

Sanad and Rijāl Study of the Sanads of the Commentary Attributed  
to Imam 'Askarī (AS) up to Sheikh Ṣadūq

بررسی اجمالی سندی و رجالی اسناد تفسیر منسوب به امام حسن عسکری (ع) تا شیخ صدوق

Received: 2021/07/19

Accepted: 2021/10/12

Kazem Ostadi<sup>1</sup>

Abstract

*The commentary attributed to Imam Hassan 'Askarī (AS) is one of the narrative commentaries with about 379 narrations; which is unique in its kind with nearly one hundred late manuscripts. This work, apart from the indifference of cataloguers and translators to it, is controversial in various aspects, such as: "date of authorship, attribution of the book to the author, sanads and content of the book". One of these problems, which needs to be considered, is the review of the sanads of this book; both in terms of examining the form of sanads in manuscripts, and in terms of examining the narrators of sanads, in terms of omission and rijālī translation. In the present study, while introducing five types of sanads of this commentary and also the rijālī study of the narrators of the sanads of this commentary up to Sheikh Ṣadūq, it was found that this work, which most likely belongs to Nāṣir Aṭrūsh and is from Zaidi heritage, has about two hundred years old; Also, in the rijālī study of ten narrators of its sanads up to Sheikh Ṣadūq, it was found that apart from the Irsāl of these sanads, most of the narrators of this work are "unknown or weak". It also seems that Sheikh Ṣadūq did not have this book, at least in its current form.*

**Keywords:** Hassan Ibn Ali, Aṭrūsh, Tafṣīr Imam Hassan Naseri 'Askarī, Iḥtijāj, Ṭabrisī, Ṣadūq.

کاظم استادی<sup>۱</sup>

چکیده

کتاب تفسیر منسوب به امام حسن عسکری (ع)، از تفاسیر روایی با حدود ۳۷۹ روایت است؛ که با نزدیک به یکصد نسخه خطی متأخر، در نوع خود، کم‌نظیر است. این اثر، جدای از بی‌توجهی فهرست‌نویسان و تراجم‌نگاران به آن، از جهات مختلفی همچون: «تاریخ تألیف، انتساب کتاب به مؤلف، اسناد و محتوای کتاب»، مناقشه‌آمیز است. یکی از این مشکلات، که لازم به تأمل است، بررسی اسناد این کتاب می‌باشد؛ هم از نظر بررسی شکلی اسناد در نسخه‌های خطی، هم بررسی روایان اسناد، از نظر افتادگی و ترجمه رجالی. در پژوهش حاضر، ضمن معرفی پنج نوع اسناد این تفسیر و نیز بررسی رجالی روایان اسناد این تفسیر تا شیخ صدوق، مشخص شد این اثر، که به احتمال بسیار قوی متعلق به ناصر اطروش و از میراث زیدیه است، حدود دویست سال «ارسال طویل نسخه‌ای» دارد؛ و نیز در بررسی رجالی ده تن از روایان اسناد آن تا شیخ صدوق، مشخص شد که جدای از افتادگی‌ها و ارسال این اسناد، بیشتر روایان این اثر، «ناشناس، مجهول و یا ضعیف» هستند. همچنین به نظر می‌رسد که شیخ صدوق این کتاب را، حداقل به شکل کنونی، در اختیار نداشته است.

**کلمات کلیدی:** حسن بن علی، اطروش، تفسیر امام حسن ناصری عسکری، احتجاج، طبرسی، صدوق.

1. Graduated from Quran and Hadith Sciences, Qom Hadith and Quran University. Iran

۱. دانش آموخته رشته علوم قرآن و حدیث، دانشگاه قرآن و حدیث قم. ایران  
kazemostadi@gmail.com

## Introduction

The commentary book attributed to Imam Hassan 'Askarī (AS) is one of the narrative Imāmī commentaries; in which there are no morphological, syntactic and rhetorical issues, and less attention has been paid to the circumstances of the revelation of verses. In this commentary, some verses have been interpreted and most of the interpretations are about the miracles of the Prophet (PBUH) and the Imams of Shiite. The text of the commentary includes only until the end of verse 282 of Surah Al-Baqarah; and about 379 narrations are numbered in it ('Askarī, 1409: Index and Introduction). This commentary is very full of copies compared to similar books; so that it has nearly one hundred manuscripts (see: Derayati, 2012: Entry of the commentary of Imam 'Askarī); which is unique in its kind. In the meantime, it is necessary to know two points about this book: an indifference of cataloguers and translators to this interpretation; as well as the controversial nature of the book, both of which are explained below.

### A. Identifying the commentary in indexes and translations

Nothing was found in earlier sources, such as Barqī' Rijāl (280 AH), the index of Najjāshī (450 AH), Kashshī' Rijāl, Tūsī' Rijāl, and the index of Tūsī (d. 460 AH); unless Ibn al-Ghadā'irī (450 AH) in his Rijāl, under the title "Muhammad ibn al-Qasim" paid attention to interpretation and wrote:

"Muhammad ibn al-Qāsim, the commentator, al-Astarābādī. He was quoted by Abu Ja'far Ibn Bābiwayh. He is weak and liar. A commentary was quoted from him, in which two unknown men are reported: one is known as Yūsuf ibn Muhammad ibn

Zīyād, and the other is Ali ibn Yasār, both quoted from their fathers, from Abu al-Hassan al-Thālith (AS); This commentary was fabricated from Sahl al-Dībājī, from his father with some narrations from these unknown people." (Ibn Ghadā'irī, 1422: 98)<sup>1</sup>

Also, under the works of sheikh Ṣadūq, Najjāshī pointed out two works of commentary, Tafsīr al-Qur'an and a summary of Tafsīr al-Qur'an (Najjāshī, 1407: 391-2); they may be related to the interpretation attributed to Imam Hassan 'Askarī (AS), or they may be basically the same. Ibn Shahr Āshūb (d. 588 AH) in Ma'ālim al-Ulamā does not mention the commentary of Imam Hassan 'Askarī (AS) and Abu Ja'far al-Mar'ashī. It seems that if the book Tafsīr of Imam Hassan 'Askarī (AS) and Al-Ihtijāj with the available sanads from Abu Ja'far was in Ibn Shahr Āshūb, he would have included the name of Abu Ja'far Al-Husseini Al-Mar'ashī as the main narrator of these two books in Ma'ālim al-Ulamā, as he has mentioned the commentary of Imam Ali Al-Hadi 'Askarī (AS) from Al-Hassan Ibn Khalid Barqī (d. 254 AH) (Ibn Shahr Āshūb, nd: 34). Also, although there are similar topics in the books "Mutashābih al-Qur'an", "Mathālib al-Nawāshib" and "Manāqib" with commentaries attributed to Imam Hassan 'Askarī (AS), but there are only a few quotations of commentaries only in Manāqib (Ibn Shahr Āshūb, 2000:

١. محمد بن القاسم، المفسر، الأسترآبادي. روى عنه أبو جعفر ابن بابويه. ضعيف، كذاب. روى عنه تفسيراً يرويه عن رجلين مجهولين: أحدهما يعرف بيوسف بن محمد بن زياد، و الآخر: علي بن محمد بن يسار عن أبيهما، عن أبي الحسن الثالث (ع)؛ و التفسير موضوع عن سهل الديباجي، عن أبيه بأحاديث من هذه المناكير.

2/300, 313 and 329); it is necessary to check whether it is an appendix to Manāqib, or whether it is from Ibn Shahr Āshūb? Also, the name of Abu Ja'far al-Mar'ashī, as the main narrator of the book of Tafṣīr and also as the master of the hypothetical master of Ibn Shahr Āshūb, does not appear in his works. Only at the beginning of Manāqib', where Ibn Shahr Āshūb mentions the sanads and methods of his book; twice there are names that are synonymous with the name of Abu Ja'far al-Husseini. (Ibn Shahr Āshūb, nd: 1/10 and 11) In Muntajab al-Dīn Rāzī (d. 600 AH) and Rijāl Ibn Dāwūd (d. 707 AH), I did not find anything about the interpretation of Imam 'Askarī (AS). Although Rāzī has named more than twenty members of the Mar'ashī family in al-Fihrist (see: Muntajab al-Dīn, 1987: full text); but he did not mention Abu Ja'far Mar'ashī. Allameh Ḥillī (d. 726 AH) in the summary of the sayings, has paid attention to the commentary attributed to Imam 'Askarī (AS) and has quoted its initial sanads; and Ibn Ghadā'irī has brought the same opinion about the subject of the book (Ḥillī, 1417 AH: 404). In Manhaj al-Maqāl Astarābādī (1028 AH), Naqd al-Rijāl Tafreshi (1044 AH) and Fawā'id al-Rijāl Baḥr al-Ulūm (1212 AH), I haven't found a report from the book of commentary attributed to Imam Hassan 'Askarī (AS), and a name of Abu Ja'far Al-Husseini Al-Mar'ashī as the main narrator of the book; except for criticizing the weakness of the narrator of the commentary sanads and the subject matter of this book, which is quoted from Ḥillī from Ibn Ghadā'irī.

Qahpānī (1011 AH) did not mention Abu Ja'far al-Mar'ashī in Majma' al-Rijāl; however, he paid attention to the commentary attributed to Imam 'Askarī

(AS) and quoted its initial sanads similar to Allameh Ḥillī; and he has also expressed a critique of Ḥillī about Ibn Ghadā'irī (Qahpānī, 1985: 6/25).

Ardabili (1101 AH) in Jāmi' al-Ruwāt, we did not find a report from the commentary book attributed to Imam Hassan 'Askarī (AS); except for Ḥillī's critique of Ibn Ghadā'irī, who has been quoted from Astarābādī (Ardabili, 1403: 2/184). Also, while mentioning the title "Abu Muhammad Al-Alawī", he named Abu Ja'far Mahdi Ibn Abi Ḥarb Al-Hassani, the narrator of this book, on the occasion of the book of Iḥtijāj. (Ardabili, 1403: 2/414).

Ḥurr Āmulī (d. 1104 AH) in his Rijālī book, i.e. Amal al-Āmāl, has used the text of commentary (Ḥurr Āmulī, Nd: 1/9) but has not said anything about it. He has also mentioned Abu Ja'far al-Mar'ashī as the narrator of Iḥtijāj, etc. (Ḥurr Āmulī, Nd: 2/327).

Efendi (d. 1130 AH) in Riyadh al-Ulamā, has also repeated the same contents of Ḥurr Āmulī (Isfahani Efendi, 1403 AH: 5/221) and has mentioned this interpretation twice in his book (Isfahani Affandi, 1403: 6/6 and 395).

Māmaqānī (d. 1351 AH) in Tanqīh al-Maqāl, under the title "Al-Hassan Ibn Zayd Ibn Muhammad" has included one of the two commentary sanads attributed to Imam Hassan 'Askarī (AS); in this sanad, there is also the name of "Abi Ja'far Muhtadi ibn Ḥārith Al-Husseini Al-Mar'ashī" (Māmaqānī, 1431: 19/236). Also, under the title of "Ahmad Al-Ṭabrisī", he has quoted the narration of Ibn Shahr Āshūb in Ma'ālim and Sheikh Ḥurr Āmulī in Amal Al-Āmāl; and on this occasion, he has repeated the name of Mahdi Mar'ashī (Māmaqānī, 1431: 6/336).

Sayed Mohsen Amin (d. 1371 AH) in A'yān al-Shi'a also has no specific

information about the interpretation of Imam Hassan 'Askarī (AS); somewhere, quoting Bihār, he has mentioned Tafsīr (Amin Āmulī, 1421: 2/41) and while introducing the components of Sheikh Jawād Al-Balāghī (d. 1352 AH), he has written: "A treatise in lie through quoting the commentary attributed to Imam Hassan al-'Askarī, and this attribution is not true." (Amīn 'Āmilī, 1421: 4/156)<sup>1</sup>. He has also honored Abu Ja'far Mar'ashī without the necessary knowledge (Amin Āmulī, 1421: 10/143).

Khū'ī (d. 1413 AH) in Mu'jam Rijāl al-Hadīth, has no report or information about the commentary attributed to Imam Hassan 'Askarī (AS); only in the title of "Ali ibn Muhammad ibn Sayyār" regarding the commentary of Imam 'Askarī (AS) he has commented as follows: "And it's clearly proved that this commentary has been fabricated. For, as it's far away of the scholar's dignity to right such a book, so what about Imam!" (Khū'ī, 1413: 13/157)<sup>2</sup>

Also, in the title of "Al-Hasan Ibn Zayd", he wrote: "It has been mentioned at the beginning of the commentary attributed to al-'Askarī (AS)" (Khū'ī, 1413: 5/325)<sup>3</sup>

In some other cases, he has cited the text of this book (Khū'ī, 1413: 9/95; 13/157 and 270; 18/163). Also, the title

of Abu Ja'far Al-Husseini Al-Mar'ashī quoted from Sheikh Ḥurr Āmulī. (Khū'ī, 1413: 2/164).

### B. The authenticity of this interpretation is controversial

The commentary book attributed to Imam Hassan 'Askarī (AS) has long been debated among Shiite scholars (Ibn Ghadā'irī, 1422: 98), especially the late and modern scholars (Khū'ī, 1413: 13/157). For example, Allameh Tustarī (d. 1416 AH), apart from the book Akhbār al-Dakhīlah (Shūshtarī, nd: 1/152 and 228), in several parts of Qāmūs al-Rijāl, refers to the subject matter of the book: "And in the fabricated book titled as 'Askarī (AS)" (Shūshtarī, 1410: 2/467), "A report was received that the commentary has been attributed to 'Askarī (AS) in lie" (Shūshtarī, 1410: 10/15), "It's strange that in the fabricated commentary attributed to 'Askarī (AS)" (Shūshtarī, 1410: 7/236), "A commentary has been reported from Askarī (AS) through an unknown report" (Shūshtarī, 1410: 8/541), "And this commentary is unknown completely and has been attributed to 'Askarī (AS) in lie, as I proved in my other book *Al-Mawdū'ār*". (Shūshtarī, 1410: 6/19)<sup>4</sup>

The controversies of this Shiite book is multidimensional and consists of several layers; that is, it includes both the date of authorship and the

٤. «ففي الكتاب المجهول الذي سمّوه تفسير العسكري(ع)» (شوشتری، ١٤١٠ق: ٢ / ٤٦٧)؛ یا «... نقله خيرا الأصل فيه التفسير الموضوع المفتري على العسكري(ع)» (شوشتری، ١٤١٠ق: ١٠ / ١٥)؛ یا «... و من الغريب! أنّ في تفسير الموضوع المنسوب إلى العسكري(ع) كذبا...» (شوشتری، ١٤١٠ق: ٧ / ٢٣٦)؛ یا «... روى التفسير المفتري على العسكري(ع) خيرا منكرا...» (شوشتری، ١٤١٠ق: ٨ / ٥٤١)؛ یا «و أما خبر التفسير و الخير الأخير و هو أيضا من التفسير فالتفسير المذكور كله منكر و افتري على العسكري(ع) كما حَقَّقناه في كتابنا في الموضوعات.»

١. رسالة في التّكذيب لرواية التفسير المنسوب إلى الإمام الحسن العسكري و كذب نسبه اليه.

٢. هذا مع أن الناظر في هذا التفسير لا يشك في أنه موضوع، و جل مقام عالم محقق أن يكتب مثل هذا التفسير، فكيف بالإمام(ع).

٣. «ذكر ذلك في مفتاح التفسير المنسوب إلى العسكري(ع)».

attribution of the book to the author, as well as the sanads and content of the book (for example, see: all over the text; Ostadi, 1985 AD: all over the text).

### Problem

Considering the long-standing controversy over the interpretation attributed to Imam Hassan 'Askarī (AS); this book needs to be examined from different angles. One of these dimensions is the examination of the sanads of this book; which can be done in several ways: a. examining the form of sanads in manuscripts. b. Examining the narrators of sanads in terms of omission or rijālī translation. To examine: What is the chain of interpretation sanads? Do this series also have omitted narrators? What is the rijālī situation of these narrators?

Because the narrators from Sheikh Ṣadūq to Imam Hassan 'Askarī (AS) have been studied in other sources, in the present article, only the rijālī study of the narratives of the sanads of this interpretation up to Sheikh Ṣadūq will be considered.

### Background

Concerning the commentary attributed to Imam Hassan 'Askarī (AS), brief discussions and critical references have been made in some earlier and later sources; some of which were mentioned earlier, and there are some others too (see: Dāmād, Shāri' Al-Nejat, 121-188; Balāghī, Ālā' Al-Rahmān, 1/49; Tustarī, Al-Akhhār Al-Dakhīlah, 1/152-228; Sha'rānī, Margin of Majma' al-Bayān, 10/580) Also, there are independent works about this book: "Ostadi, Reza (1985), a discussion on the commentary of Imam Hassan Al-'Askarī (AS), The Light of Science, No. 13", "Hashemi, Fatemeh

(2006), a review of the authenticity and validity of the narrations of the commentary attributed to Imam 'Askarī (AS), Mashhad: Islamic Research Foundation" and "Lutfī, Mahdi (2007), the sanad of interpretation attributed to Imam Hassan 'Askarī (AS), Qur'an and Hadith Studies, v. 1, no. 1 »; but the present study, exclusively, only examines the series of sanads of this interpretation up to Sheikh Ṣadūq .

### A. Introducing the sanads of Imam 'Askarī (AS) commentary

For this commentary attributed to Imam 'Askarī (AS), three or four types of sanads can be proposed:

1. Sanads on the manuscripts of the commentary attributed to Imam Hassan 'Askarī (AS); which are of two types.
2. The sanads of this interpretation are in the book called Al-Iḥtijāj.
3. Similar sanad in individual narrations of other sources; like the works of Sheikh Ṣadūq.
4. Possible and exchangeable sands.

### 1. Sanads in the works of Sheikh Ṣadūq

Sheikh Ṣadūq received about thirty narrations from an unknown person named "Muhammad ibn al-Qasim Al-Astarābādī Al-Mufasssir" or "Muhammad ibn al-Qasim Al-Mufasssir known as Abi Al-Hassan Al-Jurjānī (RA)", probably in his trip to Astarābād and Jurjān (around 368 BC) with two intermediaries from "Hassan Ibn Ali", and has quoted them in some of his works. These sanads are of two categories:

**One.** The sanads of Yusuf and Ali from their fathers from Al-Hasan ibn Ali.

This group of hadiths includes similar sanads with some differences and corrections:

1. Sanads containing the phrase "They are from the Imāmī Shiite", like: "Haddathanā Muhammad ibn al-Qāsim al-Jurjānī al-mufasssir rahimahullāh qāla haddathanā Abū Ya'qūb Yūsuf ibn Muhammad ibn Zūyād wa Ali ibn Muhammad ibn Sayyār wa kāna min al-Shī'a al-Imāmīyah 'an abawayhimā 'an al-Hassan ibn Ali ibn Muhammad." (Al-Tawhīd, 230; Ma'ānī al-Akhbār, 4).<sup>1</sup>

2. The largest share of sanads: "Haddathanā Muhammad ibn al-Qāsim Astarābādī al-ma'rūf bi Abi al-Hassan al-Jurjānī al-mufasssir radīyallāh 'anhu qāla haddathanā Abū Ya'qūb Yūsuf ibn Muhammad ibn Zīyād wa Abul Hassan Ali ibn Muhammad ibn Sayyār 'an abawayhimā 'an al-Hassan ibn Ali ibn Muhammad ibn Ali ibn Musa ibn Ja'far ibn Muhammad..." (Ma'ānī al-Akhbār, 24, 33, 36, 399; 'Ilal al-Sharā'i, 2/416; 'Uyūn Akhbār al-Ridā, 1/288 and 291).<sup>2</sup>

The rest, regardless of the repetitive narrators at the beginning of the sanad, are:

"An abawayhimā 'an al-Hassan ibn Ali al-'Askarī 'an abīh-i Ali ibn Muhammad 'an abīh-i Muhammad ibn Ali (AS) 'an al-Ridā Ali ibn Musa..." (Uyūn Akhbār al-Ridā, 2/12 and 167).<sup>3</sup>

"An abawayhimā 'an al-Hassan ibn Ali ibn Muhammad ibn Ali al-Ridā 'an abīh-i 'an jaddih..." (Al-Tawhīd: 47)<sup>4</sup>

"An abawayhimā 'an al-Hassan ibn Ali 'an abīh-i Ali ibn Muhammad 'an abīh-i Muhammad ibn Ali 'an abīh-i al-Ridā Ali ibn Musa 'an abīh-i Musa ibn Ja'far 'an abīh-i al-Sādiq Ja'far ibn Muhammad..." (Uyūn Akhbār al-Ridā, 1/266, 300, 301, 305)<sup>5</sup>

3. Recovered sanads from their fathers:

"Haddathanā Muhammad ibn al-Qāsim al-mufasssir al-ma'rūf bi Abi al-Hassan al-Jurjānī radīyallāh 'anhu qāla haddathanā Yūsuf ibn Muhammad ibn Zīyād 'an abīh-i 'an al-Hassan ibn Ali 'an abīh-i Ali ibn Muhammad 'an abīh-i Muhammad ibn Ali 'an abīh-i al-Ridā Ali ibn Musā 'an abīh-i Musa ibn Ja'far 'an abīh-i al-Sādiq Ja'far ibn Muhammad..." ('Uyūn Akhbār al-Ridā, 1/254).<sup>6</sup>

4. In some of the sanads of the narrations that have been mentioned before, instead of the name of Sayyār, "Yasār" or "Sayyād" has been mentioned ('Uyūn Akhbār al-Rezā, 12/2, Sayyād; 'Ilal al-Sharāyi, 2/416, Yasār).

**Two.** Sanads of Ahmad from Hassan ibn Ali

In the two books of 'Uyūn and Ma'ānī from Sheikh Ṣadūq, there are

١. حَدَّثَنَا مُحَمَّدُ بْنُ الْقَاسِمِ الْجُرْجَانِيُّ الْمُفَسِّرُ رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ قَالَ حَدَّثَنَا أَبُو يَعْقُوبَ يُونُسُ بْنُ مُحَمَّدٍ بْنِ زِيَادٍ وَعَلِيُّ بْنُ مُحَمَّدٍ بْنِ سَيَّارٍ وَكَانَا مِنَ الشَّيْخَةِ الْإِمَامِيَّةِ عَنْ أَبِيهِمَا عَنِ الْحَسَنِ بْنِ عَلِيٍّ بْنِ مُحَمَّدٍ.

٢. حَدَّثَنَا مُحَمَّدُ بْنُ الْقَاسِمِ الْأَسْتَرَابَادِيُّ الْمَعْرُوفُ بِأَبِي الْحَسَنِ الْجُرْجَانِيِّ الْمُفَسِّرِ رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ قَالَ حَدَّثَنِي أَبُو يَعْقُوبَ يُونُسُ بْنُ مُحَمَّدٍ بْنِ زِيَادٍ وَأَبُو الْحَسَنِ عَلِيُّ بْنُ مُحَمَّدٍ بْنِ سَيَّارٍ عَنْ أَبِيهِمَا عَنِ الْحَسَنِ بْنِ عَلِيٍّ بْنِ مُحَمَّدٍ بْنِ يُونُسِ بْنِ جَعْفَرِ بْنِ مُحَمَّدٍ....

٣. عَنْ أَبِيهِمَا عَنِ الْحَسَنِ بْنِ عَلِيٍّ الْعَسْكَرِيِّ عَنْ أَبِيهِ عَلِيِّ بْنِ مُحَمَّدٍ عَنْ أَبِيهِ مُحَمَّدِ بْنِ عَلِيٍّ (ع) عَنِ الرَّضَا عَلِيِّ بْنِ مُوسَى ...

٤. عَنْ أَبِيهِمَا عَنِ الْحَسَنِ بْنِ عَلِيٍّ بْنِ مُحَمَّدٍ بْنِ عَلِيٍّ الرَّضَا عَنْ أَبِيهِ عَنِ جَدِّهِ.

٥. عَنْ أَبِيهِمَا عَنِ الْحَسَنِ بْنِ عَلِيٍّ عَنْ أَبِيهِ عَلِيِّ بْنِ مُحَمَّدٍ عَنْ أَبِيهِ مُحَمَّدِ بْنِ عَلِيٍّ عَنْ أَبِيهِ الرَّضَا عَلِيِّ بْنِ مُوسَى عَنْ أَبِيهِ مُوسَى بْنِ جَعْفَرِ عَنْ أَبِيهِ الصَّادِقِ جَعْفَرِ بْنِ مُحَمَّدٍ ...

٦. حَدَّثَنَا مُحَمَّدُ بْنُ الْقَاسِمِ الْمُفَسِّرُ الْمَعْرُوفُ بِأَبِي الْحَسَنِ الْجُرْجَانِيُّ رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ قَالَ حَدَّثَنَا يُونُسُ بْنُ مُحَمَّدٍ بْنِ زِيَادٍ عَنْ أَبِيهِ عَنِ الْحَسَنِ بْنِ عَلِيٍّ عَنْ أَبِيهِ عَلِيِّ بْنِ مُحَمَّدٍ عَنْ أَبِيهِ مُحَمَّدِ بْنِ عَلِيٍّ عَنْ أَبِيهِ الرَّضَا عَلِيِّ بْنِ مُوسَى عَنْ أَبِيهِ مُوسَى بْنِ جَعْفَرِ عَنْ أَبِيهِ الصَّادِقِ جَعْفَرِ بْنِ مُحَمَّدٍ ...

about seven narrations from "Muhammad ibn al-Qasim al-Mufassir" leading to "Al-Hasan ibn Ali" with these sanads:

"Haddathanā Muhammad ibn al-Qāsīm al-mufassir al-Jurjānī radīyallāh ‘anhu qāla haddathanā Ahmad ibn al-Hasan al-Husseinī ‘an al-Hasan ibn Ali al-Nāsirī ‘an abīh-i ‘an Muhammad ibn Ali ‘an abīh-i al-Ridā ‘an abīh-i Musa ibn Ja'far..." (Ma'ānīy al-Akhbār, 278, 288)<sup>1</sup>.

From the sanads of these narrations, four narrations in 'Uyūn Akhbār al-Rezā (AS) do not have the title of "Al-Nasiri" following the name of "Hasan Ibn Ali"; and has come alone. ('Uyūn Akhbār al-Rezā, 1/274, 297 and 2/52)

**Three.** A point about Hassan bin Ali Naseri 'Askari

Reflecting on the sanads that have been mentioned, it seems that most likely, "Hasan ibn Ali" in the sanads of these narrations does not mean the eleventh Shiite Imam, that is, Imam Hassan 'Askari (AS); rather, the same "Hasan Ibn Ali Naseri" or "Nāsir Kabīr Aṭrūsh" who in Zaidi sources, he is called "the owner of the invitation, the Great Imam, the Lecturer Imam, the True Imam", and with a special interpretation of "the helper for the right" (Alizadeh, 2016; Rahmati, 2012: full text); and sometimes he is mentioned in Zaidiyyah, on the occasion of his father's title, as "Al-'Askari" (Ibn 'Inaba, 1417: 285); and because of the similarity of his name and that of his father, that is, "Ali ibn Muhammad", he has been confused

with the name of Imam Hassan 'Askari (AS); as the mosque built by Aṭrūsh in Amol is also called the mosque of Imam Hassan 'Askari .

This possibility is also in line with the manuscript sanad of the commentary attributed to Imam Hassan 'Askari (AS):

"...kāna abūnā imāmayn wa kānat al-zaydīyah hum al-ghālibīn bi astarābād wa kānā fī imārat al-Hasan ibn al-'alawī al-mulaqab bi-dā'ī ila al-haq imām al-zaydīyah wa kān kathīr al-isghā' ilayhim yaqtul al-nāsa bi-si'āyātihim 'alā anfusinā fakharajnā bi ahlīnā ilā hadrat al-imam al-Hasan ibn Ali ibn Muhammad..."<sup>2</sup>

It is also consistent with the status of one of the children of Hassan ibn Ali Nasser Kabīr, i.e. Abu al-Hasan Ahmad ibn Hassan who was not Zaidi, but was from the Imāmīyyah Shiites (Ibn Esfandiar, 1987: 273; Amoli, 1969: 108).

Nasser Kabīr (304 AH) is the third Alawite ruler of Tabarestan, with the original name of Hassan Ibn Ali and nicknamed Nasser Aṭrūsh. He was a Zaidi (See. 'Alam al-Hudā, 1417: 38), although some have mistakenly considered him an Imāmī. Many writings and works have been attributed to him (Ibn Nadīm, 1417: 240); among these works is "Tafsīr Kabīr" or "Tafsīr al-Aṭrūsh" (see: Tehrani, 1408: 4/261).

٢. «...كان أبوانا إماميين و كانت الزيدية هم الغالبين بأسترآباد و كانا في إمارة الحسن بن زيد العلوي الملقب بالداعي إلى الحق إمام الزيدية و كان كثير الإصغاء إليهم يقتل الناس بسعائياتهم فخشيناهم على أنفسنا فخرجنا بأهلينا إلى حضرة الإمام الحسن بن علي بن محمد...»

١. حَدَّثَنَا مُحَمَّدُ بْنُ الْقَاسِمِ الْمُفَسِّرُ الْجُرْجَانِيُّ رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ قَالَ خَلَّيْنَا أَحْمَدَ بْنَ الْحَسَنِ الْحُسَيْنِيَّ عَنْ الْحَسَنِ بْنِ عَلِيٍّ النَّاصِرِيِّ عَنْ أَبِيهِ عَنْ مُحَمَّدِ بْنِ عَلِيٍّ عَنْ أَبِيهِ الرَّضَا عَنْ أَبِيهِ مُوسَى بْنِ جَعْفَرٍ.





In other manuscripts, the same sanads exist with some slight differences and spelling contradictions (for example, see: Mar'ashī version No. 9836 dated 1033 AH)

The same sanads with a slight difference in 'Awālī al-La'ālī al-Azīzīyah from Ibn Abi Jumhūr (d. 901 AH), with the title "Ṭabrisī Mufasssir" (Ibn Abi Jumhūr, 1403: 16)<sup>1</sup>;

#### 4. Possible replacement and combination sanads

Ibn al-Ghadā'irī (4<sup>th</sup> century) writes on the title of "Muhammad ibn al-Qasim" (Ibn al-Ghadā'irī, 1422: 98)<sup>2</sup>.

The same thing has been narrated by Allameh Ḥillī and others from Ibn Ghadā'irī (see: Ḥillī, 1417: 405). There are several notable points in this regard: In Ibn al-Ghadā'irī's speech, it is possible that he mentioned two interpretations on the occasion of an issue; in other words, he mentioned both the narrated commentary of Muhammad ibn Qasim and the narrated commentary of Sahl ibn Dibāj; and considered them the same in terms of "subjectivity." In other words, the sentence of Ibn Ghadā'irī is as follows: the interpretation of Astarābādī is the subject; as is the case with the Dibājī interpretation; and here, the word "kamā 'an" has been missed in the

sentence of Ibn Ghadā'irī; as Allameh Tustarī has also pointed out this possibility of missing (Tustarī, 1401: 1/215).

Here it is possible that, for example, the commentary of Hassan ibn Ali Aṭrūsh has been passed on to the next generations in two ways:

One. Through Sahl Dibājī (d. 380 AH) from his father (d. 340 AH) from Aṭrūsh (d. 304 AH); this is the existing interpretation attributed to Imam Hassan 'Askarī (AS).

Two. Through Muhammad ibn Qasim Astarābādī from Yusuf ibn Ziyād and Ali ibn Sayyār from Hassan ibn Ali Aṭrūsh; a small number of its narrations have been mentioned by Sheikh Ṣadūq, quoting Muhammad ibn Qasim al-Mufasssir, in some of his works (for example, see: Al-Tawḥīd, 230; Ma'ānī al-Akḥbār, 4).

Therefore, on the other hand, two possibilities can be considered to explain this documentation or correct the sanads:

1. The sanads of Sahl Dibājī have been destroyed from the beginning of the old version of Tafṣīr; in subsequent copies, they have taken and used the sanads in the works of Sheikh Ṣadūq, and have interpreted, written and copied them instead of the sanad at the beginning of the copy.

2. According to one of the commentary sanads attributed to Imam Hassan 'Askarī (AS) on manuscripts, Muhammad Daqqāq has quoted the commentary from Ibn Rāzī, i.e. Ja'far Qomi and also Ibn Shādhān Qomi. On the other hand, Ja'far Qomi in his works has mentioned the names of some of his sheikhs in the series of sanads, among which we can mention Sahl Ibn Ahmad Dibājī (Ibn Rāzī, 1990: "Al-Musalsalāt" 108). Also, Ibn Shādhān Qomi has some narrations

١. قَالَ الشَّيْخُ أَبُو الْفَضَائِلِ الطَّبْرِسِيُّ الْمُفَسِّرُ بِإِسْنَادِهِ حَدَّثَنِي أَلَسَيْدُ أَبُو جَعْفَرٍ مَهْدِيُّ بْنُ أَبِي حَرْبٍ الْحُسَيْنِيُّ الْمَرْعَشِيُّ عَنْ الشَّيْخِ أَبُو [أبي] عَبْدِ اللَّهِ جَعْفَرِ بْنِ مُحَمَّدٍ الدُّورِيسِيِّ قَالَ ...

٢. المفسر الأسترآبادي. روى عنه أبو جعفر ابن بابويه. ضعيف، كذاب. روى عنه تفسيراً يرويه عن رجلين مجهولين: أحدهما يعرف بيوسف بن محمد بن زياد، و الآخر: علي بن محمد بن يسار عن أبيهما، عن أبي الحسن الثالث (ع). و التفسير موضوع عن سهل الديباجي عن أبيه، بأحاديث من هذه المناكير.

from Sahl Ibn Ahmad Dibājī; Such as (see: Karājakī, 1410: 63 and 151)<sup>1</sup>.

Therefore, some people may have changed or corrected the commentary sanad in their own opinion in copying the commentary attributed to Imam Hassan 'Askarī (AS) for reasons such as Ibn Ghadā'irī's article about Sahl Dibājī. That is, they have combined the sanad of Daqqāq by Ja'far Qomi from Sahl Dibājī with the sanad of Sheikh Ṣadūq from the commentator Astarābādī, and the name of Sahl Dibājī has been removed from this sanad of Tafṣīr 'Askarī. This possibility is consistent with the status of other commentary sanads of Shādhān; because there are no narrators in those sanads between Sayed Raḍī and Sheikh Ṣadūq. This fall may be a clue to the removal of the narrators, and it is the replacement and composition of sanads from Sahl Dibājī to Sheikh Ṣadūq.

The conclusion is that, if there are any clues about Sahl Dibājī's father's relationship with Hassan bin Ali Aṭrūsh in Iraq; the first possibility will be supported; and if other manuscripts of the interpretation are found with different sanads, the second possibility is supported.

### **B. Sanads of the commentary up to Sheikh Ṣadūq**

Apart from the sanads of the narrations of Sheikh Ṣadūq from the commentator Astarābādī in his works, all three other sanads of the book of commentary attributed to Imam Hassan 'Askarī (AS) have two steps: One, the sanads of narrators up to Sheikh Ṣadūq; two, the

sanads of the narrators from sheikh Ṣadūq to Imam Hasan 'Askarī (AS); each of them has their special significance. In the present text, we will only consider the sanads of this interpretation up to the sheikh Ṣadūq.

#### **1. The importance of addressing these sanads**

Firstly, we need to discuss the importance of dealing with the sanads up to Sheikh Ṣadūq, whether it is important to pay attention to these sanads or these sanads are somehow ceremonial sanads and the reflection on their narrators is not important.

In this regard, it is necessary to note that if the whole available book attributed to the interpretation referred to as Imam Hassan 'Askarī (AS), or in a better word, the commentary of Aṭrūsh was available in the works of sheikh Ṣadūq, the attention to the narrators of the sanads up to Sheikh Ṣadūq did not have much significance for the validation of this book; that is, these sanads were considered somehow ceremonial; but since there are only 20 narratives and more than 30 narratives of this interpretation are available in the works of sheikh Ṣadūq, it means that the validity of the sanad is about 350 narratives of the interpretation attributed to Imam Hasan 'Askarī (AS) that are related to the validity and status of the sanads collection up to Sheikh Ṣadūq. In other words, these narratives cannot be attached to the validity of sheikh Ṣadūq; they may have been fake or altered and their sanads are attributed to sheikh Ṣadūq intentionally or unintentionally.

#### **2. Introduction of sanads up to Sheikh Ṣadūq**

In order to better pay attention, we show all the sanads of the narrators up

1. «الشيخ الفقيه ابن شاذان رحمه الله قال حدثنا سهل بن أحمد

عن احمد بن عبد الله الديباجي».

to Sheikh Ṣadūq on this interpretation, which we had previously mentioned, in a table separately from other narrators.

### **C. Omissions and the time interval between the manuscripts and the final narrators**

About Irsāl in the sanads of the commentary attributed to Imam Hassan 'Askarī (AS), two different approaches can be adopted, each in turn are very important.

#### **1. The time interval between the manuscripts and the narrators**

There is a time interval between almost all manuscripts of earlier works, with their authors or narrators.

The commentary book attributed to Imam Hassan 'Askarī (AS) in all three types of its sanads, has a time interval between manuscripts and narrators of sanads; which is mentioned separately:

#### **A. Sanads of interpretation's manuscripts**

These sanads, as mentioned earlier, are of two types and both are from an unknown original narrator. If the anonymous narrator of Daqqāq sanad has quoted directly from Muhammad Daqqāq (d. 425 AH), he probably died around the year 450 AH; therefore, his distance with the oldest manuscript of Tafsīr, which is related to the year 808 AH (Derayati, 2011: 661/8) and also has his sanad, is about 350 years. Also, if the anonymous narrator of Shādhān sanad has quoted directly from Shādhān Ibn Jibril (590 to 600 AH), he probably died around 620 AH; therefore, his distance with the oldest manuscript of Tafsīr, which is related to the year 808 AH and has his sanad, is about 190 years. Therefore, the manuscripts of the commentary

attributed to Imam 'Askarī (AS) at their best in these sanads have a distance of about two hundred years without sanads from the narrator of the sanads of the manuscript.

#### **B. Sanads of Interpretation in Ihtijāj**

These sanads, which are in the book of Ihtijāj and are for about forty narrations of commentary attributed to Imam 'Askarī (AS); given that the author of the book "Ihtijāj" is anonymous; there are two forms: 1- If the narrator of the unknown author of Ihtijāj has quoted the narrations directly from Mahdi Mar'ashī (539 AH); he probably died in 570 AH; therefore, according to the oldest manuscript of Ihtijāj which is in the year 736 AH (see: Ardakan version, number 177), the time interval between the date of writing the manuscript and the narrator of the commentary narrations is about 170 years. 2- Even if I consider Abu Mansour Ṭabrisī as the author of the book of "Ihtijāj", considering that his life is around the year 588 AH; the time interval between the date of writing the manuscript (736 AH) and the narrator of the commentary narrations is about 150 years. Therefore, about 40 narrations from the commentary attributed to Imam 'Askarī (AS) in the manuscript of Ihtijāj, at their best in these sanads, have a period of about one hundred and fifty years without sanads to the narrator of the sanads.

#### **C. Sanads of interpretation in the works of Sheikh Ṣadūq**

Sanads about 27 (20 + 7) narrations of the commentary attributed to Imam 'Askarī (AS) in the works of Ṣadūq, include four titles from the books of Ṣadūq: 1- The book of 'Uyūn Akhbār al-Rezā (AS), the oldest historical version of which is related to 576 AH

(Derayati, 2011: 23/212) and other versions have been estimated around the fourth century, that is, the time of Sheikh Ṣadūq (381 AH); therefore, according to the fourth-century version, there is no specific time interval with the sanads of the commentary narrations; and according to the specific version, there are at least about two hundred years without sanads to the narrator of the sanads, namely Sheikh Ṣadūq. 2- The book “‘Ilal al-Sharāyī’”, the oldest version of which is related to the ninth century (Derayati, 2012: 8/22/35); and the book of Tawḥīd, the oldest version of which is related to the year 951 AH (Derayati, 2012: 9/418); and the book Ma’ānī al-Akḥbār, the oldest version of which is related to the tenth century (Derayati, 2012: 25/30).

Therefore, some of these 27 narrations (regardless of the version of the 4th century) are about two hundred years old, and others are about six hundred years apart from the undocumented narrator up to the narrator of the versions sanads i.e. Sheikh Ṣadūq.

#### **D. Summarizing the time interval between the manuscripts and the narrators**

According to the reports mentioned in the previous three titles, the minimum time interval from the manuscripts of the book of commentary to the narrators of its sanads, as well as some narrations of commentary in the works of Sheikh Ṣadūq, is about two hundred years; that means they all have old and long background.

Only if the manuscript of ‘Uyūn Akḥbār al-Rezā (AS) with a date of about the fourth century is correct; this means that 9 of the narrations of Tafsīr

attributed to Imam Hassan ‘Askarī (AS) in the works of Ṣadūq are without a time interval in terms of manuscript to the narrator of the narrations, namely Sheikh Ṣadūq.

#### **2. Irsāl and omissions of narrators in sanads**

The sanads of the narrations of Tafsīr to Sheikh Ṣadūq are of three types; two types of manuscript sanads of the book of commentary attributed to Imam ‘Askarī (AS) and one type of sanads of about forty narrations in the book called Iḥtijāj. Apart from the initial Irsāl of sanads to anonymous narrators in the fifth and seventh centuries, these sanads have a clear and hidden omissions.

##### **A. Omission in the sanads of Shādhān Ibn Jibril**

There are two hidden omissions in the manuscripts of Ibn Jibril in the manuscripts of Tafsīr:

1. There is a secret omission between Abu Ja‘far Mohtadī Mar‘ashī (Mahdi Mar‘ashī) and Ja‘far Doristi. Because according to the life history of the elders of Abu Abdullah Ja‘far ibn Muhammad ibn Ahmad Doristi Rāzī (458 AH), the birth of Doristi was probably around 385 AH or before it. Accordingly, the date of his death is probably about 470 AH or earlier. According to this rule, Doristi could not be Sheikh and Master of Abu Ja‘far Mar‘ashī; because, according to Sam‘ānī, he was born in 462 AH, and even if he had started studying and receiving narration at the age of 15 (i.e. 477 AH), he could not have obtained narration from Ja‘far Doristi directly; unless, we consider Ja‘far Doristi to be an old man, who was alive until 477 AH. On the other hand, the name Doristi is not among the elders mentioned by Sam‘ānī from Abu Ja‘far.

Also, in the sources, the name of Abu Ja'far Mar'ashī is not among the students of Doristi; and there are no other narrations from Shiite sources quoting them, except this commentary sanads attributed to Imam Hassan 'Askarī (AS). Therefore, it is not clear whether Abu Ja'far saw Doristi in person or not. That is, it is necessary to investigate how was the narration of Abu Ja'far's narration from Doristi?

2. There is a hidden omission between Ja'far Doristi's father and Sheikh Ṣadūq; because Sheikh Ṣadūq died in the year 381 AH, and the time of death of Ja'far Doristi's father, according to the year of Ja'far's life in 474 AH, is about 425 to 450 AH. If Ja'far Doristi's father wants to narrate directly from Sheikh Ṣadūq, it is necessary that he was born at least around 360 to 365 AH, which will not be in harmony with Ja'far Doristi's life; unless we assume that either Ja'far Doristi or his father is an old man. However, if we correct the sanads according to the sanads of Muhammad Daqqāq in manuscripts as well as the commentary sanads attributed to Imam 'Askarī (AS) in the book of Ihtijāj, and add the name of Muhammad ibn Ahmad Shādhān or Ja'far ibn Ahmad Qomi between Sheikh Ṣadūq and his father Doristi; the problem of omission in this part of the sanads will be solved.

#### **B. Omission in the sanads of the narrations of the book called Ihtijāj**

Three hidden omissions can also be assumed in the sanads of Ihtijāj:

1. If Abu Mansour Ṭabrisī (lived around 480 to 580 AH) is the author of a book called Ihtijāj, there can be no presumed omission between Ṭabrisī and Mahdi Mar'ashī; but because Abu Mansour Ṭabrisī is not the author of the book called Ihtijāj, and on the other

hand, the year of life of the anonymous author of the book called Ihtijāj is not known so the condition of omission is unknown here too. That is, the author of Ihtijāj may have quoted about forty narrations of commentary in a book called Ihtijāj, at intervals.

2. Between Mahdi Mar'ashī and Ja'far Doristi, in the sanads of Ihtijāj, it is possible to assume the same omission as the sanads of interpretation, which was explained earlier.

3. In the sanads of Ihtijāj, the name of Ja'far Doristi's father is not mentioned between Ja'far Doristi and Ja'far ibn Ahmad, according to which the omission is found; unless we correct this sanad with the sanads of the manuscript of the commentary attributed to Imam 'Askarī (AS).

#### **C. Omission in the sanads of Muhammad Daqqāq**

Since Muhammad Daqqāq or Raffāq is unknown and no information can be found about him in the name of Daqqāq and Raffāq in the sources, it is not possible to make an accurate judgment about the situation between him and the later narrators before Sheikh Ṣadūq in these commentary sanads attributed to Imam Hassan 'Askarī (AS); of course, if Muhammad Daqqāq is the son of Ali Daqqāq, that is, Muhammad ibn Ali ibn Muhammad ibn Ja'far ibn al-Daqqāq, who is the Sheikh of Sheikh Ṣadūq, the sanads between Muhammad Daqqāq and the narrators before Ṣadūq are apparently inconsistent.

#### **D. Rijālī study of narrators of sanads up to Sheikh Ṣadūq**

According to the available and probable sanads, the total number of narrators of the commentary sanads, both in manuscript and in Ihtijāj, is nine: They are Shādhān Jibril, Muhammad Sarāhanak, Ahmad

Ṭabrisī, Mahdi Mar'ashī, Ja'far Doristi, Muhammad Daqqāq, Ja'far Qomi, Muhammad ibn Shādhān and Sahl Dibājī. On the other hand, the first narrator who mentions the book of commentary is unknown; therefore, the number of narrators whose religious status needs to be examined is ten; which are in chronological order:

### 1. Unknown final narrators

In the existing sanads of manuscripts of commentary attributed to Imam Hassan 'Askarī (AS), the narrators of "he said" are not known; that is, the person of the narrator who says "Shādhān Ibn Jibril said" and in another sanad, the narrator of "Muhammad Daqqāq said". Therefore, the last narrators of the commentary sanads are anonymous; and the anonymity of this narrator is a level lower than the status of "Muhmal" and "Majhūl". This means that, if the name of the narrator is known and this name does not appear in the Rijālī books, the narrator is considered Muhmal; and if the name of the narrator is specified and his name has not been mentioned in the Rijālī books, but there is no translation of him, this narrator is considered Majhūl i.e. unknown. But even if the name of the narrator is not specified in a sanad; this means that the narrator is anonymous; the state of the invalidity of an anonymous narrator is much stronger than the Muhmal and Majhūl narrator.

Also, in the sanad of the book called *Ihtijāj*, if the author was Abu Mansour Ṭabrisī, the narrator of the hadiths of the commentaries attributed to Imam Hassan 'Askarī (AS) would have been specific and usually Abu Mansour Ṭabrisī; but later it will come that the book called *Ihtijāj* is not from Ṭabrisī; so in this sanad, because the author is anonymous, so the narrator of the

"hadith" in the commentary sanad in *Ihtijāj* is also unknown; and everything we said above can be said for this narrator as well. As a result, the final narrators of all the manuscripts of the commentary, as well as the manuscripts of the book called *Ihtijāj*, are anonymous.

### 2. Shādhān Ibn Jibril (d. 590 to 600 AH)

Abu al-Faḍl al-Shādhān ibn Jibril ibn Isma'il ibn Abi Ṭālib al-Qomi has been apparently a Shiite Imāmī jurist of the sixth century. There is no translation or modification in the earlier rijālī sources, namely: Ma'ālim al-Ulamā Ibn Shahr Āshūb (d. 588 AH), Al-Fihrast Muntajab al-Din (d. 600 AH), Rijāl ibn Dāwūd (7th century) and summary of the sayings of Ḥillī (d. 726 AH). Only, his name is mentioned in the author's way to "Abi Al-Salah Taqī Ibn Najm al-Din Al-Halabī" in Rijāl Ibn Dāwūd and also a similar repetition in the summary of the sayings (see: Ibn Dāwūd, Nd: 27; Ḥillī, 1417 AH: 455). Therefore, Shādhān Ibn Jibril is unknown due to Rijālī viewpoint in the earlier works. There are a few hadiths from him in the sources of the seventh century, such as: Al-Mazār Kabīr (Ibn Mashhadī, 1999: 31 and 236), Iman Abi Ṭālib (Mousavi, 1990: 103, 130, 224, 264, 285, 304, 319 and 361) and Farhat al-Gharrā' (Ibn Tawus, Nd: 50, 99 and 112); there are also more hadiths in later sources. Four books have been attributed to him; the two books "Izahat al-illah" and "Tuhfat al-Mu'allif" are not available. The two books Al-Faḍā'il and Al-Rawḍa, apart from the fact that their attribution to Shādhān Ibn Jibril is distorted (for example, see: Tehrani, Nd: 8/135, number 507; Bahari Hamedani, 2002: all over the text) in terms of structure, form and text of their hadiths, are the

same; and now it is not clear which of these two books are original, and which are written by the other. (For more information, see: Qomi, 1423; Homo, 1984 AD: all over the text). It seems that later rijālī, such as Sheikh Ḥurr Āmulī, the author of Riyadh al-'Ulamā, and others, have identified and praised Shādhān ibn Jibril for these attributive works without any sensory reason (see: Ḥurr Āmulī, Nd: 2/130; Isfahani Afandi, 1403: 3/5). Of course, the view of some scholars towards him also had a jurisprudential aspect; like the opinion of the first martyr on the occasion of mentioning the book "Izāhat al-Illah fi Ma'refat al-Qiblah" which said: "Al-Sheikh Abol Fadl Shādhān ibn Jibrīl al-Qomī wa huwa min Ajillā' Foqahā'unā" (Āmilī, 1419: 163)<sup>1</sup>.

In any case, with the search that was done in these books attributed to Shādhān Ibn Jibril, no report was found about "Mahdi Al-Husseini Al-Mar'ashī (narrator of 'Askarī's commentary), Abu Mansour Ahmad Ibn Ali Ṭabrisī, Al-Ihtijāj and also the commentary of Imam Hassan 'Askarī (AS)". Also, hadiths and materials from the current book called Ihtijāj and Interpretation attributed to Imam Hassan 'Askarī (AS) were not found in these two books; to show the connection between the scholars and the commentary attributed to Imam Hassan 'Askarī (AS).

The conclusion is that, apart from the fact that there was no translation or modification in the earlier rijālī sources of Shādhān ibn Jibril and he is unknown; his connection with the commentary attributed to 'Askarī (AS) is also not clear.

### 3. Muhammad Ibn Sarāhanak

"Muhammad ibn Sarāhanak Al-Husseini Al-Alawi Al-Mar'ashī Al-Jurjānī" is unknown in the books of Shiite Rijāl and translators. Apart from the manuscript of the commentary attributed to Imam Hassan 'Askarī (AS) which is available with the sanads of "Muhammad Sarāhanak from Abi Ja'far Mohtadi ibn Al-Hārith Al-Husseini Al-Mar'ashī "; he is the narrator of only one narration; which is mentioned in Farhat al-Gharrā' by Ibn Tawus with the title "An al-Faqīh Muhammad ibn Sarāhanak" (see: Ibn Tawus, 1419: 134).

Of course, he is also the author of manuscripts of Rijāl Tūsī; which is written in the version: "... Al-Sayyid al-Sharif Muhammad ibn Sarāhanak ibn al-Murtidā al-Husseini in the year 533 AH ..." (See: Ostadi, 2021 AD: early text).

The name and biography of his father or brother, namely Al-Murtidā ibn Sarāhanak (who was also a writer), is mentioned in the Ṭabaqāt al-Zaidiyyah al-Kubrā on the occasion of the writing of some manuscripts, such as Nahj al-Balāghah (Al-Shahari, 1421: 1/348); and his name is mentioned in some Zaidi sources with the correction and title "Sarāhanak Vashi" or "Sarāhanak Al-Hassani Al-Mar'ashī" (for example, see: Al-Shahari, 1421: 3/121, 422). Therefore, according to Rijālī viewpoint, Muhammad ibn Sarāhanak is untranslated and unknown.

### 4. Abu Mansour Ahmad Ṭabrisī

There is no mention of Abu Mansour Ṭabrisī and the Book of Ihtijāj in the early rijālī sources and al-Fihrist of the fifth to eighth centuries, which date back to the life of Abu Mansour Ṭabrisī and probably at the time of the writing of the book called Ihtijāj. The only

١. الشيخ أبو الفضل شاذان بن جبرئيل القمي و هو من اجلاء فقهاءنا.

information we have about Ahmad Ṭabrisī; there are two lines of his bibliography that Ibn Shahr Āshūb (488 or 489-588 AH) has mentioned in *Ma'ālim al-'Uma*. There is no information in the later Shiite rijālī and translation sources other than the two lines of content in *Ma'ālim*, as well as a line of sanads in *Iḥtijāj* and commentary attributed to Imam Hassan 'Askarī (AS), which came from Abu Ja'far Mar'ashī. Only now does he know that Ibn Shahr Āshūb was a student of Ahmad Ṭabrisī; also, considering that Ibn Shahr Āshūb has been in Iraq and the Levant for at least the last 28 years (see: Pakatchi, 2020: throughout the text); it seems that Ṭabrisī was the master of Ibn Shahr Āshūb before 560 AH. Therefore, according to the year of birth of Ibn Shahr Āshūb and the date of 560 AH, only we know that the life of Abu Mansour was around the years 480 to 580 AH. Ibn Shahr Āshūb has written in *Ma'ālim*: "Shayhī Ahmad ibn Abi Tālib al-Tabrisī, lahū kitābu al-Kāfī fī al-Fiqh Hassan, al-Ihtijāj, Mafākhīrat al-Tayība, Ta'rīkh al-'A'imma (AS), Fadā'il al-Zahrā', Kitāb al-Salāt)" (Ibn Shahr Āshūb, nd: 61)<sup>1</sup>.

Now, due to the fact that he did not mention more information, it is not clear whether the current book called *Iḥtijāj* is the same book of *Iḥtijāj* mentioned in the teachings, or this work is another book of the same name that has been attributed to him. Therefore, it is not clear whether the name of the book of *Iḥtijāj*, in this remembrance of Ibn Shahr Āshūb from

his master, is the current book called *Iḥtijāj* or not? According to new research, it has been determined that the attribution of the current book of *Iḥtijāj*, which is available to us, to Abu Mansour Ṭabrisī, the master of Ibn Shahr Āshūb, is not clear and well-reasoned; on the other hand, basically two books called *Iḥtijāj* and *Tafsīr* attributed to Imam Hassan 'Askarī (AS) until the tenth century, were unknown and inaccessible among Shiite scholars (Ostadi, 2020: throughout the text). The conclusion is that "Ahmad Ibn Ali Ṭabrisī" is unknown to rijālī and translation scholars; and there is no information about him except in the names of his books in the sources of Shiite Rijāl and translators.

##### 5. Abu Ja'far Mahdi Mar'ashī

Mahdi Mar'ashī (d. 539 AH), the common narrator of the sanads of the manuscripts of *Tafsīr* and the manuscripts of the book of *Iḥtijāj*, is an unknown figure in the books of Shiite translation. For him, various names or corrections are included in the sources. The only translation available from him is a short translation quoted by Abd al-Karīm Sam'ānī (d. 562 AH) from the words of Mahdi Mar'ashī (Sam'ānī, 2003 AD: 12/192). Also, the first references to him in the Shiite translation have been made by Ardabili (d. 1101 AH), and quoting a summary of the article.

Abu Ja'far was born in 462 and was from Dehestan; and the date of his death is 539 or 540 AH which Sam'ānī and Ibn Ḥajar have quoted for his birth; and apparently he died in the city of Sariyeh Tabarestan. Sam'ānī has named six people: 1- Isma'il Al-Isma'ili (477 AH). 2- Hassan Al-Wazir (d. 485 AH). 3- Muhammad Al-Nahavandi (d.

1. «شيخي احمد بن أبي طالب الطبرسي، له كتاب الكافي في الفقه حسن، الاحتجاج، مفاخرة الطليبة، تاريخ الاثمة(ع)، فضائل الزهراء(ع)، كتاب الصلاة.»



497 AH). 4- Ahmad Al-Thaqafi (d. 483 AH). 5- Abdul Salam Al-Qazwini (d. 488 AH). 6- Al-Hussein Al-Murhaf (d. 509 AH), which Abu Ja'far has narrated in various cities for a short time. Three of them are judges; one is a minister, one is a mufti and one is an unknown. According to some narrative sanads, others can be introduced as Sheikh or Master Abu Ja'far; which may only be Ahmad Khargushi, apart from the elders named by Sam'ani, to be a Sheikh of Abu Ja'far; since he is also unknown, it is not possible to analyze him as a sheikh or a master of Abu Ja'far. Also, according to some narrative sanads, it is possible to consider some disciples for Abu Ja'far; such as: 1- Muhammad Sarāhanak (d. 533 AH); which is unknown. 2- Abdul Karim Sam'ani (506 AH); who is his translator. 3- Abu Mansour Tabrisi; for various reasons, he was not the master of Abu Ja'far Mar'ashi (Ostadi, 2020: Full text) Sam'ani has reported that Abu Ja'far's religion was "exaggerated Shiite"; and has considered him famous in this tendency (Sam'ani, 2003 AD: 12/192). Given the existence of Ghulāt Nasiriyah in Sam'ani era in Iran, it is highly probable that he was also a Nasiriyah of Iran; other evidences also highlight the state of his religion (Ostadi, 2020: throughout the text). The result is that, according to Shiite scholars, Mahdi Mar'ashi is unknown; and according to Sam'ani translation, he was a famous Ghālī; and with other evidences, he was probably from the Ghulāt of Nasiriyah.

## 6. Ja'far Doristi

Abu Abdullah Ja'far ibn Muhammad ibn Ahmad Doristi is one of the Shiite narrators; no information is available on his birth or death. According to the life history of his Mashayakh, his birth

was probably around 385 AH or earlier. Accordingly, the date of his death is probably around 470 AH or earlier. Apparently he was a contemporary of Sheikh Tusi and one of the students of Ibn Ayyash (d. 401 AH), Sheikh Mufid (d. 413 AH) and Seyyed Morteza (d. 436 AH) (Qazwini Razi, Nd: 210; Muntajabuddin, 1366 AH: 45).

There is nothing found about his name and work, as well as translation, and modification in the sources of the earlier rijali, namely: Ibn al-Ghadari (1 AH 4), Najjashi al-Fihrist (450 AH), Rijal Kashshī, and al-Fihrist of Sheikh Tusi (460 AH); also, Rijal Ibn Dawud (7th century) and the summary of the sayings of Hilli (726 AH).

Only Tusi in his Rijal has considered Ja'far Doristi as trustworthy (Tusi, 1415 AH: 459) and Muntajab al-Din (AH 600 AH) in al-Fihrist, while mentioning the works of Doristi, has called him "Trustworthy and just" (Muntajab al-Din, 1987 AH: 45). Elsewhere, he apparently mentions his son (Muntajab al-Din, 1987 AH: 86).

In Ma'ālim al-Ulamā, Ibn Shahr Ashub (d. 588 AH) only mentions the book of Al-Rad ala Al-Zaydiyyah (Ibn Shahr Ashub, Nd: 32); But others have mentioned works such as "Al-Hassani, Al-Rad Ala Al-Zaidiyyah, Al-Kifayah, Al-I'tiqadat and Yawm Laylah" for Ja'far Doristi (Muntajab al-Din, 1987 AH: 45; Isfahani Afandi, 1403 AH: 1 / 110-111). Therefore, only Tusi considered him trustworthy and Muntajab al-Din repeated the same thing for him. From the fact that his translation and modification have not been mentioned in earlier works, except for Rijal Tusi; also, Tusi has not mentioned the works of Ja'far Doristi in his al-Fihrist and Rijal, as well as the choice of Ma'refat al-Rijal; the inclusion of the short word "trust" in

the version of Rijāl Tūsī seems a bit dubious; Which may have meant "Al-Faqīh".

The result is that, because no translation and modification are found in the earlier rijālī sources of Ja'far Doristi; and only in the version of Rijāl Tūsī, he is considered trustworthy; and Tūsī has not identified him and his works in al-Fihrist; his authenticity seems questionable.

### 7. Muhammad Daqqāq

In the sanads of some manuscripts of Tafsīr attributed to Imam Hassan 'Askarī (AS) and also in the older manuscript (808 AH), the name "Muhammad Ibn Ali Ibn Muhammad Ibn Ja'far Ibn Al-Daqqāq" or "Raffāq" is mentioned as the first narrator of the Tafsīr sanad. Muhammad Daqqāq or Raffāq is unknown and no information was found about him in the sources under either Daqqāq or Raffāq. As mentioned earlier, Muhammad Daqqāq may be the son of Ali Daqqāq, who is Sheikh of Sheikh Ṣadūq; Numerous narrations have been narrated from him with names: "Ali ibn Ahmad ibn Muhammad ibn Imran al-Daqqāq", "Ali ibn Ahmad ibn Musa al-Daqqāq" and "Ali ibn Ahmad ibn Musa" are found in the works of Ṣadūq (for example, see: Ṣadūq, nd: 250). Allameh Majlisī states that the person who is nicknamed Al-Daqqāq in the series of masters of Ṣadūq is one person and that is Ali ibn Ahmad ibn Muhammad ibn Imran (Majlisī, 1403: 1/57). Of course, it is unlikely that Muhammad Daqqāq was the son of Ali; unless the father is old and then his son is little; because the time interval between these two narrations is long and about seventy years. The result is that Muhammad Daqqāq or Raffāq is Muhmal or at least Majhūl to Rijālī.

### 8. Abu Muhammad Ja'far Qomi

The date of birth and death of Abu Muhammad Ja'far ibn Ahmad Ilāqī Rāzī Qomi is not known, but based on the life history of his Mashayakh, his life can be considered in the second half of the fourth century and early fifth century. There is also disagreement in the sources about the name of his father and grandfather (see: Bagheri, Nd: beginning of the text). According to the existing narrations from Ja'far Qomi and also mentioning the sanads of al-Musalsalāt, he has narrated from narrators such as Sahl ibn Ahmad Dibājī, Sheikh Ṣadūq and others (see: Ibn Rāzī, 1990: 108); in mentioning some of these narrations, Sheikh Ṣadūq has called him "Al-Faqīh" and has written: Ja'far Qomi has narrated from people such as Ubaydullah ibn Musa Alawī, Muhammad ibn Ali al-Fawī and also Muhammad ibn Ali ibn Daqqāq (the previous narrator of the commentary sanads attributed to Imam Hassan 'Askarī) (Ibn Rāzī, 1990: 47; 'Askarī, 1409: 9).

Also, among the remaining works of Ja'far Qomi, most of which are in the field of "Manāqib, etiquette and ethics", "Al-Arūs, Al-Ghāyāt, Al-Musalsalāt, Al-A'māl Al-Mani'ah Min Al-Jannah, Nawādir Al-Athar Fi Ala Khair Al-Bashar and Jāmi Al-Ahadīth Al-Nabawīyah" are available, which have been published in a book called "Jāmi' al-Ahadīth" (Ibn Rāzī, 1990: all text). Some works have also been mistakenly attributed to Ja'far Qomi (for example, see: Tehrani, 1403: 2/225).

Regarding Rijālī's critique, no explanation was found on the credibility of Ja'far Qomi by the earlier Rijālī. However, Qahpānī, quoting Ḥillī, wrote: Sheikh Tūsī has certified Ja'far Qomi; but al-Tūsī has only said in his rijāl: "Ja'far ibn Ali ibn Ahmad

Qomī al-Ma'rūf bi Ibn al-Rāzī Yukannā Abā Muhammad Sāhib-u Tasānīf" (Tūsī, 1415: 418).<sup>1</sup>

Perhaps there was a difference between the versions of Rijāl Tūsī; or it is possible that in the version of Ibn Dāwūd Ḥillī, instead of "al-Faqīh", the word "al-Thiqāt" has been copied; also, it is possible that Ibn Dāwūd Ḥillī authenticated Ja'far Qomi apparently because of his description of Sheikh Ṣadūq, or the title of al-Faqīh. As Behbahani has considered Ibn Babawayh's satisfaction with Ja'far Qomi and his description of jurisprudence as evidence of his authenticity; but according to some Rijāl, such a description is trustworthy and indicates the goodness of the person (see: Bagheri, nd: the beginning of the text) Ibn Tawus (d. 664 AH), apparently in his credit, has called him as one of the great Imāmī scholars. (Ibn Tāwūs, 1414: 272).

In general, due to the lack of Ja'far Qomi's translation, and the lack of sufficient information from the earlier rijālī sources, it is not possible to make a definitive judgment on his authentication and modification; and we have to stop about his rijālī character.

### 9. Muhammad ibn Shādhān

There is no information about the date of birth and death of Muhammad ibn Ahmad ibn Ali ibn Hasan ibn Shādhān al-Qomi. Apparently we know that he had listened to hadith in Kufa in 374 AH, and he had a teaching session in Mecca in 412 AH. Therefore, it can be said that his birth was around 335 AH,

and his death was around 420 AH (see: Pakatchi, 2006: the beginning of the text)

Due to the sanads of available narrations, more than sixty elders of Ibn Shādhān can be counted; among them are: Ibn Ayyāsh Jawharī, Abu Ghālib Zurārī, Abu al-Mufaḍal Shaybānī, Tal Akbari, Ibn Babawayh and Sahl ibn Ahmad Dibājī (for example, see: Karājakī, 1410 AH: 63 and 151). Through the same narrative sanads, few pupils can be found for him, for example: Abu al-Faḥ al-Karājakī (d. 449 AH), Najjāshī (d. 450 AH), Sheikh Tūsī (d. 460 AH), Sharif Abu Ṭālib Zainabi, Ahmad ibn Shahriyar Khazan, and Muhammad ibn Ali Adib (See. Tehrani, nd: Ṭabaqāt, 151) It is interesting to note that, despite the fact that Ibn Shādhān had teaching sessions, his disciples and narrators are very few; some of them are also distorted; for example, according to Ibn Tawus, Harun ibn Musa al-Tal Akbari (d. 385 AH) heard and narrated the book of Mi'atah Manqabah from Ibn Shādhān, but al-Tal Akbari died many years before the writing of this book. (Pakatchi, 2006: All text)

Some works have been attributed to him: 1-Mi'atah Manqabah 2-Rad al-Shams 3- Bustān al-Kirām; if the books attributed to him are correct; this means that Ibn Shādhān tended to record Manāqibī narrations. The book Mi'atah Manqabah, which is the most important work attributed to him, about 70% of his narrations are Mutifarrid hadiths; and the others are not known and common hadiths in early books (Pakatchi, 2006: the whole test)

No translation and modification in the sources of the earlier rijālī was found from him, namely: Ibn al-Ghadā'irī Rijāl (AH 4), Fihrist Najjāshī

1. «جعفر بن علی بن احمد قمی المعروف بابن الرازی یکنی ابا

محمد صاحب تصنیفات.»

(450 AH), Rijāl Kashshī, and Fihrist Sheikh Tūsī (460 AH); also, Ma'ālim al-Ulamā Ibn Shahr Āshūb (d. 588 AH), Fihrist Muntajab al-Din (d. 600 AH), Rijāl Ibn Dāwūd (7th century) and the summary of the sayings of Ḥillī (d. 726 AH); although Najjāshī has been named as his disciple due to the narrations of Ibn Shādhān; but he has not mentioned translation, authentication or modification regarding Ibn Shādhān. More importantly, given that Sheikh Tūsī and Najjāshī had direct and close contact with him during the stay of Ibn Shādhān in Baghdad, they did not mention it in their Fihrist books, which were written between 436 and 450 AH. (Pakatchi, 2006: Full text) may be those mentioned works have been mistakenly attributed to Ibn Shādhān, or he wrote them at the end of his life and after meeting Tūsī and Najjāshī.

However, Majlisī has relied on Karājākī (for example, see: Karājākī, 1403: 23, 37, 40); in addition, Wahid and Māmaqānī tried to deduce the appreciation of Ibn Shādhān from his pity of Najjāshī and the title of "Faqīh" by Karājākī to Ibn Shādhān. (Pakatchi, 2006: End of text). Finally, it seems that since there is no translation of Ibn Shādhān, and the predecessors did not pay much attention to him; it is not possible to give an accurate and true judgment of Rijālī towards him; and demands that he stop at his rijālī status.

### 10. Sahl Dibājī

Abu Muhammad, Sahl Ibn Ahmad Ibn Abdullah Ibn Ahmad Ibn Sahl Dibājī was born in 289 AH and died in Baghdad in 380 AH. Few narrations have been narrated from Dibājī in Shiite sources (for example, see: Tūsī, 1414: 706). Most of his fame is due to quoting the book of Ash'athiyāt (see: Khatīb Baghdadi, 1422: 10/6176).

As mentioned at the beginning of the article, Ibn Ghadā'irī in the title of Muhammad ibn Qasim al-Mufassir, the narrator of the commentary attributed to Imam Hassan 'Askarī (AS), considers this commentary either made by Dibājī or similar to a thematic commentary by him (Ibn Ghadā'irī, 1422: 98). Also, Ibn Ghadā'irī, in another place, while calling Sahl Ibn Ahmad as a weak narrator, has accused him of falsifying hadiths and narrating narrations from unknown people (Ibn Ghadā'irī, 1422: 68).

However, Ibn al-Ghadā'irī has considered the narration of the book of Ash'athiyat and the like to be without any drawback from him; and perhaps the book Al-Ḥajj Sahl, which Ibn al-Ghadā'irī himself narrated from Dibājī along with al-Ash'athiyāt, is meant. Najjāshī wrote about him: "Lā ba'sa bihī, kāna yakhfī 'amruhū kathīran, thumma zāhirun bi al-dīn fī Ākhiri 'umrihī lahū kitābu Imān-i Abi Tālib" (Najjāshī, 1407: 186).<sup>1</sup>

Nothing was found about him in Rijāl Kashshī; and also in Rijāl and Fihrist of Sheikh Tūsī (d. 460 AH), there is no translation, commentary or modification of him; in his Rijāl, he only wrote: "Kāna yanzilu darb al-Za'farānī bi Baghdad, sami'a minu al-Tullakbarī sanat sab'īn wa thulāthumi'āat wa lahū minhu 'ijāzatun wa li-ibnihī, akhbaranā 'anhu al-Hussain ibn 'Ubydullah, yukannā Aba Muhammad" (Tūsī, 1415: 427).<sup>2</sup>

There is no mention of him in Ma'ālim al-Ulamā of Ibn Shahr Āshūb (d. 588 AH) and al-Fihrist of Muntajab al-Din (d. 600 AH); and (7th century)

١. «لا بأس به، كان يخفي أمره كثيرا، ثم ظاهر بالدين في آخر عمره له كتاب إيمان أبي طالب رضي الله عنه.»

٢. كان ينزل درب الزعفراني ببغداد، سمع منه التلعكبري سنة سبعين و ثلاثمائة و له منه إجازة و لابنه، أخبرنا عنه الحسين بن عبيد الله، يكنى أبا محمد.

the same point in Najjāshī has been repeated in Rijāl of Ibn Dāwūd (Muntajab al-Din , 1987: 107); and in the summary of Al-Aqwāl Hillī (d. 726 AH), the story of Najjāshī and Ibn Ghadā'irī has been quoted; however, he has mentioned these matters in the section on the names of trustees. (See: Hillī, 1417: 159). The conclusion is that, apart from weakening Ibn al-Ghadā'irī, there is no evidence of him; unless some people consider the prayer of Sheikh Mufīd on his body (Khatīb Baghdadi, 1422: 10/176) as a sign of his greatness. (See: Encyclopedia of the Islamic World, entry of Sahl Dibājī).

## CONCLUSION

Considering the long-standing controversy over the interpretation attributed to Imam Hassan 'Askarī (AS); this book needs to be examined from different angles. One of these dimensions is the examination of the sanads in this book. For this commentary attributed to Imam 'Askarī (AS), three or four types of sanads can be proposed:

1. Sanads on the manuscripts of the commentary attributed to Imam Hassan 'Askarī (AS); which are of two types.

2. The sanads of this interpretation are in the book called Al-Ihtijāj.

3. Similar sanad in individual narrations of other sources; like the works of Sheikh Ṣadūq.

4. Possible and exchange sanads. On the importance of reviewing sanads and the narrators of Tafsīr up to Sheikh Ṣadūq, it should be said that if the whole book of Tafsīr attributed to Imam Hassan 'Askarī (AS) was in the works of Sheikh Ṣadūq, it would not be important to pay attention to the narrators of the sanads up to Sheikh Ṣadūq in terms of validation; and these sanads, up to Sheikh Ṣadūq, had a ceremonial aspect; but because not all

narrations of this Tafsīr are in the works of Sheikh Ṣadūq, and the authenticity of about 350 narrations of this Tafsīr depend on the validity and status of the narrators of the sanads of the manuscripts of Tafsīr ; therefore, their validity cannot be attached to the credit of Sheikh Ṣadūq.

It should also be said about the sanads of interpretation; although in some types of sanads in the book of commentary attributed to Imam Hassan 'Askarī (AS), there is a time gap between manuscripts and narrators of sanads. Also, according to the available and probable sanads, the total number of narrators of the commentary sanads, both in manuscript and in Ihtijāj, is nine: Shādhān and Sahl Dibājī, Muhammad Sarāhanak, Ahmad Ṭabrisī, Mahdi Mar'ashi, Ja'far Doristi, Muhammad Daqqāq, Ja'far Qomi, Muhammad ibn Shādhān and Sahl Dibājī" that become ten people with the first narrator of the commentary book. Rijālī's critique of these ten people is:

1. The final narrators of all the sanads of the manuscripts of Tafsīr and also the manuscript of the book called Ihtijāj are unknown.

2. Shādhān Ibn Jibril is unknown; and his connection with the commentary attributed to 'Askarī (AS) is not clear.

3. Muhammad Ibn Sarāhanak, according to Rijālī views, is without translation and unknown.

4. "Ahmad Ibn Ali Ṭabrisī" is also unknown to rijālī and translation scholars; and there is no information about him except in the names of his books in Ma'ālim al-Ulamā of Ibn Shahr Āshūb.

5. According to Shiite scholars, Mahdi Mar'ashī is unknown; and according to the Sunni Sam'ānī translation, Mar'ashī was a famous

Ghālī; according to other evidences, he was probably from Ghulāt Nasiriyah.

6. Because translation and modification are not found in the earlier rijālī sources of Ja'far Doristi; and only in the version of Rijāl Tūsī, he is considered trustworthy; and Tūsī has not identified him and his works in al-Fihrist; his authenticity seems questionable.

7. Muhammad Daqqāq or Raffāq is also Muhmal or at least Majhul according to Rijālī.

8. Due to the lack of Ja'far Qomi's translation, and the lack of sufficient information from the earlier rijālī sources, it is not possible to make a definite judgment regarding his authentication and modification; and about his rijālī character, we have to stop.

9. Because there is no translation of Ibn Shādhān, and the predecessors did not pay much attention to him; it is not possible to give an accurate and true judgment of Rijālī towards him; and he demands that he stop at his rijālī status as well.

10. Apart from weakening Ibn Ghadā'irī from Sahl Dibājī, there is no confirmation from him; unless some people consider the prayer of Sheikh Muḥīd on his body as a sign of his greatness.

Therefore, in the rijālī study of ten narrators of the commentary sanads attributed to Imam 'Askarī (AS) up to Sheikh Ṣadūq, it is clear that apart from the omissions and Irsāl of these sanads, most of the narrators of this work are "unknown or weak."

### Suggestion

The sanad of the commentary of Imam 'Askarī (AS) can have three modes: one. This book, in fact, has the same existing sanads from the beginning. Two. This interpretation has no sanad; and later, from the sanads of the

narrations of the works of Sheikh Ṣadūq, a sanad has been prepared for the manuscript of the commentary. Three. This commentary has the same current sanads, of course, under the name of Sahl Dibājī; that at some point of the time, the previous sanad, called the narrations of Ṣadūq, has been replaced. By accepting the assumption of the second and third cases, it becomes clear that the interpretation sanads are forged; but by accepting the assumption of the first case, a few questions arise: 1- If Sheikh Ṣadūq had the book of commentary, why did he not quote 350 narrations from other narrations of this commentary book? 2- If this current interpretation with the same sanads attributed to sheikh Ṣadūq was in the hands of Ṣadūq, why did Sheikh Ṣadūq narrate its narrations in two different ways? In view of the above points, it is suggested that the sanads of Sheikh Ṣadūq from Tafsīr and other sanads of Tafsīr be examined and researched in terms of authenticity; unless it is revealed that these evidences are fake.

### References

- Ibn Esfandiār, Mohammad (1987), History of Tabarestan, edited by Abbas Iqbal, Tehran: Padideh.
- Ibn al-Nadīm, Muhammad ibn Ishāq (1417 AH), Al-Fihrist, Commentary by Ibrahim Ramezani, Beirut: Dar al-Ma'rifah.
- Ibn Rāzī, Ja'far ibn Ahmad Qomī (1369 AH), Jā al-Ahādīth, Tehran: Islamiah.
4. Ibn Shahr Āshūb, Muhammad Ibn Ali (nd), Ma'ālim al-'Ulamā, Qom: np.
- Ibn Tāwūs (1414 AH), Al-Durū Al-Wāqīya, Published by Javad Qayyumi Isfahani, Qom: Al-Afaq.
- Ibn Ghazā'irī, Ahmad Ibn Al-Hussein (1422 AH), Al-Rijāl, by the efforts of Hussein Jalali, Qom: Dar al-Hadith.
- Ibn Mashhadī, Mohammad Ibn Ja'far (1378 AH), Al-Mazār Al-Kabīr, Qom: Islamic Publishing.

Ibn Dāwūd Hillī, Hassan Ibn Ali (nd), Kitāb al-Rijāl, Research by Sayed Muhammad Sadeq Bahr al-'Ulum, Qom: Sharif Razi.

Ibn Shahr Āshūb, Mohammad Ibn Ali (1379 AH), Manāqib Āl Abi Tālib, Qom: Allama.

Ibn Tāwūs (nd), Farha al-Gharri in determining the grave of Amir al-Mu'minin (AS), Qom: Sharif Razi.

Ostadi, Reza (1984), "Inquiry of the Commentary of Imam Hassan Al-'Askarī (AS)", Noor Elm, January, no. 13.

Ostadi, Kazem (2021), In Search of Abu Ja'far al-Husseini al-Alawi al-Marashi, Tabarsi Conference, Sari: Islamic Azad University.

Ostadi, Kazem (1400 AH), Historical Biography of Abu Ja'far Al-Marashi, Np: Sokhan Tarikh.

Isfahani Afandi, Abdullah (1403 AH), Rīyād al-'Ulamā, Qom: np.

Amoli, Awliyaullah (1969), History of Royan, Edited by Manouchehr Sotoudeh, Tehran: Publications of the Iranian Culture Foundation.

Bagheri, Hamid (nd), "Ja'far Ibn Ahmad Rāzī" in Encyclopedia of the Islamic World, Tehran: Encyclopedia of the Islamic World.

Pakatchi, Ahmad (2006), "Ibn Shādhān" in The Great Islamic Encyclopedia, Volume 4, Tehran: The Center of the Great Islamic Encyclopedia.

Pakatchi, Ahmad (2020), "Ibn Shahr Āshūb" in The Great Islamic Encyclopedia, Tehran: The Great Islamic Encyclopedia Center.

Tehrani, Agha Bozorg (1403 AH), Al-Dharī'a 'ilā Tasānīf al-Shī'a, Beirut: Dar al-'Adwā'.

Tehrani, Agha Bozorg (nd), Tabaqālām A'lām al-Shī'a, Research: Alinaghi Munzavi, Qom: Ismaili Press Institute.

Hurr Āmilī, Muhammad ibn Hassan (nd), Amal al-Āmil fī 'Ulamā Jabal Āmil, Research: Sayed Ahmad al-Husseini, Baghdad: Andalusian Library.

Hillī, Hassan Ibn Yusuf (1417 AH), Khulāsāt al-Aqwāl fī Ma'rifat al-Rijāl, Qom: Fiqh Publishing Foundation.

Khatīb Baghdadi, Ahmad ibn Ali (1422 AH), History of Baghdad, Research: Bashar, Beirut: Dar al-Gharb.

Khūfī, Abu al-Qāsim (1983), Mu'jam Rijāl al-Hadith, Beirut: np (Qom offset printing).

Derayati, Mostafa (2012), Catalogs of Iranian Manuscripts, Tehran: National Library.

Rāzī, Abdul Jalīl (nd), Kitāb al-Naqd, Edited by Jalaluddin Mohaddes, Tehran: Iranian Honors Association.

Rahmati, Mohammad Kazem (2013), Zaydi in Iran, Tehran: Research Institute of Islamic History.

Sam'ānī, Abd al-Karim bin Muhammad (1382 AH), Al-Ansāb, Research: Abd al-Rahman al-Moallemī, Hyderabad: Assembly of the Ottoman Encyclopedia.

Shūshtarī, Mohammad Taqī (nd), Al-Akhhār Al-Dakhīla, Tehran: Al-Sadiq Library.

Sadūq, Mohammad Ibn Ali (nd), 'Uyūn Akhhār al-Ridā, Edited by: Lajvardi, Tehran: Jahan.

Tūsī, Muhammad ibn Hassan (1414 AH), Al-Amālī, Qom: Dar al-Thiqāfa.

Tūsī, Muhammad ibn Hassan (1415 AH), Al-Rijāl, Qom, Teachers Association.

Āmilī (the first martyr), Muhammad ibn Makkī (1419 AH), Dhikr al-Shī'ah fī Ahkām al-Sharī'a, Qom: Āl al-Bayt.

'Askarī, Hassan (1409 AH), Al-Tafsir attributed to Imam Abi Muhammad Al-Hassan Ibn Ali Al-'Askarī, Research: Muhammad Baqir Abtahī, Qom: np.

'Alam al-Hudā, Ali ibn Hussein (1417 AH), Masā'il al-Nāsiriyyāt, Research: The Research Center, Tehran: Rābitat al-Thaqāfa wal-'Alāqāt al-Islāmīya.

Alizadeh, Rajabali (2017), "The political, cultural and social heritage of Nasser Atroush in Deilman, Gilan and Tabarestan", Journal of the History of Islamic Civilization, Vol. 50, No. 2.

Karājakī, Abu al-Fath (1403 AH), Al-Tafdīl, By the efforts of Muhaddith Ormavi, Tehran: Islamic Library.

Karājakī, Muhammad ibn Ali (1410 AH), Kanz al-Fawā'id, Qom: Dar al-Zakhā'ir.

Lotfi, Mehdi (2007), "The sanad of the commentary attributed to Imam Hassan Askarī (AS)", Quran and Hadith Studies, vol. 1, no. 1.

Majlisī, Muhammad Baqir (1403 AH), Bihār Al-Anwār, Beirut: Al-Wafā Foundation.

Muntajabuddin, Ali Ibn Abdullah (1366 AH), Al-Fihrist, Qom: Ayatollah Mar'ashi Library.

Mousavi, Fakhar Ibn Ma'd (1369 AH), Īmān Abī Tālib, Qom: Sayed al-Shuhadā.

Najjāshī, Abu al-Abbas Ahmad ibn Ali (1407 AH), Rijāl al-Najjāshī, By: Zanjni, Qom: Islamic Publishing.

Hashemi, Fatemeh (2006), A Study of the Accuracy and Validity of Tafsir's Narrations Attributed to Imam Askari (AS), Mashhad: Islamic Research Foundation.

