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ABSTRACT: This article investigates the authenticity of Ziyārat ‘Āshūrā’ from a Biographical Studies (‘ilm al-rijāl) perspective. The first part is primarily devoted to an analysis of the reporters in the ziyārah’s chains of transmission as reported in Kāmil al-Ziyārāt and Miṣbāḥ al-Mutahajjid. The article then examines some other related ḥadīth matters, such as the different approaches and methods used for evaluating the authenticity of traditions; the much-debated passage in Ibn Qūlawayh’s Introduction to Kāmil al-Ziyārāt; the opinions of contemporary marāji‘ on the ziyārah’s authenticity; the different standards used for deriving rulings on obligatory and unlawful matters compared to those used for determining the reliability of ziyārats and du‘ā‘s; and the principle of leniency in evidence for recommended acts (qā‘idat al-tasāmuḥ fi adillat al-sunan).
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1. Introduction

Arguably the most well-known and oft-recited ziyārah (salutation) among Shi‘ī Muslims is Ziyārat ‘Āshūrā’. For some, the ziyārah is an expression of love for the Ahl al-Bayt (a), a renewal of allegiance to them, and a reminder of the afflictions that befell Imam al-Ḥusayn (a) in Karbala. For others, it is a prescription for spiritual growth, a guide to understanding what God wants from them, and a means to attaining immense rewards. Still others will recite the ziyārah for all these reasons, seeing it as an extensive pronouncement of religious feeling, belief, and devotion.

1 Director of Research and Publications, The Islamic College, London, UK. Email: m.ismail@islamic-college.ac.uk
2 For example, one of the reports that will be discussed in this paper – namely, the report pertaining to Chain 5 – states that God will record for the reciter the reward of a) one hundred million degrees; b) being martyred with Imam al-Ḥusayn (a); and c) every prophet, messenger, and person who has visited him.
Nevertheless, the authenticity of the *ziyārah* has been the subject of much discussion. Sometimes, the focus of debate has been on the content (*matn*) of the *ziyārah*; other times, questions have been raised about its chain of transmission (*sanad*). In response, scholars have presented various types of evidence and indicators to establish the *ziyārah*’s authenticity. These include:

- it being considered reliable by the highest authorities in Shi’i jurisprudence;
- its content complying with verses of the Qur’an;
- its content existing in other authentic *ziyārah*;
- its recitation being the practice of generations of believers;
- numerous reports of people experiencing extraordinary blessings from reciting it regularly; and
- its chain of transmission being sound.

This article investigates the last of these. It first analyses the reporters in the *ziyārah*’s chains of transmission and then examines some other matters pertaining to the *ziyārah*’s authenticity from a Biographical Studies perspective.

### 2. Biographical Studies (‘ilm al-rijāl)

Biographical Studies is one of the most important disciplines of Hadith Studies. It is the study and application of principles used for determining the status of reporters of traditions (*ahādith*). In short, it is the science of evaluating hadith reporters. It aims to answer questions such as ‘How can a reporter’s reliability be established?’ and ‘Is such and such reporter reliable?’

### 3. The four-fold classification of traditions

The four terms used in the classification of traditions, as described in the table below, are said to have been first coined by Sayyid Ibn Ṭawūs (d. 664/1265) and then popularised by his student ‘Allāmah al-Ḥillī (d. 726/1325).³

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ṣaḥīḥ (Authentic)</td>
<td>Complete chain of transmission (sanad)⁴ to the Prophet (s) or Imam (a); each reporter in the chain possesses moral probity (ʿādil),⁵ is accurate in his retention and transmission (ḍābit), and is Imāmī⁶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḥasan (Good)</td>
<td>Complete chain consisting of accurate and commended Imāmī reporters but the moral probity of one or more of them has not been explicitly affirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muwaththaq (Reliable)</td>
<td>Complete chain consisting of accurate and reliable reporters but one or more of them is non-Imāmī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daʿīf (Weak)</td>
<td>Does not fulfil the requirements of the three categories above⁷</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As it can be seen, this classification focuses purely on the characteristics of the reporters and the completeness of the chain of transmission. As such, ‘authentic’ does not mean it was definitely said, just as ‘weak’ does not mean it was definitely not said; rather, the terms simply refer to the soundness, or lack thereof, of the chain of transmission.

The four-fold classification would have been entirely unfamiliar to scholars of the formative period of Shi‘i scholarship, such as the compilers of the Four Books.⁸ For them, ‘ṣaḥīḥ’ referred to a tradition that could be confidently attributed to an Infallible even if

---

⁴ The sanad represents the transmission path between the first narrator of the tradition and the collection into which the tradition culminates.

⁵ An ‘ādil person is someone who has deep-rooted God-wariness (taqwā) and consequently does not commit major sins nor persists in committing minor ones (Subḥānī (2019) p. 141).

⁶ ‘Imāmī’ here refers to a person who believes in the imamate of the Imam of his time (Ibid).

⁷ al-Īrawānī (2017) p. 143; Faḍlī (2011) pp. 115-117; and Subḥānī (2019) pp. 138-142. Subḥānī adds that the first three categories are sometimes subdivided into ‘the highest’ (al-aʿlā), ‘the middle’ (al-awsat), and ‘the lowest’ (al-adnā) (p. 143).

⁸ The Four Books are the most reliable early collections of Shi‘i hadith. They are: Kitāb al-Kāfī by Muḥammad b. Yaʿqūb al-Kulaynī (d. 328/940 or 329/941 AH); Man Lā Yaḥḍuruhu al-Faqīh by Abū Jaʿfar Muḥammad b. Ali b. Bābawayh al-Qummi, known as Shaykh al-Ṣadūq (d. 381/991); Tahdhīb al-Ahkām fī Sharḥ al-Muqniʿah by Abū Jaʿfar Muḥammad b. Hasan al-Ṭūsī, known as Shaykh al-Ṭūsī (d. 460/1067); and al-Istibṣār fīmā Uktulifā min al-Akhbār also by Shaykh al-Ṭūsī.
the chain of transmission was weak. For example, if a tradition with weak individuals or a disjointed chain was repeated in several unrelated sources, they might have seen this as indicative of the tradition originating from an Infallible.9

As we shall see later, some scholars go beyond a purely sanadī (chain-focused) approach when evaluating traditions and consider other indicators and supporting evidence as well. Therefore, when one hears terms such as ‘authentic’ and ‘weak’ being mentioned about a ziyārah, duʿāʾ (supplication), or other religious text, it is important to keep in mind that a text may be deemed weak by one scholar but authentic by another based on the different approaches and methods they use for evaluating narrations.

4. Where is Ziyārat ‘Āshūrā’ originally reported?

Ziyārat ‘Āshūrā’ is originally reported in two famous works by two illustrious scholars:

1. Ḧāmil al-Ziyārat by Jaʿfar b. Muḥammad b. Qūlawayh al-Qummī (d. 367/977). Ḧāmil al-Ziyārat is a collection of hadith on various aspects of ziyārah, such as its rewards, etiquette, and recitational texts. A large portion of the work is devoted to the ziyārah of Imam al-Ḥusayn (a) and matters relating to his martyrdom. As for its author, al-Najāshī describes Ibn Qūlawayh as ‘among our reliable fellow Shias and among the esteemed of them in jurisprudence and hadith’.10

2. Miṣbāḥ al-Mutahajjid wa Salāḥ al-Mutaʿabbid by Muḥammad b. Ḥasan b. ʿAlī b. al-Ḥasan al-Ṭūsī (d. 460/1067). Miṣbāḥ al-Mutahajjid is a primary work on duʿāʾs, ziyārah, certain ritual acts of worship, and recommended practices for specific days and months. Shaykh al-Ṭūṣī, known as ‘Shaykh al-Ṭāʾifah’ (Head of the Sect), is described by al-Najāshī as ‘esteemed among our fellow Shias; reliable; eminent; [and] among the students of our teacher Abū ‘Abd Allāh’.11

5. The chains of transmission relating to Ziyārat ‘Āshūrā’

It is not uncommon to find authors mentioning different figures for the number of chains of transmission for Ziyārat ‘Āshūrā’ – four, five, and six chains are mostly cited. The differences are mainly due to the way the chains appear in the two works and the decisions taken by the authors to count some of them together or to treat them separately. For instance, in Ḧāmil al-Ziyārat, the first two chains are mentioned together

---

10 al-Najāshī (1418 (lunar)/1997) p. 123.
11 Ibid, p. 403.
in one passage, and the third chain is mentioned later in the text without a separate hadith number allocated to it (all three come under hadith number 8 in the Dār al-Murtadawiyyah edition referenced in this paper). In Miṣbāḥ al-Mutahajjid, the three chains are mentioned separately but all of them appear in the same body of text under one heading (‘An explanation of the ziyārah of Abā ‘Abd Allāh (a) on the day of ‘Āshūrā’ from near and afar’).

In this paper, six chains are analysed. Two of the chains, namely Chain 3 and Chain 5, report the text of the ziyārah itself. One further chain, Chain 6, reports that Ṣafwān b. Mihrān recited the same ziyārah from Imam al-Ṣādiq (a) that ‘Alqamah b. Muhammad reported from Imam al-Bāqir (a). The other three chains report matters concerning visiting Imam al-Ḥusayn (a) and the day of ‘Āshūrā’.

The content of each report is summarised in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chain</th>
<th>What the report mentions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **First two chains in Kāmil al-Ziyārāt**  
(‘Chain 1’ and ‘Chain 2’) | Imam al-Bāqir (a) states the rewards for visiting Imam al-Ḥusayn (a) on the day of ‘Āshūrā’; he explains what one should do on that day if they cannot go to the shrine and says he will be the guarantor and assurance for whoever does these things; he explains how one should offer condolences on the day of ‘Āshūrā’; he says if possible, one should abstain from fulfilling their worldly needs and procuring provisions for their home on that day and states the rewards for doing so. |
| **Third chain in Kāmil al-Ziyārāt**  
(‘Chain 3’) | Imam al-Bāqir (a) tells ‘Alqamah the rewards for reciting the ziyārah and what should be done before reciting it; he then teaches him the text of the ziyārah and recommends that he recite it every day. |
| **First chain in Miṣbāḥ al-Mutahajjid**  
(‘Chain 4’) | Imam al-Bāqir (a) states the rewards for visiting Imam al-Ḥusayn (a) on the day of ‘Āshūrā’; he explains what one should do on that day if one cannot go to the shrine and says he will be the guarantor and assurance for whoever does those things; he explains how one should offer condolences on the day of ‘Āshūrā’; he says if possible, one should abstain from fulfilling their worldly needs and procuring provisions for their home on that day and states the rewards for doing so. |
Second chain in Miṣbāḥ al-Mutahajjid

(‘Chain 5’)

Imam al-Bāqir (a) tells ‘Alqamah the rewards for reciting the ziyārah and what should be done before it; he then teaches him the text of the ziyārah and recommends that he recite it every day.

Third chain in Miṣbāḥ al-Mutahajjid

(‘Chain 6’)

Sayf b. ‘Amīrah reports the circumstances leading up to Ṣafwān performing the ziyārah as Imam al-Ṣādiq (a) had shown him; he explains that Ṣafwān recited the same ziyārah that ‘Alqamah reported from Imam al-Bāqir (a) and that Ṣafwān then read what is widely known as the ‘Supplication of ‘Alqamah’ – this duʿāʾ is quoted in full; Sayf further reports the rewards for reciting the ziyārah and the duʿāʾ; he also reports that the ziyārah is ḥadīth qudsi and narrates the glad tidings that were conveyed to the Prophet (s) by Jibrīl when he brought the ziyārah to him.

5.1 Chain 1 and Chain 2

As both of these chains are mentioned in one passage, the second chain is marked in red below to distinguish it from the first.

خذّنِي حكِيّم بنّ ذاول بنّ حكِيّم وغيّرَةٌ عنّ حمّاد بنّ موسى الهُمّدِاَيِّيّ عنّ حمّاد بنّ خالد الطَّيّالِيّيّ منّ سفيّ بنّ عيّرِة وصالح بنّ عقَمَة جمعاً عنّ علِيّهّا بنّ حمّاد الْحُضِّرِيّيّ وحمّاد بنّ إسحاقِيّ عَنّ صالِح بنّ عقَمَة عنّ مالكِ الجهنيّ عنّ أبي جعفرِ الْباقِرِ عَلّامٌ

Hazīk b. Dāwūd b. Ḥazīk and others reported to me [Ibn Qūlawayh] from Muḥammad b. Mūsā al-Ḥamādānī from Muḥammad b. Khālid al-Taylīsī from both Sayf b. ‘Amīrah and Śāliḥ b. ‘Uqbah from ‘Alqamah b. Muḥammad al-Ḥaddhramī. And Muḥammad b. Ismā’īl from Śāliḥ b. ‘Uqbah from Mālik al-Juhanī that Abū Ja’far al-Bāqir (a) said...

---

12 That is, speech of God that is not part of the Qur’ān.
5.2 Biographical analysis of reporters: Points to note

With regard to the biographical analysis that will be presented in the following sections, it is important to note:

1. The phrase ‘Neither explicitly authenticated nor explicitly discredited’ means the works of early (or ‘classical’) bibliographers do not explicitly state whether the reporter was reliable or unreliable.14

2. The focus of attention in the analysis is on reporters who have not been explicitly authenticated or have been explicitly discredited by the early bibliographers, as it is these reporters over whom opinions are divided. As for the explicitly authenticated reporters, references to early biographical works are given.

---

14 There are eight principal collections of Shi‘i riżāl. The foremost of these are: Rījāl al-Kashshī by Muḥammad b. ‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-ʿAzīz, known as al-Kashshī (d. circa 340/951-2); Rījāl al-Najāshī by Abū al-ʾAbbās Ḥāmad b. ʿAlī, known as al-Najāshī (d. after 463/1071); al-Rījāl by Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al-Ṭūsī (d. 460/1067); and al-Fihrist also by Shaykh al-Ṭūsī.
3. For the sake of brevity, what was considered to be the main supporting evidence for establishing the reliability of reporters who have not been explicitly authenticated has been mentioned. Further details can be found in Subḥānī (n.d.), al-Zanjānī (2020), Ray-shahri (1388 (solar)/2009), IslamQuest (2012), Qurbānī-Muqaddam (1395 (solar)/2016), Yadullāh-pūr (1387 (solar)/2008), Muḥammadi-Muẓaffar (1385 (solar)/2006), and al-Khūʾī (1410 (lunar)/1990).

4. As shall be explained later, not all scholars accept all the supporting evidence.

5.3 Biographical analysis of reporters in Chain 1 and Chain 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporter</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ḥakīm b. Dāwūd b. Ḥakīm</td>
<td>Explicitly authenticated&lt;sup&gt;15&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muḥammad b. Mūsā al-Hamdānī</td>
<td>Al-Najāshī states the Qummīs discredited him.&lt;sup&gt;16&lt;/sup&gt; Ibn al-Ghaḍā’īrī discredits him.&lt;sup&gt;17&lt;/sup&gt; However, it has been argued that al-Najāshī was doubtful about the discreditation levelled at al-Hamdānī.&lt;sup&gt;18&lt;/sup&gt; As for the discreditation by Ibn al-Ghaḍā’īrī, this has been seriously questioned or dismissed entirely.&lt;sup&gt;19&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>15</sup>This is based on the opinion that Ibn Qūlawayh authenticated all his teachers in his Introduction to Kāmil al-Ziyārāt (1356 (solar)/1977, p. 4). See also al-Tustarī (1411 (lunar)/1990) v. 3, p. 635.

<sup>16</sup>al-Najāshī writes, ‘The Qummī’s have considered him weak due to [him having] an extremist (ghulūw) stance. Ibn al-Walīd says, ‘He would fabricate hadith’, and God knows best (wa allāhu a‘lām). He has a book on what has been reported about the days of the week, and a book on refuting the extremists (al-ghulāt), reported to us by Ibn Shādhān from Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Yaḥyā from his father from him via his books.’ (1418 (lunar)/1997, p. 338). It should be noted, however, that the Qummīs, of whom Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan b. Aḥmad, known as Ibn al-Walīd, was the chief, are said to have taken a very strict stance against anyone who narrated a tradition that did not concur with their beliefs on Imamate. See also footnote 19 below.

<sup>17</sup>Aḥmad b. al-Ḥusayn b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Ghaḍā’īrī (fl. 4th/10th and 5th/11th centuries), known as Ibn al-Ghaḍā’īrī, was a scholar of rijāl. Referring to Muḥammad b. Mūsā al-Hamdānī, Ibn al-Ghaḍā’īrī writes, ‘He is weak and reports from weak people’ (1422 (lunar)/2001, pp. 94-95).

<sup>18</sup>Sayyid al-Khūʾī posits that al-Najāshī stops short of classing Muḥammad b. Mūsā al-Hamdānī weak because after al-Najāshī mentions how some have considered him weak, he says, ‘And God knows best’. This expression suggests that al-Najāshī was doubtful about the discreditation (1410 (lunar)/1990, v. 17, p. 283).

<sup>19</sup>For example, Subḥānī (n.d.) states that Ibn al-Ghaḍā’īrī is known to have criticised many trustworthy people and that he ‘... had some unique beliefs and ideas about the twelve Imams and whoever disregarded these views or narrated a tradition on the topic of the Imamate which did not agree with his beliefs, tended to be described by him as an extremist and as a liar.’ For instance, Ibn al-Ghaḍā’īrī considered reporters who transmitted karāmāt by the Imams (a) to be unreliable. Furthermore, according to Sayyid al-Khūʾī, it is not even established that the book attributed to Ibn al-Ghaḍā’īrī was in fact his work (1410 (lunar)/1990, v. 9, p. 79).
| Supporting evidence used to establish his reliability: | None, as he is neither explicitly authenticated nor explicitly discredited.

| Muḥammad b. Khālid al-Ṭayālisī | a) The following eminent scholars report from him:
• ‘Alī b. al-Ḥasan b. Faḍḍāl
• Saʿd b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Qummī
• Ḥamīd b. Ziyād. Al-Ṭūsī says in his *Rijāl*, ‘Ḥamīd transmits many *uṣūl*’ from him.”
• ‘Alī b. Ibrāhīm al-Qummī
• Muḥammad b. ‘Alī b. Maḥbūb. In the words of al-Zanjānī, ‘Muḥammad b. ‘Alī b. Maḥbūb, one of the pillars of the community, narrates al-Ṭayālisī’s books. This indicates... |

---

20 In the terminology of the later scholars, such a narrator is classed ‘majhūl’, i.e. one who has been mentioned in the books of * rijāl* but has not been praised nor criticized. * Majhūl* is sometimes confused with ‘muhmal’, which refers to a narrator who has been mentioned in a chain of transmission but not in the books of * rijāl*.

21 *Uṣūl* is plural of ‘aṣl’. An *aṣl* (‘foundational text’ or ‘principle’) is a collection of traditions from an Imam by one of his students who either heard them directly from the Imam or from someone who heard them directly from the Imam.

22 Al-Ṭūsī (1430 (lunar)/2008) p. 441.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporter</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sayf b. 'Amīrah</td>
<td>Explicitly authenticated</td>
<td>For some prominent reporters, he is the source to books of hadith, such as the books of Sayf b. 'Amīrah and Muḥammad b. Maʻrūf. For example, Muḥammad b. Jaʻfar al-Razzāz, one of the most well-regarded scholars of his time, reports both books from al-Ṭayālisī.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šāliḥ b. ʻUqbah</td>
<td>An entry in an early biographical work discredits him. However, this discreditation has been rebutted.</td>
<td>Indicator used to establish his reliability: Eminent authorities like Muḥammad b. Ismā‘īl b. Bazī and Muḥammad b. al-Ḥusayn b. Abī al-Khaṭṭāb report from him. Other notable information: He was a companion of Imam al-Ṣādiq (a).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʻAlqamah b. Muḥammad al-Ḥaḍhrāmī</td>
<td>Neither explicitly authenticated nor explicitly discredited.</td>
<td>Indicator used to establish his reliability:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

23 al-Zanjānī (2020).
25 Ibn al-Ghaḍā‘irī says about him, 'Extremist (ghāfī), liar (kadhdhāb), he is not to be paid any attention to (lā yultaftu ilayh)' (1422 (lunar)/2001, p. 69).
26 Sayyid al-Khūṭī considers him reliable as he was authenticated by ‘Alī b. Ibrāhīm al-Qumāmī (1410 (lunar)/1990, v. 9, p. 79). As for Ibn al-Ghaḍā‘irī’s criticisms, see footnote 19 above.
• In the third report in *Miṣbāḥ al-Mutahajjid* (see Section 5.13 below), Sayf b. ‘Amīrah says to Ṣafwān b. Mihrān that the *duʿāʾ* he recited was not reported by Ṭalqamah from Imam al-Bāqir (a). Ṣafwān replies that he heard it from Imam al-Ṣādiq (a). If Ṭalqamah was not reliable, Sayf would not have presented Ṭalqamah’s report as an argument; in other words, when Sayf said to Ṣafwān that the supplication does not appear in the report of Ṭalqamah from Imam al-Bāqir (a), he was using Ṭalqamah’s report as the standard for evaluating Ṣafwān’s report; hence, Sayf clearly considered Ṭalqamah reliable. Further, if Ṭalqamah was unreliable, Ṣafwān would have commented on his unreliability in his response to Sayf. Ṣafwān’s report is therefore an endorsement of the *ziyārah* reported by Ṭalqamah.

Other notable information:
• He was a companion of Imam al-Bāqir (a) and Imam al-Ṣādiq (a).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Muḥammad b. Ismāʿīl b. Bazī</th>
<th>Explicitly authenticated^27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mālik al-Juhanī</td>
<td>Neither explicitly authenticated nor explicitly discredited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supporting evidence used to establish his reliability:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) ‘Alī b. Ibrāhīm al-Qummī and Muḥammad b. ‘Isā report from</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


b) He appears in the chains of traditions in all the Four Books.

Other notable information:

• He was a companion of Imam al-Bāqir (a) and Imam al-Ṣādiq (a).

5.4 Ibn Qūlawayh’s path to Muḥammad b. Ismāʿīl b. Bazī’

There is some debate as to what exactly the words ‘And Muḥammad b. Ismāʿīl’ in the chain of transmission follow on from. Some scholars have suggested ‘And’ here is a coordinating conjunction of ‘Ḥakīm b. Dāwūd b. Ḥakīm’ at the start of Chain 1; i.e. Ibn Qūlawayh is reporting a new chain beginning with Muḥammad b. Ismāʿīl. 29 Unlike Ḥakīm b. Dāwūd b. Ḥakīm, however, Muḥammad b. Ismāʿīl was not a teacher of Ibn Qūlawayh; hence, we need to investigate the path of transmission from Ibn Qūlawayh to him.

Ibn Qūlawayh most likely reported the ziyārah from Muḥammad b. Ismāʿīl b. Bazī’ s book in the same way that al-Ṭūsī did (see Section 5.8 below). 30 In any event, in Kāmil al-Ziyārāt, Ibn Qūlawayh mentions reliable paths which link him to Muḥammad b. Ismāʿīl. One of these paths is quoted below – it comprises solely of explicitly authenticated narrators: 31


---

28 The Companions of Consensus are an esteemed group of eighteen narrators who were companions of one or more of the Imams from Imam al-Bāqir (a) through to Imam al-Riḍā (a). Scholars of rijāl consider them to be of the highest rank of reliability.
29 Subḥānī (n.d.); IslamQuest (2012). The authors mention other possibilities as well. See also Muḥammadī-Muẓaffar (1385 (solar)/2006) for a more detailed discussion.
30 Subḥānī (n.d.); IslamQuest (2012).
35 As mentioned in Section 5.3.
5.5 Chain 3


We understand from what is mentioned in Chain 2 that Muḥammad b. Ismāʾīl b. Bazī reports from Ṣāliḥ b. ʿUqbah al-Juḥānī and Sayf b. ʿAmīrah. The chain of transmission is illustrated below.

5.6 Biographical analysis of reporters in Chain 3

All the reporters in Chain 3 are mentioned in Chain 1 and Chain 2. Their biographical analysis was discussed in Sections 5.3 and 5.4 above.

5.7 Conclusion regarding the chains in Kāmil al-Ziyārāt

An analysis of the narrators in Chain 3, which reports the ziyārah itself, shows the route of transmission through Sayf b. ʿAmīrah to be sound. All the narrators on that route have been explicitly authenticated except ‘Alqamah b. Muḥammad al-Haḍḥramī, for whom there is strong supporting evidence.

36 Ibn Qūlawayh (1356 (solar)/1977) p. 175.
As for Chain 1 and Chain 2, which report on matters pertaining to visiting Imam al-Ḥusayn (a) and the day of ‘Āshūrā, if one were to accept the arguments in defence of Muḥammad b. Mūsā al-Hamdānī and Šāliḥ b. ʿUqbah, then the chains would be acceptable; otherwise, they would be deemed weak.

In Section 6.3, an important interpretation of a passage in Ibn Qūlawayh’s Introduction to Kāmil al-Ziyārāt will be presented, which, if accepted, would increase one’s trust in the reports even if it were conceded that there are weaknesses in the chains.

5.8 Chain 4

روئى محمد بن إسماعيل بن بزي من بني عقبة عن صالح بن عقبة عن أبيه عن أبي ح<=(...)

Muḥammad b. Ismāʾīl b. Bazī reports from Šāliḥ b. ʿUqbah from his father [ʿUqbah b. Qays] that Abū Jaʿfar [al-Bāqir] (a) said... 37

Diagram of Chain 4

5.9 Biographical analysis of reporters in Chain 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporter</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Muḥammad b. Ismāʾīl b. Bazī</td>
<td>See Section 5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šāliḥ b. ʿUqbah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

37 al-Ṭūsī (1411 (lunar)/1990) p. 772.
5.10 Shaykh al-Ṭūsī’s path to Muḥammad b. Ismā‘īl b. Bazī

In his Fihrist, Shaykh al-Ṭūsī mentions three reliable paths from him to Muḥammad b. Ismā‘īl b. Bazī. One of them is quoted below; all the reporters in it have been explicitly authenticated:


5.11 Chain 5

Chain 5 is the same as Chain 3 except the latter also mentions the demonym of Ṣāliḥ b. ʿUqbah (al-Juhani).

قَالَ صَالِحٌ بْنُ عَفْقَةٍ وَسَيِّفُ بْنُ عَمِيرَةَ قَالَ عَلَّمَهُ بِنْ عَلَّمَةٍ بِنْ مُحَمَّدٍ الحَضْرَمِيَّ فَلَمْ يَأْبَيَ عِلَّمْيَ عِلَّمَيْنِ...

Ṣāliḥ b. ʿUqbah and Sayf b. ʿAmīrah reported that ʿAlqamah b. Muḥammad al-Haḍhrāmī said, ‘I requested Abū Jaʿfar [al-Bāqir] (a), ’Teach me...’”

---

39 al-Najāshī (1418 (lunar)/1997) p. 69.
40 al-Najāshī (1418 (lunar)/1997) p. 64; al-Ṭūsī (1417 (lunar)/1996) p. 104.
42 al-Ḥillī (1388 (solar)/2010) p. 49. Sayyid Ibn Ṭawūs claims there is consensus (ijmāʿ) on him being reliable (al-Khûṭṭī (1410 (lunar)/1990) v. 1, p. 317).
43 al-Ṭūsī (1411 (lunar)/1990) p. 773.
5.12 Biographical analysis of reporters in Chain 5

Shaykh al-Ṭūsī’s path to Muḥammad b. Ismā‘īl b. Bazī was discussed in Section 5.10. The biographical analysis of the other reporters was discussed in Section 5.3.

5.13 Chain 6

And Muḥammad b. Khālid al-Ṭayālisī reports from Sayf b. ‘Amīrah that he said, ‘I rode out with Ṣafwān b. Mihrān al-Jammāl towards al-Ghārī [Najaf], and a group of our companions were with us. This was after Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Ṣādiq (a) had left. Later, we set out for Medina from al-Ḥirah. When we had completed performing the pilgrimage rites, Ṣafwān turned his face in the direction of the grave of Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Ḥusayn (a) and said to us, “Salute al-Ḥusayn (a) from this place, from the place of the head of the grave of the Leader of the Faithful [Imam ʿAlī (a)], for Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Ṣādiq (a) pointed towards it [i.e. the grave of Imam al-Ḥusayn (a)] from right here while I was with him.”’ He [Sayf b. ‘Amīrah]
said, 'Then Ṣafwān recited the salutation that ʿAlqamah b. Muḥammad al-Haḍramī reported from Abū Jaʿfar [al-Bāqir] (a) for the Day of ‘Āshūrā.’  

---

**Diagram of Chain 6**

---

### 5.14 Biographical analysis of reporters in Chain 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporter</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Muḥammad b. Khālid al-Ṭayālisī</td>
<td>See Section 5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sayf b. ‘Amīrah</td>
<td>Explicitly authenticated&lt;sup&gt;45&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṣafwān b. Mihrān al-Jammāl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### 5.15 Shaykh al-Ṭūsī’s path to Muḥammad b. Khālid al-Ṭayālisī

In his *Fihrist*, Shaykh al-Ṭūsī states his path to Muḥammad b. Khālid al-Ṭayālisī as follows.<sup>46</sup> Only Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Yahyā al-ʿAṭṭār has not been explicitly authenticated.

---

<sup>44</sup> al-Ṭūsī (1411 (lunar)/1990) p. 777.
<sup>45</sup> al-Najāshī (1418 (lunar)/1997) p. 198.
<sup>46</sup> al-Ṭūsī (1417 (lunar)/1996) p. 228.
As for Āḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Yahyā al-‘Aṭṭār, supporting evidence used to establish his reliability include the fact that:

- He was a teacher of Shaykh al-Ṣadūq, who quotes many traditions from him and adds ‘radī allāh ‘anhu’ (may God be pleased with him) after his name.
- He was a Master of Permit (shaykh al-ijāzah).

Furthermore, as al-Zanjānī points out, it appears that Shaykh al-Ṭūsī had personally verified the attribution of the narration to al-Ṭayālisī. This is because Shaykh al-Ṭūsī says in the active voice, ‘Muḥammad b. Khālid narrated’ (rawā Muḥammad ibn Khālid...) instead of using the passive form, ‘It has been reported by Muḥammad b. Khālid’ (ruwiya ‘an Muḥamad ibn Khālid...); this indicates Shaykh al-Ṭūsī’s confidence in the report coming from al-Ṭayālisī.

5.16 Conclusion regarding the chains in Miṣbāḥ al-Mutahajjid

All the narrators in Chain 6 have either been explicitly authenticated or have strong supporting evidence pointing to their reliability. The same could be said for the narrators in Chain 5 if one were to take the route of transmission through Sayf b. ‘Amīrah rather than Şāliḥ b. ‘Uqbah.

As for Chain 4, even if one were to accept the counterarguments concerning the discreditation levelled at Şāliḥ b. ‘Uqbah, the chain still suffers from the presence of ‘Uqbah b. Qays about whom very little is known.

Another route through solely explicitly authenticated narrators can also be presented by combining Chain 5 and Chain 6, both of which report on the ziyārah itself. This route is made possible due to there being more than one narrator at each ṭabaqah (stage or generation of transmission):

2. Second stage: Sayf b. ‘Amīrah and Şāliḥ b. ‘Uqbah

49 al-Najāshī (1418 (lunar)/1997) p. 349.
50 When a teacher permits a student to narrate from him the narrations he has recorded in his book, the term for the author of the book is ‘Master of Permit’ (shaykh al-ijāzah). See also Section 6.2 below.
51 al-Zanjānī (2020).

Consequently:

a) At the first stage, even if we assume the reliability of ‘Alqamah b. Muḥammad al-Haḍhramī is not established, the chain of transmission is correct through Ṣafwān b. Mihrān al-Jammāl.

b) As for the second stage, even if we assume the reliability of Ṣāliḥ b. ‘Uqbah is not established, the chain of transmission is correct through Sayf b. ‘Amīrah.

c) And in the third stage, even if we assume the reliability of Muḥammad b. Khālid al-Ṭayālisī is not established, the chain of transmission is correct through Muḥammad b. Ismāʿīl b. Bazī.\(^{52}\)

---

**Diagram of possible route when Chain 5 and Chain 6 are combined**

---

6. Other related *rijālī* matters

6.1 Approaches to evaluating narrations

There are two general approaches to evaluating the authenticity of narrations:

1. **Reliability of the chain of transmission/the reporters (wuthūq sanādi/mukhbirī)**
   
   With this approach, the reliability of a narration is solely or primarily determined by its chain of reporters. Among the advocates of this approach was Sayyid Abū al-Qāsim al-Khūʿī (d. 1992).

---

\(^{52}\) IslamQuest (2012).
2. **Reliability of issuance/the report (wuthūq ṣudūrī/khabarī)**

Here, the reliability of a narration is determined by accumulated indicators and evidence, including its chain of reporters. Among the advocates of this approach is Sayyid ʿAlī al-Ḥusaynī al-Sistānī.

Sayyid al-Sistānī maintains that if through rational means we attain confidence (iṭmiʾnān) that a particular narration was issued by an Infallible, it will be probative/authoritative (ḥujjah) for us.53 Hence, while it is necessary to study the chain of transmission, it is not sufficient. In other words, the rijālī status of the reporters in the chain helps to judge whether a narration was issued by an Infallible, but it is not the only factor to consider.

6.2 Methods for evaluating reporters

In addition to the two approaches mentioned above, there are differences of opinion on the methods and criteria that should be used for evaluating reporters. Consequently, different conclusions are reached depending on what a rijālī scholar’s stance is on questions such as:

1. Is the testimony of later scholars (al-mutaʾakhkhirīn) about the reliability of a reporter to be accepted?
2. What is the significance of considering the Companions of Consensus reliable?
3. Does being an agent (wakīl) of an Imam (a) indicate reliability?
4. When a reliable person reports from someone, does it mean that the other person is also reliable?
5. Does ‘Mastership of Permit’ (shaykhūkhat al-ijāzah) indicate reliability?
6. Can all the reporters in Tafsīr al-Qummī be deemed reliable?
7. Can all the reporters in Kāmil al-Ziyārāt be deemed reliable?
8. If a member of the Banī Faḍḍāl54 appears in a chain, does it render the report reliable?
9. Are all the Masters of al-Najāshī reliable?
10. If one of the Three Narrators55 report from someone, is it evidence of that person’s reliability?56

---

54 The Banī Faḍḍāl are said to have been a group of individuals from the Faṭḥiyyah sect. Another view is that they were companions of Imam al-Kāẓim (a), Imam al-Riḍā (a), Imam al-Hādī (a), and Imam al-Askāri (a), or they were Faṭḥiyyah initially but later believed in the imamate of these four Imams and became their companions.
55 They are Muḥammad b. Abī ʿUmayr, Ṣafwān b. Yaḥyā, and Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Abī Naṣr al-Baṣantī.
56 For more information on these topics and the different opinions about them, see al-Īrawānī (2017) pp. 77-133, and Subḥānī (2019) pp. 19-109.
It is beyond the scope of this article to discuss these issues here, but one example, relating to the chains of Ziyārat ‘Āshūrā’, will be mentioned to give an idea of the different opinions that exist and the implications they have on a scholar’s assessment of a narration’s reliability. Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Yaḥyā is in the ziyārah’s path of transmission from Shaykh al-Ṭūsī to Muḥammad b. Khālid al-Ṭayālisī (see Section 5.15 above). Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Yaḥyā has neither been explicitly authenticated nor explicitly discredited, but he is known to have held Mastership of Permit. However, according to Sayyid al-Khūʾī (d. 1992), Mastership of Permit is not sufficient for establishing reliability; hence, based on his methodology, Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Yaḥyā is not reliable.57 According to other experts, however, Mastership of Permit is sufficient for establishing reliability; hence, for them, the presence of Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Yaḥyā in the chain is not problematic.58

6.3 The much-debated passage in Ibn Qūlawayh’s Introduction to Kāmil al-Ziyārāt

In his Introduction to Kāmil al-Ziyārāt, Ibn Qūlawayh writes:

وَقَدْ عَلَمْنَا أَنَّا لا نَحْيَبُ تَجْمِيعَ مَا رَوَى عَنْهُمْ فِي هَذَا المَعْنَى وَلَا فِي غَيْرِهِ لَكَنْ مَا وَقَعَ لَنَا مِن
جهة الثقات من أصحابنا رحمهم الله برحمة ولا أُخْرِجْتُ فِيهِ حَدِيْثاً رَوَى عَنِ الشَّدَاذُ مِن
الرَجُلُ يُؤَثِّرُ ذَلِكَ عِنِّ الْمَذْكُورِينَ غَيْرِ الْمَعْرُوفِينَ بِالرَّوَايَةِ الدِّهْرِيِّينَ بِالحَدِيثَ وَالْعَلْمَ.

We acknowledge that we have not encompassed everything which has been narrated from them [the Infallibles] about this topic [ziyārah] nor any other topic [for that matter]; rather, we have included what we have come across from reliable reporters from among our companions, may God be merciful to them with His mercy. I have not reported in it [this book] any tradition that has been narrated from irregular reporters (shudhdhādh) who have not been quoted for their reports from the aforementioned persons by those known for reporting and famed for their traditions and knowledge.59

The meaning of this passage has been subject to lengthy discussion in Biographical Studies. Three main opinions on what Ibn Qūlawayh intended have emerged:

57 al-Khūʾī (1410 (lunar)/1990) v. 2, p. 328.
1. Ibn Qūlawayh meant to authenticate all the reporters mentioned in the chains of narrations in his book (388 reporters). Al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī (d. 1104/1693) held this opinion. It was also Sayyid al-Khūṭī’s initial opinion.

2. Ibn Qūlawayh meant to authenticate only his shaykhs (teachers), i.e. the first reporters in the chains (32 reporters). Mīrzā Ḥusayn al-Nūrī (d. 1320/1902) was of this opinion. It was also Sayyid al-Khūṭī’s later opinion.

3. Ibn Qūlawayh neither meant to authenticate all the reporters nor only his teachers; instead, he was explaining why the narrations in his book are reliable. This opinion is held by Sayyid al-Sīstānī. He writes:

   The meaning of the passage is that he [Ibn Qūlawayh] did not include narrations from weak and criticised reporters in his book. This is because such narrations [i.e. from weak and criticised reporters] were not reported by reliable reporters famed for their traditions and knowledge, known as the ‘critical experts of hadith’ (nuqqād al-ahādīth),60 like Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan b. al-Walīd and Sa’d b. ‘Abd Allāh. Even if some of these experts – be they his teachers or the teachers of his teachers – did report such narrations, he clearly trusted them and included them in his book. It seems he – may his soul be sanctified – sufficed in his trust of narrations from irregular reporters, as he says, when they were included [in the works of] some of these great critical experts of hadith.61

In support of this interpretation, one can see that the same approach was used by other distinguished scholars as well, i.e. they too trusted in the assessment of reliable critical experts of hadith and reported traditions that those experts had deemed reliable even if there were individuals in the chains who were irregular. These scholars include:

- al-Kulaynī (d. 329/941) in al-Kāfī
- al-Ṣadūq (d. 381/991) in al-Muqni‘ and ‘Uyūn Akhbār al-Ridā (a)
- Sayyid Ibn Ṭawūs (d. 664/1266) in Falāḥ al-Sā’il
- ‘Imād al-Dīn al-Ṭabarī (d. 6th/12th century) in Bishārat al-Muṣṭafā li-Shī‘at al-Murtaḍā62

According to this interpretation, Ibn Qūlawayh was expressing his belief in the reliability of the narrations in his book, not the narrators. It is possible that the critical experts of hadith relied on certain evidence that was passed down to them, such as a

---

60 The critical experts of hadith were known for their ability to distinguish authentic reports from non-authentic ones, even if there were one or more weak reporters in the chain.
reliable book or a reliable verbal transmission, and on the basis of that evidence they deemed the narrations reliable; evidence that may not have reached us today. Such an interpretation is significant because, if accepted, it would increase one’s confidence in the reliability of even those reports in Kāmil al-Ziyārāt that are deemed to have weaknesses in their chains.

6.4 Opinions of marāji‘ on the ziyārah’s authenticity

Sayyid al-Sīstānī’s opinion about the authenticity of Ziyārat ‘Āshūrā’ is unequivocal, as seen in the following response to a question about the chain and text of Ziyārat ‘Āshūrā’ and al-Jāmi‘ah al-Kabīrah:

Ziyārat ‘Āshūrā’ and al-Jāmi‘ah al-Kabīrah are among the most important, best, and authentic ziyārats from the perspective of their chain of transmission (sanad) and text (matn). Their content is mentioned in many authentic narrations. Therefore, the believers should persevere in reciting them, and they should not pay attention to the deceiving arguments of those who pursue their own agendas.63

Many other marāji‘ have also spoken unreservedly about the authenticity of Ziyārat ‘Āshūrā’. For example, Grand Ayatollah Sayyid Mūsā Shubayrī al-Zanjānī, one of the foremost authorities on rijāl today, states:

Disregarding what has been narrated from reliable sources about its endorsement from the unseen realm (al-ta’īdāt al-ghaybiyya), which in itself suffices as a proof of the authenticity of this sacred Ziyārat, the chain of narration mentioned in Misbāh al-Mutahajjid after this Ziyārat is veracious.64

One of the most decisive responses to the question of the ziyārah’s reliability is from Grand Ayatollah Waḥīd Khurāsānī:

According to jurists (may God elevate their rank), Ziyārat ‘Āshūrā’ is indisputable and is therefore reliable and does not need a chain of transmission.65

The views of some other contemporary marāji‘ are mentioned below:

• Grand Ayatollah Nāṣir Makārim-Shirāzī:

64 Quoted in Khalfan (2009) pp. xliv-xlvi.
65 Khurāsānī (2007).
Ziyārat ‘Āshūrā’, in addition to its lofty content and meaning, is renowned and possesses acceptable chains of transmission. Ziyārat ‘Āshūrā’ is as it is written in its current form in reliable books.66

- Grand Ayatollah Jaʿfar Subḥānī:
  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.67

- Grand Ayatollah Isḥāq-Fayyād:
  These narrations [about Ziyārat ‘Āshūrā’] are so numerous that they reach the level of tawātur ijmālī.68 As a consequence, every Ziyārat ‘Āshūrā’, short and long, is authentic and reliable.69

- Grand Ayatollah Sayyid Muḥammad Saʿīd al-Ḥakīm:
  Ziyārat ‘Āshūrā’ is reliable from the perspective of its chain of transmission and text.70

- Grand Ayatollah Mirzā Jawād Tabrīzī presents 12 reasons why the ziyārah is authentic.71

6.5 Different standards for determining reliability

The standards employed in jurisprudence (fiqh) to determine the reliability of traditions for the purposes of deriving rulings on what is obligatory (wājib) and unlawful (ḥarām) are different to those used for determining the reliability of ziyārats and duʿāʾs. Stringent standards are used for the former, not the latter.

66 Makārim-Shīrāzī (n.d.) Makārim-Shīrāzī also explains that some of the earliest extant manuscripts include the section beginning with ‘allāhumma khusṣa anta awalla zālimin bil-laʾni minni...’ – a section which some have claimed is not an authentic part of the ziyārah. He goes on to suggest that it was probably because of taqiyyah that some other early manuscripts do not mention this part. (Makārim-Shīrāzī (n.d.) and Makārim-Shīrāzī (n.d.a))


68 ‘Non-specific wide-scale transmission’. Tawātur (wide-scale transmission) refers to a narration that has so many reporters at each stage of its transmission that it leads to certainty about its authenticity. Ijmālī (non-specific) here means the reports are different but they all speak of a common subject. The view being expressed by the Grand Ayatollah is that there are so many reports of the ziyārah that one attains certainty in the ziyārah’s authenticity even though there are differences in the reports.

69 Shafaqna (2020).

70 al-Baldāwī (2013) p. 29.

71 al-Tabrīzī (1432 (lunar)/2010) pp. 76-87.
For a jurist to use a tradition pertaining to \( \textit{wājib} \) and \( \textit{ḥarām} \) acts, the tradition has to meet specific criteria of authentication and be subject to extensive scrutiny. This is because of the consequences of abiding by, or not abiding by, obligations and prohibitions in the Hereafter. Hence, the tradition must usually have an unbroken chain of transmission that traces back to an Infallible, and the reliability of each reporter in the chain must be independently verified.

Applying the same stringent standards to supplications and salutations can be likened to using the same standards to assess the cleanliness of the kitchen at a friend’s house where you have been invited for dinner, and the cleanliness of a strictly controlled laboratory where medical tests are done; and then objecting that the kitchen fails to match the level of sterilisation found in those laboratories!  \(^72\)

6.6 The principle of leniency in evidence for recommended acts (\( \textit{qāʿidat al-tasāmuḥ fi adillat al-sunan} \))

According to this principle, traditions attributed to an Infallible whose chains of transmission are weak can be relied upon if they state a certain act merits reward and there is no evidence to indicate it is not permitted.

The principle is derived from narrations known as ‘\textit{akhbār man balagh}’ (‘reaches a person reports’).  \(^73\) One such report is the \textit{Saḥīḥ} of Ḥishām b. Sālim in which Imam al-Ṣādiq (a) is reported to have said:

\[
\text{ والله ص لم يقله}\\
\text{م من }\text{ البلغة عن }\text{ النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم }\text{ من }\text{ التواب فعمله كان أجبر ذو ذلك الله كأن كان رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم}
\]

If any [promise of] reward reaches a person from the Prophet (s), and he acts on it, he shall get the reward for that act even if the Messenger of God (s) did not [in fact] say it.  \(^74\)

Based on these reports, if a narration states a certain act merits reward, and there is nothing to indicate it is forbidden, and one performs the act with the intention of attaining its reward, then he will get that reward. Therefore, according to this principle, even

---

72 Slightly modified version of the example given by Modarresi (2021).
73 A case could also be made on purely rational grounds: Reason dictates that trying to attain a benefit, albeit a potential benefit, is good. The greater the benefit at stake is, the more reason deems it good to make an attempt at achieving it.
74 al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī (1367 (solar)/1988) v. 1, section 18, tradition 184. This is one of 9 such traditions in the section.
though such a narration may not be 'authentic' in the strict fiqhī sense, one would be justified in acting on it.

Even scholars who do not take the view that the principle can be used for deeming an act 'recommended' (mustaḥabb) say that one may still perform the act with the intention of rajā', i.e. in the hope that it is desired by Allah.75

7. Conclusion

The different approaches, methods, and criteria used by scholars of rijāl for evaluating the status of a narration’s reporters impact considerably on their final assessment of the narration’s reliability. While a few scholars have deemed the chains of Ziyārat ‘Āshūrā’ weak based on a strict application of the wuthiq sanadī approach,76 most experts regard it as reliable based on their methods of assessment. An additional case is also made for the second and third chains of the reports quoted by Shaykh al-Ṭūsī in which there is more than one individual at each stage of the chain’s transmission; therefore, even if one of those individuals were deemed to be weak, the alternative route could be taken, thereby maintaining the integrity of the chain.

Sayyid al-Sīstānī’s interpretation of Ibn Qūlawayh’s statement in his Introduction to Kāmil al-Ziyārāt is significant, as it would mean that critical experts of hadith had scrutinised the reports and judged them to be reliable. Perhaps one other message that could be derived from his interpretation is the need to trust in the judgement of the foremost specialists in issues about which one does not have sufficient knowledge or evidence at hand.

Furthermore, as Ziyārat ‘Āshūrā’ does not concern a wājib or ḥarām action, the most stringent standards of verification need not be applied. Even if one were to deem the chains weak, the narrations reporting the ziyārah could still be relied upon according to the principle of leniency in evidence for recommended acts, or, at the very least, the

75 In Islamic jurisprudence, when a jurist declares something 'mustaḥabb' or 'makrūh', it means that in his or her opinion the action has an established legal status, i.e. it is something that the sharia has legislated as being 'recommended' or 'disapproved'. A jurist will only make such a declaration if he or she is convinced that there is sufficiently strong evidence to support it. If, on the other hand, the jurist deems the evidence weak but finds no reason to suggest the act should not be performed/avoided, then he or she may say [...] that it can still be enacted but with the intention of 'rajā' (shorter form of 'rajā’-al-matḥūbiyyah'), i.e. in the hope that it is desired by Allah. In this way, the jurist has not attributed something to the sharia that may not have actually been sanctioned by it, nor has he or she dissuaded their followers from performing/avoiding the action just in case in reality it is something that has been divinely legislated and carries with it abundant blessings and rewards’ (al-Sīstānī (2017) Ruling 12, Translator’s footnote number 15).

76 See, for example, Hobbollah (2020), who applies Sayyid al-Khū’ī’s methodology to the reporters in the chains of the ziyārah and concludes that the chains are weak. Nevertheless, when it came to giving a legal opinion on the matter, Sayyid al-Khū’ī ruled that the narration in either Kāmil al-Ziyārāt or Miṣbāḥ al-Mutahajjid could be recited with the intention of rajā’.
ziyārah could be recited with the intention of rajā’. By doing so, one would not be closing off a route that has the potential for showering reciters with tremendous rewards and blessings.
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