transmitting complete collections to their students, who either preserved these works intact or selectively incorporated materials into new compilations. While bibliographical works (*fihrist*s) documented these transmission paths and source texts, many original compilations gradually fell into disuse and eventually disappeared. Innovative analytical frameworks developed by contemporary Iranian scholars have made it possible to trace and reconstruct these lost sources through careful examination of transmission patterns, textual features, and bibliographical evidence.

This study examines the methodological principles governing contemporary source-critical approaches to *ḥadīth* in Iranian scholarship. It categorises and analyses the diverse rules and criteria that scholars have developed for identifying written sources, distinguishing between oral and written transmission, and reconstructing the complex chains of textual transmission underlying major *ḥadīth* collections. By synthesising these methodological

discussions, which have primarily appeared in Persian-language scholarship and remain largely untapped in Western academia, this research illuminates the sophisticated analytical techniques that have revitalised the study of early Shīʿī textual history.

List of Ten Articles Reviewed in This Paper

1. Āmina Ḥaddādī, Nuṣrat Nīlsāz, Nahla Gharawī Nāʾinī, and Muḥammad Kāzim Rahmati, “Taḥlīl-i Kārkard-i Ḥalqa-yi Mushtarak dar Bāzyābī-yi Manābīʿ-i Āthār-i Riwayī-yi: Muṭālaʿa-yi Mawridī-yi Riwayāt-i ʿAlī b. Ibrāhīm dar *al-Kāfi*,” *Ulūm-i Qurʾān wa Ḥadīth* 107 (2022): 271-93.
2. Ḥammādī, ʿAbd al-Riḍā and ʿAliriḍā Ḥusaynī Shirāzī, “Bāzshināsī-yi Manābīʿ-i Kulaynī dar Tadwīn-i *Kāfi*,” *Ḥadīth Pazhūhī* 6/11 (2014): 181-206.
3. Jamāl Farzandwahy and Minā Yaʿqūbī, “Iʿtibārsanjī-yi Manābīʿ-i Kitāb-i *al-Kāfi*,” *Sirāj Munīr* 8 (2021): 114-38.
4. Muḥammad Jawād Shubayrī Zanjānī, “*al-Kātib al-Nuʿmānī wa Kitābahu al-Ghayba*,” *Ulūm al-Ḥadīth* 2/3 (2007): 238-75.
5. Muḥammad Jawād Shubayrī Zanjānī, “*Maṣādir al-Mahdawiyya wa al-Ghayba fī Kamāl al-Dīn wa Tamām al-Niʿma*,” *Majmūʿa Maqālāt Muʿtamar al-Imām al-Mahdī wa Mustaqbal al-Ālam* 2 (2013): 85-151.
6. Muḥammad Riḍā Jadīdīnizhād, “Ravish-i Dastyābī bi Manābīʿ-i *al-Kāfi*,” *Āyini-yi Pazhūhish* 123 (2019): 16-20.
7. Muhammad Kazim Rahmati, “Bāzyābī-yi Mutūn-i Kuhan-i Imāmiyya dar Āthār-i Shaykh Ṣadūq,” *Ḥadīth-i Andisha* 9-10 (2016): 107-12.
8. Muḥsin Qāsimpūr and Muḥtabā ʿAlī Akbariyan, “*al-Nawādir-i Ashʿarī: Maṣdar-i Ḥadīthī-yi al-Kāfi-yi Kulaynī*,” *Muṭāliʿāt-i Fahm-i Ḥadīth* 7 (2020): 9-33.
9. Umīd Muḥīd Bujnūrdī, “Chigūnigī-yi Irtibāṭ-i Kulaynī bā Kitāb-i Muḥammad b. Muslim dar Partu-i Barrasī-yi Asnād wa Dādihā-yi Kitābshinākhti,” *Ḥadīth Ḥawza* 9/18 (2018): 61-96.
10. Zahrā Sarbāz, Murtaḍā Īrwānī, and Suhiylā Pīrūzfar, “Aḥādīth-i Hishām b. Sālim dar *Kāfi*-yi Kulaynī: Maṣādir wa Maʾākhidh,” *Muṭālaʿāt-i Tārīkhī-yi Qurʾān wa Ḥadīth* 69 (2023): 45-63.

1. Written and Oral Transmission and Their Identification

In the process of transmitting *ḥadīth* from teacher to student, two methods are typically employed: “oral” (*shafāhī*) and “written” (*katbī*). In the oral method, the student hears the *ḥadīth* from the teacher without access to the text; conversely, when the student has the text of the book and hears the *ḥadīth* from the teacher, this method is recognised as written transmission. As Muḥammad Jawād Shubayrī Zanjānī has oft-noted, an author’s explicit mention of hearing a *ḥadīth* does not necessarily mean that the *ḥadīth* was not transmitted from a book.¹ There is substantial evidence showing that most Shī‘ī *ḥadīths* existed in written form from a certain point in history, and by the early third/ninth century, few *ḥadīths* from the second/eighth century remained that were transmitted only orally.

1.1 Methods of Distinguishing Written from Oral Transmission

One of the fundamental questions in this field is: How can one prove the existence of written sources for a compiler without relying on bibliographical (*fiḥristī*) reports? Shubayrī considers the principle of “taking *ḥadīth* from a written source” (*akhdh al-ḥadīth min maṣḍar maktūb*) to be proven based on specific evidence: he believes that the repetition of several names (all together or some of them together) or phrases like “a group of our companions” (*jamā‘a min aṣḥābinā*) at the beginning of an *isnād* that leads to one person in multiple instances is “the best evidence” for the existence of one or more written sources for that compiler. This is because it is unlikely that all these *ḥadīths* were transmitted orally from the teachers. Of course, methods such as the compiler’s explicit mention of his sources are also among important pieces of evidence, which will be addressed later in the article.²

However, if there is no evidence for the written nature of a compiler’s sources, should one consider the transmission of those

¹ Muḥammad Jawād Shubayrī Zanjānī, “*Maṣādir al-Mahdawiyya wa al-Ghayba fī Kamāl al-Dīn wa Tamām al-Ni‘ma*,” *Majmū‘a Maqālāt Mu‘tamar al-Imām al-Mahdī wa Mustaqbal al-‘Ālam* 2 (2013), 95.

² See Section 2.1.1.

ḥadīths to have been oral? One could argue that given the numerous pieces of evidence for the written transmission of *ḥadīths* among the Shīʿī from the third/ninth century onward, even if we cannot identify a compiler's written source for a particular *ḥadīth*, we can still consider its transmission to have been written. This is because our current rules for identifying written sources are limited and cannot identify all of a compiler's written sources. Of course, if there is independent evidence indicating the oral transmission of a specific *ḥadīth*, we can accept that the *ḥadīth* was transmitted orally. However, Shubayrī suggests the possibility of oral transmission from teacher to student in cases where no evidence has been found to identify a written source—even tentatively. It is unclear whether he means oral transmission without any reliance on writing, or merely that the student did not have access to the teacher's written text and the teacher dictated it for the student to write down or memorise.

1.2 Evidence for Identifying Oral Transmission

What independent evidence can be presented for the oral transmission of a *ḥadīth*? Shubayrī presents evidence for identifying the oral transmission of *ḥadīth*. This evidence can be limited to seven cases.

1.2.1 The Compiler's Explicit Statement of Hearing with Evidence

Shubayrī presents this category of evidence,³ and it seems this category should be of a nature that excludes the possibility of hearing a book, because as we mentioned, explicitly stating that a *ḥadīth* was heard (*samāʿ*) is broader than oral transmission and includes written transmission as well. Additionally, Shubayrī takes the expression “he read to me” (*aqraʿanī*) at the beginning of an *isnād* as evidence for the oral transmission of that text.⁴

³ Shubayrī, “*Maṣādir al-Mahdawiyya*,” 95.

⁴ Idem., “*al-Kātib al-Nuʿmānī wa Kitābahu al-Ghayba*,” *ʿUlūm al-Ḥadīth* 2/3 (2007), 225.

1.2.2 The Chain Including One or More Narrators Other Than the Compiler

Sometimes the chain of transmission available contains only one narrator who is not counted as a compiler,⁵ and sometimes the chain includes several narrators with this characteristic.⁶ Naturally, Shubayrī's reliance in determining that someone is not a compiler is based on reports in existing bibliographical works (*fihrist*). In one case, he also considers it unlikely that a person from Qom would be a compiler but that his book would not be reflected in *fihrist*s—especially Qummī bibliographies such as al-Ṣadūq's bibliography, which is the primary source for existing bibliographies.⁷

1.2.3 The Compiler's Teacher Having Only One or Two *Ḥadīth* and not Being Among the Compilers

In cases where one of al-Ṣadūq's teachers has only one or two *ḥadīths* in all of *Kamāl al-dīn* and is not counted as a compiler, Shubayrī considers him to be an oral transmitter of *ḥadīth*.⁸ In his article on al-Nu'mānī, regarding teachers from whom only one *ḥadīth* appears in al-Nu'mānī's *Kitāb al-ghayba*, Shubayrī considers it probable that al-Nu'mānī received (at least most of) these *ḥadīth* from them orally.⁹

1.2.4 Different Chains After the Name of a Teacher Who is not a Compiler

The explanation of this category of evidence is as follows: al-Ṣadūq's narration of several *ḥadīths* from one of his teachers is in such a way that in each case, after the name of that teacher, there appears a chain that differs from the chain that appears after his name elsewhere. Additionally, this teacher should not be counted as a compiler. However, in his examples, some of these teachers have occasionally

⁵ Idem., "*Maṣādir al-Mahdawiyya*," 96.

⁶ Ibid., 101.

⁷ Ibid., 97.

⁸ Ibid., 97-100.

⁹ Idem., "*al-Kātib al-Nu'mānī*," 224-5.

narrated two *ḥadīths* from one person.¹⁰

1.2.5 The Unusual Chain of a Teacher Who is not a Compiler

When a teacher who serves as al-Ṣadūq's path to some books but is not counted as a compiler has unusual chains of transmission, Shubayrī considers it "not unlikely" that the *ḥadīth* that this teacher narrated with those chains can be considered his oral transmission to the compiler.¹¹ For example, in a case where the author has identified al-ʿAyyāshī's book as al-Ṣadūq's source based on evidence, even though that *ḥadīth*'s chain ends with Sulaym and the *ḥadīth* exists in Sulaym's current book, due to the unusual nature of al-ʿAyyāshī's chain up to Sulaym, he does not consider Sulaym's book to be al-ʿAyyāshī's direct source and considers this *ḥadīth* to be al-ʿAyyāshī's oral transmission from his teachers.¹² Of course, it is clear that here, his intended meaning of oral transmission cannot be transmission without reliance on writing or dictation, because the identical text of this report with the existing text of Sulaym's book indicates the presence of a written text that was made available to al-ʿAyyāshī in some way—even if through dictation.

1.2.6 Evidence that a Teacher Who has a Book is not a Path

Sometimes one of al-Ṣadūq's teachers is counted as a compiler, but we know through evidence that in this chain, he is not a path to the books of previous individuals. Such evidence includes: the restriction of the subsequent narrator to this chain or to a few chains, or that the narrator after the teacher is not counted as a compiler. In these cases, Shubayrī has tentatively raised the question of whether al-Ṣadūq received that *ḥadīth* orally from his teacher or whether it was a transmission from that teacher's book.¹³

¹⁰ Idem., "*Maṣādir al-Mahdawiyya*," 100-1.

¹¹ Ibid., 102.

¹² Ibid., 105-6.

¹³ Ibid., 111 and 119; Shubayrī, "*al-Kātib al-Nu'mānī*," 224-5.

1.2.7 The Absence of a Book by the Compiler-Teacher in the Subject Matter of Those *Ḥadīths*

In the article on al-Nu‘mānī, in cases where evidence indicates that a compiler-teacher is the source—for example, when there is discontinuity (*irsāl*) after the compiler-teacher (see section 2.1.10)—and he is counted as a compiler but does not have a book on the subject matter in question, Shubayrī considers that transmission to be oral. For example, in the chain “Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Sa‘īd from some of his men...” given that between the compiler (= al-Nu‘mānī) and the discontinuity there is only one person, he must be al-Nu‘mānī’s source, but since this person does not have a book on occultation (*ghayba*), this *ḥadīth* is considered oral.¹⁴

2. Rules for Determining the Presence or Absence of Written Sources

Several rules have been presented in order to identify the written sources of a book. The authors of the articles in question, assuming the written transmission of *ḥadīth* in Shī‘ī tradition, have presented some of these rules as important evidence, while others are presented only as supporting evidence alongside other indicators. At times, some of this evidence sees counterevidence against the authors’ claims; hence, some writers—such as Shubayrī—have explicitly stated that such evidence alone cannot identify a written source, or that its identification is acceptable only when it does not conflict with other evidence.

The rules presented in the articles under consideration are divided into two categories: rules that identify one of the narrators in the chain as the author of a written source, and rules that negate the possibility of a person in the chain being the source of a book.

¹⁴ Ibid., 196. The explanation of parts of this matter will come in the sections on “Discontinuity” (see Section 2.1.10) and “The thematic relationship of the *ḥadīth* with people’s books” (see Section 3.1).

2.1 Rules That Determine Whether a Narrator is the Source Owner

What follows are the rules that authors have presented for determining the written sources of a compiler. These rules have mainly been presented in Shubayrī's articles, and subsequent articles have used these rules to identify other sources. Naturally, the author of each article may have their own variations in using a particular rule, just as it is possible to use a rule in a different way that yields the opposite result.

2.1.1 The Explicit Reference of a Compiler or Narrator to Their Source

Shubayrī considers the book of Sulaym b. Qays as the only source that al-Nu'mānī explicitly references¹⁵. Similarly, he considers al-Ṣadūq's use of the phrase "I found in so-and-so's book..." (*wajadtu fī kitāb fulān*) as his explicit reference to his written source. In *Kamāl al-dīn*, al-Ṣadūq uses this expression once regarding Sa'd b. 'Abdullāh's book: "I found it written in Sa'd b. 'Abdullāh's handwriting."¹⁶ The author also uses al-Ṣadūq's explicit reference to one of his sources—al-'Ayyāshī's book—in *al-Faqīh*, which can also confirm that al-'Ayyāshī's book was a source for *Kamāl al-dīn*.¹⁷

In the article on al-Nu'mānī, the author also considers the phrase "from his book" (*min kitābihī*) in some of al-Nu'mānī's chains as an explicit indication that al-Nu'mānī—or one of the narrators in the chain—took from the book of the person whose name precedes this phrase. In numerous instances in this book, Ibn 'Uqda (al-Nu'mānī's teacher) explicitly states that his teacher narrated to him "from his book."

Muḥammad Kazim Rahmati also used two main methods to reconstruct al-Ṣadūq's sources, one of which is "al-Ṣadūq's explicit

¹⁵ Shubayrī, "*al-Kātib al-Nu'mānī*," 187.

¹⁶ Idem., "*Maṣādir al-Mahdawīyya*," 115.

¹⁷ Ibid., 127. Regarding al-'Ayyāshī's book being a source for al-Ṣadūq, more details will be presented in Section 2.1.2.2.

reference to his source.” Rahmati believes that in *Kamāl al-dīn*, when using theological books, al-Ṣadūq generally mentions the name of the book. Al-Ṣadūq’s theological sources in this book are as follows: several treatises by Ibn Qība, *al-Tanbīh fī l-imāma* written by Abū Sahl al-Nawbakhtī, *al-Mab‘ath wa-l-mubtada’ wa-l-maghāzī* written by Abān b. ‘Uthmān, and *al-Mab‘ath wa-l-mubtada’ wa-l-mab‘ath wa-l-maghāzī* written by Ibn Ishāq.¹⁸ However, al-Ṣadūq does not mention the names of some of these books. Rahmati also considers Faḍl b. Shādhān’s *Ilal al-sharā’i’* to be one of al-Ṣadūq’s sources in *‘Uyūn akhbār al-Riḍā*, which al-Ṣadūq explicitly references.¹⁹ Additionally, he considers his teacher Ibn al-Walid’s book *al-Jāmi’* as one of al-Ṣadūq’s sources in *al-Tawḥīd*, which al-Ṣadūq explicitly references as a source in one instance.²⁰

2.1.2 The Existence of the Source in Modern Times or the Ability to Identify Parts of It

In Shubayrī’s—and other writers’—approach, his category of evidence can both affirm or deny the existence of a source. This means that if a *ḥadīth* appearing in a book was found in one of the existing sources, then that source was available to the author of that book and was used by them. If it was not found, this means that the *ḥadīth* was not taken from this source. Additionally, has addressed the topics of “indirect transmission” and “chain transformation among early scholars,” and using various pieces of evidence, he has identified a book as the source for some *ḥadīths* in one of the existing books, even though the name of the author of that source does not appear in the chains of those *ḥadīths*.²¹ Therefore, we will divide the discussion of this rule into three parts.

¹⁸ Muḥammad Kazim Rahmati, “Bāzyābī-yi Mutūn-i Kuhan-i Imāmiyya dar Āthār-i Shaykh Ṣadūq,” *Ḥadīth-i Andīsha* 9-10 (2016), 109-10.

¹⁹ Ibid., 109.

²⁰ Ibid., 110.

²¹ Shubayrī, “*Maṣādir al-Mahdawiyya*”.

2.1.2.1 The Affirmative Role of this Category of Evidence

It seems that Shubayrī believes that when a *ḥadīth* exists in an available source belonging to someone who appears in that *ḥadīth*'s chain of transmission, that *ḥadīth* can be considered as taken from that source. In his article on *Kamāl al-dīn*, he has identified *al-Kāfi* by al-Kulaynī and *al-Imāma wa-l-tabṣira* by al-Ṣadūq's father as al-Ṣadūq's available sources.²² He has also considered a *ḥadīth* from Sulaym to be from al-ʿAyyāshī's book due to al-ʿAyyāshī's presence in the chain and the existence of the *ḥadīth* in *Shawāhid al-tanzīl* through al-ʿAyyāshī's route²³, as it is known that al-ʿAyyāshī's exegesis was available to the author of *Shawāhid al-tanzīl*. The author also considers *al-Kāfi* as the only available source for al-Nuʿmānī's book.²⁴

Zahrā Sarbāz et al have also considered that when al-Kulaynī narrates a *ḥadīth* with a chain from Ibn Abī ʿUmayr, and al-Ṭūsī's *Tahdhīb al-aḥkām* also narrates it from Ibn Abī ʿUmayr's book, this indicates that the author of *al-Kāfi* also took it from Ibn Abī ʿUmayr's book.²⁵ Similarly, the authors have considered that when several *ḥadīths* in *Tahdhīb* are narrated from Ḥusayn b. Saʿīd's books, this indicates that *al-Kāfi* also took them from the same source, since Ḥusayn b. Saʿīd's name appears in those chains.²⁶ Although Ibn Abī ʿUmayr's book and Ḥusayn b. Saʿīd's books have not reached us, the authors have taken it as a premise that al-Ṭūsī in *Tahdhīb* took these *ḥadīths* from these books. The authors have also erroneously claimed that al-ʿAllāma al-Majlisī had access to Ibn Abī ʿUmayr's *Nawādir*, and therefore, they consider the *ḥadīths* that are directly narrated from Ibn Abī ʿUmayr in *Biḥār al-anwār* to be from his book, and consequently, if these *ḥadīths* appear in another book with Ibn Abī ʿUmayr in their

²² Ibid., 103-4.

²³ Ibid., 105-6.

²⁴ Idem., "*al-Kātib al-Nuʿmānī*," 188.

²⁵ Zahrā Sarbāz, Murtaḍā Īrwānī, and Suhiylā Pirūzfar, "Aḥādīth-i Hishām b. Sālim dar *Kāfi*-yi Kulaynī: Maṣādir wa Maʾākhidh," *Muʿālaʾāt-i Tārīkhī-yi Qurʾān wa Ḥadīth* 69 (2023), 53.

²⁶ Ibid.

chain, they consider that *ḥadīth* to be taken from his book.²⁷

Ḥammādī and Ḥusaynī Shīrāzī have also used this category of evidence in their article as corroboration for identifying one of *al-Kāfi*'s written sources (namely *Baṣā'ir al-darajāt*).²⁸

2.1.2.2 The Role of This Category of Evidence in Denying the Existence of a Source

In his article on *Kamāl al-dīn*, Shubayrī has taken the absence of a *ḥadīth* in an existing source—when the chain of the *ḥadīth* includes the name of that source's author—as evidence that this chain was not a direct path to that existing source, even if there is other evidence suggesting that book was a source.²⁹ In an example given by the author, a *ḥadīth* in *Kamāl al-dīn* has a chain that is al-Ṣadūq's most frequent and closest chain (in his books) to Furāt—which suggests that Furāt's book should be al-Ṣadūq's source—but since this *ḥadīth* does not appear in the existing *Tafsīr Furāt*, he has not considered *Tafsīr Furāt* to be al-Ṣadūq's source.³⁰

However, in some cases, the author has not considered an existing source to be the direct source of the compiler (i.e. al-Ṣadūq), even when the *ḥadīth* appears in that source. For example, regarding two *ḥadīth* that al-Ṣadūq has narrated with two different chains from 'Abbād b. Ya'qūb, which also appear in 'Abbād's *Aṣl* included in the *Uṣūl sittat 'ashar*, he does not consider the *Aṣl* of 'Abbād b. Ya'qūb to be al-Ṣadūq's direct source. Instead, he has identified one of the intermediaries in the chain as al-Ṣadūq's source, whose source in turn was 'Abbād's *Aṣl*.³¹

The author has also denied that Sulaym's book was a source for al-Ṣadūq and has suggested that the *ḥadīths* that contain chains that

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ 'Abd al-Riḍā Ḥammādī and 'Aliriḍā Ḥusaynī Shīrāzī, "Bāzshināsī-yi Manābi'-i Kulaynī dar Tadwīn-i *Kāfi*," *Ḥadīth Pazhūhī* 6/11 (2014), 196.

²⁹ Shubayrī, "*Maṣādir al-Mahdawiyya*," 107.

³⁰ Ibid., 107-8.

³¹ Ibid., 108-9.

include Sulaym's name—which also appear in Sulaym's existing book—were taken from one of the intermediate sources. It is noteworthy that he has not provided evidence for this claim in general barring one case in which he has considered al-ʿAyyāshī's book—not Sulaym's book—to be al-Ṣadūq's direct source due to al-ʿAyyāshī's presence in the chain up to Sulaym b. Qays and the evidence he has presented for al-ʿAyyāshī's book being a source.³²

Sarbāz et al have claimed that the chain “ʿAlī b. Ibrāhīm from his father from Ibn Abī ʿUmayr from Hishām b. Sālim” indicates that ʿAlī b. Ibrāhīm was al-Kulaynī's teacher who granted him permission (to narrate), and is not the author of a source that was available to him. To deny that ʿAlī b. Ibrāhīm's book was a source for al-Kulaynī, the authors have relied on evidence suggesting that *Tafsīr al-Qummī* was not among al-Kulaynī's sources.³³ However, some scholars disagree with this claim and, based on certain pieces of evidence, consider this book to be among al-Kulaynī's sources in *al-Kāfī*.³⁴ It should be noted that according to various pieces of evidence, *Tafsīr al-Qummī* does not actually belong to ʿAlī b. Ibrāhīm,³⁵ but rather, he used a manuscript of this book which may not have been reliable.

2.1.2.3 Identical Arrangement of *Ḥadīth* in Two Sources; The Status of Chain Substitution and Indirect Transmission

Shubayrī, in addition to his article on *Kamāl al-dīn*, has also discussed the topics of “indirect transmission” (*akhdh bi-l-tawassuṭ*) and “chain

³² Ibid., 105-6.

³³ Sarbāz et al, “Aḥādith-i Hishām b. Sālim,” 50-1.

³⁴ Āmina Ḥaddādī et al, “Taḥlīl-i Kārkard-i Ḥalqa-yi Mushtarak dar Bāzyābī-yi Manābīʿ-ī Āthār-i Riwayī: Muṭālaʿa-yi Mawridī-yi Riwayāt-i ʿAlī b. Ibrāhīm dar *al-Kāfī*,” *ʿUlūm-i Qurʾān wa Ḥadīth* 107 (2022), 283.

³⁵ Muḥammad Kāzīm Raḥmān Sitāyish and Rūḥullāh Shahidī, “Bāzyābī-yi Manābīʿ-ī Tafsīr-i Qummī,” *Ḥadīth Pazhūhī* 9 (2017), 115; Shubayrī, Muḥammad Jawād, “Tafsīr ʿAlī b. Ibrāhīm,” *Dānishnāma-yi Jahān-i Islām*, entry on “Tafsīr Maʾthūr” (2015), 7:701; Shubayrī, “Dar Ḥāshiya-yi dū Maqāla,” *Āyini-yi Pazhūhish* 6 (1997), 43; Aḥmad Mūsawī Madadī, “Pazhūhishī Pīrāmūn-i Tafsīr-i Qummī,” *Kiyhān Andīsha* 32 (1990), 93.

substitution among early scholars” (*tabdīl sanad*) in some of his other articles.³⁶ According to this discussion, sometimes authors of certain books—whether extant works or existing reports of books that have not reached us independently—have used *ḥadīths* from another book in their work, but the name of the original source’s author does not appear in the chain they provide for those *ḥadīths*. To prove his view, the author has used various pieces of evidence, perhaps the most important of which is: the identical arrangement of *ḥadīths* in both the claimed earlier source and the extant source.³⁷ The author has also, in one part of his article on *Kamāl al-dīn*, taken the lack of identical arrangement of *ḥadīths* in two books (as well as the difference in chains) as evidence for the non-use of an extant source.³⁸

Qāsimpūr and ‘Alī Akbariyān have claimed that some of *al-Kāfi*’s extant sources have their *ḥadīths* arranged in the same order as they appear in *al-Kāfi*.³⁹ Sarbāz et al have also cited this claim.⁴⁰

One of the articles written with this approach is “*al-Nawādir-i Ash‘arī: Maṣḍar-i Ḥadīthī-yi al-Kāfi-yi Kulaynī*” (*al-Nawādir al-Ash‘arī: A ḥadīth source of al-Kulaynī’s al-Kāfi*). In this article, Qāsimpūr and ‘Alī Akbariyān, contrary to Shubayrī’s view, attribute this book to Aḥmad al-Ash‘arī and dedicate a portion of the article’s conclusion to examining this theory. However, the main focus of the article is to prove that *al-Nawādir* was a source for *al-Kāfi*, and thus the authors have explicitly stated that whoever the author of *al-Nawādir* may be does not affect their claim about it being a source for *al-Kāfi*. The authors have claimed in this article that out of a total of 456 *ḥadīths* in *al-Nawādir*, approximately 200 *ḥadīths* are found in *al-Kāfi*. The criterion for identifying matches is “unity of subject matter” (*ittiḥād*

³⁶ Shubayrī, “*Maṣādir al-Shaykh al-Ṭūsī fī Kitābihi Tahdhīb al-Aḥkām*,” *Ulūm al-Ḥadīth* 6 (2010), 191-223.

³⁷ Ibid.

³⁸ Ibid., 104, footnote 1.

³⁹ Muḥsin Qāsimpūr and Muḥtabā ‘Alī Akbariyān, “*al-Nawādir-I Ash‘arī Maṣḍar-i Ḥadīthī al-Kāfi-yi Kulaynī*,” *Muṭāla‘āt-i Fahm-i Ḥadīth* 7 (2020), 21.

⁴⁰ Sarbāz et al, “*Aḥādīth-i Hishām b. Salīm*”, 52.

mawḍūʿ), “similarity in text” (*mushābahat fī l-matn*), and similarity in *isnād*. The authors then divide the similar *ḥadīths* into three groups and draw conclusions for two of them:

1. *Ḥadīths* similar in both text and chain; in these cases, they consider *al-Nawādir* to be al-Kulaynī’s source due to the presence of al-Ashʿarī’s name in the chain (although they do not address the issue of al-Kulaynī’s multiple chains up to al-Ashʿarī).
2. *Ḥadīths* similar in text and the end of the chain; in these cases, if the *ḥadīth* in *al-Nawādir* is incomplete (*mursal*) and al-Ashʿarī’s name appears in *al-Kāfi*’s chain, they conclude that *al-Nawādir* is al-Kulaynī’s source and its attribution to al-Ashʿarī is proven (although they do not provide an analysis for why this chain is incomplete in *al-Nawādir*). However, in cases where al-Ashʿarī’s name is not in *al-Kāfi*’s chain—whether *al-Nawādir*’s chain is incomplete or not—based on the principle that Shubayrī attributed to early scholars, regarding the substitution of one reliable chain with another reliable chain, *al-Nawādir* is still considered a possible source for *al-Kāfi*.
3. *Ḥadīths* similar in text but different in the entire chain; the authors do not discuss the implications of this category

The authors have presented additional evidence for *al-Nawādir* being a source for *al-Kāfi*.

1. The identical arrangement of *ḥadīths* in both books: the authors have reported that the general arrangement of most of these similar *ḥadīths* (approximately 200 similar *ḥadīth*) is identical. The *ḥadīths* claimed to be in identical arrangement in both books are mostly in pairs. Interestingly, the authors do not consider cases of similar *ḥadīths* without identical arrangement to contradict *al-Kāfi*’s derivation from *al-Nawādir*, suggesting that this change in arrangement might have been according to al-Kulaynī’s organisation and for a specific reason.

2. There are *ḥadīths* in *al-Nawādir* that are found in *al-Kāfī* with two chains of transmission (up to a common link), where al-Ash‘arī’s name appears in one chain. The authors consider these cases as evidence that al-Kulaynī (probably) took from *al-Nawādir* all other cases that he narrated only with that other chain—which does not include al-Ash‘arī’s name—and which exist in *al-Nawādir*, but presented a different chain.⁴¹

2.1.3 Sequential *Ḥadīth* with a Single Chain leading to a Famous Author

According to Shubayrī, when several sequential *ḥadīths* appear in a book with chains sharing the same initial portion up to a famous author, this indicates that the book of the last person whose name appears in all the chains was the author’s source.⁴² The author also considers the phrase “with this chain” (*bi-hādhā al-isnād*) at the beginning of several chains as evidence that this famous person was the source.⁴³ Similarly, he sees no difference whether subsequent chains are connected to the previous chain through “suspension” (*ta‘līq*) or “omission” (*iḍmār*), or whether the entire chain is repeated again.⁴⁴ It seems that even if one *ḥadīth* with a different chain appears among these sequential chains, it does not invalidate this evidence,⁴⁵ and sometimes several *ḥadīths* with different chains may appear between these sequential chains.⁴⁶ However, the author himself sometimes describes the use of this method for source identification as “speculative” (*ẓannī*).⁴⁷ Interestingly, the author has even claimed this evidence in sequential repetitions of the name of the compiler

⁴¹ Qāsimpūr and ‘Alī Akbariyyān, “*al-Nawādir*”.

⁴² Shubayrī, “*Maṣādir al-Mahdawiyya*,” 123; Shubayrī, “*al-Kātib al-Nu‘mānī*,” 204-7.

⁴³ Idem., “*Maṣādir al-Mahdawiyya*,” 123.

⁴⁴ Idem., “*al-Kātib al-Nu‘mānī*,” 189.

⁴⁵ Idem., “*Maṣādir al-Mahdawiyya*,” 126.

⁴⁶ Ibid., 138, footnote 3.

⁴⁷ Ibid., 130.

shaykh; thus, in cases where Ibn Hammām's name (Nu'mānī's *shaykh*) appears in several sequential chains and the continuation of the chains after Ibn Hammām differs, he considers his book to be Nu'mānī's source.⁴⁸ However, for Shubayrī, this evidence is not valid in every case and has numerous counter-examples. The author also explicitly states that using this method does not necessarily reveal the direct source of the compiler, but in some cases, the author may have taken these *ḥadīths* from an intermediary source between him and the book of the last person common in the chains. Also in his view, the person mentioned after the demonstrative pronoun in the phrase "with this chain" (*bi-hādhā al-isnād*) is not necessarily the author of the *ḥadīth* source; rather, sometimes it could be the narrator from him, his shaykh, or even another person.⁴⁹

This rule is one of the rules that Jadīdīnizhād has also used for source identification, though it differs somewhat from Shubayrī's rule. The author considers the repetition of a chain up to a particular narrator in closely related instances as evidence that the last person common among the chains was the source, even if these *ḥadīths* appear in different chapters.⁵⁰ This rule is broader in the author's view than it is in Shubayrī's perspective, because while Shubayrī did not consider the intervention of one or more chains among the common and sequential chains as detrimental to this rule, the author also does not consider the presence of these *ḥadīths* in different but closely related chapters as detrimental to the rule.

Sarbāz et al also place significant emphasis on this evidence,⁵¹ though they extend this rule to include different sequential chains as well. Thus, their perspective will be discussed in the next rule—the rule of "unusual repetition of an author occurring in sequential

⁴⁸ Idem., "*al-Kātib al-Nu'mānī*," 221-2.

⁴⁹ Idem., "*Maṣādir al-Mahdawiyya*," 130.

⁵⁰ Muḥammad Riḍā Jadīdīnizhād, "Ravish-i Dastyābī bi Manābī'-i *al-Kāfi*," *Āyini-yi Pazhūhish* 123 (2019), 18-9.

⁵¹ Sarbāz et al, "*Aḥādith-i Hishām b. Sālim*," 51, 55, and 56.

chains.”⁵² However, most authors focus more on sequential chains than closely related chains, which differs somewhat from Jadīdīnizhād’s view. What they have presented regarding this rule is also consistent with what they believe about the evidence of “chain transformation” (*taḥwīl*).⁵³ In the frequently repeated chain “Alī from his father from Ibn Abī ‘Umayr from Hishām b. Sālim,” the authors cite the sequential repetition of this chain up to Ibn Abī ‘Umayr in *al-Kāfi* as reason to deny that Hishām b. Sālim was the source in this chain, and consequently consider Ibn Abī ‘Umayr’s book as the source for *al-Kāfi* in these chains.⁵⁴ Using this rule along with the rules of “transformation” (*taḥwīl*)⁵⁵ and “unusual repetition of an author occurring in sequential chains”,⁵⁶ they have also commented on other books being sources for *al-Kāfi*. The authors have used these pieces of evidence either together or individually—and sometimes along with other evidence—to deny Ibrāhīm b. Hāshim’s book as a source and to claim that the books of Ibn Abī ‘Umayr, Ibn Maḥbūb, Ḥusayn b. Sa‘īd, Aḥmad al-Ash‘arī, and Aḥmad al-Barqī were sources.⁵⁷

The authors have claimed that in each chapter, Kulaynī extracted from one source in its entirety before moving on to another source, and thus the traditions from each source are mentioned consecutively. By applying this rule along with the rule mentioned in “The existence of the source in our time...,”⁵⁸ they have claimed that one can be certain that Kulaynī took the traditions he narrated with the chain “Alī b. Ibrāhīm from his father from Ibn Abī ‘Umayr” from the book of Ibn Abī ‘Umayr.⁵⁹

⁵² See Section 2.1.4.

⁵³ See Section 2.1.8.

⁵⁴ Sarbāz et al, “Aḥādīth-i Hishām b. Sālim,” 51.

⁵⁵ See Section 2.1.8.

⁵⁶ See Section 2.1.4.

⁵⁷ Sarbāz et al, “Aḥādīth-i Hishām b. Sālim”.

⁵⁸ See Section 2.1.2.

⁵⁹ Sarbāz et al, “Aḥādīth-i Hishām b. Sālim”, 51-2.

Some of Shubayrī's examples are cases where, using this category of evidence, he has claimed the last common person in the chain as the source, while other examples are cases where someone else in the chain might have been al-Ṣadūq's source.⁶⁰

2.1.4 Unusual Repetition of an Author in Consecutive Chains

The difference between this category of evidence and the previous one is that in the present case, the consecutive chains that end with one person are different chains. Accepting this category of evidence is based on a general principle for which Shubayrī has not provided evidence in these two articles, although he has stated that evidence for it exists. This general principle is as follows: the author (i.e. al-Ṣadūq) has many chains to different authors, but for various reasons, he does not always use a single chain. In al-Ṣadūq's books, this is often due to peripheral reasons such as showing respect to his teachers—in the case of his father and Ibn al-Walīd—but usually the main reason is variety, which can apparently be claimed in the case of al-Ṣadūq's other teachers.⁶¹ It seems that Shubayrī considers the main criterion for a chain to be the repetition of a chain up to a narrator; therefore, if among different chains to one narrator, a chain is not repeated and appears only once, that chain will not be considered a path.⁶² Also, if occasionally a chain that has no connection to the chains under consideration appears among these chains, it will not prevent the chains in question from being considered consecutive, and the ruling for all cases before and after it (except for this case) is the same.

This rule is one of the principles that Jadīdīnizhād has used for source identification, though he has also expanded it: the repetition of a narrator's name in the middle of different chains that are close to each other in *al-Kāfi* indicates that this narrator's book was a source, even if these chains appear in different chapters. However, in his work, this rule is conditional upon not falling under his next rule (namely:

⁶⁰ Shubayrī, "*Maṣādir al-Mahdawiyya*," 123-30.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 131-2, and 147-8.

⁶² *Ibid.*, 132.

the repetition of a segment of the chain in successive and closely related traditions)⁶³. He considers these two chains of Kulaynī as his path to the books of Ḥusayn b. Saʿīd: “Muḥammad b. Yaḥyā from Aḥmad b. Muḥammad from al-Ḥusayn b. Saʿīd” and “a number of our companions (*ʿiddat min aṣḥābinā*) from Aḥmad b. Muḥammad from al-Ḥusayn b. Saʿīd.”⁶⁴

In the rule of “succession of multiple traditions with a single chain to a well-known author,” it was seen that Sarbāz et al place significant emphasis on this evidence in their article.⁶⁵ According to the authors, this rule is based on the repetition of a narrator’s name in multiple chains that are close to each other, whether these chains are identical up to that narrator or are different chains.⁶⁶ Therefore, their rule actually encompasses both this rule and the previous one—the rule of “succession of multiple traditions with a single chain to a well-known author.” It was mentioned that the authors’ emphasis is on successive chains rather than chains that are merely close to each other, and in this respect their view differs slightly from Jadīdīnizhād’s perspective. What they have presented regarding this rule is also consistent with what they believe about the evidence of “chain transformation” (*taḥwīl*).⁶⁷ In the rule of “succession of multiple traditions with a single chain to a well-known author,” the authors’ applications of this rule to *al-Kāfī* was discussed.⁶⁸ It was also mentioned that the authors claimed that al-Kulaynī would completely extract from one source in each chapter before moving on to another source, and thus the traditions from each source appear successively in *al-Kāfī*.⁶⁹ According to this view, while al-Kulaynī was extracting from one source, he

⁶³ See Section 2.1.5.

⁶⁴ Jadīdīnizhād, “Ravish-i Dastyābi”, 18-9.

⁶⁵ See Section 2.1.3.

⁶⁶ Sarbāz et al, “Aḥādīth-i Hishām b. Sālim”, 51, 55, and 56.

⁶⁷ See Section 2.1.8. This has been discussed in two places: transfer [of narration] and chains with unusual repetition.

⁶⁸ See Section 2.1.3.

⁶⁹ Ibid.

would cite different paths to that source as his chain up to the source's author.

2.1.5 Repetition of a Segment in the Middle of a Chain to a Well-Known Author (Non-Successive)

In the previous rule, it was seen that Shubayrī presupposes a general principle in his articles: that al-Ṣadūq has different paths to authors and uses them in a varied manner.⁷⁰ This seems to have led him to conclude in the present rule that it is not necessary for the entire chain from the author's teacher (i.e. al-Ṣadūq) to an author to be repeated; rather, it is sufficient for just a portion of the chain to be identical in order to establish that chain as a path to a single source.⁷¹ Additionally, as mentioned in the previous rule, according to his writings, if among different chains to one narrator, one of the chains appears only once, that chain is not considered a path.⁷²

2.1.6 Common Chains to an Author Even When Scattered Throughout the Book (Non-Successive)

Shubayrī considers the repetition of a single chain throughout a book and the branching of chains from a specific person as evidence that the last person common to all chains is the source of the author (i.e. Nu'mānī). The writer considers this indication to be the most important "general indication" for source identification.⁷³ He also considers this indication as one of the important signs for determining the source of a *ḥadīth*,⁷⁴ but since various authors appear in common chains, he finds it difficult to determine the source without adding external information.⁷⁵ The writer also stipulates that in most cases—if not all—this indication requires that the content of the *ḥadīths* must be compatible with the titles of the books of the person whose book

⁷⁰ See Section 2.1.4.

⁷¹ Shubayrī, "*Maṣādir al-Mahdawiyya*," 143.

⁷² See Section 2.1.4.

⁷³ Shubayrī, "*al-Kātib al-Nu'mānī*," 190.

⁷⁴ Idem., "*Maṣādir al-Mahdawiyya*," 139-47.

⁷⁵ Ibid., 145-7.

we suspect to be the source.⁷⁶ Therefore, we will see that in some examples, the writer abandons this evidence due to other indicators. Hence, this evidence in Shubayrī's view might also be considered confirmatory evidence.⁷⁷ It seems that in these cases too, the writer accepts that an author has multiple paths to one person's book, and thus, according to this rule, multiple chains can be considered as an author's path to one book.

Ḥammādī and Ḥusaynī Shīrāzī, also use the frequency of *ḥadīths* from one student from one teacher or several teachers—with or without intermediaries—as one of the rules for identifying the written sources of *al-Kāfī*. According to this rule, the book of the last common teacher in the chains is the source of *al-Kāfī*, especially if this frequency constitutes most or all of that student's *ḥadīth*.⁷⁸ Similarly, one of the indicators that Mufīd Bujnūrdī used to identify the sources of *al-Kāfī* is the frequent repetition of Kulaynī's chain to one narrator. The writer also considers the dispersion of a narrator's teachers with the same ratio as evidence that that narrator's book is the source. Based on these indicators, he considers the books of Ḥarīz and 'Umar b. Udhayna to be Kulaynī's sources; unlike the books of Abū Ayyūb al-Khazzāz and 'Alā' b. Razīn, whose status as sources cannot be proven by this rule. It appears that Jadīdīnīzhād, inspired by this rule, has presented a rule with new terminology for source identification that is broader than Shubayrī's rule: the frequent repetition of one or more chains that all lead to one of the companions of the Imams—but where the narrator before him is also common in these chains—is evidence that this chain is a path to that narrator's book. As examples, he mentions Kulaynī's various chains up to "Uthmān b. 'Īsā from Samā'a" as well as the single chain "Aṭṭār Aḥmad Ash'arī Qāsim b.

⁷⁶ Ibid., 147.

⁷⁷ In some of the examples that will follow, sometimes other individuals are mentioned instead of or alongside the first person in the chain, the explanation for which will come when discussing the fifth category of evidence. See Section 3.

⁷⁸ Ḥammādī and Shīrāzī, "Bāzshināsī-yi Manābi'-i Kulaynī."

Yaḥyā Ḥasan b. Rāshid.”⁷⁹

Sarbāz et al have used this rule to reject sources. They consider the infrequent repetition of a specific chain to Maṣṣūr b. Ḥāzim in *al-Kāfi* as evidence that Maṣṣūr’s book was not a source for Kulaynī.⁸⁰ Similarly, regarding the chains of two other traditions, after noting their infrequent repetition in *al-Kāfi*, they have claimed that these traditions are not from Hishām’s book but are from Hishām’s oral traditions.⁸¹ They have also taken Ibn Ṭāwūs’s limited reference to the “*Aṣl* of Hishām b. Sālim” being a source as evidence that this *aṣl* was not Ibn Ṭāwūs’s source, or that his copy of Hishām’s *aṣl* was incomplete. The authors, apparently relying on this same rule,⁸² believe that the frequently repeated chain “‘Alī from his father from Ibn Abī ‘Umayr from Hishām b. Sālim” must be from a single source;⁸³ Subsequently, however, due to this chain’s succession in several instances up to Ibn Abī ‘Umayr’s name, they consider his book to be Kulaynī’s source.⁸⁴

2.1.7 Chain Suspension or Pronoun Reference and Beginning the Chain with a Famous Author

Chain suspension (*ta’līq*) refers to the occurrence whereby after mentioning a chain and its text, the chain of the next tradition begins with one of the individuals from the previous chain (other than the first person in the chain); this person’s name might be mentioned in the second chain, or it might suffice to use a pronoun referring to them. considers the book of the first person mentioned in the suspended chain to be Nu’mānī’s source.⁸⁵ However, in his article on *Kamāl al-dīn*—although he presents this rule as independent

⁷⁹ Jadīdīnīzhād, “Ravish-i Dastyābi,” 18-20.

⁸⁰ Sarbāz et al, “Aḥādīth-i Hishām b. Sālim,” 57.

⁸¹ Ibid.

⁸² Although they have not specified any evidence.

⁸³ Ibid., 50.

⁸⁴ Ibid., 51-3.

⁸⁵ Shubayri, “*al-Kātib al-Nu’mānī*,” 198.

evidence—he explicitly states that the “mere” beginning of a suspended chain with a person’s name is not sufficient evidence that their book was a source for al-Ṣadūq.⁸⁶ He then cites al-Ṣadūq’s chain to Ibn Abī al-Dunyā as a counter-example to this rule. In this case, after mentioning one chain up to Ibn Abī al-Dunyā, al-Ṣadūq begins subsequent narrations from him with his name, even though we know he was not an author, and his narrations were collected later.⁸⁷ The author in this article first provides an example supporting this rule and then presents another example that contradicts it. However, in that example, he ultimately considers this rule as evidence for that person’s book being a source, though he does not consider this rule sufficient to prove that book was a direct source for al-Ṣadūq.⁸⁸ Therefore, perhaps this evidence in his view is among the corroborating evidence that will be discussed later.⁸⁹

Ḥammādī and Ḥusaynī Shīrāzī also used chain suspension (*ta’līq*) in the chain of transmission as one of their methods for identifying the written sources of *al-Kāfi*. The authors consider chain suspension as evidence that the book of Ishāq b. Muḥammad was a source for Kulaynī, since his name appears at the beginning of the suspended chains.⁹⁰ Mufid Bujnūrdī also used chain transfer (*taḥwīl*) and suspension (*ta’līq*) as evidence for identifying the sources of *al-Kāfi*, but only when such transfer or suspension is “frequent” and “consecutive.” The author does not accept transfer and suspension as evidence in other cases.⁹¹

2.1.8 Chain Transfer (*Taḥwīl*) in the Chain

Chain transfer (*taḥwīl*) or interruption (*ḥaylūla*) in the chain means that in the middle of a chain, a conjunction occurs where a chain

⁸⁶ Ibid., 199–200. In fact, it is not even evidence that the person was an author.

⁸⁷ Shubayrī, “*Maṣādir al-Mahdawiyya*,” 150.

⁸⁸ Ibid., 149.

⁸⁹ See Section 3.

⁹⁰ Ḥammādī and Shīrāzī, “Bāzshināsī-yi Manābi’-i Kulaynī,” 186.

⁹¹ Mufid Bujnūrdī, “Chigūnigī-yi Irtibāṭ-i Kulaynī.”

containing two or more narrators is joined to previously mentioned individuals. In this conjunction, more than one chain may be joined to the previous individuals. However, in this occurrence, a single person should not be joined to another single person, as this would not qualify as an instance of transfer.

Shubayrī considers the occurrence of chain transfer (*taḥwīl*) in the chain of transmission, when it takes a specific form, as an indication that the source owner is a student whose name appears at the beginning of both chains. By “specific form,” he means that in the middle of a chain, a parallel chain is presented and joined to a portion of the first chain. In some cases, this may be accompanied by the repetition of the phrase “and he said” at the beginning of the second chain, or by repeating the name of the student who is the first person in the second chain—who is the source owner.⁹² The author apparently means that the second chain should not be among those cases where the compiler has presented the second chain from the beginning with a new teacher. The author also stipulates (after several pages and during the discussion) that there must be evidence proving that the chain containing the transfer is not the compiler’s path to the book of one of the individuals in the rest of the chain, since transfer in paths is also very common. He then considers one piece of evidence for this to be the lack of repeated transfers in Nu‘mānī’s book, because a path—whether containing transfer or not—should naturally be repeated in several places in the book.⁹³

In his article on *Kamāl al-dīn*, the author does not provide much explanation on this topic, as he has not presented this rule independently but has only occasionally used it as supporting evidence. However, it appears that in this article, he believes that in chain transfer (*taḥwīl*), the person who is al-Ṣadūq’s source—and who appears before the chain to which the second chain is joined—has used two sources in his book; two sources that belong to two individuals who appear in the continuation of the two chains after

⁹² Shubayrī, “*al-Kātib al-Nu‘mānī*,” 198–201.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, 202–3.

him. Furthermore, this itself indicates that he is a source (and not merely a transmitter) for the compiler or one of the individuals between the compiler and himself.⁹⁴

Of course, this evidence is not always conclusive in the article on Nu'mānī either; because in cases where considering the narrator before the two chains as a source conflicts with other evidence—such as a subsequent statement from one of the individuals in the chain⁹⁵—the author has claimed that in the second chain, the name of the book's narrator is repeated along with the name of the book's compiler.⁹⁶

In some articles, another form of chain transfer (*taḥwīl*) has been used. In this form, the second chain is joined to the entire first chain, and in fact, the compiler presents two independent chains from two teachers to a common narrator. One of the rules that Jadīdīnizhād has used for source identification of *al-Kāfi* is chain transfer in this form. According to his view, this rule indicates that Kulaynī's source is the first common person after the two transferred chains. However, an important point he has noted is that this evidence shows that in (most) cases where only one of these two chains appears, the same person (or someone in the level before him) is the source of *al-Kāfi*, even though there is no chain transfer in the chain.⁹⁷ Of course, the assumption that the first two people in the chain are transmitters is a foundation that the author has taken for granted for his evidence.⁹⁸

Sarbāz et al also heavily rely on this rule with the explanation that Jadīdīnizhād has provided. Additionally, what they have stated about different consecutive chains up to one narrator⁹⁹ is consistent with what they believe here in the discussion of the implications of chain

⁹⁴ Shubayrī, “*Maṣādir al-Mahdawiyya*,” 125 and 150.

⁹⁵ For example, Muḥammad b. Ḥassān from Muḥammad b. ‘Alī. See Section 3.4.

⁹⁶ Shubayrī, “*al-Kātib al-Nu‘mānī*,” 200.

⁹⁷ Jadīdīnizhād, “*Ravish-i Dastyābi*,” 17.

⁹⁸ Ibid.

⁹⁹ See Section 2.1.3.

transfer (*taḥwīl*) in chains. They have used these two pieces of evidence together, or just one of them—and sometimes along with other evidence—to prove or disprove certain books as sources of *al-Kāfi*.¹⁰⁰ The authors have relied on three pieces of evidence regarding the chain: “Alī b. Ibrāhīm from his father from Ibn Abī ‘Umayr from Hishām b. Sālim” to prove that Ibrāhīm b. Hāshim’s book was not a source for *al-Kāfi*. One of these pieces of evidence is as follows: chain transfer appears in many of Kulaynī’s chains and indicates that two or more chains are paths to the book of the common person after both chains, and many of these transferred chains include the chain “Alī b. Ibrāhīm from his father,” therefore this chain is actually Kulaynī’s path to the books of previous individuals.¹⁰¹

In the rule of “suspended chain” (*ta’līq sanad*) it was also mentioned that one of the pieces of evidence that Muḥid Bujnūrdī used to identify the sources of *al-Kāfi* is chain transfer and suspension in the chain; however, only when this transfer or suspension is “frequent” and “consecutive.”¹⁰² The author does not accept chain transfer and suspension as evidence in cases other than these two.¹⁰³

2.1.9 Chain Ending with a Well-Known Author

Shubayrī has not presented this rule as a method for identifying al-Ṣadūq’s sources, but he has stated that when we identify one of al-Ṣadūq’s sources, this evidence becomes clearly apparent.¹⁰⁴ It seems this evidence serves as corroboration, and perhaps the author’s intention is that through investigation, this rule has been seen to be consistent with other evidence, and therefore it can be relied upon even without other supporting evidence. For example, using the rule

¹⁰⁰ Sarbāz et al, “Aḥādīth-i Hishām b. Sālim.” Also see Section 2.1.3. It has been mentioned in two places: transfer [of narration] and successive chains.

¹⁰¹ Ibid., 51.

¹⁰² See Section 2.1.7.

¹⁰³ Muḥid Bujnūrdī, “Chigūnigī-yi Irtibāṭ-i Kulaynī.”

¹⁰⁴ Shubayrī, “*Maṣādir al-Mahdawiyya*,” 150.

of “shared chains to one author...”,¹⁰⁵ the author believes that al-Ṣadūq’s source in the chain “al-Qaṭṭān → al-Sukkārī → al-Ghalābī → Jaʿfar b. Muḥammad b. ʿUmāra → his father” is al-Ghalābī’s book, because Jaʿfar b. Muḥammad and his father are not counted among the authors. The author considers one of the supporting types of evidence for this conclusion to be that this chain in some cases ends with the name of al-Ghalābī—who is a well-known author.¹⁰⁶ In this rule as well, the author presents the same example without referring back to that section.¹⁰⁷

2.1.10 Ambiguous or Indirect Transmission Phrases

Shubayrī discusses this category of evidence by describing that if a chain contains an ambiguous phrase or one indicating indirect transmission (*irsāl*) (such as “he raised it” (*rafaʿahu*) or “he raises it” (*yarfaʿuhu*)), the person mentioned after the ambiguous or indirect transmission cannot be the source of the existing book (or a path to another source). Rather, the source must be one of the individuals between the author and the person before the indirect transmission. Therefore, when the indirect transmission appears immediately after the name of a Shaykh who authored a book, that Shaykh’s book is the source. The author also points to the absence of ambiguity and indirect transmission in the paths of bibliographical works to negate that individuals appearing after such phrases in these chains could be paths.¹⁰⁸ Jadīdīnizhād also considers cases where indirect transmission appears after the first person or first two people as evidence that one of these two individuals is the source in these instances,¹⁰⁹ as well as indirect transmission appearing after the third person,¹¹⁰ although the status of the first two people in the chain as paths is a foundation he

¹⁰⁵ See Section 2.1.6.

¹⁰⁶ Shubayrī, “*Maṣādir al-Mahdawiyya*,” 143-4.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, 150.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, 112-3; Shubayrī, “al-Kātib al-Nuʿmānī,” 189 and 195-6.

¹⁰⁹ Jadīdīnizhād, “*Ravish-i Dastyābī*,” 17, footnote 4, and 18, footnote 5.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 19, footnote 18.

assumes for his other evidence.¹¹¹ This rule will also be discussed in the “Negating Rules” section.¹¹²

2.2 Rules for Negating a Narrator’s Status as Source Owner

In source identification, an important part of the work relies on rules that negate a person’s book being the source, as this reduces the number of candidates who could be source owners in a chain. Shubayrī divides the rules in this section into two categories:

- 1- Rules that negate both a narrator’s book being the source and their status as a path.
- 2- Rules that only negate a narrator’s book being the source, while still allowing the possibility of that narrator being a path.¹¹³

2.2.1 Rules Negating Both Source Ownership and Path Status of a Narrator

The rules previously discussed for oral transmission can all be used to negate both source ownership and path status of certain individuals. Some of the applicable rules in this regard were covered in the first section.¹¹⁴ Additionally, rules that identify one or more narrators in a chain as source owners can also negate source ownership for individuals before and after them, as well as path status for those after them. For example, the “ambiguous or indirect transmission phrase” rule¹¹⁵ can be considered a rule establishing that individuals appearing after indirect transmission cannot be source owners for the existing book or paths to another source.

However, apart from the previous rules, five new rules have been presented for this discussion.

¹¹¹ Ibid., 17.

¹¹² See Section 2.2.1.

¹¹³ Shubayrī, “*Maṣādir al-Mahdawiyya*.”

¹¹⁴ See Section 1.2.

¹¹⁵ See: 2.1.10

2.2.1.1 An Unknown Narrator Who Appears in Only One or Few Chains

Shubayrī considers the presence of an unknown narrator in a chain—who appears only in this chain or a few limited chains—as evidence that al-Nu‘mānī’s source must be one of the individuals between him and this unknown person, not the unknown person himself or those after him.¹¹⁶ However, while the author also presents this evidence in multiple works, he does not consider it sufficient on its own to determine between two possibilities (namely: “source ownership by one of the middle narrators in the chain” or “oral transmission of the *ḥadīth*”).¹¹⁷ The author also does not consider merely being a “narrator of few traditions” (*qalīl al-riwāya*) sufficient to negate someone’s status as a “path”,¹¹⁸ although it apparently does negate their “source ownership.”

2.2.1.2 Multiple Intermediaries Between an Author and a Well-Known Person

Shubayrī considers al-Ṣadūq’s narration from Sa’d b. ‘Abdullāh through five intermediaries as evidence that Sa’d’s book was not the source, since al-Ṣadūq usually narrates from Sa’d through only one intermediary.¹¹⁹ Naturally, in this chain, Sa’d b. ‘Abdullāh is not a path either.

2.2.1.3 Unusual Chain to a Famous Narrator

Shubayrī provides two examples of chains to Sa’d b. ‘Abdullāh for this rule: one chain with a single intermediary and one with two intermediaries. Each of these chains appears only once in *Kamāl al-dīn*.¹²⁰

¹¹⁶ Shubayrī, “*al-Kātib al-Nu‘mānī*,” 189 and 197.

¹¹⁷ Idem., “*Maṣādir al-Mahdawiyya*,” 111.

¹¹⁸ Ibid., 119.

¹¹⁹ Ibid., 113-114.

¹²⁰ Ibid., 114.

2.2.1.4 The Phrase “I Found in So-And-So’s Books” (*Wajadtu fī Kutub Fulān*)

According to Shubayrī, the presence of this phrase in a chain—provided it is not in the author’s own words—indicates that the source is not the author’s direct source, although it shows it is his indirect source.¹²¹ This rule serves as negating evidence in that it shows that source is not the author’s (i.e. al-Ṣadūq’s) direct source. Additionally, when it becomes clear that the person in whose book the *ḥadīth* was found is the source, it becomes evident that the person or persons after him are not paths either.

2.2.1.5 The phrase “I Heard from So-and-So” (*Sami’tu min Fulān*) in al-Ṣadūq’s Chain

Shubayrī believes this phrase indicates that the person from whom the hearing took place is neither the author’s (i.e. al-Ṣadūq’s) source nor a path to another source.¹²²

2.2.2 Evidence Negating a Narrator’s Status as Source

In these cases, although the narrator in question is not the source owner, they may still be a path. These pieces of evidence are as follows.

2.2.2.1 Shared Title in the Chain Without Specification

Shubayrī appears to believe that if someone who has a title shared with another person or multiple people is the author’s source, the author must specify who that person is when presenting their chain.¹²³ Therefore, if this is not done, this person is naturally a path to others’ books, even if, through contextual evidence, it can be determined which of these several people is meant by this shared title. Regarding al-Ṣadūq’s multiple chains to Aḥmad al-Ash‘arī, the author first considers it undeniable that Aḥmad could be a path to the books of those before him, and then states in a footnote that in some of these

¹²¹ Ibid., 114-5.

¹²² Ibid., 115-6.

¹²³ Ibid., 116-7.

chains, even the narrator after Aḥmad is the author's path to the book of the previous person or persons, because the name of the next person is shared and the author has not specified who they are.¹²⁴

2.2.2.2 Unusual Reference to a Well-Known Narrator

Well-known narrators are usually referred to by commonly used titles. In cases where Ibn Abī 'Umayr, a famous Imāmī narrator, is referred to as "Muḥammad b. Ziyād," Shubayrī considers it unlikely that this unusual reference came from al-Ṣadūq. Similarly, this applies to referring to "Muḥammad b. al-Ḥusayn b. Abī l-Khaṭṭāb" as "Muḥammad b. al-Ḥusayn b. Zayd al-Zayyāt," or referring to "Alī b. Abī Ḥamza" as "Alī b. Sālim."¹²⁵ Regarding "Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Yaḥyā," he also considers the reference "Muḥammad b. Aḥmad" in al-Ṣadūq's chains as unusual and evidence that al-Ṣadūq did not take directly from his book.¹²⁶

2.2.2.3 Not Being Listed Among Authors

Shubayrī considers it unlikely that a well-known narrator would be the author of a book but not be independently listed in the bibliographical indexes. Similarly, he considers it unlikely that an obscure person would be a source for *Kamāl al-dīn* without being listed as an author in the indexes. However, he does not consider this evidence as proof that such a person could not be a path to others' works, as they might still serve as an intermediary.¹²⁷

3. Corroborating Evidence in Source Identification

Shubayrī has mentioned various pieces of evidence as corroboration within the rules he established for determining or rejecting whether a person's book was a source.¹²⁸ These pieces of evidence sometimes

¹²⁴ Ibid., 145.

¹²⁵ Ibid., 117-8.

¹²⁶ Ibid., 109, footnote.

¹²⁷ Ibid., 119-21.

¹²⁸ These pieces of evidence do not form an independent section of the

confirm the identification of a source's author and sometimes help determine which book among several books by a narrator is the source. Additionally, some of the previously determining evidence has been presented as corroborating evidence in some articles; for example, the evidence of "the existence of the source in our time" in Ḥammādī and Ḥusaynī Shīrāzī's work¹²⁹, the evidence of "explicit declaration by the author or one of the chain's narrators about their source",¹³⁰ and the evidence of "the chain ending with a well-known author" in the same article¹³¹ have been presented as corroborating evidence. Furthermore, one might say that Shubayrī—unlike others—considers the evidence of "suspended chain or its implicitness and the chain beginning with a well-known author" as corroborating evidence, as he considers the determining nature of this evidence questionable due to counter-examples.¹³² As previously mentioned, one might say that the evidence of "shared chains to one author..." is considered corroborating evidence by Shubayrī, as it requires the addition of other evidence.¹³³

3.1 Thematic Connection Between *Ḥadīth* and Authors' Books

The bibliographical works (*fihrist*s), in addition to naming individuals and mentioning the chain of transmission to their books, have also undertaken to list the titles of many books. Of course, many books did not have titles, especially in cases where the person belonged to the second/eighth century and had only one book. Some book titles were also "non-thematic"—such as *al-Nawādir* ("rarities"), *al-Jāmi'*

articles being discussed in this work. Therefore, in this section of the article, these pieces of evidence have been collected from his articles, as well as the works of others. Some of these pieces of evidence were used in Shubayrī's *al-Kātib al-Nu'mānī* to determine al-Nu'mānī's source.

¹²⁹ See Section 2.1.2.1.

¹³⁰ See Section 2.1.1.

¹³¹ See Section 2.1.9.

¹³² See Section 2.1.7.

¹³³ See Section 2.1.6.

(“comprehensive collection”)—which generally either had no specific subject matter or had a general subject. Additionally, some books were untitled and later became known by their author’s name, such as *Kitāb al-Ḥalabī*.

After identifying the source author from whom the compiler (i.e. al-Ṣadūq) drew, Shubayrī has determined which book among that person’s works was their source. The author states that upon finding the source’s author, one must consult the bibliographical works for the source’s name; if that person had only one book, that would be the source in question, but if they had multiple books, the *ḥadīth*’s content must be compared with the titles of their books to possibly identify the source name.¹³⁴

But how is this evidence used as corroboration—not proof—in source identification? When other evidence identifies the source author in a chain of transmission, the fact that this person is attributed a book whose title relates to the subject matter of the *ḥadīth* in question can corroborate that identifying this person’s book as the source was correct, and generally that the method used to identify the source author is one that leads to results.

However, Shubayrī has explicitly stated in some cases that he has not identified the exact source. For example, where he identifies Muḥammad b. Zakariyyā al-Ghalābī’s book as the source, he explicitly states that he has not determined which of his books was al-Ṣadūq’s source.¹³⁵ Similarly, regarding Ibn ‘Uqda’s book as a source, he states that while the *ḥadīths* relate to the twelve Imams and it is likely that they were taken from one of his books, many of his book titles correspond to the subject matter of these *ḥadīths*; therefore, he has not identified the specific source book.¹³⁶ Additionally, sometimes the author has identified the source’s author but found no book among their works with a title related to the subject matter of those *ḥadīths*, leading him to attribute a book with that specific subject to them, even

¹³⁴ Shubayrī, “*al-Kātib al-Nu‘mānī*,” 191-5.

¹³⁵ Idem., “*Maṣādir al-Mahdawīyya*,” 144.

¹³⁶ Ibid., 146, footnote 2.

though that book title is not mentioned in the bibliographical works. For example, in one part of the *Kamāl al-dīn* article, after identifying Muḥammad Ibn Awrama's book as the source, although no book about prophetic stories and history is listed for him, he suggests that he might have had a book on this subject, since these particular *ḥadīths* from Ibn Awrama deal with that specific topic and his being the source has been established through evidence; therefore, he suspects (*aẓunnu*) that he had a book in this field (History of the Prophets) that was not mentioned in the bibliographical works.¹³⁷ Perhaps the difference between this case and the al-Nu'mānī article case is that here there is more than one *ḥadīth*, and also since Ibn Awrama is not the compiler's (i.e. al-Ṣadūq's) direct teacher, the possibility of oral transmission is ruled out.

However, just as this evidence cannot independently prove that a narrator did not have a book on a specific subject, it seems it can also be used in a negative sense. For example, Shubayrī considers the absence of a book titled *Ghayba* (or related to this topic) for one of the narrators—like Ibn 'Uqda—as evidence that his book was not a source for al-Nu'mānī—at least in some chains of transmission.¹³⁸ In the same article, even in cases where there is evidence proving that the compiler's teacher (i.e. al-Nu'mānī) was the source, if that person did not have a book on this subject (or was not known to have authored books), he considers the transmission to be oral. For example, in the chain "Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Sa'īd from some of his men..." since there is only one person between the compiler (i.e. al-Nu'mānī) and the point where the chain becomes incomplete (*irsāl*), that person must be al-Nu'mānī's source. However, since this person did not have a book about occultation (*ghayba*), the author considers this *ḥadīth* to be transmitted orally.¹³⁹ This case was discussed in the section on indicators for identifying oral transmission (See Section 1).

¹³⁷ Ibid., 148.

¹³⁸ Idem., "*al-Kātib al-Nu'mānī*," 188-9.

¹³⁹ Ibid., 196 and 200.

Ḥammādī and Ḥusaynī Shīrāzī also use the correspondence between the subject matter of a narrator's *ḥadīth* and the title of a book attributed to him in bibliographical works as one of their methods for identifying the written sources of *al-Kāfi*.¹⁴⁰

In his article “Bāzyābī-yi Mutūn-i Kuhan-i Imāmiyya dar Āthār-i Shaykh Ṣadūq” (Recovering Ancient Imāmī Texts in Shaykh al-Ṣadūq's Works), Rahmati has employed two main methods for reconstructing al-Ṣadūq's sources, one of which is “the thematic connection between *ḥadīth* or al-Ṣadūq's book with the book of one of the individuals mentioned in the chain of transmission.”¹⁴¹ Furthermore, elsewhere in the article, to recover lost sources in al-Ṣadūq's works, he suggests that—for example—we should identify authors of exegetical (*tafsīr*) books in al-Najāshī's and al-Ṭūsī's bibliographical works, and then find these individuals' names in al-Ṣadūq's chains of transmission (which contain exegetical *ḥadīths*) to identify al-Ṣadūq's exegetical sources.¹⁴² The author also discusses the sources of one of al-Ṣadūq's lost books titled *al-Tafsīr*. Given that al-Ṣadūq narrates from the exegesis attributed to Imam Ḥasan al-‘Askarī in various books and sometimes refers the continuation of *ḥadīth* to his own book of exegesis, by comparing these cases with the exegesis attributed to Imam al-‘Askarī and finding the continuation of the *ḥadīth* in it, he concludes that this book is the same as al-Ṣadūq's exegesis.¹⁴³

Rahmati identifies some of al-Ṣadūq's sources in *Uyūn akhbār al-Riḍā* by examining the thematic connection between *ḥadīths* and source titles in bibliographical works. These include: *Ṣaḥīfat al-Riḍā* by ‘Abdullāh b. Aḥmad b. ‘Āmir, *al-Awrāq fī akhbār āl ‘Abbās wa ash‘ārihim* by Muḥammad b. Yaḥyā al-Ṣawlī, *al-Masā’il* by Muḥammad b. Sinān, and *Ilal al-sharā’i’* by Faḍl b. Shādhān. Al-Ṣadūq explicitly mentions the last source.¹⁴⁴ The author also examines al-Ṣadūq's

¹⁴⁰ Ḥammādī and Shīrāzī, “Bāzshināsī-yi Manābī‘-i Kulaynī.”

¹⁴¹ Rahmati, “Bāzyābī-yi Mutūn-i Kuhan-i Imāmiyya.”

¹⁴² Ibid., 111.

¹⁴³ Ibid., 112.

¹⁴⁴ Ibid., 108-9.

sources in *al-Tawḥīd* and identifies some of them through thematic connections: *Kitāb al-Jabr wa-l-istiṭāʿa* by Muḥammad b. Jaʿfar al-Asadī (from which al-Ṣadūq extracted approximately 100 *ḥadīths* through his teachers, and which the author considers the most important source for this book), *al-Tafsīr* by Abū l-Jārūd, and *al-Tanzīl min al-Qurʾān wa-l-tahrīf* by ʿAlī b. al-Ḥasan b. Faḍḍāl. The book *al-Jāmiʿ* by his teacher Ibn al-Walīd was also one of al-Ṣadūq's sources in this book, which al-Ṣadūq explicitly mentions.¹⁴⁵ In this article, Rahmati suggests using bibliographical works to identify authors,¹⁴⁶ apparently referring to examining the thematic connection between a person's *ḥadīth* in al-Ṣadūq's books and the titles of books attributed to that person.

3.2 Transformation/Interruption in *Isnād*

This evidence was used by Shubayrī in his article on al-Nuʿmānī as one of the indicators for identifying sources, but in the article on *Kamāl al-dīn*, it was used more as supporting evidence. We have also included this evidence in the Section 2.1.8 on determining indicators and repeat it here.

3.3 Restriction of *Isnād* to One Person in a Book

It appears that Shubayrī used this evidence as supporting proof in his article on al-Nuʿmānī. The evidence is as follows: If a narrator appears in only one chain of transmission in a book, and that chain appears two or more times in that book, then that person's book is the source for the author (i.e. al-Nuʿmānī). Additionally, if this person appears in other chains but with a different title than the one used in the chains under discussion, this evidence is still applicable. However, in the example under consideration, he used two other supporting proofs: 1) The transmitter of this person's book in bibliographical works is the same transmitter from him in this chain, 2) The transmitter from him in this chain appears in several other places in the book, but only in

¹⁴⁵ Ibid., 110-1.

¹⁴⁶ Ibid., 111.

these chains under discussion is he referred to by a specific title (= Abū Jaʿfar al-Hamdānī).¹⁴⁷

3.4 The Appearance of Content After a *Ḥadīth* Quoted from One of the Chain's Narrators

Shubayrī considers this category of evidence as supporting proof in an example where content from al-Ḥimyarī (one of the narrators present in the chain) appears after the *ḥadīth*, indicating that the *ḥadīth* was taken from al-Ḥimyarī's book and this chain is the author's (i.e. al-Nu'mānī's) chain to his book.¹⁴⁸

3.5 Bibliographical Data

In Section 1, it was discussed that Shubayrī sometimes uses the fact that a narrator in the chain is not known as an author as one of several pieces of evidence for the oral nature of a transmission. We mentioned that he apparently means that this person is not known as an author according to bibliographical data. In one case, he even considers it unlikely that a person from Qom would be an author without their book being mentioned in bibliographical works—especially Qummī bibliographies like al-Ṣadūq's bibliography, which is the source for existing bibliographies.¹⁴⁹

However, the author has also used bibliographical data as supporting evidence to identify written sources. Shubayrī considered the chain "al-Ṭāliqānī → Ibn 'Uqda → Ibn Faḍḍāl → his father" to be the path to the same manuscript that al-Najāshī reported,¹⁵⁰ and apparently took al-Najāshī's statement as supporting evidence. Additionally, he sometimes considers the fact that a person's book transmitter in bibliographical works is the same person who narrates from that author in a chain as confirmation that the author is the source. For example, Ḥaydar b. Muḥammad al-Samarqandī appears in

¹⁴⁷ Shubayrī, "*al-Kātib al-Nu'mānī*," 124.

¹⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 223.

¹⁴⁹ *Idem.*, "*Maṣādir al-Mahdawiyya*," 97.

¹⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 141-2.

al-Najāshī's path to al-ʿAyyāshī's books as the transmitter of al-ʿAyyāshī's books. Similarly, al-Shaykh al-Ṭūsī explicitly stated in his bibliography that he (al-Samarqandī) transmitted all of al-ʿAyyāshī's books. The author considers these reports as "supporting evidence" that he was the path to al-ʿAyyāshī's books in the chain of *Kamāl al-dīn*.¹⁵¹ He also states that he hopes to succeed in comparing the chains of *Kamāl al-dīn* with al-Ṣadūq's paths to the companions' books (which appear in two bibliographies).¹⁵²

Ḥammādī and Ḥusaynī Shīrāzī attempt to identify some of Kulaynī's sources by comparing the information from two bibliographies of al-Najāshī and al-Ṭūsī with the chains of *al-Kāfi*. One of the methods the authors use to identify the written sources of *al-Kāfi* was determining whether a narrator was listed as a transmitter of his teacher's books in the bibliographies, especially in cases where Kulaynī appears in the bibliographical transmission chains.¹⁵³ Additionally, they sometimes conclude that a narrator was the transmitter for the book of one of his predecessors based on the fact that the narrator was not independently mentioned in the bibliographies (along with some other evidence).¹⁵⁴

Sarbāz et al. also deny that Hishām's book was a source for Manṣūr regarding the traditions of Hishām that were narrated by Manṣūr b. Ḥāzim, because Manṣūr was not listed among the transmitters of Hishām's books.¹⁵⁵ The authors also cite three pieces of evidence to show that Ibrāhīm b. Hāshim's book was not the source in the chain: "Alī from his father from Ibn Abī ʿUmayr from Hishām b. Sālim." Two of these pieces of evidence were related to bibliographical data: 1) Ibrāhīm b. Hāshim was not a prolific author, 2) It was claimed that

¹⁵¹ Ibid., 128.

¹⁵² Ibid., 150-1.

¹⁵³ Ḥammādī and Shīrāzī, "Bāzshināsī-yi Manābiʿ-ī Kulaynī".

¹⁵⁴ Ibid., 186.

¹⁵⁵ Sarbāz et al, "Aḥādith-i Hishām b. Sālim," 57.

Ibrāhīm b. Hāshim transmitted “all books and traditions” from some of his prominent teachers.¹⁵⁶

Mufīd Bujnūrdī also uses the correspondence between Kulaynī’s chain and the bibliographical transmission paths to a book to confirm or strengthen the case that a book mentioned in the bibliography was indeed Kulaynī’s source.¹⁵⁷

Farzandwaḥy and Ya‘qūbī emphasise that according to bibliographical data, many individuals whose books served as direct or indirect sources for Kulaynī were either trustworthy (*thiqa*) and of high status, or despite being considered weak, their books were reliable. They claim that Kulaynī’s *al-Kāfī* “possesses high scholarly value and credibility due to its use of authentic and original sources.”¹⁵⁸

3.6 Using *al-Faqīh* and the Paths of *Mashyakha*

It appears that Shubayrī considers that if a tradition in *Kitāb man lā yaḥḍuruḥu al-faqīh* begins with the name of a narrator, and al-Ṣadūq’s path to that person in the *Mashyakha* of that book corresponds with his chain in *Kamāl al-dīn* to that same person, this data serves as “confirmation” that that person’s book was a source for al-Ṣadūq in *Kamāl al-dīn*. For example, al-Ṣadūq explicitly states in one place in *al-Faqīh* that al-‘Ayyāshī’s book was a source, and in another place begins with his name. His path to al-‘Ayyāshī in the *Mashyakha* of *al-Faqīh* corresponds with one of his frequently repeated chains to al-‘Ayyāshī in *Kamāl al-dīn*. The author appears to consider this as confirmation that al-‘Ayyāshī’s book was a source for al-Ṣadūq in this chain of *Kamāl al-dīn*.¹⁵⁹

Rahmati, in examining al-Ṣadūq’s sources in the book *al-Tawḥīd*, proposes a method for identifying al-Ṣadūq’s sources as follows: comparing al-Ṣadūq’s paths to individuals in the *Mashyakha* of *al-*

¹⁵⁶ Ibid., 51.

¹⁵⁷ Mufīd Bujnūrdī, “Chigūnigī-yi Irtibāt-i Kulaynī,” 79.

¹⁵⁸ Jamāl Farzandwaḥy and Minā Ya‘qūbī, “T‘tibārsanjī-yi Manābī-i Kitāb-i *al-Kāfī*,” *Sirāj Munūr* 8 (2021), 133.

¹⁵⁹ Shubayrī, “*Maṣādir al-Mahdawiyya*,” 127-8.

Faqīh with al-Najāshī's and al-Ṭūsī's paths to the same individuals in their bibliographical works.¹⁶⁰ He appears to believe that if al-Ṣadūq's path in the *Mashyakha* to a person matches the path in one of the two bibliographies to that person's book, then that path represents al-Ṣadūq's path to that person's book. Additionally, in the middle of the discussion and in the section on the sources of *al-Tawḥīd*, he states that the only source that al-Ṣadūq explicitly mentions in the *Mashyakha* is Kulaynī's *al-Kāfī*.¹⁶¹

Mufīd Bujnūrdī also uses al-Ṣadūq's path in the *Mashyakha* to confirm that Ibn Abī 'Umayr was the transmitter of 'Umar b. Udhayna's book.¹⁶²

3.7 Unusual Frequency of Two People Appearing Together in *Isnāds*

Shubayrī considers the "unusual frequency" of "Sa'd b. 'Abdullāh" and "'Abdullāh b. Ja'far al-Ḥimyarī" appearing together in the chains of *Kamāl al-dīn* as evidence that these two individuals' books were sources. However, because in some cases it is possible that these two individuals were paths to others' books, he does not consider this independent evidence that their books were sources in these chains, though he does consider it "general evidence" for source identification.¹⁶³

Conclusion

The rules that have been presented by Persian-speaking researchers in the field of Shī'ī *ḥadīth* for identifying lost written sources can be divided into two categories: 1) Rules that are claimed to have a determining role, 2) Rules that have a confirmatory role. The rules presented in the second category are not such that it has been claimed that by applying them, one can identify the lost source. Therefore,

¹⁶⁰ Rahmati, "Bāzyābī-yi Mutūn-i Kuhan-i Imāmiyya," 110.

¹⁶¹ Ibid.

¹⁶² Mufīd Bujnūrdī, "Chigūnigī-yi Irtibāt-i Kulaynī," 88.

¹⁶³ Shubayrī, "*Maṣādir al-Mahdawiyya*," 138-9.

these rules are falsifiable. However, regarding the rules of the first category, it has been claimed that they will always or usually apply to and account for the intended instances. The rules of this category can be divided into two groups: 1) Rules that have a negative aspect and negate the status of being a path or source owner for one or more narrators in the chain. 2) Rules that have a positive aspect and identify one (or more) of the narrators in the chain as the source owner. Some of these rules have been used by different authors in a minimal or maximal way, or with specific conditions. Additionally, some authors have considered some of these rules as belonging to one of the two categories while others have considered that rule as belonging to the other category.