

The Implications of Inconsistency in the Ḥadīth of the Shī'ah

by:

Mawlānā Muḥammad Ṭāhā Karaan
(May Allah have Mercy on him)

WWW.MAHAJJAH.COM

Transliteration key

أ-'	ض - ḍ
آ - ā	ط - ṭ
ب - b	ظ - ḏ
ت - t	ع - ʿ
ث - th	غ - gh
ج - j	ف - f
ح - ḥ	ق - q
خ - kh	ك - k
د - d	ل - l
ذ - dh	م - m
ر - r	ن - n
ز - z	و - w, ū
س - s	ه - h
ش - sh	ي - y, ī
ص - ṣ	

The Implications of Inconsistency in the Ḥadīth of the Shī'ah

by: Mawlānā Muḥammad Tāhā Karaan رَحْمَةُ اللهِ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ

Background

The Ahl al-Sunnah and Shī'ah both share in taking the Qur'ān as a source of religious legislation (tashrīṭ), and despite the opinion of the Qur'ān being tampered with being common among the Shī'ah, they are nonetheless ordered to rely upon the Qur'ān currently in our midst, until the Hidden Imām appears.

Likewise, just as both groups deem the Qur'ān a source of religious legislation, they both rely upon the Sunnah, except that the Shī'ī concept of Sunnah differs with that of the Ahl al-Sunnah. We can disregard the finer distinction between the concepts of Sunnah according to each group, and for practical reasons, conclude that the Sunnah according to the Ahl al-Sunnah is that which the ḥadīth books of the Ahl al-Sunnah comprise. At the forefront of these books are the Six Books—the two *Saḥīḥs* and the four *Sunan* collections—and the *Musnad* and *Mu'jam* collections. On the other hand, the Sunnah according to the Shī'ah is that which their Ḥadīth sources comprise, the most important of them being the Four Books (*Al-Kutub Al-Arba'ah*): *Al-Kāfī* of al-Kulaynī; *Man La Yaḥḍuruhū al-Faqīh* of Al-Ṣadūq ibn Bābuwayh; *Tahdhīb al-Aḥkām*; and *al-Istibṣār*, both by Abū Ja'far al-Ṭūsī.

Whatever the case, both groups claim they are exclusively upon the truth which was revealed to Muḥammad ﷺ, and that other groups besides them have erred from this truth, because they took the Sunnah from the wrong people and trusted unreliable sources which were distorted at the hands of fabricators. It was, hence, vital to carefully consider what each group considers a reliable source of religious legislation.

As the Qur'an is a common denominator for both groups, albeit at a superficial level¹, the only option was to look at the Sunnah and see which is the real Sunnah

1 In light of the many Shī'ī narrations which state the Qur'ān was tampered with and is currently not in its original form.

of Muḥammad ﷺ: the Sunnah of the Ahl al-Sunnah or that of the *Imāmiyyah Shī'ah* (Twelvers)? With this purpose in mind, we shall shed some light upon the Sunnah tradition according to the Shī'ah.

And with Allah lies all success.

The Concept of Imāmah

The core belief of the *Imāmiyyah*¹ is Imāmah, the belief that Allah—the Most High—appointed twelve Imāms after Muḥammad ﷺ whose duty was to take charge of the heritage of the Prophet ﷺ, and to protect and convey it; the Imām is the sole conveyor from the Messenger ﷺ. And to ensure his conveying was sound from lapses or mistakes, Allah—the Most High—granted them inerrancy (Iṣmah), making them infallible (Ma'ṣūm) Imāms, **conveying one after the other in a manner that is divinely-protected by Allah from every human deficiency.**

This succession continued through twelve Imāms, each Imām having students who recorded the Sunnah which they took from them. And why should they not record it, seeing that they are the inerrant Imāms and custodians of the heritage of their grandfather, the Chosen One ﷺ? How can they not write on their authority, when they are the treasurers of the knowledge of Muḥammad ﷺ; specifically appointed by Allah—the Most High—to convey on behalf of the Prophet ﷺ; with them are the Tawrah, Injil, and the Qur'ān written by Amīr al-Mu'minīn; their and their forefathers' status is greater than that of the Prophets of Great Resolve (Ulū al-'Azm); and every atom in the universe humbles itself before their power? For this reason, every Imām was the sole infallible authority, with respect to the Sunnah, in his lifetime, whereas others were merely narrators who were either right or who had erred.

Hence, whatever books the students of a particular Imām compiled during his lifetime, when a new Imām would take the former Imām's place after his demise

1 Also known as the Ithnā 'Ashariyyah, or Twelvers.

and become the new sole authority of the Sunnah, it left no need for what his father's¹ students had compiled.

Based on this, one would expect after a golden chain of infallible Imāms, each with his own students who recorded the Sunnah from him, that the Sunnah of the followers of these Imāms would all trace back through this chain: the Twelfth Imām, from his father, from his father, from his father, until it reaches 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib عليه السلام from Muḥammad, the Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم.

A Shī'ī poet has actually boasted about this:

If you wish to choose a school for yourself,

Which shall deliver you from the flames of the Fire on the Day of Gathering,

Leave the opinions of Shāfi'ī, Mālik, Ibn Ḥanbal, and what Ka'b al-Aḥbār
has related,

Take from people whose statements and narrations are: Our grandfather
narrated from Jibrīl from the Creator.

Furthermore, the basis for the claim that the Sunnah in its entirety should be narrated through this golden chain is that Allah's care towards the Sharī'ah being soundly conveyed meant that He did not suffice upon average narrators to preserve the Sharī'ah from being lost and to transmit it to future generations. Rather, Allah chose for this Ummah divinely-guided guides and infallible Imāms. All of this was to ensure no mistake or lapse could seep into this great heritage. Thus, Allah was not going to let the Ummah depend on the narrations of human transmitters who were prone to human error and forgetfulness, as long as He had appointed for them those regarding whom none of the above was ever imaginable. This is the philosophy of infallibility (Iṣmah) which the Shī'ah claim for their Imāms.

1 i.e. the previous Imām.

Nonexistence of Shīī Ḥadīths Through the Infallible Chain

After explaining the concept, we move towards the ground reality and turn to the Shīī books of ḥadīth, to examine the extent of conformance to this concept. At this point, we are left utterly surprised to realise we cannot find a single narration which has been related through this golden infallible chain.

Let us take a few chapters from *Uṣūl al-Kāfī*¹ as an example:

Chapter on the Incumbence of Obeying the Imāms. There are seventeen ḥadīths in this chapter:

1. On the authority of Zurārah from Imām al-Bāqir
2. On the authority of Abū al-Ṣabbāḥ from Imām al-Ṣādiq
3. On the authority of Bashīr al-‘Aṭṭār from Imām al-Ṣādiq
4. On the authority of Ḥusayn ibn al-Mukhtār from one of our companions from Imām al-Ṣādiq
5. On the authority of Abū al-Ḥasan al-‘Aṭṭār from Imām al-Ṣādiq
6. On the authority of Abū al-Ṣabbāḥ al-Kinānī from Imām al-Ṣādiq
7. On the authority of Ḥusayn ibn Abī al-‘Alā’ from Imām al-Ṣādiq
8. On the authority of Ma‘mar ibn Khallād from Imām al-Riḍā’
9. On the authority of Abū Baṣīr from Imām al-Ṣādiq
10. On the authority of Muḥammad ibn Zayd al-Ṭabarī from Imām al-Riḍā’
11. On the authority of Abū Salamah from Imām al-Ṣādiq
12. On the authority of Muḥammad ibn Fuḍayl from Imām al-Bāqir
13. On the authority of Ismā‘īl ibn Jābir from Imām al-Bāqir

¹ *Uṣūl al-Kāfī*, vol. 1 pg. 108.

14. On the authority of Abū Ishāq from one of the companions of Amīr al-Mu'minīn
15. On the authority of Muḥammad ibn Ḥazm from Imām al-Ṣādiq
16. On the authority of Ḥusayn ibn Abī al-'Alā' from Imām al-Ṣādiq
17. On the authority of 'Abd al-A'lā from Imām al-Ṣādiq

Although this is just one chapter, we chose it randomly upon opening the book, not through selection or browsing its pages. What the reader notices in the narrations of this chapter, namely that most of the chains converge at Imām al-Ṣādiq and Imām al-Bāqir through the chains of their students and not the Imāms from their progeny, is a phenomenon which is reflected throughout the book, and in fact, all four of their books.

If you find this issue surprising, what is more surprising is that there is not a single narration from the Twelfth Imām in *al-Kāfi*, despite al-Kulaynī being a contemporary of all four of his emissaries (safīrs)¹. Why does al-Kulaynī rely on secondary narrators when he is able to take the Sunnah from his contemporaries from Imām al-Mahdī, who had only been given infallibility so he can convey “from his grandfather from Jibrīl from the Creator”²?

And if this left you astonished, here is something which will surprise you even more: 'Uthmān ibn Sa'īd al-'Amrī was the first emissary who benefitted from being in contact with the Hidden Imām; hence, he was by virtue of this contact, the best narrator from the Hidden Imām from his forefathers. Despite this, we

1 It was believed that the Hidden Imām had emissaries who met him and relayed messages on his behalf to the people, after he went into hiding.

2 It is appropriate to mention that I came across this point when I heard a Shī'ī say that al-Bukhārī deviated from the Ahl al-Bayt, as he had abandoned narrating from Imām Ḥasan al-'Askarī, despite being his contemporary. I researched the matter and said to him, “If this proves that al-Bukhārī was a *Nāṣibī* [an opponent of the Ahl al-Bayt], al-Kulaynī is the greatest *Nāṣibī*.” It then became clear to me that this objection stems from 'Abd al-Ḥusayn in *al-Murāja'āt*. (Mawlānā Ṭāhā Karaan رَحِمَهُ اللهُ).

do not find a single narration of his from the Twelfth Imām in the Four Books. In fact, not even from the eleventh Imām, whom he was known to have served. In *Jāmi‘ al-Ruwāt*¹, al-Ardabīlī mentions five of his chains in *al-Tahdhīb* and *al-Kāfi*, but none of them reach Ḥasan al-‘Askarī [the eleventh Imām] or the Hidden Imām.

Below are these five chains:

1. ‘Uthmān ibn Sa‘īd al-‘Amrī—from Muḥammad ibn Sulayman—from Maymun al-Bān—from Imām al-Ṣādiq
2. ‘Uthmān ibn Sa‘īd al-‘Amrī—from ‘Abd al-Karīm al-Hamadanī—from Abū Tumāmāh—from Imām al-Jawwād
3. ‘Uthmān ibn Sa‘īd al-‘Amrī—from a man—from Imām al-Ṣādiq
4. ‘Uthmān ibn Sa‘īd al-‘Amrī narrates from his dream of al-Qā‘im
5. ‘Uthmān ibn Sa‘īd al-‘Amrī—from ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd ibn ‘Alī al-Kūfī—from Muhājir al-Asadī—from Imām al-Ṣādiq

This will definitely raise many questions in the reader’s mind. Did al-‘Amrī not have any occupation besides amassing wealth and producing letters?² Did al-Kulaynī, his contemporary in Baghdad, not find in these letters anything worthy of inclusion in his book? Was there nothing more to those letters besides cursing the accursed individuals who competed with al-‘Amrī and his son to be emissaries of the Hidden Imām, and praising those emissaries who were entrusted with collecting the Khums³ and the share of the Imām?

Let us leave the father and move to the son, Muḥammad ibn ‘Uthmān, the second emissary who remained at this post for close to half a century. Al-Ardabīlī tells

1 *Jāmi‘ al-Ruwāt*, vol. 1 pg. 533.

2 Letters claimed to be from the Hidden Imām and sent to the Shī‘ah via al-‘Amrī.

3 A substantial tax collected on behalf of the Imām

us that Shaykh al-Ṭūsī has mentioned in *al-Fihrist* that Muḥammad [ibn ‘Uthmān] ibn Sa’īd did not narrate from any of the Imāms, and this was by writing the symbol ۛ with his name.¹ Fifty years, yet not a single narration from the Imām he claims to meet.

As for the single narration al-Ardabīlī² narrated from the third emissary, Abū al-Qāsim Ḥusayn ibn Rawḥ al-Nawbakhtī, in *al-Tahdhīb*³, it is by way of Abū al-Qāsim—from Muḥammad ibn Ziyād—from Abū al-Hāshim al-Ja’farī—from Imām al-Jawwād.

The fourth emissary, Abū al-Ḥasan al-Samarrī, is the most destitute among them in narration: no narration from him in the books of ḥadīth nor any mention of him in the earlier biographical collections. According to *Jāmi’ al-Ruwāt*, his first listing as a narrator appears as late as Ibn Muṭahhar’s eighth century list, *al-Khulāṣah*.⁴

The Real Sources of Shī’ī Ḥadīths

It is established from what has passed that the infallible chain has not played—for the Shī’ah—the role for which Allah had made it infallible. So we ask: if the authors of the Four Books did not rely upon this chain in acquiring the Sunnah, what did they rely upon? And if they did not take ḥadīth directly from the Imāms of the Ahl al-Bayt, whom did they take it from? The answer to this has been briefly alluded to in some of what we mentioned previously, but now we shall answer in detail.

The sources from which these authors acquired the Sunnah are the books which the students of the Imāms, in particular Imāms al-Bāqir and al-Ṣādiq, compiled.

1 *Jāmi’ al-Ruwāt*, vol. 2, pg. 148. ۛ was a symbol to denote there are no narrations from him.

2 *Jāmi’ al-Ruwāt*, vol. 1 pg. 240.

3 *Al-Tahdhīb*, vol. 6 pg. 93.

4 *Jāmi’ al-Ruwāt*, vol. 1 pg. 598.

These books are known by the Shī'ah as the Four Hundred Sources (al-Uṣūl al-Arba'umi'ah). Shaykh al-Ṣadūq and Shaykh al-Ṭā'ifah Abū Ja'far al-Ṭūsī have, in a very lucid and satisfactory manner, explained to us that they rely upon these sources, as they do not quote any ḥadīth in their books with their own complete chains of transmission, but rather the chain starts by mentioning the author of the particular relied-upon amongst the Four Hundred Sources. They have mentioned at the end of *al-Faqīh* [i.e., *Man Lā Yaḥḍuruhū al-Faqīh*], *al-Tahdhīb*, and *al-Istibṣār* the shaykhs through whom their chains trace back to the authors of the Four Hundred Sources, albeit some discrepancy in these chains of their teachers too. In short, their reliance upon these sources is true beyond any doubt.

As for al-Kulaynī, his methodology in narrating ḥadīth is different to that of his two colleagues; he narrates the full chain from himself to the Imām. If this casts a doubt on al-Kulaynī's reliance upon these sources, al-Taḳī al-Majlisī has affirmed that al-Kulaynī is no different to Ibn Bābawayh and al-Ṭūsī with respect to relying upon the Four Hundred Sources.

He says in his commentary of *al-Faqīh*, entitled *Rawḍat al-Muttaqīn*:

It is apparent that the two Shaykhs transmitted everything in the two books from the Four Hundred Sources, upon which the True Sect relies, as stated by al-Ṣadūq. The same is understood from the words of Thiḳat al-Islām [al-Kulaynī].¹

To emphasise further, we relate what one of the eminent Shī' scholars said in this regard. Al-Shahīd al-Thānī Zayn al-Dīn al-Āmilī says in his book, *al-Dirāyah*:

The earlier scholars compiled the ḥadīths which had reached them from our Imāms—may Allah's peace be upon them—into four hundred books they named the Sources (al-Uṣūl) and upon which they relied, such as the *Aṣl* of Jamīl ibn Darrāj, the *Aṣl* of Zurārah, and so forth. Some of our elders

1 *Rawḍat al-Muttaqīn*, vol. 1 pg. 28.

embarked on compiling and sequencing them into specific books, to make them more accessible to the reader. The best of them are the Four Books which are relied upon in this era. They are *al-Kāfi* of Muḥammad ibn Ya‘qūb al-Kulaynī (d. 329 A.H), in which he gathered different types of ḥadīth; *Man Lā Yahḍuruhū al-Faqīh* of Abū Ja‘far Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī (d. 381 A.H), in which he gathered the ḥadīths of rulings from the Sources; and *al-Tahdhīb* and *al-Istibṣār* of Shaykh Abu Ja‘far Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan al-Ṭūsī (d. 460 A.H) in which he also gathered just ḥadīths of rulings.¹

Hence, the reliance of the authors of the Four Books on the Four Hundred Sources and their taking therefrom is an undisputed matter.

Let us now move to defining the period in which the Four Hundred Sources were compiled. Here too, Shī‘ī scholars have saved us the difficulty of investigating the matter.

Al-Māmāqānī states in *Miqbās al-Hidāyah fi ‘Ilm al-Dirāyah*:

It is commonly stated by the scholars, rather in their books too, that the Four Hundred Sources were compiled in the era of our master al-Ṣādiq عليه السلام according to some, or in the era of both (i.e. al-Bāqir and al-Ṣādiq) according to another, or in the era of al-Ṣādiq and al-Kāzim عليهما السلام as mentioned by al-Ṭūsī in *I‘lām al-Warā*, where he says: “Four thousand people among the renowned people of knowledge narrated from al-Ṣādiq عليه السلام. Four hundred famous books were compiled from his answers to questions, known as *al-Uṣūl*, and which were narrated by his students and the students of his son, Mūsā عليه السلام.”²

One who has read the beginning of this article must note the connection between what al-Māmāqānī has mentioned here, on the authority of al-Ṭabarsī, and the chapter of *al-Kāfi* which we presented as an example.

1 *Al-Dirāyah*, pg. 7.

2 *Miqbās al-Hidāyah*, vol. 3 pg. 20.

Inconsistency in Shī'ī Ḥadīth

It is clearly established from what has already passed that with respect to the Sunnah, the Shī'ah rely on their books, the most important of them being the Four Books, just as it is established that these books trace their origins back to the Four Hundred Sources, and that these four hundred compilations appeared in the era of Imām al-Ṣādiq, his father al-Bāqir, and his son al-Kāẓim.

From this point we move to another very critical phenomenon, which is the issue of inconsistency in Shī'ī ḥadīth. However, before going to the depths of this discussion, we would like to digress by postulating another issue, namely that these sources should enjoy a high level of credibility and authenticity. This is because it is supposed that their authors compiled them in light of what they took from the Imāms, and at times they would also present these books to them. For this reason, reliance upon these books was widespread amongst the early Shī'ī scholars.

The first Majlisī [the father of Bāqir al-Majlisī] says in his *Sharḥ al-Faqīh*:

Undoubtedly, the reliance of our early scholars was on the books narrated by the reliable companions of the Imāms... They recorded what they heard from them in their books, and these books were authentic according to the scholars.¹

This is what also prompted the authors of the Four Books to place uncritical reliance upon the Four Hundred Sources.

Ibn Bābawayh said in the introduction to *al-Faqīh*:

I wrote this book by removing the chains, so that its paths of transmission are not too many... Everything contained in it has been extracted from renowned books which are relied upon and which are referred back to.²

1 *Rawḍat al-Muttaqīn*, vol. 1 pg. 130.

2 *Al-Faqīh*, vol. 1 pg. 12.

Thus, he had every right to say in the preface to his book that he will only include in the book that which he agrees with, affirms as authentic, and considers a proof (ḥujjah) between him and his Lord.

Likewise, al-Ṭūsī paid great attention to giving preference to and reconciling between differing ḥadīths. However, you will rarely see him preferring one ḥadīth over the other due to one being weak.

It is also clear from al-Kulaynī's preface that he trusts what he has narrated in his book. He addresses the person who requested him to compile the book as follows:

And you said you would like to have a book which suffices, gathering therein from all branches of religious knowledge that which the student can suffice upon, and to which a seeker of guidance can refer, and from which he may take who seeks knowledge of the religion and wishes to act upon authentic narrations of the truthful عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ and practiced sunan... And Allah made easy, and to Him belongs praise and favour, compiling what you asked. I hope it is as you anticipated.¹

Moreover, when the Four Hundred Sources were trusted, it is only logical that we should find therein the knowledge of the family of Muḥammad صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, pure and impeccable, and harmonious without any crookedness or discrepancy, as *“had it been from other than Allah, they would have found much discrepancy therein”*. It was also expected that the Four Books, due to their content being taken from the Four Hundred Sources, will reflect the same harmony and consistency.

However, what the reader of these books will encounter is something starkly different. What you will find when looking into them is discrepancy in its most ugly form. If you think I have fallen into this extreme mode of expression due to becoming a victim of bias, listen with me to what al-Ṭūsī said in the beginning of his book, *al-Tahdhīb*, immediately after praising Allah and sending blessings on the Prophet صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ:

1 *Al-Kāfi*, vol. 1 pg. 49.

One of my friends amongst those whose right upon me is binding—may Allah support him—discussed with me the ḥadīths of our people—may Allah support them and have mercy on the predecessors among them—and the difference, incongruity, contradiction, and disparity which has occurred in them, to the extent that rarely will there be a narration except that in opposition to it, there is that which contradicts it, and no ḥadīth is safe from being opposed by that which negates it. Our opponents have made this one of the biggest attacks on our school and have used this as a route to nullify our creed. They said, “Your shaykhs, from the predecessors and the successors, have always criticised their opponents for the differences they follow, and they vilify them over disunity in subsidiary matters, mentioning that it is impermissible for a person of wisdom to adopt this as a religion, and for a person of knowledge to allow this to be practiced. However, we have found you to differ even more than your opponents and to conflict with each other more than your adversaries. The existence of this difference on your part, despite your believing this to be falsehood, is a proof of the invalidity of the source.” This reached the extent that doubts crept into a group of them who are not strong in knowledge nor do they have insight into the modes of contemplation and meanings of words. Many of them retracted from the truth when the reason behind this [i.e. this difference] was unclear to them and they were unable to solve the doubt therein. I heard my Shaykh, Abū ‘Abd Allāh [al-Mufīd]—may Allah support him—mention that Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Hārūnī al-‘Alawī used to believe the truth and follow the belief of Imāmāh. However, he retracted from it when the matter of differences in ḥadīth became confusing for him. He left the school and practiced something else, when the different meanings therein were not clear to him.¹

It was this phenomenon of gross and ubiquitous discrepancy that spurred Shaykh al-Ṭūsī to compile *al-Tahdhīb*. Once his book *al-Tahdhīb* became renowned, some asked him to separately compile the ḥadīths in which there was discrepancy. Hence, he wrote his second book *al-Istibṣār*, whose full name *al-Istibṣār fī*

1 *Al-Tahdhīb*, vol. 1 pg. 2.

mā ukhtulifa min al-Akhbār (Contemplating the narrations in which there is discrepancy) discloses its real essence. Specifying two books amongst four books of ḥadīth, due to inconsistency in the texts, is the clearest proof of the true extent of this discrepancy. However, we cannot stop here out of astonishment, but rather pose another bitter question: what could the cause of this unsightly discrepancy be, which was condemned by this group among the Imāmiyyah, whose disavowing of Imāmiyyah Shī'ism and its beliefs was lamented by al-Ṭūsī? This is where the heart of the matter lies.

As a preface to uncovering this secret, I would like readers to imagine the following scene: a man is sat with us, and surrounding him are a group of people who are speaking in his name, except that they are all essentially lying and fabricating against him what he did not say. Each one of them is speaking independently of the other, without them conspiring amongst themselves to achieve a uniform statement. Even if this unification occurs at times, it is non-existent for the majority of the time. So I ask you in the name of Allah: is it not natural that there will be discrepancy and inconsistency between what these liars all say in the name of this one person?

Take into consideration how many liars had gathered around the Imāms of the Ahl al-Bayt, to the extent that Imām al-Ṣādiq said, “Not a single one of us (Imāms of the Ahl al-Bayt) is safe from liars.” Consider the extent to which these narrators were affiliated to extremist sects, regarding whom Imām al-Ṣādiq said, “Amongst them are those who lie, to the extent that even Satan is in need of their lies.”¹ Also consider the fact that a number of the authors of the Four Hundred Sources were of heterodox belief.

Al-Māmāqānī states:

Al-Mawlā al-Wahīd related from his maternal uncle, al-Majlisī (the second), and also his grandfather al-Majlisī (the first) that being an author

1 *Miqbās al-Hidāyah*, vol. 2 pg. 403.

of one of the Sources is amongst the causes of excellence, but he himself scrutinised this, considering that many of the authors of the Sources had adopted incorrect beliefs, albeit their books are reliable, as clearly stated at the beginning of *al-Fihrist*.¹

Thereafter, al-Māmāqanī presents ‘Alī ibn Abī Ḥamzah al-Baṭā’inī as an example, who wrote many books and a complete commentary of the Qur’ān, except that Ibn Faḍḍāl said about him, “A liar, accused [of lying], accursed... I do not consider it lawful to relate even one ḥadīth from him.”²

If you consider all of this, it will become totally clear to you, Allah willing, that this huge heritage which the Shī‘ah boastfully attribute towards the Imāms from the family of Muḥammad ﷺ is nothing but a caricature of what Allah said: So woe to those who write the ‘scripture’ with their own hands, then say, “*This is from Allah,*” in order to exchange it for a small price. Woe to them for what their hands have written and woe to them for what they earn.³

And if you want proof for this, look for it in the principle which Allah Most High informed us of when He said, “*If it had been from [any] other than Allah, they would have found within it much contradiction.*”⁴

And if you want to find out the identity of those who are accused of this great lie, look at what al-Māmāqanī said:

It is commonly stated by the scholars, rather in their books too, that the Four Hundred Sources were compiled in the era of our master al-Ṣādiq عليه السلام according to some, or in the era of both Ṣādiqs عليهم السلام (i.e., al-Bāqir and al-Ṣādiq) according to another, or in the era of al-Ṣādiq and al-Kāzim عليهم السلام.⁵

1 *Miqbās al-Hidāyah*, vol. 3 pg. 33.

2 *Jāmi‘ al-Ruwāt*, vol. 1 pg. 547.

3 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 79.

4 Sūrah al-Nisā’: 82.

5 *Rawḍat al-Muttaqīn*, vol. 1 pg. 130.

Having read this, you will now hopefully realise:

- Why there are so few narrations from the latter Imāms in the books of the Shī'ah,
- why they completely ignored the divinely-infallible chain of narration of the Imāms,
- why, in transmitting the Sunnah, their exclusive reliance is upon suspicious and mendacious persons who turned Imām Ja'far al-Ṣādiq عليه السلام into the pseudo-source for the lies which they then spread in his name,
- and how all of that turned into the self-contradictory mass of narrations that is the Ḥadīth of the Shī'ah.

When you see al-Kulaynī turn away from narrating the ḥadīth of the Ahl al-Bayt through the chain of Imām al-Mahdī—from Imām al-'Askarī—from Imām al-Hādī—from Imām al-Jawwād—from Imām al-Riḍā—from Imām al-Kāzīm—from Imām al-Ṣādiq; but you see he is very happy to acquire the Sunnah from 'Alī ibn Ibrāhīm al-Qummī—from Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad al-Barqī—from 'Alī ibn al-Ḥakam—from 'Alī ibn Abī Ḥamzah al-Baṭā'inī—from Abū Baṣīr—from al-Ṣādiq; then know the secret behind this and do not be from the absentminded!

We ask Allah to protect our religion for us.

All praise belongs to Allah in the beginning and the end. May Allah bless and send peace on our leader Muḥammad, his family and his companions.