

Historical and Jurisprudential Issues Pertinent to the Ziyāratu ‘Āshūrā’.

By Āyatullāh Shaykh Ja‘far Subhānī.

Translated by Afzal Sumar.

Edited by: Mrs Sajida Meralli/Rehmtullah.

As a prelude to the study of the chains of transmission of Ziyāratu ‘Āshūrā’ and in order to clarify the subject, several themes surrounding it will be discussed.

Reliability of the Traditions.

Early Shi‘ite scholars classified traditions into two: the reliable and the unreliable. Those traditions that were corroborated by circumstantial evidence were considered reliable and authoritative. Those that were not, were considered unreliable.

So, what is circumstantial evidence? Circumstantial evidence can be defined as any of the following:

- 1) The presence of a tradition in many of the four hundred primary works of traditions that were circulating among the early scholars and which they transmitted on the authority of their teachers in an unbroken continuous chain, which linked them to the infallible Imāms (as).
- 2) The recurrence of a tradition in one or more primary works of traditions by means of multiple reliable chains. Alternatively, the existence of a tradition in a primary work attributed to a disciple of any of the Imāms whose reliability and truthfulness was unanimously attested by the scholars. Examples of such disciples are Zurāra bin A‘yān, Muḥammad bin Muslim and Fuḍayl bin Yasār.
- 3) The existence of a tradition in one of the primary works that was presented to one of the Imāms who commended it and praised its compiler. Examples are the book of traditions of ‘Ubaydullah al-Ḥalabi (presented to Imām al-Ṣādiq), or the books of Yūnus bin ‘Abd al-Raḥmān and Faḍl bin Shāzān (presented to Imām al-‘Askari).
- 4) The citation of a tradition from the books in circulation among the predecessors of the early scholars, provided the books were reliable, trustworthy and credible, irrespective of whether the compiler was an Imāmi or a non-Imāmi. Examples of such works from Imāmis are the book on the ritual prayers of Ḥurayz bin ‘Abdullah al-Sijistani or the books of the two sons of Saīd bin al-Ḥusayn al-Aḥwāzi and ‘Ali bin Mahzayar. From the non-Imāmis these include the book of Ḥafṣ bin Ghiyath al-Qāḍi and Ḥusayn bin ‘Ubaydullah al-Sa‘di as well as the book on the prayer direction (*al-Qibla*) of ‘Ali bin al-Ḥasan al-Ṭāṭāri. The early

scholars therefore judged the transmitted traditions of some of the narrators as authentic and correct even when those narrators were not from the Imāmiyya, such as ‘Ali bin Muḥammad bin Riyāḥ.¹

These are some of the examples of circumstantial evidence used to determine the authenticity of traditions. There are many other types of evidence too, but for the purposes of this discussion, the above-mentioned evidence will suffice.

With regards to the later Shi‘ite scholars, they had to relinquish the two-fold classification in favour of a four-fold classification of traditions: authentic (*ṣaḥīḥ*), dependable (*muwathāq*), good (*ḥasan*) and weak (*da‘īf*). The reason for the adoption of a four-fold classification was the lack of circumstantial evidence, due to the passage of time and the loss of reliable primary compilations of traditions. Thus, the evidence rendering a tradition authentic due to the knowledge that it originated from the infallible Imāms, was also lost. The four-fold classification of the traditions was now based on an analysis of the chains of transmission of the traditions and an investigation into the circumstances, conditions and positions of the narrators who featured in these chains.

Hence, for the early Shi‘ite scholars, if the origin of a tradition was from the infallible Imāms, it was confirmed by circumstantial evidence and was considered to be authentic. However, as a consequence of a loss of this evidence over time, the same was not the case for the later Shi‘ite scholars.

The Probative Authority of a Tradition (*ḥujjiyyatu al-khabar*).

The ultimate question is: can a tradition be proven as reliable based on the fact that it is transmitted by a reliable narrator or can it only be authoritative if it is rendered certain that the text originated from an infallible? There are two perspectives on this.

The most correct position is the latter one; the reliability of a tradition based on the certainty that the text originated from an infallible. It is for this reason that, in the instance where the reliability and truthfulness of the narrator is not established, but circumstantial evidence proves the report to have originated from an infallible, the report assumes probative authority. As a consequence, it is adopted in law, which completes and lends credence to the practice of the intelligent people in this field.

Rational jurists (*al-Uṣūliyyūn*) focussed on discussing the probative authority of a reliable person’s reported speech in their studies in a way that suggested that the divine Legislator intended to establish this as a principle above all else. However, an investigation into the matter shows that there is no evidence in the law that this is the case. Even the evidence

¹ Al-Wāfi, volume 1, pages 11-12, in the second introduction.

from Qur'ānic verses in favour of the principle, is not definitive, as is apparent to anyone who refers to the works of jurisprudence.²

With regards to the transmitted traditions pertaining to this issue, all of them are concerned with the latter position. This is because the query contained in the relevant traditions is associated with concerns in favour of the second position and there is nothing in the traditions that legitimately points to the establishment of the first position. Hence for example, it is sometimes the case that a narrator would ask the Imām

“Is Yūnus bin ‘Abd al-Raḥmān reliable and *should I take from him what I need of the religious directives?*”³

Or the Imām is reported to have said,

“Al-‘Umari and his son are both reliable, therefore whatever they claim to convey from me *then that is from me*”.⁴

The sole evidence for the probative authority of a singly transmitted report is therefore the practice of intelligent people, implemented in their daily lives. This practice transpires into a reliance on a reliable and authentic report originating from an Infallible. The reliability of the reporter of such a report must also be one of the circumstantial pieces of evidence that renders the report certain as originating from an Infallible. It is for this reason that in the instance where the reliability and truthfulness of a narrator is established and circumstantial evidence does not prove the origins of a tradition to be from an Infallible, the tradition is abandoned.

In conclusion, for the early scholars the criterion for the probative authority of a tradition lay in the testimony of internal and/or external circumstantial evidence for the provenance of a tradition's origins to be from an Infallible.

Widespread Practice of a Tradition Mitigates the Weakness of its Chain.

The widespread practice of the contents of a tradition compensates for the weakness of its chain. A tradition may be divided into three types in terms of its fame and renown.

1) Fame and renown due to widespread transmission: A tradition may be renowned and famous due to its wide transmission among narrators and transmitters of hadith as well as its transmission in books, irrespective of its utilisation by the jurists and scholars.

2) Fame and renown due to widespread reliance and use by jurists: A tradition may be renowned and famous due to jurists' widespread reliance on it and their use of it in issuing verdicts. An example is the Prophetic tradition “every person is responsible for what he

² Refer to our lectures transcribed in the book ‘Al-Maḥṣūl fi ‘Ilm al-Uṣūl’ and ‘Irshād al-Uqūl fi ‘Ilm al-Uṣūl’, in the context of the discussion of the probative authority of solitary traditions.

³ Waṣā’il al-Shi‘a, volume 18, chapter 11, hadith number 33. This chapter contains traditions on the attributes and qualities necessary for a judge.

⁴ Ibid, hadith number 4.

undertakes till he discharges that responsibility,” or the Prophetic report “people have authority over their possessions”. Both these traditions, even though they are not transmitted in the Shi‘ite books of traditions, have been applied in the juridical exercises of jurists. Therefore, widespread reliance on and use of the contents of traditions by jurists indicates the existence of circumstantial evidence related to those traditions, which makes it certain that the origins of those traditions are from an Infallible.

It is known that the widespread transmission of a tradition produces benefit if the transmission is coupled with practice. However, if the hadith is merely transmitted widely without being practiced then this negates its authority and instead engenders suspicion about the tradition’s authenticity.

3) Fame and renown of a juridical verdict: Sometimes, there is a famous and renowned juridical verdict regarding a particular issue, irrespective of a relevant tradition existing in its favour or the verdict being contrary to a tradition. In such a case the question is: does such renown possess probative authority or not? The matter is a lengthy and detailed one, which has been explained in my jurisprudential lectures.

However, in general, a tradition that is widely utilised in juridical deduction (indicating wide reliance on it by jurists) compensates the weakness of its chain, if a chain exists, and engenders certainty regarding its authentic provenance.

The evidence for such a stance is the ‘accepted’ report (*maqbulā*) of ‘Umar bin Ḥanzala.⁵ Here the Imām was asked about two contradictory traditions which were transmitted by two reliable persons. Ibn Ḥanzala reports that he said to the Imām,

“Both the narrators are veracious and acceptable to our companions such that it is not possible to prefer one over the other.”

The Imām responded,

“Look into what they are transmitting from us regarding the matter under consideration and *the tradition which is unanimously agreed upon among your colleagues is the tradition and judgement to be accepted as originating from us and the contrary report* (i.e., the one which is rare and unknown among your colleagues) *is to be set aside*. This is because *the matter that is unanimously agreed upon is beyond doubt* (*fa inn al-mujma‘ ‘alayhi, lā rayba fihi*). Indeed matters are of three types. A matter, whose correctness is established, has to be obeyed. A

⁵ A similar report is ascribed to Zurāra bin A‘yān and is identified as *marfū‘*. A *marfū‘* report is defined as one whose chain has some narrators omitted. A *marfū‘* tradition can also be termed as *mursal*. A *mursal* tradition is defined as one which has either all or some of the intermediary narrators omitted. Shaykh Subhani points out that he has not cited the *marfū‘* tradition of Zurāra here and has instead preferred the *maqbulā* report of Ibn Ḥanzala. This is because the *marfū‘* report of Zurāra is *mursal* and that is because ‘Allāma al-Ḥilli (d 726 AH) has reported it from Zurāra (d 150 AH) (without providing the intervening chain). Shaykh Subhani writes that such a report cannot be used as evidence.

matter whose error is manifest has to be avoided and finally a matter which is doubtful and ambiguous has to be returned to Allah and His prophet.”⁶

Evidence in Favour of this Perspective.

The meaning and intent of the phrase ‘*that which is unanimously agreed upon,*’ does not mean a tradition that is *unanimously* transmitted by all but rather that the tradition is transmitted *widely* among the Shi‘ite. This understanding is supported by the following statement from the Imām,

“...and the rare tradition is to be set aside; that which is rare and unknown among your colleagues.”

A tradition that is renowned in its transmission among the Shi‘ite means that it is one that is renowned in transmission as well as practice according to its contents and its utilisation in issuing juridical verdicts. As mentioned earlier, a tradition that is simply transmitted but not practiced inspires doubt about its authenticity.

Furthermore, the meaning of the statement ‘*a unanimously agreed upon tradition is beyond doubt*’ is the absolute negation of doubt. The vocabulary used is similar to the Qur’anic verse (2:2) ‘This Book, *there is no doubt in it (dhālik al-kitābu lā rayba fīhi...)*’ where the negative phrase ‘there is no doubt in it’ contains the word ‘*rayb*’, meaning ‘doubt’, in the indefinite form. The use of the indefinite form denotes generality (the definite form would have been ‘*al-rayb*’). Therefore, if a renowned and practiced tradition is one that has no doubt in it, then a rare tradition would have the opposite connotation: there would be no doubt about its invalidity from a logical perspective. When the validity and correctness of one part of a proposition is certain and beyond doubt then the other part is obviously invalid and incorrect. Otherwise it would require the combination of certainty and doubt regarding a single matter, which is logically unacceptable. For example, if the veracity of Zayd is beyond doubt then its contrary, his dishonesty, is negated beyond doubt too.

From the above discussion, it can be concluded that a renowned tradition belongs to the first part of the tripartite division mentioned by the Imām, that is, a matter whose correctness is established and is therefore required to be obeyed, while the rare tradition belongs to the second part of the tripartite division, that is, a matter whose error is manifest and therefore needs to be avoided. The rare tradition cannot be said to belong to the third part of the tripartite division, that is, a matter which is dubious and which requires its knowledge to be returned to God and His Prophet.

Therefore the meaning of the Imām’s statement ‘*that which is unanimously agreed upon is beyond doubt*’ is the tradition that is renowned and practiced among the Shi‘ite and not a

⁶ Waṣā’il al-Shi‘a, volume 18, chapter 11, hadith number 1. This chapter contains traditions on the attributes and qualities necessary for a judge.

tradition regarding which there is mere unanimity that it originates from the infallible. This is because the narrator in the tradition above assumes that both the contradictory traditions, which two veracious and acceptable narrators report, ensue from the Imām and that is why neither one can be preferred over the other, for if the converse were true, and only one of the traditions was unanimously known to originate from the Imām then there would have been no crisis of ambiguity.

The significance of a renowned tradition having its meaning elucidated as above lies in its ability to stimulate certainty with respect to its origins (being from an Infallible). It is this that makes it the subject of the principle of the probative authority of a tradition.

Therefore, in light of the above discussion, it should be known that when the five chains of transmission of Ziyāratu ‘Āshūrā’, each of which varies in its reliability and concomitant authority, are collectively considered along with the circumstantial evidence that accompanies them, then this bequeaths certainty and conviction regarding its divine origins. As a result, the faith and devoutness professed in it has come about in light of its probative authority and the recitor will be awarded according to the rewards specified in the tradition.

The analysis of the chains of Ziyāratu ‘Āshūrā’, according to the criteria of the science of biographies, is a significant and substantial affair. However, to restrict oneself to its conclusions and to disregard the large amount of circumstantial evidence proving its authenticity and correctness would be to make a mistake. The circumstantial evidence presented in this study will perhaps bestow a level of reliability to the narrators or to the tradition itself.

The Book of Biographies of Al-Ghadā’iri and its Scholarly Significance.

The scholar, al-Ḥusayn bin ‘Ubaydullah al-Ghadā’iri or his son Aḥmad bin al-Ḥusayn are attributed to have had a book of biographies of the narrators of traditions compiled. The collection is entitled ‘*Kitāb al-Du‘afā*’,⁷ which, as its title makes apparent is a book that purports to contain information on hadith transmitters deemed weak and unreliable. However, the authenticity of this attribution has not been verified. This is because this book was lost for a couple of centuries between the time of al-Ghadā’iri (d 411 AH) and his son, till its discovery two centuries later by Seyyid Jamāl al-Dīn Abū al-Faḍā’il Aḥmad bin Ṭāwūs al-Ḥusayni al-Ḥilli (d 673 AH). In light of these facts, how is it possible to rely on this work?

In addition to the above, circumstantial evidence related to this book proves that it does not belong to the aforementioned individuals. Seyyid al-Khū’i has elaborated on this matter

⁷ This title would be translated as: ‘the book of weak narrators’.

in his book *Mu'jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*⁸ and we have done the same in our book *Kuliyātū fī 'Ilm al-Rijāl*.⁹ Those who wish to be apprised of the details should refer to these books.

Furthermore, the early scholars of Qum have disparaged a huge number of the narrators but their disparagement was not based on the report of a veracious person from a veracious person, but rather on the basis of their theological differences with those narrators. Therefore if they noticed anything in a tradition that seemed like an exaggeration (*al-ghuluww*) in doctrinal issues, they would criticise the tradition as being exaggerated or fabricated.

Al-Muḥaqqiq al-Bihbahāni writes,

‘It is clear that many of the early scholars and especially the scholars of Qum, of which al-Ghaḍā’iri was one, used to profess distinctly special beliefs regarding the Imāms on the basis of their personal research and they would not tolerate any infringement of those beliefs. They used to consider any infringement of their theological stance to amount to doctrinal exaggeration (*al-ghuluww*) to the extent that they considered the negation of forgetfulness for the Imāms to be akin to such exaggeration. It is possible that they even considered any concept of the delegation of divine powers, any sort of elevation, miracles and extraordinary acts, negation of defects, and knowledge of the secrets of the heavens and the earth attributed to the Imāms as doctrinal exaggeration and worthy of censure. This is especially in light of the fact that people professing deviant religious ideas and beliefs had concealed themselves among the Shi‘ite, mixing with them and deceiving them.

In short, it is clear that the early scholars disagreed on theological issues such that there would be a matter considered by some of them to amount to disbelief or doctrinal exaggeration while the same matter would be considered a requirement of the faith by others, or it could be that the matter was neither this nor that. Or perhaps the source of their disparagement would be their feeling that a tradition was a fabrication by those deceitful exaggerators or that the claim of the leading scholars of the sect that a certain tradition was a fabrication of those extremists’.

Al-Muḥaqqiq al-Bihbahāni writes,

‘It should be known that (Aḥmad bin Muḥammad bin ‘Isa and) al-Ghaḍā’iri used to accuse a narrator of lies or fabrications *after* having accused him of doctrinal exaggeration as if his transmission indicated that’.¹⁰

⁸ *Mu'jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, pages 113-114 of the introduction, in the Najaf edition and pages 101-103 of the Lebanon edition.

⁹ *Kuliyātū fī 'Ilm al-Rijāl*, page 81-106.

The Utility of a Weak Report.

Previously, it was pointed out that the later Shi‘ite scholars classified the traditions into a fourfold division: *ṣaḥīḥ*-authentic, *ḥasan*-good, *muwathāq*-reliable and *da‘īf*-weak. A *ṣaḥīḥ* tradition is one that has been transmitted from an infallible by a continuous chain consisting of veracious Imāmis. A *ḥasan* tradition is one that has been transmitted from an infallible by a continuous chain consisting of commendable Imāmis but where there is no explicit or clear statement of their veracity. A *muwathāq* tradition is one that has been transmitted from an infallible by a continuous chain consisting of veracious individuals, some of whom may espouse unorthodox beliefs and ideas. Given these definitions, a *da‘īf* tradition is contrary to all three categories, though it may be in accord with reality and perhaps more so than the other three categories. However, due to the criteria established in the science of hadith, verification of such a tradition will not have probative authority.

Hence, in light of this explanation, if there is a tradition regarding a specific matter that is judged weak, it is not possible to abandon it simply on the basis of its weakness. This is because every tradition has an effect and a bearing on the soul of an individual with respect to its reliability. Therefore, if reasons for its reliability increase then the degree of its reliability also increases in the estimation of a person.

In light of the above, if it is assumed that the chains of Ziyāratu ‘Āshūrā’ are weak (although such an assumption is incorrect as will be proven later), then these five chains, especially in light of the individuals who feature in them who are peerless and who cared to transmit this salutation, still inspires confidence in its truthfulness when the separate chains are considered together and in their totality. One should therefore not be hasty in rejecting this salutation on the basis of the weakness of its chain.

Principle of Leniency in Deducing Proofs for Recommended Acts (*al-tasāmuḥ fī adillati al-sunan*).

The principle of leniency in deducing proofs for recommended acts is one that is widely known among scholars. The significance of this principle is that a researcher does not insist on the fulfilment of those stringent conditions that are necessary in establishing obligatory acts and duties, when attempting to ascertain recommended acts. For example, one of these stringent conditions is that the narrators in a chain must be absolutely reliable and trustworthy. This condition is however, not mandatory in ascertaining recommended acts.

¹⁰ Al-Fawā’id al-Rijāliyya of Waḥīd al-Bihbahāni, pages 38-39, printed at the end of the work Rijāl al-Khāqāni. The same may be found on page 8 of this work printed as part of the introduction of Minhāj al-Maqāl.

It is sufficient even if a recommended act is transmitted by means of an inferior chain in terms of the reliability and trustworthiness of the narrators who appear in it.

This principle is addressed and discussed by both Sunni and Shi'ite scholars. The Sunni scholars refer to it as 'an act based on a weak tradition, (which is nevertheless encouraged) because of the merits of virtuous acts'- *al-'amal bi al-khabar al-da'if fi fadā'il al-a'māl*. The following scholars have alluded to this principle in their respective works:

- 1) Al-Shahīd al-Awwal in his work, *Al-Dhikrā*.
- 2) Ibn Fahd al-Ḥilli (d 854 AH) in his work, *'Uddat al-Dā'ir*.
- 3) Al-Shahīd al-Thāni (d 966 AH) in his work, *Al-Dirāya*.
- 4) Bahā al-Dīn al-Āmili (d 1030 AH) in his work, *Al-Arba'īna*.
- 5) Shaykh al-Anṣārī (d 1282 AH) in a special treatise devoted to discussing this principle.

Shaykh al-Kulayni transmits the following authentic report from Ibn Abi 'Umayr who in turn reports from Hishām bin Sālim who heard from Abu 'Abdullah al-Ṣādiq (as) that:

“One, who learns of the merits and virtues of an act and as a result carries it out, will be eligible for that reward, even if later that report proves to be inauthentic”.¹¹

Scholars have elaborated at length on this and other traditions similar to it, as well as discussing whether or not such reports accord the act a position of being meritorious and recommended. However, further discussion on this subject is not necessary here as the issue has been considered at length both in this paper and in our jurisprudential lectures.¹²

It should be noted that there is no aim to encourage the transmission and propagation of weak reports by means of these traditions, rather the aim is to preserve the teachings and traditions of the Prophet and the Imāms so that they may not be abandoned simply because the chain is deemed weak.

Therefore, if it is assumed that the chains of this Ziyārat are weak, (an incorrect assumption), a Shi'ite Muslim will still obtain the rewards mentioned for this Ziyārat if he recites it with a heart brimming with grief and sadness due to the oppression and injustices to which Imām al-Ḥusayn (as) was subjected.

Some pertinent points have been mentioned briefly here. A reader who gives due consideration to these points and those to follow in the study of the chains of Ziyāratu 'Āshūrā' will come to realize that the Ziyārat is a reliable one, which has its origins with the Imāms of the Ahlulbayt (as). It ensued from a pained and sorrowful heart, denouncing the

¹¹ Waṣā'il al-Shi'a, volume 1, chapter 18, hadith number 6. This chapter contains traditions on the acts required to be carried out in preparation for the formal rituals.

¹² Irshād al-'Uqūl volume 3, pages 435-444.

politics of tyranny and oppression perpetrated by the Banu Umayya against the Ahlulbayt and that it was and continues to remain radiant throughout the centuries.

Ziyāratu ‘Āshūrā’: An Analytical Study of the Reports of
the Pilgrimage to Imām al-Husayn (a.s.) on the Day of
‘Āshūrā’.

By Āyatullāh Shaykh Ja‘far Subhānī.

Translated by Afzal Sumar.

Edited by: The Sun Behind The Cloud Publications.

This translation is dedicated to the warm memory of my two
late grandmothers, Mrs Nurbanubai Sumar (Maa), Mrs
Marziyabai Khalfan (Nani maa), my late grandfather Mr
Ahmadbhai Sumar, my late great aunt Mrs Sughrabai Dinani
and my two late cousins Miss Taherabai Kara and Miss
Fatimbai Manji. Heartfelt gratitude is due to Aly Nasser and
Miqdad Versi for reading the entire draft of the translation and
suggesting feedback.

Shaykh Ja‘far Subhānī published this essay in Arabic in the
third volume of a series of four volumes. The four Volumes are
titled “Letters and Essays: Researches on the subjects of
Philosophy, Theology, Law, Jurisprudence and Society.” The
edition consulted for this translation was the first edition,
obtained by the translator whilst studying in the erstwhile
precincts of the mausoleum of the Lady Zainab (a.s.) in the city
of Damascus in the year 2008 AD. These volumes were
published by the Imām al-Şādiq (a.s.) Institute in the year 2002
AD.

Ziyāratu¹ ‘Āshūrā’: An Analytical Study of the Reports of the Pilgrimage to Imām al-Ḥusayn (a.s.) on the Day of ‘Āshūrā’.

By Āyatullāh Shaykh Ja‘far Subḥānī².

Translated by Afzal Sumar.

The recommendation to visit the grave of the Lord of the Martyrs, Imām al-Ḥusayn (a.s.) (d. 61 A.H. / 680 A.D.) on the tenth day of the month of Muḥarram, is one on which the scholars of the Imāmiyya sect have collectively agreed on throughout the centuries. This consensus is the best proof of its authenticity and its origins from the Imāms of the House of the Prophet, may the peace and blessings of Allāh be upon them all.

A question has been posed concerning the authenticity of the reports that recommend this pilgrimage, which are included in the books of the Imāmiyya. This essay has been written in order to set aside any doubts, regarding the authenticity of the recommendation of this pilgrimage.

The reports encouraging the pilgrimage to the grave of the Lord of the Martyrs on the tenth day of the month of Muḥarram, have been narrated through five chains of transmissions.

The distinguished jurist and leader of the Imāmiyya sect, Shaykh Ṭūṣī (d. 460 A.H. / 1067 A.D.) has recorded three reports in his book *Miṣbāḥul Mutaḥajjid wa Ṣilāḥul Mut‘abbid*. Each report has its own chain of transmission. The first report, simply describes the rewards of visiting the grave, without providing the well-known text of the salutation, which is supposed to be recited at the site of the grave. However, the two other reports both state the text of the salutation.

In addition, Ibn Qawlawayhi (d. 369 A.H. / 979 A.D.) has recorded two reports of this recommendation in his book *Kāmil al-Ziyārāt* and both reports include a chain of transmission. Therefore the reports total five in number. In what follows, the five reports and their respective chains of transmissions will be presented and examined.

¹ Translator’s note: The term "Ziyārat" as used in the Imāmiyya religious texts tends to mean one or both of the following two meanings. It can mean the physical act of visiting the grave of a saint and / or the recitation of a specific salutation text either at the site of the grave or from afar.

² Translator’s note: This analysis and the resultant conclusion arrived at in this article are those of the author himself and readers should know that other scholars may, (and indeed have) arrived at different conclusions. Settling on one or the other conclusion should rest on an impartial comparison between the various studies undertaken on this subject.

The First Chain of Transmission.

The Chain of the Report about the Rewards of the Pilgrimage to the Grave of Imām al-Ḥusayn (a.s.).

Shaykh Ṭūṣī reports: Narrated Muḥammad bin Ismā‘il bin Bazi‘, from Ṣāliḥ bin ‘Uqba, from his father, from Abu Ja‘far³ (a.s.) (d. 114 A.H. / 732 A.D.) who said: "Whoever visits the grave of al-Ḥusayn bin ‘Ali (a.s.) on the day of ‘Āshūrā’, in the month of Muḥarram and persists in weeping at his grave, then Allāh the Glorified and Exalted will receive him on the Day of Judgment with the reward of two thousand major pilgrimages, two thousand minor pilgrimages and two thousand military expeditions. The reward of each major and minor pilgrimage and military expedition will be akin to having undertaken them with the Prophet of Allāh and the Rightly Guided Imāms."

The narrator said: "May I be ransomed for you⁴, but what about him who lives in far and distant lands and is unable to travel there (i.e. to the site of the grave) on that day?"

He (the Imām) said: 'If that is so, then let such a person go out into the desert or climb up to the terrace or roof-top of his house and gesture in the direction of the grave of Imām al-Ḥusayn (a.s.); send greetings and salutations and exert himself in invoking curses on his enemies. Thereafter he should recite two units of prayer. This ritual should be done at the beginning part of the day, before the sun passes its zenith. Thereafter, he should lament and weep over al-Ḥusayn (a.s.), and command the people of his house, who are unaware of it, to cry over al-Ḥusayn (a.s.). He should establish mourning in his house by expressing grief and sorrow over al-Ḥusayn (a.s.). Some of them are to console others of their feelings of distress. If they do all this, then I am their guarantor near Allāh the Exalted.'

I said (i.e. the narrator, in a state of amazement): 'May I be ransomed for you, are you their guarantor in that?!'

He (the Imam) said: 'I am the guarantor for him who does that.'

I (i.e. the narrator) said: 'But how do some of us console others?'

He (the Imam) said: 'You should say: "May Allāh magnify our recompense due to our distress for al-Ḥusayn (a.s.). May He establish you and us from amongst those who seek to avenge his murder, in the company of His friend, the Imām al-Mahdi from the progeny of Muḥammad."

³ Translator's Note: This was the epithet of the fifth Twelver Shi'a Imām Muḥammad bin ‘Ali al-Bāqir (a.s.).

⁴ Translator's Note: This is an expression of respect found in Arabic texts used to address noble and venerable people.

(The Imām continues). ‘Furthermore, if one is able to abstain from spending this day in fulfilling needs⁵, then do so, for it is a day of misfortune and calamity, in which the needs of a faithful are not fulfilled. If the need is fulfilled, it will not be blessed and he will not see any goodness in it. None of you must attempt to accumulate anything for the future in his house on that day; for he who does so will not obtain any blessings in what he has accumulated and neither will his family.

Thus if they do this, Allāh will ordain for them the reward of a thousand major pilgrimages, a thousand minor pilgrimages and a thousand military expeditions, as if done with the Prophet of Allāh (saw). Additionally, for such a person will be the recompense of the suffering of every Prophet, Messenger, Successor (of the Prophets), the Truthful and the Martyr who was killed, since the creation of the world till the Day of Judgement.”⁶

Here ends the text reported by Shaykh Ṭūṣī regarding the rewards of the pilgrimage to Imām al-Ḥusayn (a.s.) on the day of ‘Āshūrā’. The report does not mention a specific salutation to be recited at the gravesite; rather it merely mentions the rewards of going out into the desert or climbing up to a high rooftop and pointing towards al-Ḥusayn’s gravesite with greetings, and exertion in cursing his enemies.

An Analysis of the Chain of This Tradition.

Shaykh Ṭūṣī has obtained the above tradition from the book of Muḥammad bin Ismā‘īl bin Bazi‘ and the Shaykh has mentioned his chain of authorities leading to Muḥammad bin Ismā‘īl bin Bazi‘’s book in his Fiḥrist⁷ as follows;

Ibn Abi Jīd, from Muḥammad bin al-Ḥassan bin al-Walīd, from ‘Ali bin Ibrāhīm, from Muḥammad bin Ismā‘īl bin Bazi‘.⁸

Thus the Shaykh narrates the rewards of visiting al-Husayn (a.s.) on the day of ‘Āshūrā’ from the following authorities:

Ibn Abi Jīd – Muḥammad bin al-Ḥassan bin al-Walīd – ‘Ali bin Ibrāhīm – Muḥammad bin Ismā‘īl bin Bazi‘ - Ṣāliḥ bin ‘Uqba – ‘Uqba bin Qays – from Abu Ja‘far al-Bāqir (a.s.).

A study of the integrity of these narrators:

1) Ibn Abi Jīd: His name is Aḥmad bin Muḥammad bin Abi Jīd, known by the epithet Abu al-Ḥassan. He was one of the authorities and teachers of Najāshi (d.

⁵Translator’s Note: What is meant here are a person’s worldly needs, the implication being that this day needs to be reserved solely for the remembrance of Imām al-Ḥusayn (as).

⁶ Misbāḥul Mutaḥajjid wa Ṣilāḥul Muta‘abbid, pg 713

⁷ Translator's note: This is one of Shaykh Ṭūṣī’s books of biographies.

⁸ Al-Fiḥrist, pg 160, in the chapter on Muḥammad, no. 606, and the Shaykh mentions him also on pg 183, no 705.

450 A.H. / 1058 A.D.) and Shaykh Ṭūṣī; the teachers of Najāshi are all trustworthy and reliable.

2) Muḥammad bin al-Ḥassan bin al-Walīd: He died in the year 343 A.H. (954 A.D.) and was among the important leaders and respected authorities of the (Imāmiyya) sect, such that his integrity is beyond doubt. Shaykh Ṣadūq learned the science of "biographical analysis" from him. This science is known as 'Ilm al-Ta'dīl wa al-Tajrīh.

3) 'Alī bin Ibrāhīm al-Qummi: He was a teacher of Shaykh Kulayni and lived until the year 307 A.H. (919 A.D.) He was one of the authorities of the (Imāmiyya) sect, without equal and unrivalled in his integrity.

4) Muḥammad bin Ismā'īl bin Bazī': He was from the companions of Abu al-Ḥassan (al-Kādhim), al-Ridhā' and al-Jawād (a.s). Shaykh Ṭūṣī remarks concerning his character in his Rijāl: "reliable, veracious and a Kufan"⁹ (i.e. from Kufā in 'Irāq). In addition Najāshi says: "He was from amongst the virtuous and trustworthy members of the (Imāmiyya) sect, and abundant in doing good deeds."¹⁰

5) Ṣāliḥ bin 'Uqba: He is Ṣāliḥ bin 'Uqba bin Qays bin Sim'ān. Najāshi introduces him as; Ṣāliḥ bin 'Uqba bin Qays bin Sim'ān bin Abi Rabiḥa. He narrates from his father, who in turn narrates from his own father and from Zayd bin Shahhām. Whilst those who narrate from him include: Muḥammad bin al-Ḥusayn bin Abi al-Khattāb and his son (i.e. Ṣāliḥ's son) Ismā'īl bin Ṣāliḥ bin 'Uqba.¹¹

It needs to be pointed out here that the person by the name of Ṣāliḥ bin 'Uqba mentioned in this chain must not be confused with Ṣāliḥ bin 'Uqba bin Khālīd al-Asadi. This is because Muḥammad bin Ismā'īl bin Bazī' narrates from Ṣāliḥ bin 'Uqba bin Khālīd al-Asadi through the intermediary of Muḥammad bin Ayyub whilst he narrates without any intermediary from Ṣāliḥ bin 'Uqba bin Qays bin Sim'ān. This is proved from a study of the chain of authorities of Najāshi to the book of Khālīd al-Asadi, where he writes, after mentioning a number of his teachers and authorities..."from Muḥammad bin Ismā'īl bin Bazī', from Muḥammad bin Ayyub, from Ṣāliḥ bin 'Uqba bin Khālīd al-Asadi".¹² Thus it can be seen that Muḥammad bin Ismā'īl bin Bazī' transmits from Ṣāliḥ bin 'Uqba bin Khālīd al-Asadi via an intermediary, whereas he transmits directly from Ṣāliḥ bin 'Uqba bin Qays bin Sim'ān as observed in the chain above which is the subject of the current scrutiny.

This is further supported by the chain recorded by Shaykh Ṭūṣī where he writes; "Ṣāliḥ bin 'Uqba possesses a book, about which Ibn Abi Jīd informed us, from Ibn al-Walīd, from al-Ṣaffār, from Muḥammad bin al-Ḥusayn, from Muḥammad bin

⁹ Rijāl of -Shaykh Ṭūṣī pg 364, in the chapter on the companions of al-Ridhā' (a.s.), no. 6.

¹⁰ Rijāl of Najāshi, vol 2 pg 214, no. 894.

¹¹ Rijāl of Najāshi, vol 1 pg 444, no. 530.

¹² Rijāl of Najāshi, vol 1, pg 445, no. 532.

Ismā'īl bin Bazi', from him".¹³ And the person meant here by the word "him" is Ṣāliḥ bin 'Uqba bin Qays and not Khālīd al-Asadi. Thus what Muḥaqqiq al-Tustari assumed is incorrect.¹⁴

Therefore according to a general rule regarding all that Najāshi mentions, Ṣāliḥ bin 'Uqba bin Qays bin Sim'ān bin Abi Rabiḥa was an Imāmi, for had he been other than that, then Najāshi would have raised an objection about his sectarian affiliations, just as, if there was a concern about his integrity, then he would have mentioned it.

The scholars of the science of Rijāl¹⁵ such as Seyyid Baḥr al-'Ulūm al-Ṭabāṭabāi (d 1212 A.H. / 1797 A.D.) have relied on this general rule. He mentions this general rule as the tenth benefit in his book al-Fawā'id al-Rijāliyya. He held the view that all those narrators whom Shaykh Ṭūṣī and Najāshi mention in their (two) books (of Rijāl) are from among the Shi'ite Imāmiyya, of correct sectarian affiliation and praiseworthy in a general sense. These are the attributes, which qualified them to be mentioned among the scholarly authors. Furthermore, due to these very same attributes, attention was also paid to their significance and the significance of their books; the mentioning of the paths of transmission to them; along with citing the names of those who narrated from them; as well as those whom they narrated from. This is with the exception of those among them, who were stipulated on the contrary to be from the Zaydiyya¹⁶ or Faṭḥiyya¹⁷ or the Wāqifiyya¹⁸ and others.

In light of this, Ṣāliḥ bin 'Uqba bin Qays bin Sim'ān bin Abi Rabiḥa was an Imāmi, praiseworthy in a general sense, which was the reason he was included in the books.

Secondly, from another perspective, two noble authorities from the great Shi'ite scholars narrate from him. They are: Muḥammad bin al-Ḥusayn bin Abi al-Khaṭṭāb (died in the year 262 A.H. / 875 A.D.), and Muḥammad bin Ismā'īl bin Bazi', who was one of the great Shi'ite scholars.

Admittedly, Ibn al- Ghadhāiri has considered him (Ṣāliḥ bin 'Uqba) to be weak, just as Allāma Hilli (d 726 A.H. / 1325 A.D.) has mentioned in his book Al-Khulāṣa where he writes concerning Salih bin 'Uqba; "Extremist, liar, he is not to be paid any attention to."¹⁹

¹³ Al-Fihrist pg 110, no. 364.

¹⁴ Qāmus al- Rijāl, vol 5, pg 465, no. 3633.

¹⁵ Translator's note: The discipline of Rijāl is the science, which studies the integrity, or otherwise of the narrators who appear in the chains of traditions.

¹⁶ Translator's note: Those who opted for the Imāmate of Zayd bin 'Ali, another son of the fourth Imām Zainul Ābideen (a.s.), rather than Muḥammad al-Bāqir (a.s.).

¹⁷ Translator's note: Those who opted to follow the eldest son of Imām Ja'fer al-Ṣādiq (a.s.), namely; 'Abdullah bin Aftāḥ, after the sixth Imam's demise.

¹⁸ Translator's note: Those who halted at the Imāmate of the seventh Imām Mūsa bin Ja'fer (a.s.), after his death, claiming ignorance of any stipulated succession.

¹⁹ Al-Khulāṣa, second section, pg 23; Rijāl al-Najāshi, no.894.

However, the disparagement of Ibn al- Ghadhāiri is not to be relied upon, for he has criticized many of our scholars and trustworthy people who were unparalleled and peerless in their integrity. Ibn al- Ghadhāiri had some unique beliefs and ideas about the twelve Imams and whoever disregarded these views or narrated a tradition on the topic of the Imāmate which did not agree with his beliefs, tended to be described by him as an extremist and as a liar, as in this speech: "extremist, liar, he is not to be paid any attention to." This is proof that his describing somebody with falsehood, was because of his (Ibn al- Ghadhāiri's) suspicions of extremism.

Indeed, how is it possible for Ṣāliḥ bin 'Uqba to be described as an extremist when he was from the authorities of Muḥammad bin al-Ḥusayn bin Abi al-Khattāb and Muḥammad bin Ismā'īl bin Bazi', who was mentioned in the presence of al-Ridhā' (a.s.), who said (about Muḥammad bin Ismā'īl bin Bazi'); "I would love to see people like him amongst you." He was a person towards whose person and book, the two authorities Najāshi and Ṭūsi devoted their attention to, so it can be concluded that his trustworthiness and reliability was strong and his narrations are reliable.

6) 'Uqba bin Qays bin Sim'an: Shaykh Ṭūṣī has mentioned him in his Rijāl and considered him from the companions of Imām al-Bāqir (a.s.)²⁰. His being a companion of Imām al-Bāqir (a.s.) proves that he was an Imāmi and the Shaykh has not criticized him.

Here ends the study of the first chain of the report presented by Shaykh Ṭūṣī, regarding the rewards of visiting the grave of Imām al-Ḥusayn (a.s.) on the day of 'Āshūrā'. It can be concluded here that the chain has no defects and it is one of the *ḥasan*²¹ chains, in the sense of being generally praiseworthy.

The Second Chain of Transmission.

The Chain to The Text of the Salutation Recital, as narrated by Shaykh Ṭūṣī.

The important thing here is the study of the chain by which Shaykh Ṭūṣī narrates the text of the salutation. He writes:

Ṣāliḥ bin 'Uqba and Sayf bin 'Umayra narrate from 'Alqama bin Muḥammad al-Ḥadhrami who reports: "I said to Abu Ja'far (al-Bāqir) (a.s.); 'Teach me a salutation by which I may greet and salute him (al-Ḥusayn) on that day (i.e. the day of 'Āshūrā'), if I were to visit him from near, and by gesturing towards him when from afar and when at home."

'Alqama said: "He (al-Bāqir (a.s.) said to me 'O 'Alqama, if you recite two units of prayer after gesturing towards him with greetings and salutations, then say these

²⁰Rijāl al-Ṭūṣī, pg 142, in the chapter of the companions of Imām al-Bāqir (a.s.), no.74.

²¹ Translator's note: A chain of transmitters, which is classified as *ḥasan*, is one where all the transmitters are Imāmi but the moral probity of each transmitter is not individually confirmed, rather it would be individually confirmed for some and deduced on a general level from indirect evidences, for others.

words after glorifying²² Allah.²³ And so if you say that, then you will have greeted and saluted him with words by which the angels greet him. And Allah will elevate you a million ranks and you will be like him who was martyred with al-Husayn (a.s.) and you will share with them in their ranks. Then you will be known as being with the martyrs who were martyred with him. Allah will ordain for you the reward of visiting every Prophet and every Messenger and (the reward) of the pilgrimage of every person who visited al-Husayn (a.s.) since he and his family were killed.'

The Salutation:

'Greetings unto you O Abā 'Abdillah²⁴. Greetings unto you O Son of the Messenger of Allah. Greetings unto you O Son of the Prince of Believers and the Son of the Leader of the Successors. Greetings unto you O son of Fātima, the Mistress of the Women of the Worlds...'

"Then he (al-Bāqir) (a.s.) said – after specifying the salutations once and invoking of curses once – 'then prostrate and say:

"O Lord, for you is the praise, the praise of the thankful ones, (even) during adversities and tribulations. Praise be to Allah for my intense grief. O Lord, grant me the intercession of al-Husayn on the Day of Judgement, and strengthen me in truth, with you and with al-Husayn, and with al-Husayn's companions who sacrificed themselves for al-Husayn (a.s.)."

Then 'Alqama said: "Abu Ja'far (al-Bāqir) (a.s.) said; 'If you are able to greet and salute him (al-Husayn) every day with this salutation from your house, then do so, and you will obtain the reward of all that (all the above-mentioned rewards)."²⁵

This is the conclusion of the report of the salutation of 'Āshūrā', along with its chain and text.

An Analysis of The Chain of This Report.

The manner of the mode of expression makes apparent that Shaykh Ṭūṣī has taken this tradition from the book of Muḥammad bin Ismā'īl bin Bazī' regarding whose reliability there is no doubt, rather the need for verification is for those whom he narrates from.

²² Translator's note: The actual Arabic word used here is "Takbīr".

²³ Translator's note: Thus the sequence of acts which is recommended is as follows; Takbīr – then the recitation of the salutation whilst pointing and gesturing towards the Imām's grave – then two units of prayer.

²⁴. Translator's note: This was the epithet of Imām al-Husayn (a.s.). It means "the father of 'Abdullah". Men in the Arab tradition tend to be given such epithets as "O father of..." with the name following being generally, that of the eldest son.

²⁵Misbāḥul Mutaḥajjid pg 715 - 718.

Thus Muḥammad bin Ismā‘īl bin Bazi‘ narrates the text of the salutation through the following chain: Ṣāliḥ bin ‘Uqba and Sayf bin ‘Umayra, and they from ‘Alqama bin Muḥammad al-Ḥadhrami.

As for Ṣāliḥ bin ‘Uqba, his biographical details have been presented above, as well as the fact that he is considered in the books of Rijāl (biographies) to be an Imāmi and praiseworthy in a general sense. However other evidences prove that he was acceptable in his narrations despite the criticisms of Ibn al-Ghadhāiri.

Nevertheless, if we were to assume the absence of proof of his trustworthiness, this does not affect the authenticity of the chain, for Muḥammad bin Ismā‘īl bin Bazi‘ narrates the text of the salutation from two persons; one of them being Ṣāliḥ bin ‘Uqba and the other being Sayf bin ‘Umayra and the second is reliable without doubt.

Najāshi says: Sayf bin ‘Umayra al-Nakha‘i was an Arab, a Kufan and trustworthy. He reports from Abu ‘Abdillah (the sixth Imām al-Ṣādiq (a.s.) and Abu al-Ḥasan (the seventh Imām al-Kādhim (a.s.)). He possessed a book and a group of our companions narrate from it.²⁶

Shaykh Ṭūṣi has explicitly declared his trustworthiness in his Fiḥrist.²⁷

Thus, so far, the narrators are all trustworthy and consequently the narration is authentic. Now there remains the need to verify the last narrator: ‘Alqama bin Muḥammad al-Ḥadhrami.

Shaykh Ṭūṣi regarded ‘Alqama to be one of the companions of al-Bāqir (a.s.) and al-Ṣādiq (a.s) (d. 148 A.H. / 765 A.D.).²⁸

There is no explicit statement about his veracity in the books of biographies; however other evidences testify to his reliability, such as:

1) Al-Kashi (floruit in the first half of the fourth century hijri) reports from Bukār bin Abi Bakr al-Ḥadhrami, who said: "Abu Bakr and ‘Alqama visited Zayd bin ‘Ali (d. 122 A.H./ 739 A.D.). ‘Alqama was older than my father. Zayd seated one of them on his right and the other on his left. It had reached their attention that he was saying; 'the Imam from amongst us²⁹ is not one who is politically quiescent³⁰. So Abu Bakr, who was the more courageous of the two, said to him (Zayd), 'O Abu al-

²⁶ Rijāl al-Najāshi vol 1, pg 425, no.502.

²⁷ Fiḥrist of Shaykh Ṭūṣi pg 104, no. 335.

²⁸ Rijāl of Shaykh Ṭūṣi, pg 140, in the section of the Companions of al-Bāqir (a.s.), no. 38 and in the section of the Companions of al-Ṣādiq (a.s.), pg 262, no.641

²⁹ Translator’s note: The phrase ‘from amongst us’ here, means ‘from amongst the ahl al-bayt.’

³⁰ Translator’s note: A literal translation of the Arabic text would be ‘the Imām from amongst us is not one who lowers the curtain down over himself, rather the Imām is one who draws his sword.’

Ḥasan, tell me about ‘Ali bin Abi Ṭālib (a.s.). Was he an Imām when he was leading a politically quiet life³¹ or did he not become an Imām till he drew his sword?

Zayd understood the intent of his speech, and so remained silent and didn't answer. Abu Bakr repeated his question to him three times and every time Zayd did not answer him.

So he (Abu Bakr) said to him (Zayd): ' If ‘Ali bin Abi Ṭālib was an Imām even when he was politically inactive then it is possible that there is an Imām after him who also leads a politically inactive life, and if ‘Ali was not an Imām and leading a politically inactive life, then what is your problem here?'

(At that moment), ‘Alqama insisted that Abu Bakr should restrain himself (from carrying on his speech) and so Abu Bakr kept silent."³²

This tradition reveals that the two brothers possessed insight in the matter of the Imāmate.

2) Furthermore, on the basis of the forthcoming analysis of the third chain below, through which Shaykh Ṭūsī narrates the text of the salutation, it can be determined that Sayf bin ‘Umayra, the trustworthy narrator (*al-thiqa*), complained to Ṣafwān bin Mihrān, also a trustworthy narrator (*al-thiqa*), that the supplication by which he supplicated³³, doesn't appear in the report of ‘Alqama from al-Bāqir (a.s.), whereupon Ṣafwān excused himself and clarified that he had heard the supplication from Imām al-Sādiq (a.s.) during the course of the latter's pilgrimage to his ancestor al-Ḥusayn (a.s.).

Thus Sayf's complaint at the absence of the supplication, and the response of Ṣafwān that he had heard it from Imām al- Ṣādiq (a.s.), delineates from the acceptability of these two trustworthy men, the trustworthiness of ‘Alqama bin Muḥammad al-Ḥadhrami, for if not, then Sayf bin ‘Umayra would not have advanced ‘Alqama's report as an argument, and Ṣafwān would not have responded to him that he had heard it (the supplication) from al-Ṣādiq (a.s.).

On this basis, it is known that the reported supplication (to be recited after the salutation) is not from ‘Alqama, even though it is famously believed to have been reported from him, rather it is reported from Ṣafwān bin Mihrān.

Therefore, the following conclusion can be deduced:

1) That the chain of Shaykh Ṭūṣī leading to the book of Muḥammad bin Ismā‘īl bin Bāzī is authentic as found in (his) Fiḥrist.

³¹ Translator's note: This is obviously a reference to the approximately twenty five years of political hiatus in the life of Imām ‘Ali (a.s.), beginning from soon after the death of the Prophet till his election as Caliph in the year 35 A.H.

³² Al-Kashi, the number of the biography is 416, and 417

³³ Translator's note: The supplication referred to here is the one customarily recited after the recital of the salutation text. This supplication is commonly known as the Du‘ā al-‘Alqamā..

2) That Muḥammad bin Ismā‘īl bin Bazī‘ is unanimously agreed upon to be trustworthy.

3) That Sayf bin ‘Umayra is trustworthy, which has been explicitly declared by Najāshi.

4) That ‘Alqama bin Muḥammad al-Ḥadhrami is trustworthy according to the evidences made known.

This brings to a close the second chain. Thus if we were to maintain the trustworthiness of ‘Alqama, then the chain is authentic (i.e. *sahih*)³⁴ and if not, then it is good (*hasan*) according to general praiseworthiness.

The Third Chain of Transmission.

The Chain to The Text of the Salutation.

Shaykh Ṭūṣī has an additional third chain in (his book) *Misbāḥ al-Mutaḥajjid* for the text of this salutation.

Shaykh Ṭūṣī reports: Muḥammad bin Khālid al-Ṭayālīsī narrated from Sayf bin ‘Umayra who said; "I rode out with Ṣafwān bin Mihrān al-Jammāl towards al-Ghāriy,³⁵ and a group of our companions were with us. This was after Abu ‘Abdillah (a.s.) (i.e. Imām al-Ṣādiq) had left. Later we set out for Medina from al-Hīra.³⁶

When we had completed performing the pilgrimage rites, Ṣafwān turned his face in the direction of the grave of Abu ‘Abdillah (al-Ḥusayn) (a.s.) and said to us: 'salute and greet al- Ḥusayn (a.s.) from this place, from the place of the head of the grave of the Prince of the Believers³⁷, the blessings of Allah be upon him, for Abu ‘Abdillah (al- Ṣādiq) (a.s.) pointed towards it (towards the grave of al-Husayn) from right here, and I was with him."

He (Sayf bin ‘Umayra) said: "Then Ṣafwān recited the salutation, which ‘Alqama bin Muḥammad al-Ḥadhrami had narrated from Abu Ja‘far al-Bāqir (a.s.) for the day of ‘Āshura. Thereafter he recited two units of prayer at the head of the grave of the Prince of the Believers. At the end of these two rites, he bid farewell to the Prince of the Believers and gestured towards (the grave of) al-Ḥusayn (a.s.) in the state of salutations and greetings, making his departure while his face was turned towards his

³⁴ Translator’s note: A *sahih* chain is one where all the narrators in the chain are Imāmi and the moral probity of each one of them has been individually established.

³⁵Translator's note: This is the name of the place where Imām Ali (a.s.) is buried. Another, more well-known name for this place is al-Najaf-al-Ashraf.

³⁶ Translator's note: From the context of this report, as will become clear a little later on, it seems that Sayf bin ‘Umayra, along with Ṣafwān al- Jammāl and their companions rode out to the grave site of ‘Ali bin Abi Ṭālib in order to pay homage to him at his grave. They then later paid homage to Imām al-Ḥusayn (a.s.) from the same spot, i.e. from near the grave of ‘Ali bin Abi Ṭālib (a.s.).

³⁷Translator's note: "Prince of the Believers" is the famous title of ‘Ali bin Abi Ṭālib (a.s.).

(al-Ḥusayn's) direction and bid him farewell. At the end he recited the following supplication:

'O Allah! O Allah! O Allah! O He who responds to the call of the afflicted...' (The famous supplication, widely known as the supplication of 'Alqama).

This tradition is clear that Ṣafwān greeted Imām al-Ḥusayn (a.s.) by the salutation text, which 'Alqama bin Muḥammad al-Ḥadhrami had narrated.

At the end of the tradition, Sayf bin 'Umayra says; "So I asked Ṣafwān: 'Alqama bin Muḥammad al- Ḥadhrami did not narrate this supplication, by which I mean, 'O Allah! O Allah! O Allah! O He who responds to the call of the afflicted...!' Rather he narrated only the text of the salutation!' So Ṣafwān replied: 'I arrived with my Master, Abu 'Abdillah al-Ṣādiq (a.s.) at this place and he acted in a similar way to how we acted in our pilgrimage rituals and he supplicated with this supplication when bidding farewell after having recited the ritual prayers which we had recited, and he bade farewell in the same manner as we bade farewell.'

Thus the disagreement was regarding the supplication that is recited after the salutation, whereas there is no disagreement about the famous text of the salutation, which is accepted and acknowledged.

The report continues further as follows:³⁸

"Then Ṣafwān said to me: 'Abū 'Abdillah (al-Ṣādiq) (a.s.) said to me: "Commit yourself to the recitation of this salutation, and supplicate by this supplication (of 'Alqama) and visit him (i.e. Imam al-Ḥusayn (a.s.) for I am a guarantor near Allāh the Most High for anyone who visited and greeted (al-Ḥusayn) with this salutation and supplicated by this supplication from near or from afar: that his visit will be accepted, his endeavours acknowledged and appreciated, his greetings arriving (at their intended destination) without being veiled (or concealed) and his needs fulfilled by Allāh however difficult, and He (Allāh) will not disappoint him.

O Ṣafwān! I obtained this salutation guaranteed with this guarantee from my father, and my father from his father 'Ali bin al-Ḥusayn (a.s.). 'Ali bin al-Ḥusayn (a.s.) obtained it from his father al-Ḥusayn, and al-Ḥusayn from his brother al-Ḥasan, and al- Ḥasan from his father, the Prince of the Believers. The Prince of the Believers obtained it from the Prophet of Allāh, and the Prophet of Allāh from Gabriel and Gabriel from Allāh, Great and Exalted. The guarantee is that Allāh, Great and Exalted, has taken it upon Himself that whosoever visits and greets al-Ḥusayn (a.s.) with this salutation text, from near or from afar and supplicates with this supplication then He will accept his greetings and his supplication with regards to his problem however difficult, and will fulfil his wish. Thereafter the visitor will not turn away from Allah disappointed, rather Allah will turn his state into a happy one; (a state) whereby his eyes will be delighted by the granting of his requests and success in heaven and emancipation from hell. Furthermore, Allah will accept the

³⁸ Translator's note: The paragraphs that follow describing the exhortation of al-Ṣādiq (a.s.) to Ṣafwān to adhere to the recitation of this salutation and the accompanying supplication and the description of Allāh's guarantee are not part of the original article. The translator has appended it here for the sake of completion and wholesomeness. He has also sourced this passage from an edition of Miṣbāḥul Mutahajjid different to that of the author's.

intercession of any who intercedes, except the intercession of our opponent, the opponent of the people of the House (of the Prophet). Allah has undertaken this on Himself, and called us to witness what the angels of His realm had witnessed regarding that.

Then Gabriel said: 'O Messenger of Allāh, He (Allāh) has sent me to you with glad tidings and joy, and glad tidings and joy for 'Ali (a.s.) and Fātima and al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusayn (a.s.) and for the Imāms from his (al-Ḥusayn's) progeny till the Day of Judgment. So may your happiness and joy continue O Muḥammad, and that of 'Ali and Fātima and al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusayn and the Imāms from al-Husayn's progeny and that of your adherents till the Day of Resurrection.'

Then Ṣafwān said: 'Abū 'Abdillah (a.s.) said to me, 'If you happen to be in need and desire it's fulfilment from Allāh, then greet and salute (al-Ḥusayn) with this salutation wherever you may be, and supplicate with this supplication and beseech your need from your Lord, it will certainly be fulfilled by Allāh, for Allāh is not one who goes against His promise nor does He go against what He has blessed and graced His Messenger with, and all praise is due to Allāh.'³⁹

An Analysis of The Third Chain.

Shaykh Ṭūṣī has taken this tradition from the book of Muḥammad bin Khālid al-Ṭayālīsī and has mentioned his chain of transmission to this book in his Fiḥrist. He says: He (i.e. Muḥammad bin Khālid al-Ṭayālīsī) has a book which we have transmitted from al-Ḥusayn bin 'Abdallah (al-Ghadhāiri), from Ḥmed bin Muḥammad bin Yaḥya (the teacher of Shaykh Ṣadūq), from his father (Muḥammad bin Yaḥya al-'Attār al-Qummi), from Muḥammad bin 'Ali bin Maḥbūb, from him (i.e. Muḥammad bin Khālid al-Ṭayālīsī).⁴⁰

Shaykh Ṭūṣī's chain of transmission to the book (of Muḥammad bin Khālid al-Ṭayālīsī) is authentic and correct, and Ḥmed bin Muḥammad bin Yaḥya is one of the teachers and authorities of Shaykh Saduq. Shaykh Saduq narrates from him with appreciation and satisfaction, and the teachers do not need further verification.

It should be known that the judgment about the veracity of the chain of transmission depends on an analysis of the integrity of the narrators who occur in it, and the narrators who occur in this chain are: Muḥammad bin Khālid al-Ṭayālīsī, Sayf bin 'Umayra, and Ṣafwān bin Mihrān al-Jammāl.

As for the second narrator, Sayf bin 'Umayra, Najāshi has authenticated him, thus what remains is the need to analyse the first and third narrator.

³⁹ Miṣbāḥul Mutahajjid, pg 542 – 543 (Different edition: Published by Alami Library, Beirut Lebanon, P.O.Box 7120, 1998).³⁹

⁴⁰ Fiḥrist of Shaykh Ṭūṣī, pg 176, no: 648.

As for Muḥammad bin Khālīd al-Ṭayālīsī, Shaykh Ṭūṣī has considered him in his *Rijāl* to be one of the companions of al-Kādhim (a.s.).⁴¹ Further, the testimony of great authorities confirms and corroborates his veracity. These include:

- 1) ‘Ali bin al-Ḥasan bin al-Fadhāl
- 2) Sa‘d bin ‘Abdallah al-Qummi
- 3) Ḥamid bin Ziyād: Shaykh Ṭūṣī says in his *Fiḥrist*⁴² that: Ḥamid transmits many *Uṣūl*⁴³ from Muḥammad bin Khālīd al-Ṭayālīsī (who is) also known by the epithet of Abu ‘Abdillah.
- 4) ‘Ali bin Ibrāhīm al-Qummi
- 5) Muḥammad bin ‘Ali bin Maḥbūb
- 6) Muḥammad bin Yaḥya al-M‘ādī
- 7) Mu‘āwiyā bin Ḥakīm.⁴⁴

Najāshī writes: Muḥammad bin Khālīd bin ‘Umar al-Ṭayālīsī al-Ṭamīmī, Abu ‘Abdillah, died when three days were yet left in the month of Jamādi al-Ākhar in the year 259 A.H. (872 A.D.). He was ninety-seven years old.⁴⁵

And perhaps this number of verifications substantiates his eminence in ḥadīth and that he commanded prestige and dignity amongst the scholars of ḥadīth. Thus it can be concluded that he was an Imāmi and praiseworthy, and therefore acceptable in transmission.

As for the third narrator in the chain by whom I mean: Ṣafwān bin Mihrān, he was a Kufan and trustworthy, and known by the epithet of Abu ‘Abdillah.⁴⁶

Concluding Remarks.

⁴¹ *Rijāl* of Shaykh Ṭūṣī, pg 343, from amongst the companions of al-Kādhim (a.s.), no: 26. Observe also the chapter titled: "He who did not narrate from the Imāms," no: 11.

⁴² *Fiḥrist* of Shaykh Ṭūṣī, pg 176, no: 648.

⁴³ Translator's Note: The "Usuls" formed the primary texts of Shia hadith literature. They tended to be little notebooks or manuscripts compiled by the companions and disciples of the Imams, during their times. The companions would jot down the narrated traditions of the Imams as well as their teachings on various aspects of the faith. And if there was an intermediary between the compiler and the Imam, such an intermediary tended to be just one or two persons. This literature belonged to the time before the period of the larger compilations, which have come down to us today. Most of these primary compilations are no longer extant. Refer to the following article for further information on literature: <http://www.hawza.org.uk/index.php?option=content&task=view&id=133&Itemid=27>this

⁴⁴ *Mu‘jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, vol 18, pg 76.

⁴⁵ *Rijāl al-Najāshī*, vol 2, pg 229, no: 911.

⁴⁶ *Rijāl al-Najāshī* vol 1, pg 440, no: 523.

Here ends the analysis of the three chains of transmissions through which Shaykh Ṭūṣī reports the recommendation for the pilgrimage to the grave of Imam al-Ḥusayn (a.s.) as well as the text of the salutation to be recited at his gravesite, and the following conclusions can be deduced:

The first of the three chains of transmissions is the chain of Shaykh Ṭūṣī to the report, which describes the consequences of visiting al-Ḥusayn (a.s.) in terms of the rewards attainable, in a general sense. It was initially thought that to mention this report here would be a digression, however, Shaykh Ṭūṣī has narrated all three reports in one place and therefore we decided to mention it as well.

As for the second chain of transmission, Shaykh Ṭūṣī narrates it from Sayf bin ‘Umayra and he is reliable and trustworthy by consensus. He in turn narrates it from ‘Alqama bin Muḥammad al-Ḥadhrami. Shaykh Ṭūṣī did not elucidate his reliability; rather other evidences prove his trustworthiness.

As for the third chain, Shaykh Ṭūṣī narrates it from Muḥammad bin Khālīd al-Ṭayālīsī, from Sayf bin ‘Umayra, from Ṣafwān bin Mihrān. The last two are reliable. As for the first, the Shaykh did not elaborate on his reliability; rather other evidences prove the acceptability of his ḥadīth transmissions.

Next we will consider the chains of transmissions of Ibn Qawlawayhi to the text of this salutation.

The First Chain of Transmission of Ibn Qawlawayhi to the Text of the Salutation.

Ibn Qawlawayhi reports the salutation of the day of ‘Āshūrā’ in his book Kāmil al-Ziyārāt with the following chain:

Ḥakīm bin Dāwūd bin Ḥakīm and others narrated to me, from Muḥammad bin Mūsa al-Hamadāni, from Muḥammad bin Khālīd al-Ṭayālīsī, from Sayf bin ‘Umayra and Ṣālih bin ‘Uqba together, from ‘Alqamā bin Muḥammad al-Ḥadhrami, from Abu Ja‘far al-Bāqir (a.s.) who said: "Whoever visits (the grave of) al-Ḥusayn bin ‘Ali (a.s.) on the day of ‘Āshūrā’ and persists in weeping at his grave, then Allāh the Glorified and Exalted will present him on the day of judgment, with the reward of two thousand major pilgrimages..."

And Muḥammad bin Ismā‘īl, from Ṣālih bin ‘Uqba, from Mālīk al-Juhani, from Abu Ja‘far al-Bāqir (a.s.) who said: "Whoever visits (the grave of) al-Ḥusayn bin ‘Ali (a.s.) on the day of ‘Āshūrā’ in the month of Muḥarram and persists in weeping..."⁴⁷

Ibn Qawlawayhi has concluded the first chain with the words "from ‘Alqamā bin Muḥammad al-Ḥadhrami," and then he starts with the other chain and says "and Muḥammad bin Ismā‘īl, from Ṣālih bin ‘Uqba."

Thus his words "Muḥammad bin Ismā‘īl..." carry two possibilities:

⁴⁷Kāmil al-Ziyārāt, pg 173, Chapter 71.

First possibility: Ibn Qawlawayhi commenced with the first chain and took the tradition from the book of Muḥammad bin Ismā'īl bin Bazī', and you know that Shaykh Ṭūsī narrates the same salutation from that book. As discussed earlier in the section on the analysis of the first chain of transmission of Shaykh Ṭūsī, that his path of transmission to the book of Muḥammad bin Ismā'īl bin Bazī' is authentic and correct and thus it yields evidence of the existence of the text of the salutation in that book. Thus both the authorities, Shaykh Ṭūsī and Ibn Qawlawayhi, have undertaken its narration from that book, although the chain of transmission of the Shaykh to the book is known while the chain of Ibn Qawlawayhi to it is not known. However, that does not harm the authenticity of the tradition, due to the knowledge of the existence of the tradition in that book by way of the path of transmission of the Shaykh. This possibility is the most distinguished and so Ibn Qawlawayhi has two chains of transmissions for the salutation of 'Āshūrā'.

Second possibility: His writing "and Muḥammad bin Ismā'īl", is a coordinating conjunction to his writing " Muḥammad bin Khālīd al-Ṭayālīsī ". Thus the chain of transmission of Ibn Qawlawayhi to the book of Muḥammad bin Ismā'īl bin Bazī' is the same chain as his chain to the book of Muḥammad bin Khālīd al-Ṭayālīsī. Thus it would seem that he narrates the book of Ibn Bazī' by the same path of transmission as the one through which he narrates the book of al-Ṭayālīsī.

Therefore, his chain to the book of Muḥammad bin Ismā'īl bin Bazī' would be as follows: Ḥakīm bin Dāwūd, from Muḥammad bin Mūsa al-Hamadāni, from Muḥammad bin Ismā'īl bin Bazī'. However this possibility is far fetched.

Third Possibility: None who have the knowledge of (the science of) Rijāl would voice this, which is, that his writing "and Muḥammad bin Ismā'īl " is a coordinating conjunction to his writing " 'Alqamā bin Muḥammad al-Ḥadhramī " and therefore a part of the preceding chain. Indeed this would be far from accurate, indeed exceedingly far-fetched, for 'Alqamā is from the companions of al-Bāqir and al-Ṣādiq (a.s.), while Ibn Bazī' is from the companions of al-Ridhā' and al-Jawād (a.s.), and so with a difference in the generation, how can a person from a later generation be considered contemporaneous to a person from an earlier generation?

Now that this has been clarified, a study of the narrators of the first chain will be undertaken.

Study of the First chain of Narrators.

1) Ḥakīm bin Dāwūd bin Ḥakīm: He is one of the teachers of Ibn Qawlawayhi and Ibn Qawlawayhi has authenticated his (Ḥakīm bin Dāwūd bin Ḥakīm) teachers en masse in the beginning of his book where he says; "He (Ḥakīm bin Dāwūd bin Ḥakīm) does not mention anything in his book except that which he has come across from authentic sources." And Ibn Qawlawayhi narrates from him in Kāmil al-Ziyārāt in the second chapter, hadith number eleven, and in the fifty fourth chapter, third hadith⁴⁸ in addition to the seventy first chapter, hadith number nine.

2) Muḥammad bin Mūsa al-Hamadāni: Najāshi mentions him as follows: "Muhammad bin Mūsa bin 'Isa, Abu Ja'far al-Hamadāni al-Samān."

⁴⁸Qāmus al-Rijāl, Vol 3, number, 2385.

Muḥammad bin Yaḥya al-‘Attār al-Qummi narrates from him (i.e. from Muḥammad bin Mūsa al-Hamadāni). This is proven from the path of transmission of Najāshi to Muḥammad bin Mūsa bin ‘Isa bin al-Hamadāni’s book, where Najāshi says; "Ibn Shādhān informed us, from Aḥmed bin Muḥammad bin Yaḥya, from his father, from him (Muḥammad bin Mūsa bin ‘Isa bin al-Hamadāni), from his book.

Similarly, Muḥammad bin Aḥmed bin Yaḥya bin Imrān al-Ash‘ari narrates from him. He was the most important of Kulayni's teachers. Muḥammad bin Mūsa bin ‘Isa bin al-Hamadāni has been mentioned in the chains of the book Nawādir al-Ḥikma of al-Ash‘ari, though Ibn al-Ghadhāiri has undermined his integrity saying he was: “weak, narrates from weak people and it is permissible that he be ruled out as a witness." Ibn al-Walīd, the teacher of Shaykh Ṣadūq (d. 381 AH / 991 AD) also undermines his integrity.

However, their disparagement is due to their differences regarding the stations of the Imāms, for the people of Qum and at their head was Muḥammad bin al-Walīd, had special beliefs with regards to the members of the Prophet's house to which perhaps, the Imāmiyya scholars did not agree with.

Shaykh Mufīd (d. 413 AH / 1022 AD) writes in his book *Tas-ḥiḥ al-I’tiqād* that: "we have heard an opinion of Abu Ja‘far Muḥammad bin al-Ḥasan bin al-Walīd, regarding which we did not find any support in the exegesis, which is what is narrated from him that he said: 'the first stage of extremism (ghuluww) is the negation of forgetfulness for the Prophet and the Imāms (a.s.)!!"⁴⁹ Thus, if this account is true, then he was a reductionist⁵⁰ despite the fact that he was from the scholars of Qum and their chief. We also met a group from Qum whom we found clearly denigrating matters of religion and lowering the rank of the Imāms (a.s.) from their stations alleging that they (the Imāms) did not know many laws of religion until it was impressed (lit: scratched) on their hearts. There were amongst them those who said that they (the Imāms) took recourse to personal opinions and conjectures in matters of the law. They also claimed that the Imāms were merely from the scholars. This implies that the Imāms had no special significance above the others. This is a denigration of the stations of the Imāms, about which there is no doubt!!"⁵¹

Therefore it is not improbable that Muḥammad bin Mūsa bin ‘Isa bin al-Hamadāni's disparagement by Ibn al-Walīd is due to their differences with regards to the stations of the Imāms, and for that reason, when Najāshi narrates the speech of

⁴⁹ Translator’s note: The reader will find it interesting to note that some of the people of Qum in the fifth century hijri / 10th century A.D considered anyone believing that the Prophet and the Imāms could not forget as a Ghāliyy, i.e. a person who wrongfully exaggerates the position and stations of the prophet and the Imāms beyond their proper bounds! This is contrary to our contemporary times where the belief that the Prophet and the Imāms could not possibly forget has become an established principle of the Shi‘ite faith and maintaining the contrary would be considered heresy.

⁵⁰. Translator's Note: A reductionist here is a person who "falls short, lessens or curtails" the unique stations and merits of the Prophet and the Imams.

⁵¹ *Tas-ḥiḥ al-I’tiqād*, pg 66.

Ibn al-Walīd saying that he (i.e. Muḥammad bin Mūsa bin ‘Isa bin al-Hamadāni's) used to forge traditions, he (Najāshi) concluded with the words "and Allāh knows best".⁵²

3) Muḥammad bin Khālīd al-Ṭayālisi: His biography has been mentioned in the course of the study of the third chain of Shaykh Ṭusī and evidences prove him being acceptable in his narrations.

4) Sayf bin ‘Umayra: It has been mentioned that he is reliable without doubt.

5) Ṣāliḥ bin Uqba: His biography has been mentioned during the course of the study of the first chain of Shaykh Ṭusī. He was an Imāmi and praiseworthy in a general sense.

6) ‘Alqama bin Muḥammad al-Ḥadhrami: His biography has been presented during the course of the study of the Shaykh about him. And we said that the evidences prove that he was trustworthy.

Here ends the first chain of Ibn Qawlawayhi. What follows is the study of the second chain.

The Second Chain of Transmission of Ibn Qawlawayhi to the Text of the Salutation.

Muḥammad bin Ismā‘īl narrates from Ṣāliḥ bin ‘Uqba, who narrates from Mālik al-Juhani, who narrates from Abu Ja‘far al-Bāqir (a.s.) that: "Whoever visits (the grave of) al-Ḥusayn bin ‘Ali (a.s.) on the day of ‘Āshūrā’, in the month of Muḥarram and persists in weeping at his grave..."

Now, this chain of transmission does not need an analysis except for the biography of Mālik al-Juhani, for the biographies of Muḥammad bin Ismā‘īl and Ṣāliḥ bin ‘Uqba have already been presented. As for Mālik al-Juhani, Shaykh Ṭusī has considered him to be from the companions of al-Bāqir (a.s.) and al-Ṣādiq (a.s.) in his Rijāl, saying; "(He was) a Kufan, (and he) died in the lifetime of Abu ‘Abdillāh (a.s.)."⁵³

It is possible to demonstrate his reliability with the following evidences.

First: ‘Ali bin Ibrāhīm narrates from Muḥammad bin ‘Isa, from Yūnus, from Yaḥya al-Ḥalabi, from Mālik al-Juhani who said: "Abu Ja‘far al-Bāqir (a.s.) said; 'O Mālik! You are from our Shi‘ites; do you not see that you are being negligent in our affair?! Indeed it is impossible to appraise the attributes of Allah, and just as it is impossible to appraise the attributes of Allah, likewise it is impossible to appraise our attributes, and just as it is impossible to appraise our attributes, likewise it is impossible to appraise the attributes of the believer. Surely when a believer meets another believer

⁵² Rijāl al-Najāshi, vol 2, pg 227, number 905.

⁵³Rijāl of Shaykh Ṭusi, pg 145, in the section of the Companions of al-Bāqir (a.s.), number 11, and in the section of the Companions of al-Ṣādiq (a.s.), pg 302, number 458.

and shakes hands with him, Allāh continues to watch over them and their sins wear away from their faces just as leaves fall off from trees, till they part company, so how is it possible to appraise the attributes of one who is like that?"⁵⁴

Even though this tradition ends at Mālik al-Juhani himself, the interest of ‘Ali bin Ibrāhīm al-Qummi and Muḥammad bin ‘Isa bin ‘Abīd and Yūnus bin ‘Abd al-Raḥmān in narrating it, expresses their reliance and confidence in his narrations.

Second: al-Kulayni (d. 329 AH / 940 AD) narrates from ‘Isa al-Ḥalabi, from Ibn Miskān from Mālik al-Juhani who said: "Abu ‘Abdillāh (a.s.) said to me; 'O Mālik! Aren't you all satisfied and pleased that you establish prayers; give the poor-rate, refrain (from the prohibited) and that you will enter heaven? O Mālik! Indeed it is not for any community which is led by a leader in the world, except that he (the leader) will come on the Day of Judgment cursing them and they will be cursing him, save you and he who is in the same state as you. O Mālik! Surely the deceased among you, who adheres to our leadership, is like a martyr with the status of a fighter who fought with his sword in the way of Allāh."⁵⁵

Third: His eulogy in praise of Imām al-Bāqir (a.s) highlights his perception and cognizance of the station of the Imām, and that he used to publicly declare devotion and allegiance to the Imām at a time when declaring it was prohibited. He said:

"If mankind demands the knowledge of the Qur’ān,
Then the Quraysh are dependent on him (i.e. on al-Baqir (a.s.)),
And if it is said, 'where is the son of the daughter of the Prophet?'
I realized that in you with long branches,
They [i.e. the Ahlulbayt] are like stars, which shine and glitter for those who
set out at night,
(They are like) mountains that bequeath great knowledge".⁵⁶

Concluding Remarks

This study is a quick citation of the chains of transmissions of the reports recommending the pilgrimage to Imām al-Ḥusayn (a.s.) as well as transmitting the text of the salutation of ‘Āshūrā’. Their authenticity and acceptability has also been discussed. A consideration of the sum-total of these chains results in strengthening some of them with the others and grants knowledge or approximate certainty of the origins of these traditions from the infallibles (a.s.) in addition to two further considerations, which are:

1) The consensus of the (Shi‘ite) community and their diligence in reciting this salutation throughout the centuries, which is one of the indications that the origins of these traditions lie with the infallibles, and

⁵⁴Al-Kāfi, vol 2, pg 180, hadith number, 6.

⁵⁵Al-Rawdha, pg 146, number 122.

⁵⁶Al-Irshād, pg 262.

2) A careful study of the contents of the salutation indicates its origins to be from a heart brimming with grief and sadness, whose tears and torment cannot be appeased except through revenge, and it is in harmony with the contents of all the transmitted traditions in the supplications and salutations.

Here culminates what was intended to be explained in this essay, of the study of the chains of transmissions of the salutation to Imām al-Ḥusayn (a.s.) on the day of ‘Āshūrā’.

Ja‘far Subḥāni

Qum – Imām Ṣādiq (a.s.) Institute.

Composed on the 20th of Safar al-Mudhaffar, year 1422 A.H.

