سال چهارم، شماره اول، پیاپی هفتم، بهار و تابستان ۱۴۰۲ (۲۰-۱)

تاریخ دریافت: ۱۴۰۰/۱۰/۲۷ تاریخ پذیرش: ۱۴۰۲/۰۲/۲۱

DOI: 10.30473/QURAN.2023.62607.1110

نشریه علمی

قرآن و روشنگری دینی

«مقاله پژوهشی»

بررسی رجالی اسناد تفسیر منسوب به امام عسکری(ع) از شیخ صدوق تا عسکری

کاظم استادی

۱ کارشناسی ارشد علوم قرآن و حدیث، دانشگاه قرآن و حدیث قم، قم، ایران.

نویسنده مسئول:
کاظم استادی
رایانامه: kazemostadi@gmail.com

چکیده

کتاب تفسیر منسوب به امام حسن بن علی عسکری(ع) یا تفسیر ابومحمد اطروش، از تفاسیر مأثور متقدم شیعه است؛ که از دیرباز میان اندیشمندان شیعه امامیه، مخصوصاً علمای متأخر، مورد مناقشه و گفتگو بوده است؛ و حتی عده‌ای، آن را به نسبت امامیین عسکریین(ع)، جعلی و موضوع می‌دانند. مناقشات دربارهٔ این کتاب، چند بُعدی است؛ یعنی هم شامل تاریخ تألیف و انتساب کتاب به مؤلف می‌شود، و هم شامل اسناد، راویان و محتوای کتاب می‌شود. بنابراین لازم است این تفسیر از جهات گوناگون مورد بررسی قرار گیرد؛ یکی از این ابعاد، بررسی رجالی راویان این اثر است تا مشخص شود که سلسله اسناد تفسیر چگونه هستند؟ آیا در این سلسله راویان، افتادگی و اضطرابی وجود دارد؟ نیز، وضعیت رجالی این راویان چگونه می‌باشد؟ از آن جهت که بررسی راویان اسناد تفسیر تا شیخ صدوق، در مقالات دیگری پرداخته شده، در نوشته حاضر، تنها به بررسی رجالی ده تن از راویان اسناد این تفسیر، از شیخ صدوق تا عسکری اطروش پرداخته شده است. در این بررسی رجالی راویان، مشخص شد که غالب راویان این بخش از اسناد تفسیر، در منابع امامیه، مجهول هستند و دیگر افراد نیز توثیق نشده‌اند.

واژه‌های کلیدی

حسن بن علی، اطروش، تفسیر امام حسن ناصری عسکری، احتجاج، صدوق.

استناد به این مقاله:

استادی، کاظم (۱۴۰۲). بررسی رجالی اسناد تفسیر منسوب به امام عسکری(ع) از شیخ صدوق تا عسکری. دو فصلنامه علمی قرآن و روشنگری دینی، ۴(۱)، ۲۰-۱.

https://quran2020.journals.pnu.ac.ir/

Spring and Summer (2023) 4(1): 1-20
DOI: 10.30473/QURAN.2023.62607.1110
Received: 17 Jan 2022 Accepted: 11 May 2023

Quran and Religious Enlightenment

Open Access

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Rijālī Review of Isnād in the Interpretation Attributed to Imām ʿAskarī (AS) from Sheikh Sadūq to ʿAskarī

Kazem Ostadi

M.Sc., Qur'an and Hadith Sciences, University of Qur'an and Hadith, Qom, Iran.

Correspondence
Kazem Ostadi
Email: kazemostadi@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The Tafsīr book attributed to Imām Hassan ibn ʿAlī ʿAskarī (AS) or Tafsīr of Abū Muḥammad Uṭrūsh is one of the Tafsīr al-Ma'thūr (traditional interpretation) of early Shi'a, which has long been the subject of controversy and discussion among Imāmī Shiite thinkers, especially the later scholars; and even some consider it as fabricated which has been attributed to Imāmayn ʿAskarīyayn (AS). Controversies about this book are multidimensional; that is, it includes both the date of authorship and attribution of the book to the author, and also includes the Isnād, narrators, and content of the book. Therefore, it is necessary to examine this interpretation from various aspects; one of these dimensions is the rijālī review of the narrators of this work to find out how is its chains of transmitters? Is there any vacancy and anxiety in these chains of narrators? And also, what is the rijālī status of these narrators? Since the review of the narrators of Isnād up to Sheikh Sadūq has been discussed in other articles, in this article, only the rijālī review of ten of the narrators of this Isnād is discussed from Sheikh Sadūq to ʿAskarī Uṭrūsh. In this rijālī review of the narrators, it was found that the majority of the narrators of this part of the Tafsīr Isnād are unknown in the Imāmī sources, and the rest have not been confirmed.

KEYWORDS

Hassan ibn ʿAlī, Uṭrūsh, Tafsīr of Imām Hassan Nāṣirī ʿAskarī, Iḥtijāj, Sadūq

How to cite
Ostadi, K. (2023). Rijālī Review of Isnād in the Interpretation Attributed to Imām ʿAskarī (AS) from Sheikh Sadūq to ʿAskarī. Quran and Religious Enlightenment, 4(1), 1-20.

Introduction

The Tafsīr attributed to Imām Hassan ibn ʿAlī ʿAskarī (AS) is one of the early narrative and Ḥadīth interpretations of Shi'a, in which, many verses are interpreted and most of the interpretations are about the miracles of the Prophet (PBUH) and the Shiite Imāms, i.e. the issues of Imamate and Wilāyat (Guardianship). The existing text of this commentary is incomplete and somehow mixed up (Ostadi, 2021: 3) and only includes up to the verse 282 of Surah Al-Baqarah, among which many verses are missing; and in its printed version, about 379 narrations are numbered (ʿAskarī, 1409 AH: entire text). This commentary, compared to similar books, has many manuscripts; so that it has nearly one hundred manuscripts (see: Derayati: 2012, the entry of Imām ʿAskarī's commentary), which is rare in its kind, although most of the manuscripts are late and new.

Meanwhile, it is necessary to know two things about this book: 1) the inattention of catalogers and translators to this commentary. 2) the controversial text of this interpretation. The Tafsīr book attributed to Imām Hassan ʿAskarī (AS) has long been the subject of controversy and discussion among Shiite scholars (e.g. see: Ibn Ghaḍāirī, 1422 AH: 98), especially later and contemporary scholars. For example, Allameh Shūshtarī (1416 AH), apart from the book Akhbār al-Dakhīlah (Shūshtarī, 1401 AH, 1: 152 and 228), in several places of Qāmūs al-Rijāl, refers to the point that this book is Mawḍūʿ (Shūshtarī, 1410 AH, 2: 467; 10: 15; 7: 236; 8: 541; and 19: 6). Ayatollah Khoei (1413 AH) also gave the same opinion in his Encyclopedia of Rijāl al-Ḥadīth, under the title "ʿAlī Ibn Muḥammad Ibn Sayyār" regarding ʿAskarī's interpretation (Khoei, 1413 AH, 13: 157).

The controversies of this Shi'a book are multi-dimensional and consist of many layers; that is, it includes both the date of creation and also the attribution of the book to the author, as well as the Isnād and content of the book (e.g., see: the entire text; Ostadi, 1985: the entire text).

Problem Statement

Considering the long-standing controversies about the interpretation attributed to Imām Hassan ʿAskarī (AS); it is necessary to examine this book from different aspects: One of these dimensions is reviewing the Isnād of this book; which can be done in several ways: 1: examining the form of Isnād in manuscripts. 2: Examining the narrators of the Isnād in terms of omission or rijālī translation. In this way, what are the chains of interpretation Isnād? Does this chains also have omitted narrators? What is the rijālī status of these narrators?

Since reviewing the narrators from Sheikh Sadūq to Imām Hassan ʿAskarī (AS) has been discussed in another article, in the present article, only the rijālī review of the narrators of the Isnād of this commentary from Sheikh Sadūq to ʿAskarī will be considered.

Background

There have been brief discussions and critical references about the interpretation attributed to Imām Hassan ʿAskarī (AS) in some early and late sources, some of which were mentioned earlier. Also, there are independent works related to this book: "Ostadi, Reza (1985), a discussion about the interpretation of Imām Hassan al-ʿAskarī (AS), "Hashemi, Fatemeh (2006), checking the authenticity and validity of the narrations attributed to Imām ʿAskarī (AS)" and "Lotfi, Mahdi (2007), an interpretation Isnād attributed to Imām Hassan ʿAskarī (AS); Ostadi, Kazem (2021), "Analyzing the content of the stories of narrators of Tafsīr attributed to Imām Hassan ʿAskarī (AS)", etc.

A- Isnād of Tafsīr from Sheikh Sadūq to ʿAskarī

Three to four types can be proposed for this Tafsīr attributed to Imām ʿAskarī (AS): 1- Isnād on the manuscripts of the Tafsīr attributed to Imām Hassan ʿAskarī (AS); which are of two types. 2- The Isnād of this Tafsīr, in the book called Al-Iḥtijāj. 3- Similar sanad in individual narrations of other sources; like the narrations of the works of Sheikh Sadūq 4- Possible and substitute Isnād. (See: Ostadi, 2021: the entire text)

Apart from the Isnād of the interpretive narrations of Sheikh Sadūq from Astarabadi in his works, all three other types of Sanad of the Tafsīr book attributed to Imām Hassan ʿAskarī (AS) and Iḥtijāj have two stages: one. Isnād of Narrators up to Sheikh Sadūq (see: Ostadi, 2021: the entire text); two. Isnād of Narrators from Sheikh Sadūq to Imām Hassan ʿAskarī (AS); that each of these steps has its own specificities and importance. (For more information, see: Ostadi, 2021: the entire text).

It is true that the narrators from Sheikh Sadūq to ʿAskarī are similar in three categories of Tafsīr Isnād, i.e. Isnād of manuscript, Isnād of Sadūq narrations, and Isnād of the book of Iḥtijāj; but these methods also have important differences; which include:

1- The Isnād of Manuscripts of Tafsīr reached the 11th Imām (AS); of course, this connection is Muḍūʿ (see: Ostadi, 2021: the entire text). And on the other hand, since Sheikh Sadūq did not have the book of Tafsīr in his possession (we will talk about this soon), it seems that these Isnād entered the manuscripts of Tafsīr in a newly written and distorted form.

2- The sanad of ʿAskarī's interpretation in the book of Iḥtijāj reaches Imām Hādī (AS); which is also seen in the Isnād of narrations of Sadūq (see: Tabrisī, 736 AH 1); And of course, this connection is also one of the writings of the copyists of the works of Sadūq (see: Ostadi, 2021: D, the entire text).

3- The Isnād of the narrations of Sadūq, which reach the narrations of Tafsīr of ʿAskarī in two ways, have two important points: 1. These Isnād of Sadūq do not directly reach the main book of interpretation; rather, as mentioned, Sadūq had access to some narrations of Tafsīr, and through intermediaries; not all the text of the commentary. Two. The Isnād of narrations of Sadūq, apart from their two ways, are different in different sources of Sadūq; and some of them that have been corrected reach the 11th Imām. And some others reach Imām Hādī (AS); and some others go back to Hassan ibn ʿAlī Nāṣirī from his father; of course, and in fact, all these Isnād are from Hassan ibn ʿAlī ʿAskarī Nāṣirī Uṭrūsh (see: Ostadi, 2021: the entire text). To pay more attention to the Isnād types of ʿAskarī interpretation and their differences, look at the table of interpretation Isnād on the next page.

In any case, we are faced with these names for rijālī review of the narrators of Tafsīr from Sheikh Sadūq to ʿAskarī: Sheikh Sadūq, Muḥammad ibn Qāsim Mufassir, Yūsuf ibn Muḥammad ibn Zīyād, ʿAlī ibn Muḥammad ibn Sayyār, the fathers of Yūsuf and ʿAlī, Aḥmad ibn Hassan Al-Ḥusaynī, Hassan ibn ʿAlī ʿAskarī Uṭrūsh in addition to ʿAlī ibn Hassan ʿAskarī (father of Nāṣir Uṭrūsh). If we also consider Ibn Ghaḍāirī's article (see: Ibn Ghaḍāirī, 1422 AH: 98) about ʿAskarī's commentary, Sahl Dībājī is also added to these people. Therefore, for rijālī review of the narrators of Tafsīr from Sheikh Sadūq to ʿAskarī, it is necessary to consider rijālī review of ten people; which we will consider soon and after preliminary mention.

Tafsir Isnād of Nāsir Utrūsh, Attributed to Imam Hassan Askarī (AS)															
		+600 AH	+575 AH	+550 AH	+525 AH	+475 AH	+450 AH	+425 AH	+400 AH	+375AH	+350 AH	+325 AH	+300 AH	+275 AH	+250 AH
1	early probable sanad from Suhail Dībājī (according to Ibn Gadā'irī)	--	--	--	--	--	--	Muhammad ibn Ali ibn Muhammad ibn Ja'far ibn Daqāq (Rifāq)	Abu Muhammad Ja'far ibn Ahmad ibn Ali al-Qumī	Sahl ibn Ahmad Dībājī (d. 380 AH)	Abīh	?	?	?	?
2	The Commentary of Imam Askarī (AS) (the oldest manuscript dated back to 808 AH)	--	--	--	--	--	Narrator of Qala is unknown (lower than majhūl and muhmal)	Muhammad ibn Ali ibn Muhammad ibn Ja'far ibn Daqāq (Rifāq)	Abul-Hassan Muhammad ibn Ahmad ibn Ali ibn Hassan ibn Shāzhān (412 AH) and Abu Muhammad Ja'far ibn Ahmad ibn Ali al-Qumī	Abū Ja'far Muhammad ibn Ali ibn Hussein ibn Musā ibn Bābiwayh al-Qumī (Sheikh Sadūq)	Abulhassan Muhammad ibn Qasim al-Mufassir Astarābādī al-Khatīb	Abu Yaqūb Yūsuf ibn Zīyād and Abu al-Hussein Ali ibn Muhammad ibn Yasār	?	?	Hassan ibn Ali ibn Muhammad (d. 260 AH)
3	The Commentary of Imam Askarī (AS) (manuscripts A, B, D, T, Q, W)	--						Muhammad ibn Ali ibn Muhammad ibn Ja'far ibn Daqāq (Rifāq)	Abul-Hassan Muhammad ibn Ahmad ibn Ali ibn Hassan ibn Shāzhān (412 AH) and Abu Muhammad Ja'far ibn Ahmad ibn Ali al-Qumī	Abū Ja'far Muhammad ibn Ali ibn Hussein ibn Musā ibn Bābiwayh al-Qumī (Sheikh Sadūq)	Abulhassan Muhammad ibn Qasim al-Mufassir Astarābādī al-Khatīb	Abu Yaqūb Yūsuf ibn Zīyād and Abu al-Hussein Ali ibn Muhammad ibn Yasār	?	?	Hassan ibn Ali ibn Muhammad (d. 260 AH)
4	The Commentary of Imam Askarī (AS) (manuscripts B, S, Ṣ, W)	Narrator of Qala is unknown (lower than majhūl and muhmal)	Abulfadl Shāzhān ibn Jibrīl ibn Ismāīl al-Qumī (590 to 600 AH)	Muhammad ibn Sharāhatk al-Husseinī al-Jurjānī (from 533 AH)	Abi Ja'far Muhtad ibn Hārith al-Mar'ashī (d. 539 AH)	Abi Abdullah Ja'far ibn Muhammad al-Durīstī	Abīh	?	?	Abū Ja'far Muhammad ibn Ali ibn Hussein ibn Musā ibn Bābiwayh al-Qumī (Sheikh Sadūq)	Abulhassan Muhammad ibn Qasim al-Mufassir Astarābādī al-Khatīb	Abu Yaqūb Yūsuf ibn Zīyād and Abu al-Hussein Ali ibn Muhammad ibn Yasār	?	?	Hassan ibn Ali ibn Muhammad (d. 260 AH)

5	The Commentary of Imam Askarī (AS) (new-written margined sand, dated back to 880 AH)	Narrator of Qala is unknown (lower than majhūl and muhmal)	Abulfadl Shāzhān ibn Jibrīl ibn Ismāīl al-Qumī (590 to 600 AH)	Muhammad ibn Sharāhatk al-Husseinī al-Jurjānī (from 533 AH)	Abi Ja'far Muhtad ibn Hārith al-Mar'ashī (d. 539 AH)	Abi Abdullah Ja'far ibn Muhammad al-Durīstī	Abīh	?	?	Abū Ja'far Muhammad ibn Ali ibn Hussein ibn Musā ibn Bābiwayh al-Qumī (Sheikh Sadūq)	Abulhassan Muhammad ibn Qasim al-Mufassir Astarābādī al-Khatīb	Abu Yaqūb Yūsuf ibn Zīyād and Abu al-Hussein Ali ibn Muhammad ibn Yasār	?	?	Hassan ibn Ali ibn Muhammad (d. 260 AH)
6	Ihtijāj, Ardakan Manuscript (376 AH), Isnad of the Commentary of Imam Askarī	--	Al-Ihtijāj attributed to Abu Mansūr Tabrisī (ca. 588 AH)	?	Abi Ja'far Muhtad ibn Hārith al-Mar'ashī (d. 539 AH)	Abi Abdullah Ja'far ibn Muhammad al-Durīstī	?	?	Abu Muahmmad Ja'far ibn Ahmad	Abū Ja'far Muhammad ibn Ali ibn Hussein ibn Musā ibn Bābiwayh al-Qumī (Sheikh Sadūq)	Abulhassan Muhammad ibn Qasim al-Mufassir Astarābādī al-Khatīb	Abu Yaqūb Yūsuf ibn Zīyād and Abu al-Hussein Ali ibn Muhammad ibn Yasār	(kāna abawānā Imāmayn) ‘An Abū Muhmmad Hassan ibn Ali Askarī	Abī	Ābāyih
7	conclusion of Sheikh Sadūq’s chains of transmitters 1 (abawayhimā)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	Abū Ja'far Muhammad ibn Ali ibn Hussein ibn Musā ibn Bābiwayh al-Qumī (Sheikh Sadūq)	Abulhassan Muhammad ibn Qasim al-Mufassir Astarābādī al-Khatīb	Abu Yaqūb Yūsuf ibn Zīyād and Abu al-Hussein Ali ibn Muhammad ibn Yasār	(‘An abawayhimā) Al-Hassan ibn Ali al-Nāsirī	Abīh	Ābāyih
8	conclusion of Sheikh Sadūq’s chains of transmitters 2 (Ahmad ibn Hassan al-Husseini)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	Abū Ja'far Muhammad ibn Ali ibn Hussein ibn Musā ibn Bābiwayh al-Qumī (Sheikh Sadūq)	Abulhassan Muhammad ibn Qasim al-Mufassir Astarābādī al-Khatīb	Abu Yaqūb Yūsuf ibn Zīyād and Abu al-Hussein Ali ibn Muhammad ibn Yasār	(‘An abawayhimā) Al-Hassan ibn Ali al-Nāsirī	Abīh	Abīh

B- The gaps and the time interval between the manuscripts and the final narrators

Three different approaches can be adopted regarding the Irsāl in Isnād of interpretation attributed to Imām ʿAskarī (AS); each of which is very important in turn.

1- The time interval between manuscripts and narrators

There is a time interval between almost all the manuscripts of the ancient works, with their authors or narrators of the works. The commentary book attributed to Imām Hassan ʿAskarī (AS) also has a time gap between the manuscripts and the narrators of the Isnād in all three types of Sanad; that is: A- Isnād of manuscripts of Tafsīr. B- Isnād of interpretation in Iḥtijāj. C- Isnād of interpretation in the works of Sheikh Sadūq.

The minimum time interval from the manuscripts of the Tafsīr book to the narrators of its Isnād, as well as some Tafsīr narrations in the works of Sheikh Sadūq, is about two hundred years; it means that all of them have a long version Irsāl.

Only if the manuscript of ʿUyūn Akhbār al-Reza (AS) dated around the 4th century is correct; this means that there are 9 narrations of the narrations of commentary attributed to Imām Hassan ʿAskarī (AS) in the works of Sadūq are without a time interval from the manuscript to the narrator of the narrations (i.e. Sheikh Sadūq). (See: Ostadi: 2021).

2- Irsāl and Omission of the Narrators of Tafsīr in the Isnād up to Sheikh Sadūq

There are three types of Isnād for the narrations of Tafsīr up to Sheikh Sadūq; two types are the Isnād for the manuscripts of the Tafsīr book attributed to Imām ʿAskarī (AS) and one type is the Isnād for about forty narrations in the book known as Iḥtijāj. Apart from the initial Irsāl of Isnād up to unknown narrators in the fifth and seventh centuries, this Isnād has clear and hidden intervals; such as: A- An omission in the Isnād of Shādhān ibn Jibrīl. B- An omission in the Isnād of the narrations of the book known as Iḥtijāj. C- An omission in the Isnād of Muḥammad Daqāq. (See: Ostadi: 2021).

3- Irsāl and omission of narrators in Tafsīr Isnād from Sadūq to ʿAskarī

In order to be accurate in Irsāl and omission of the narrators of Tafsīr after Sheikh Sadūq to ʿAskarī, it is very important to know the type of ʿAskarī's Tafsīr. Regarding the speaker and the owner of ʿAskarī's Tafsīr, there are three situations or perspectives in front of us:

1- This Tafsīr is attributed to the tenth Imām, that is, Imām Hādī (AS), who was martyred in 254 AH; as some have said like Ibn Ghaḍāirī (Ibn Ghaḍāirī, 1422 AH: 98).

2- This Tafsīr is attributed to the 11th Imām, that is, Imām Hassan ʿAskarī (AS), martyred in 260 AH; as some notable people say (see: Ostadi, 1985: full text)

3- This Tafsīr is from Imām Hassan ʿAskarī Uṭrūsh, which is, Imām Zaydīyyah, was martyred in 304 AH (see: Ostadi, 2021: the entire text).

If we know the interpretation from the 10th Imām (AS), between Yūsuf and ʿAlī and the 10th Imām (AS), there will be an Irsāl and omission of the narrator. In addition to this, the history of the narrators of Tafsīr (which is given at the beginning of the Tafsīr text) is not compatible with the death of the 10th Imām (AS).

If we know this Tafsīr from the 11th Imām (AS); two cases are assumed: one. The story of the narrators of Tafsīr happened after 260 lunar years. In this case, the same situation of the 10th Imām as mentioned above will occur; that is, there will be a drop and omission of the narrator between Yūsuf and ʿAlī and the 11th Imām (AS). Two. The story of the narrators of

Tafsīr happened before 260 lunar years, which is exactly 253 lunar years. In this case, this story of the narrators can be combined with the life of the 11th Imām and the understanding of his presence. Although the face-to-face lesson of Yūsuf and ʿAlī in the presence of the 11th Imām (AS) is seriously disputed (see: Ostadi, 2021: R., the entire text)

If we consider Tafsīr of ʿAskarī from Hassan ibn ʿAlī ʿAskarī, that is, Nāṣir Kabīr Uṭrūsh, there will be no differences between the narrators of Tafsīr and ʿAskarī.

In the text of the story at the beginning of ʿAskarī's commentary, which is about Yūsuf and ʿAlī, it is stated: "...our fathers were Imāmī Shi'a; the Zaydīyyah had prevailed in Astarabad; and we were under the governance of Hassan ibn Zayd Alawī, nicknamed advocate for the right, Imām of Zaydīyyah..." (See: ʿAskarī, 1409 AH: 11)

There are two historical references in this story, which shows two histories: 1- We were under the rule of Hassan ibn Zayd Alawī 2- The Zaydīyyah had prevailed in Astarabad.

"Hassan ibn Zayd" nicknamed "Dāʾī Kabīr" and "Al-Dāʾī ilā al-Ḥaqq", was from Sadat Hasani from Medina, and followed the religion of Jārūdīyyah Zaydīyyah; who moved from Hejaz to Ray. In 250 AH, after the request of the people of Tabaristan, he led an uprising in that region; from the heart of it, the Alawī government of Tabaristan was established (see: Jaʿfariyan, 2008: 302-304; Varedi, 2009: 84). After several battles against the Taheriyan, he was able to dominate the entire mountains and plains of Tabaristan (as an example see: Varedi, 2009: full text). Also, after suppressing the internal opposition, Hassan ibn Zayd sent "Muḥammad ibn Ibrahim" and "Deylamī Army" to Astarabad at the head of the army on the 3rd of Dhu al-Hijjah 253 AH, who were able to conquer the region of Gorgan and Astarabad. Until 270 AH, he continued his rule with the official religion of Zaydīyyah (Ibn Isfandiyar, 1987: 240), centered in the city of Amol; and he was buried in the same city (see: Varedi, 2009: 69 and 82).

Therefore, the historical knowledge of the Tabaristan Alawī government shows that the story of Yūsuf and ʿAlī, the narrators and writers of Tafsīr ʿAskarī, took place between 253 AH and 270 AH, that is, around 260 AH or later. According to this story (see: ʿAskarī, 1409 AH: 11), Yūsuf and ʿAlī were teenagers at this time; who were the students of ʿAskarī.

Maybe some people think that this problem can be solved by knowing the fathers of Yūsuf and ʿAlī; just as there are some documents of small and annotated narrations of Tafsīr in the works of Sadūq, quoted by the fathers of Yūsuf and ʿAlī (see: Sadūq, Uyūn, nd, 1: 267); but this solution is not compatible with the explanation of the story of the narrators of Tafsīr; because it is stated in several places of Tafsīr that Yūsuf and ʿAlī were students of Hassan Ibn ʿAlī ʿAskarī and quoting Tafsīr from him (e.g. see: ʿAskarī, 1409 AH: 10, 316 and 363).

C- Rijālī review of the narrators of the Isnād from Sheikh Sadūq to ʿAskarī

According to the explanations that were mentioned earlier about the Isnād of Tafsīr, we will examine the authority of the narrators of the Tafsīr Isnād from Sheikh Sadūq to ʿAskarī and his father, in addition, Sahl Dībājī as one of the possible narrators of Tafsīr ʿAskarī.

1- Abu Ja'far Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī Babawayh Qumī (Sheikh Sadūq)

Regarding the rijālī review of Sheikh Sadūq in relation to ʿAskarī's interpretation, it is necessary to present some issues in several sections:

1-1- Summary of Sheikh Sadūq's rijālī status

Apart from the problems that some scholars have had regarding the Ḥadīthī performance of Sheikh Sadūq, and have accused him of change and anxiety in narrating Ḥadīth (see: Majlisī, 1403 AH, 5: 156; Nouri, 1408 AH, 11: 170); his rijālī status has also been disputed by some (e.g., see: Baḥrānī: 1429 AH, 357; Ibn Sharer, 2015: full text; and the answer to this article: Ohadi, 2017: full text).

Although some scholars have praised Sheikh Sadūq (e.g. see: Najāshī, 1407 AH: 389; Tūsī, 1417 AH: 152), but they (like Najāshī, Sheikh Tūsī, Allameh Hillī and other famous scholars), have not explicitly approved sheikh Sadūq; while they commented on his contemporaries, for example, ʿAlī Ibn Ibrahim Qomi and confirmed them (e.g. see: Tūsī, 1417 AH: 152). For this reason, some Ḥadīth scholars and elders have considered this non-specifying the authenticity of Sheikh Sadūq to mean his lack of authenticity (see: Baḥrānī, 1429 AH: 357); or they have stopped regarding the rijālī status of Sheikh Sadūq (see: Ḥurr Āmulī, 1403 AH: 7).

Other later scholars have explained this non-authenticity of Sheikh Sadūq with reasons; and they have considered the dignity of Sheikh Sadūq higher than the statement of endorsement (Baḥrānī, 1429 AH: 357). Similar to this argument, other later rijālī scholars, such as Muḥaqqiq Khoei, have also made this argument (see: Khoei, 1413 AH, 347: 17).

1-2- Separation of Sadūq's rijālī status in narrations of Tafsīr

Whether Sheikh Sadūq is reliable or not, it seems that his rijālī status has an effect only in Sheikh Sadūq's narrations from ʿAskarī's interpretation that are present in Sheikh Sadūq's own works; because we will say that Sheikh Sadūq did not have the copy of Tafsīr of ʿAskarī book in his possession. Therefore, it is necessary for us to separate the rijālī status of Sheikh Sadūq in the Ḥadīth of Tafsīr; and we should not apply the same ruling for the version of Tafsīr and narrations of Tafsīr in the works of Sadūq.

1-3- Sheikh Sadūq did not have the Tafsīr book in his possession

It seems that Sheikh Sadūq did not have the Tafsīr book directly. Even, he has not seen and heard all the traditions and Ḥadīth of the book in the ways of other people. This means that Sheikh Sadūq only had access to a small number (that is, about forty narrations) of the Ḥadīth of ʿAskarī's Tafsīr, through Astarabadi and others; which has only reflected the same narratives in his works. In this regard, some evidence and proofs can be presented, some of which are:

1- Not using the narrations of Tafsīr in the related works of Sadūq and others

Assuming that the interpretation of narrations and Ḥadīth are from Imām Hassan ʿAskarī (AS) or attributed to him, because they are directly quoted from the Imām or even if they are quoted from the Imām, it could be a very important text; that no author and news-teller could easily pass by it and ignore these narrations especially authors, who believe in collecting all Ḥadīth such as Sheikh Sadūq, or authors who have works on the same topic as some Ḥadīth, such as Uyūn Akhbār al-Reza (AS).

Therefore, the authors who wrote works similar to the subject of the commentary attributed to Imām ʿAskarī (AS) are the main audience for applying this interpretation; unless they don't have access to the text of the interpretation book. So, paying attention to whether the authors have used and benefited from the book of commentary attributed to ʿAskarī or not; can convey important points. And it can show whether the author or authors of those works have seen the commentary book

or not? Now, according to this introduction, we will discuss the works of Sheikh Sadūq:

There are more than forty narrations of ʿAskarī's interpretation in the works of Sadūq. Of course, some of them are not available in the current and existing book of Tafsīr attributed to Imām Hassan ʿAskarī (AS) (e.g. see: Sadūq, Uyūn, nd, 2: 167). Therefore, due to the existence of the Isnād of the narrations of Sadūq and the manuscripts of the Tafsīr of Sheikh Sadūq, the status of the Isnād of Sadūq from Tafsīr of ʿAskarī becomes significant.

The original and real sanad of Tafsīr of ʿAskarī can have three states: 1. In fact, this book has the same existing Isnād from the beginning. 2. This interpretation has no sanad; and later, a sanad for manuscripts of interpretation was established from the Isnād of narrations of the works of Sheikh Sadūq or similar. 3. This commentary has the same current Isnād, of course, under the name of Sahl Dībājī or, for example, Khālid Barqī (see: Ibn Shahr Āshūb, nd: 70); that some time, the previous sanad was replaced with the name of the narrators of the narrations of Sadūq.

By accepting the second and third assumption, it is clear that the Isnād of interpretation is forgery but by accepting the first assumption, several questions are raised: 1- If Sheikh Sadūq had the book of interpretation, why didn't he narrate about 350 narrations of this book? Even though Sadūq has various works, the narrations of Tafsīr of ʿAskarī are suitable for use in those works. 2- If this current Tafsīr with the same documents attributed to Sheikh Sadūq was in the hands of Sadūq, why Sheikh Sadūq has quoted its narrations with two or more different ways?

2- Lack of fully adaption between Sadūq's narrations and current interpretation

In some cases, the narrations of Sheikh Sadūq from Tafsīr ʿAskarī, which are now available in the current book of Tafsīr ʿAskarī; do not fully match the current interpretation. This situation can be indicative of the fact that, if the narrations of Sadūq were not distorted, the narrations of Sheikh Sadūq from Tafsīr of ʿAskarī did not happen directly. This means that he has quoted a limited number of narrations of Tafsīr of ʿAskarī from other sources, not directly from the current book of Tafsīr ʿAskarī.

1-4- Summing up the rijālī status of Sadūq according to Tafsīr of ʿAskarī

It seems that since Sheikh Sadūq did not have the current book of Tafsīr of ʿAskarī in his possession, the rijālī status of the Sheikh will not play a role in the original book of Tafsīr of ʿAskarī and as the narrator of this book.

In other words, if Sheikh Sadūq is reliable, about forty narrations of Tafsīr of ʿAskarī (e.g. see: Sadūq, 1379 AH: 4, 24, 33; ibid, 1996: 11, 40; ibid, nd: 140 and 298; and ibid, 1978: 47, 230) some of which exist in the current book and some of which do not exist (see: Sadūq, nd, 2: 167), will be credited in terms of the position of this narrator. And this reliability of Sheikh Sadūq cannot be extended to the current version of Tafsīr ʿAskarī. And that Rijālī situation cannot be considered as the support of the entire current version of Tafsīr of ʿAskarī according to the new Isnād of the version.

2- Sahl Dībājī

Abu Muḥammad, Sahl ibn Aḥmad ibn Abdullah ibn Aḥmad ibn Sahl Dībājī was born in 289 AH and died in 380 AH in Baghdad. A few narrations have been narrated from Dībājī in Shi'a sources (e.g. see: Tūsī, 1414 AH: 706). Most of his fame is due to the recitation of Al-Asha'thīyāt book (see: Khatīb al-Baghdādī, 1422 AH, 10: 176).

As mentioned at the beginning of the article, Ibn Ghaḍāirī, in the title of Muḥammad ibn Qāsim, the narrator of the commentary attributed to Imām Hassan ʿAskarī (AS), considers this

commentary to be either Dībājī's creation or similar to his thematic commentary (Ibn Ghaḍāirī, 1422 AH: 98). Also, in another place, Ibn Ghaḍāirī, while calling Sahl ibn Aḥmad weak, accused him of falsifying Ḥadīth and narrating narrations from unknown people (Ibn Ghaḍāirī, 1422 AH: 68). Even though Ibn Ghaḍāirī considered the narration of Al-Asha'thīyāt and the like from him to be correct and perhaps the Book of Ḥajj written by Sahl, which was narrated by Ibn Ghaḍāirī himself along with Al-Asha'thīyāt from Dībājī, is meant.

Najāshī wrote about him: "No problem of him, his characters are hidden but at his last lifetime, his faith was clear. He had a book named The Faith of Abi Tālib".[1] (Najāshī, 1407 AH: 186) No information was found about him in Rijāl Kashshī; and there is no mention of his translation, correction, or modification in Sheikh Tūsī's Rijāl and list (460 AH); In his Rijāl, he only wrote: "He settled in Baghdad in Za'farānī. Al-Tullakbarī heard of him in 370 AH and had permission of him for himself and his sons. Al-Hussein ibn 'Ubaydullah, known as Abā Muhammad, narrated from him."[2](Tūsī, 1415 AH: 427) There is no mention of him in the works of Ibn Shahr Āshūb (588 AH) and al-Fihrist Muntajab al-Dīn (600 AH); and in Ibn Dāwūd's Rijāl (7th century), the same story of Najāshī is repeated (Muntajab al-Dīn, 1366 AH, 107). And in Khulāsat al-Aqwāl of Hillī (726 AH) the story of Najāshī and Ibn Ghaḍāirī is also quoted; although he has given these contents in the name of believer's section. (See: Hillī, 1417 AH, 159)

The result is that, apart from weakening and Jarḥ of Ibn Ghaḍāirī, there is no confirmation of him; unless some people consider Sheikh Mufīd's prayer over his funeral (Khatīb al-Baghdādī, 1422 AH, 10: 176) as a sign of his majesty. (See: Encyclopedia of Islamic Universe, Sahl Dībājī's entry).

3- Muḥammad ibn Qāsim the commentator

In the Shi'a sources, there are various names for this narrator of Tafsīr ʿAskarī, such as: Muḥammad ibn Al-Qāsim and Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī and the like. Due to the lack of information about Muḥammad ibn Qāsim and for more attention, we will now discuss his translation and status in three parts:

3-1- Translation and life of Muḥammad ibn Qāsim

Most of the Shi'a sources have listed his name as "Muḥammad ibn Qāsim" after Sheikh Sadūq. A few mentions of Jurjānī have been mentioned in the narrations of Sheikh Sadūq, along with the title "Abul Hassan". Also, in the old version of Tafsīr of ʿAskarī and the Book of Iḥtijāj, the same nickname of Abul Hassan is given to him. The mention of Muḥammad ibn Qāsim's name is included in all Isnād of Sadūq with the title of "Mufassir"; and in some other cases, like the manuscripts of the commentary, his name is mentioned with the description of "Khatīb". Also, in most of the Isnād of Sheikh Sadūq from Muḥammad Ibn Qāsim, his name is mentioned with the name "Al-Jurjānī"; and in several cases, his name is mentioned with the name "Astarabadi". There is no information about the dates of his birth and death; but by summarizing the various evidences, it can be concluded that the life of Jurjānī was around 290 to 367 lunar years (see: Ostadi, 2021: the entire text).

At a glance, it is clear that Muḥammad Ibn Qāsim was Shi'a, and he was also of its extreme type. However, since Muḥammad Ibn Qāsim lived in the Zaydīyyah age of Tabaristan and his homeland was the region of the Zaydīyyah

---

۱. «لا بأس به، كان يخفي أمره كثيرا، ثم ظاهر بالدين في اخر عمره له كتاب إيمان أبي‌طالب رضي‌الله عنه».

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

religion, therefore, we must consider the possibility of his being a Zaydīyyah as possible.

Narrative elders and teachers of Jurjānī are these people: Yūsuf ibn Muḥammad ibn Zīyād; ʿAlī ibn Muḥammad ibn Sayyār; Aḥmad Nab Al-Hassan; Abdul Malik ibn Ibrahim or Aḥmad; and also, Ja'far ibn Aḥmad. Also, several people can be counted as his students or Ḥadīthī narrators: Sheikh Sadūq; Ḥusayn ibn Muḥammad; Muḥammad Isfahani. Works and narrations attributed to Jurjānī are: the current interpretation of ʿAskarī; Narratives of Tafsir ʿAskarī from Sadūq; Nudbah of Imām Sajjad (AS); other miscellaneous narratives. (see: Ostadi, 2021)

3-2- Rijālī review of Muḥammad Ibn Qāsim

In the old sources, such as Najāshī's list (450 AH), Kashshī's Rijāl, Tūsī's Rijāl and Tūsī's list (460 AH), no mention of Tafsīr of ʿAskarī and its narrator, namely Abul Hassan Jurjānī, was found; except that Ibn Ghaḍāirī (450 AH) in his Rijāl, along with the title "Muḥammad ibn al-Qāsim" paid attention to its interpretation and narrator and considered it as Muḍūʿ and wrote: "Muhammad ibn Qāsim….weak and lier. A commentary has been narrated from him through two unknown men: Yusuf ibn Muhammad ibn Ziyad and Ali ibn Muhammad ibn Yasār."[1] (Ibn Ghaḍāirī, 1422 AH: 98)

Also, under the works of Sheikh Sadūq, Najāshī mentioned two interpretive works, Tafsīr al-Qur'an and Mukhtaṣar Tafsīr al-Qur'an (Najāshī, 1407 AH: 391 and 392); that they may be related to the interpretation attributed to Imām Hassan ʿAskarī (AS), or basically the same; but there was no mention of Jurjānī.

Ibn Shahr Āshūb (588 AH) does not mention the commentary of Imām Hassan ʿAskarī (AS) nor Jurjānī in his Ma'ālim al-'Ulamā. If the commentary of Imām ʿAlī al-Hādī ʿAskarī (AS) is written by al-Hassan ibn Khālid al-Barqī (254 AH) (Ibn Shahr Āshūb, nd: 34).

Ibn Dāwūd Hillī (7th century), in his book Rijāl, described Muḥammad ibn Qāsim as a "Liar" and used the code "Lam" for him. This means that Abul Hassan Jurjānī did not quote Imāms (AS) (See. Ibn Dāwūd Hillī, nd: 275).

Allameh Hillī (726 AH) also quoted the same opinion of Ibn Ghaḍāirī in his Khulāsat al-Aqwāl, and he mentioned only the name of Jurjānī, apart from Muḥammad ibn Qāsim, with the mention of, "Muḥammad ibn Abi al-Qāsim" (see: Hillī, 1417 AH, 405: no. 60)

Therefore, from the early sources of Rijālī, it appears that Jurjānī is unknown; and only the statement of Ibn Ghaḍāirī remains for us, who called Abul Hassan Jurjānī "Weak and liar". Also, in the later sources, no additional information was found about Muḥammad ibn Qāsim; and the same previous content has been repeated or processed.

Apart from the Rijālī sources, what remains in our hands of the state of Jarḥ and Taʿdīl of Jurjānī are the narrations of Sheikh Sadūq. Sheikh Sadūq did not criticize Muḥammad Ibn Qāsim, or confirm or undermine him; however, in some of the documents of the narrations that he has narrated from him, he has included the words of mercy and reconciliation for him. Of course, the existence of these cases is based on the assumption that these reconciliations are written by Sheikh Sadūq himself, not the additions of scribes copying Sheikh Sadūq's works.

These cases of mercy and reconciliation mentioned earlier are Isnād with conciliatory prayers (e.g. see: Sadūq, Uyūn, nd, 1: 137, 282, 254); and in one case the Isnād of Sadūq's Amālī book "RA" has been mentioned (see: Sadūq, Amālī, 1996: 110). Some few cases of these Ḥadīth documents are also mentioned

---

۱. «محمّد بن القاسم... ضعيف، كذّاب. روى عنه تفسيرا يرويه عن رجلين مجهولين: أحدهما يعرف بيوسف بن محمّد بن زياد، و الآخر: عليّ بن محمّد بن يسار عن أبيهما، عن أبي الحسن الثالث(ع)؛ و التفسير موضوع عن سهل الديباجيّ، عن أبيه بأحاديث من هذه المناكير»

along with the expression of mercy (Sadūq, Al-Tawḥīd, 1977: 47, 230).

Therefore, two issues are now in front of us: 1- Is compassion and reconciliation considered validation? Some have considered the existence of compassion and reconciliation as the cause of verification (e.g. see: Al-Husaini, 1415 AH, 1: 135) and some have not accepted this method of verification (Khoei, 1413 AH, 18: 162). 2- If Abul Hassan Jurjānī is a Zaydī and a Waqifī, what is the status of his narrations? It was pointed out that with the condition of the text of Tafsīr and Nāṣir Uṭrūsh, and the geographical area of Muḥammad Ibn Qāsim in the third century, there is a possibility that Jurjānī is Zaydī, and Waqifī. Therefore, it is necessary to consider his rijālī reputation in this regard as well (which we will discuss in the future under the title of Uṭrūsh).

3-3- Summing up the rijālī status of Muḥammad Ibn Qāsim

In the conclusion of the rijālī analysis of the Astarabadi, it can be said: considering that Muḥammad ibn Qāsim is called weak and liar by Ibn Ghaḍāirī, as well as the low power of the narrator's validation based on mercy and reconciliation; and on the other hand, the confused and chaotic situation of Tafsīr of ʿAskarī of Uṭrūsh, it seems that the interpretive narrations quoted by Muḥammad Ibn Qāsim should be evaluated as weak.

4- Yūsuf ibn Muḥammad ibn Zīyād

Apart from the narrations of Tafsīr al-ʿAskarī, which are shared by Yūsuf ibn Muḥammad ibn Zīyād and ʿAlī ibn Muḥammad ibn Sayyār, no other narrations of Yūsuf were found. This means that from Yūsuf ibn Muḥammad ibn Zīyād, there are only about forty narrations that are in the works of Sadūq and especially ʿUyūn al-Akhbār al-Reza (PBUH) (ʿUyūn 12 narrations, Maʾānī al-Akhbār 5 narrations, Tawḥīd and Amālī 3 narrations, ʿIlal al-Sharāyiʿ 2 narrations and the attributes of al-Shiʾa, Faqīh and Khiṣāl, 1 narration for each) as well as the traditions of the current manuscript of Tafsīr ʿAskarī, which is quoted by him, are available; and he has no other work in Imāmīyyah sources.

Apart from this, Jurjānī and his narratives have not been noticed by Imāmīyyah Shiʾa authors and scholars; because from the fourth century when his narrations appeared in the works of Sheikh Sadūq until the twelfth century, only about 12 Ḥadīth (repeated and non-repeated) can be found from Yūsuf ibn Muḥammad in the Imāmīyyah Ḥadīthī sources.

Yūsuf ibn Muḥammad ibn Zīyād, from Hassan ibn ʿAlī ʿAskarī Uṭrūsh directly, and in some documents, which are ascribed (e.g. see: Sadūq, ʿUyūn, nd, 1: 279) through his father or through their fathers (i.e. Yūsuf and ʿAlī's father) has narrated the exegetical traditions that are available to us. (E.g. see: Sadūq, ʿUyūn, nd, 1: 267).

In any case, Yūsuf ibn Muḥammad ibn Zīyād is unknown in Rijālī books and translations, as well as the Imāmīyyah sources; and now we only know that he was one of Nāṣir Uṭrūsh's students and that he died around the year 325.

5- ʿAlī ibn Muḥammad ibn Sayyār

ʿAlī ibn Muḥammad ibn Sayyār is also the narrator of ʿAskarīʾs Tafsīr; and Hassan ibn ʿAlī ʿAskarī Uṭrūsh directly narrated the narration. Of course, in some documents, which have been edited, through their fathers (i.e. Yūsuf and ʿAlī's father), he has narrated narrations (e.g. see: Sadūq, ʿUyūn, nd, 1: 266 and 267).

Apart from the narrations of Tafsīr ʿAskarī, which are common between Yūsuf and ʿAlī; Astarabadi has also narrated several narrations, only from ʿAlī Sayyār, quoting from Abu Yaḥyā Muḥammad ibn Yazīd (see: Sadūq, ʿIlal al-Sharāyiʿ, nd, 1: 230 two narrations).

The name of this narrator, i.e. Abul Hassan, is mentioned in several Isnād of Sheikh Sadūq's narrations from Yūsuf and ʿAlī or from ʿAlī alone, with the spelling "Bashār, Yasār, Ṣayyād, Sanān". That is, in several places of the copies of Sheikh Sadūq's works, ʿAlī ibn Muḥammad ibn Sayyār has been included (Sadūq, 1379, 4: 24, 33, and 36; ʿIlal al-Sharāyiʿ 2/416; ʿUyūn Akhbār al-Reza, 1/282, 288; Al-Tawḥīd, 230). Also, in one place, ʿAlī ibn Muḥammad ibn Ṣayyād (ʿUyūn Akbar al-Reza, 2/12); and also in another place, ʿAlī ibn Muḥammad ibn Sanān (Sadūq, Ma'ānī al-Akhbār, 1379 AH, 339) is included. Also, in the manuscripts of ʿIlal al-Sharāyiʿ, his name is "Abu al-Hassan ʿAlī ibn Muḥammad ibn Bashār"; which Sahib-e-Bihar and Sahib-e-Awālim al-Ulūm have narrated it by quoting the reasons of Sheikh Sadūq (Majlisī, 1403 AH, 63/46; Al-Baḥrānī Al-Isfahani, Nd: 192/18) that in the new editions of ʿIlal al-Sharāyiʿ, the name Bashār has been changed to Sayyār. Probably, this spelling is due to the presence of a person with the same name in Ḥadīthī sources and others. For example, in this same book, ʿIlal al-Sharāyiʿ, the name of Muḥammad Ibn ʿAlī Ibn Bashār al-Qazwīnī has been mentioned (Sadūq, ʿIlal al-Sharāyiʿ, nd: 1/67) and also in non-Shi'a sources, there is a person with this name (e.g. see: Khatīb al-Baghdādī, 1422 AH, 13: 534) and there are some names similar to it such as "Abu al-Hassan ʿAlī ibn Muḥammad ibn Bishr" (as an example see: Al-Dānī, 1407 AH, 1: 9)

There is also a short article quoted by Astarabadi in the Dīwān attributed to Imām Sajjad (AS) (see: ʿAlī ibn Ḥusayn, 1423 AH, Aghar version), which is also mentioned in Biḥār al-Anwār Majlisī (see: Majlisī, 1403 AH, 104: 121) and some, like Sheikh Baha'i, doubt its attribution (for more information see: Tehrani, 1408 AH, 9: 431). The same short story, with a long sequence and with slightly different Isnād, has been stated in the Nudbah of Imām al-Sajjad (AS) (ʿAlī ibn Hussain, nd: 197; also see: Sadūq, ʿIlal, nd, 1: 230).[1]

In any case, ʿAlī ibn Muḥammad ibn Sayyār is unknown in the books of Rijāl and translations, as well as the Imāmīyyah sources; and now we only know that he was one of Nāṣir Uṭrūsh's students and that he died around the year 325.

6 and 7 – The fathers of Yūsuf and ʿAlī

As mentioned earlier, a number of the narratives of Sheikh Sadūq have been included in Tafsīr of ʿAskarī through the father or fathers of Yūsuf and ʿAlī.

On the other hand, in at least two Isnād of Sadūq, it is stated: "Abu Ya'qūb Yusuf ibn Muhammad ibn Ziyad and Ali ibn Muhammad ibn Sayyār, both were among Imamī Shī'a" (See: Sadūq, Tawḥīd, 1977, 230; Ma'ānī, 1379 AH, 4),[2] and this Isnād is similar to the Isnād of Tafsīr of ʿAskarī in the book of Iḥtijāj attributed to Tabrisī. According to the Isnād of Tafsīr of ʿAskarī in Iḥtijāj and Ibn Ghaḍāirī's mention of Tafsīr of ʿAskarī (Ibn Ghaḍāirī, 1422 A.H., 98), "From their fathers" in Sadūq's Isnād, as a mediator of quoting the narration, is incorrect; and apparently, they are written in the Isnād. In fact, according to the Isnād of Tafsīr of ʿAskarī in the Iḥtijāj, the following sentence was an explanatory sentence among the Isnād that "Our fathers" was changed and added to the Isnād in Sadūq, as a means of quotation (see: Ostadi, 2021):

"Yūsuf ibn Muḥammad ibn Zīyād and Abu al-Hassan ʿAlī ibn Muḥammad ibn Sayyār and they were Shi'a al-Imāmīyyah and they said our fathers were Imāmayn and they were

---

١. «... أخبرنا أبوجعفر محمد بن بابويه قال حدّثنا أبو بكر محمد بن القاسم بن محمد الإسترآباذي قال حدّثنا عبد الملك بن إبراهيم و علي بن محمد بن محمد بن سيار قال حدّثنا أبو يحيى محمد بن عبد اللّه بن يزيد المقرئ قال حدّثنا سفيان بن عُيينة عن الزهري قال سمعت علي بن الحسين(ع)...»

٢. «أَبُو يَعْقُوبَ يُوسُفُ بْنُ مُحَمَّدِ بْنِ زِيَادٍ وَ عَلِيُّ بْنُ مُحَمَّدِ بْنِ سَيَّارٍ وَ كَانَا مِنَ اَلشِّيعَةِ اَلْإِمَامِيَّةِ»

Zaydīyyah and they were from Astarabad..." (See: Isnād of Tafsīr in Iḥtijāj),

For more accuracy, let's pay attention to the story of the narrators at the beginning of the commentary: "Told me Abū Yaʾqūb Yūsuf ibn Muḥammad ibn Zīyād and Abu al-Hassan ʿAlī ibn Muḥammad ibn Sayyār and they were Shi'a al-Imāmīyyah and they said our fathers were Imāmayn and they were Zaydīyyah and they were from Astarabad and they were in..." (See: ʿAskarī, 1409 AH: 11)

According to this story, and several other stories from the same narrators in Tafsīr of ʿAskarī (see: Ostadi, 2021: the entire text), it is clear that Yūsuf and ʿAlī directly understood Tafsīr from ʿAskarī Uṭrūsh.

In any case, whether the middleman of the fathers in narrating the narration is correct or whether it is from the writings of the copies of Sadūq's works; the fathers of Yūsuf and ʿAlī are unknown like themselves.

8- Aḥmad ibn Hassan al-Ḥusaynī

In the works of Sheikh Sadūq, there are about twelve narrations from "Muḥammad ibn al-Qāsim al-Mufassir" from "Aḥmad ibn al-Hassan al-Ḥusaynī" from "Hassan ibn ʿAlī" (Sadūq, 1996: 110 and 358; Ibid, Al-Shari'a, nd, 1: 298; Ibid, Uyūn Akhbār al-Reza (AS), nd, 1: 274, 297, 312 and 2: 2, 52; ibid, 1379 AH: 287, 288, 289).

There are about five narrations from "Muḥammad ibn Al-Qāsim al-Mufassir" ending with "Al-Hassan ibn ʿAlī" in the three books of ʿUyūn Akhbār al-Reza (PBUH), Al-Amālī and Maʾānī al-Akhbār by Sheikh Sadūq, with this Isnād:

"Told us Muḥammad ibn Al-Qāsim al-Mufassir al-Jurjānī, May God be pleased with him, the Ḥadīth of Aḥmad ibn Al-Hassan al-Ḥusaynī from Hassan ibn ʿAlī al-Nāṣirī from his father from Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī from his father Reza from his father Musa ibn Ja'far (See Sadūq, 1379 AH: 287 (two Ḥadīths) and 288; Ibid, 1996: 358; Ibid, ʿIlal al-Sharāyiʿ, nd, 1: 298).

Therefore, seven narrations of the Isnād of these narrations of Aḥmad ibn Hassan in the works of Sadūq, do not have the title "Al-Nāṣir" "Al-Nāṣirī" after the name "Hassan ibn ʿAlī"; and they have come alone. (See: Sadūq, 1996: 110; Ibid, Uyūn Akhbār al-Reza (AS), nd, 1: 274, 279, 312 and 2: 2, 52; Ibid, Maʾānī al-Akhbār: 289); In the meantime, considering that the text of some of these narrations are the same, it is clear that these "Hassan ibn ʿAlī" have the same Nāṣirī suffix (e.g. see: Sadūq, Uyūn al-Akhbār, nd, 1: 312 and 2: 52).

Therefore, it seems that in all the documents of Aḥmad ibn Hassan, what is meant by "Hassan ibn ʿAlī" is the same "Hassan ibn ʿAlī al-Nāṣirī", that is, Nāṣir al-Uṭrūsh although these Ḥadīths are among the surahs that are part of the missing volumes in ʿAskarī's current interpretation.

Abu al-Ḥusayn Aḥmad ibn al-Hassan al-Nāṣirī al-Ḥusaynī died in 311 AH, he was the son of Nāṣir al-Uṭrūsh (see: Ibn ʿInabah, 1417 AH: 284). Hassan ibn ʿAlī, that is, Nāṣir Uṭrūsh, had ten children; five of them were boys. Aḥmad is his fifth son and his mother was Umm Walad (see: ʿAlam Al-Huda, 2018, 100). Unlike his father and brothers, Aḥmad ibn Al-Hassan was an Imāmī and attacked the Zaydīyyah belief in his poems (See. Ibn Isfandiyar, 1987: 273; Āmulī, 1968: 108).

Abu al-Ḥusayn Aḥmad ibn Hassan is the father-in-law of Hassan ibn Qāsim, that is, Dā'ī Ṣaghīr Zaydīyyah. With the death of Nāṣir Uṭrūsh on 25 Sha'ban 304 AH and according to his will, Abul Ḥusayn Aḥmad and Deylamī commanders called Dā'ī Ṣaghīr, who was the governor of Gorgan, from there to Amol, and in Ramadan of the same year, they entrusted him with the government of Tabaristan region (Haruni, 2008: 61). Abul Ḥusayn Aḥmad has

participated in wars against Dā'ī Ṣaghīr. Dā'ī made peace with Aḥmad ibn Hassan at a time when he was at war with him and made him a partner in his government, and made Aḥmad ibn Hassan the governor of Gorgan. After that, Aḥmad ibn Hassan participated in wars in favor of Dā'ī or against him with the company of Abul Qāsim Ja'far; and during these wars, he finally died in Rajab 311 AH (see: Ibn Isfandiyar, 1987, 1: 276-286).

In any case, he is also unknown in Rijālī books and translations, as well as the Imāmīyyah sources; and now we only know that he was the son and student of Nāṣir Uṭrūsh.

9- Hassan ibn ʿAlī ʿAskarī Uṭrūsh

It was pointed out that Tafsīr of ʿAskarī is, in fact, for Hassan Ibn ʿAlī, nicknamed Uṭrūsh (for more detailed information, see: Ostadi, 2021: the entire text). In any case, in the existing ʿAskarī commentary, there are traditions quoted by the Imāms (AS), so it is justified for Rijālī review of Hassan Uṭrūsh with this situation. At least three aspects can be proposed about him:

9-1- Brief translation by Nāṣir Kabīr

Hassan ibn ʿAlī ʿAskarī nicknamed Nāṣir Kabīr, Nāṣir Uṭrūsh and Nāṣir li al-Ḥaqq (230-304 AH) was the third Alawī ruler of Tabaristan. He was a descendant of Sadat Ḥusaynī and a descendant of Imām Sajjad (AS) and a Zaydī (see: Mousavi Tanyani, 2014: full text). In addition to Tabaristan, he also ruled over other parts of northern Iran, including Deylam and the eastern parts of Gilan, and made Amol the center of his government. Nāṣir Kabīr has been introduced as a just ruler and according to Tabari's history report, the people of Tabaristan had never seen any government as just as his rule (Tabari, nd, 353: 4). He is also known as "ʿAskarī " or "Imām Hassan ibn ʿAlī ʿAskarī "; which we will discuss soon in his father's translation, the reason of this title.

Seyyed Morteza ʿAlam Al-Hudā spoke about the scientific status, asceticism and jurisprudence of Nāṣir Kabīr (see: ʿAlam Al-Hudā, 2018: introduction). Hassan Uṭrūsh has played an important role in bringing the people of Tabaristan to Islam and becoming Shi'a. Supporting the scholars and inviting Sadat to live in Tabaristan, as well as the establishment of mosques and religious schools, are known as his actions (see: Mar'ashi, 1984: 308; Seyyed Kobari, 2008: 550).

9-2- The works and compositions of Nāṣir li al-Ḥaqq

Some works have been mentioned for Nāṣir Kabīr, but according to the text of his remaining works, such as Al-Basat wa al-Ihtisab, it seems that his books, or at least the works left by him, are the narrations and notes of Nāṣir li al-Ḥaqq's educational lessons for his students (e.g. see: Uṭrūsh, 1423 AH: 12); which were either written during his lifetime or collected or written by some after the life of Nāṣir Kabīr (see: Mas'udi, 1385 AH, 4: 377 and 373; Amin Āmulī, 1421 AH, 5: 180).

In the various catalogs and works of the Zaydīyyah and Imāmīyyah, numerous books and works have been listed for Nāṣir Uṭrūsh; that this number ranges from about nine (see: Najāshī, 1407 AH: 135) and fourteen works (see: Ibn Nadim, 1417 AH: 244), to more than one hundred and sixty works. And even, according to the belief of some Zaydī of the Qāsimīyyah sect, it reaches three hundred works (see: Anonymous, Manuscripts, 8th century: 10 ff.). Although at present, nothing has been remained of these numerous works, except for two or three works, which are now attributed to him. To see more of these titles and to explain some of these works, you can use the numerous indexes of Zaydīyyah (also see: Uṭrūsh, 1418 and 1423 AH: introduction) and some new articles of the Imāmīyyah (see:

ʿAlam Al-Hudā, 2019: 175; Ostadi: 2021: throughout the text).

9-3- Nāṣir Kabīr in Rijāl sources

In Ibn Ghaḍāirī's Rijāl, Maʾālim al-Ulamā Ibn Shahr Āshūb (588H) and Muntajab Al-Din's List (600H), have been mentioned and nothing has been said about Nāṣir Uṭrūsh; although the authors of the two recent works have paid special attention to mentioning the scholars of Tabaristan.

It is stated in the Rijāl of Najāshī (450 AH): "Al-Hassan ibn ʿAlī ibn Al-Hassan ibn Umar ibn ʿAlī ibn Al-Ḥusayn ibn ʿAlī ibn Abi Ṭālib, Abu Muḥammad al-Uṭrūsh believed in Imāmah, and some books were written..." (Najāshī, 1407 AH: 57) The same mention was made in Ibn Dāwūd's Rijāl (7th century) and Khulāsat al-Aqwāl of Allameh (726 AH) without mentioning his works (Ibn Dāwūd Hillī, nd: 239; Hillī, 1417 AH: 337).

In Rijāl of Tūsī (460 AH), it is mentioned once by Nāṣir's father; appropriately, his name has also been mentioned: "ʿAlī ibn al-Hassan ibn ʿAlī ibn Umar ibn ʿAlī ibn Al-Ḥusayn ibn ʿAlī ibn Abi Ṭālib (AS), the father of Nāṣir al-Hassan ibn ʿAlī, may God be pleased with him" (Tūsī, 1415 AH: 376). This note is not present in some versions of Rijāl Tūsī; and it is not exactly clear whether the mentioned agreement is for the father or the son. Also, once again, it is mentioned by Uṭrūsh himself: "Al-Hassan ibn ʿAlī ibn Al-Hassan ibn ʿAlī ibn Umar ibn ʿAlī ibn Al-Ḥusayn ibn ʿAlī ibn Abi Ṭālib, Al-Nāṣir li al-Ḥaqq, may God be pleased with him" (Tūsī, 1415 AH: 385). This note is also missing in some versions of Rijāl Tūsī. It is very important that there is no mention of Uṭrūsh in Sheikh Tūsī's list; although Nāṣir Kabīr Uṭrūsh has many books (Ostadi, 2021, 3: the entire text). Also, there is no mention of Uṭrūsh in Ikhtīyār al-Ma'refah al-Rijāl by Sheikh Tūsī either.

In the summary of Tūsī's works about Hassan ibn ʿAlī al-Uṭrūsh, it can be said that due to the fact that he mentioned two things about Uṭrūsh in his Rijāl, it is not in some editions of that book, and there is no mention of Uṭrūsh in the books of Al-Fihrist wa Ikhtīyār al-Ma'refah al-Rijāl; It seems that the title of Uṭrūsh in Rijāl al-Tūsī is one of the additions to the copy of this book by the later copyists.

9-4- Rijālī status of Uṭrūsh in relation to his Zaydī religion

It was said that Hassan ibn ʿAlī ʿAskarī Uṭrūsh was Zaydī. He had seen the 11th Imām of Imāmīyyah (see: Hakim Jashimi, Jala al-Absar, nd: 30) and he had participated in his funeral. And he believed that Imām Hassan ʿAskarī (AS) had no children (as an example see: Deylamī, 1369 A.H., Second position), therefore, it is necessary to consider the rijālī status of Uṭrūsh in relation to Zaydīyyah and Wāqifīyyah religions.

Apart from the issue of distinguishing the imposition of Ḥadīth at the time of endowment and before, there are two minimum and maximum points and their intermediate states around the corrupt narrators of the non-twelfth-Imam Shi'a religion. Some scholars may believe in not paying attention to the narrations of the corrupt narrators of the Shi'a religion, unconditionally and exceptionally; and on the other hand, some may also confirm them. E.g. some have considered Othman ibn Isa Waqifī to be trustworthy due to the endorsement of Sheikh Tūsī and Shahr Āshūb (Khoei, 1413 AH, 12: 132). These scholars have distinguished between the use of corrupt traditions of religions and their beliefs (e.g. see: Tūsī, 1425 AH: 387; Tūsī, 1420 AH: 16, 39, 156, 256; Najāshī, 1418 AH: 42, 255, 329, Sh. 384) or at least, they accept these Ḥadīths if they do not have any opposition from Imāmīyyah traditions (Tūsī, 1417 AH, 50: 1). Some scholars have also

given a moderate opinion; and they believe that only the narrations of non-Imāmī Shi'a narrators are accepted, which are not of the type of belief in their religion (e.g. see Nouri, 1382 AH, 623: 3). This means that the agreement of the text of the narration with the beliefs of the corrupt narrators of the religion weakens the narration (see: Me'mari, 1377: 57).

9-5- Summarizing the rijālī status of Nāṣir Kabīr

In summing up the study of Rijāl Hassan ibn ʿAlī Uṭrūsh, it can be said that he is unknown in the Rijālī sources of Shi'a; and only in Najāshī's book, his name is mentioned; and it has been pointed out that he believed in Imāmate; the same thing has been repeated in some other sources. In Najāshī's memoirs, the word Taraḥḥum is included, and in Tūsī's memoirs, the word Tarāḍī is included for him. If these phrases are not the additions of the later copyists, in the eyes of some of the later scholars, it means confirmation; and in the eyes of others, no. According to the Zaydī religion of Nāṣir Uṭrūsh, only narrations from him are acceptable that is not religious and related to his Theological religion. In general, in terms of his rijālī status, he is considered weak.

10- ʿAlī ibn Hassan ʿAskarī

Abu al-Hassan ʿAlī ibn Hassan ibn ʿAlī ibn Umar al-Ashraf is the father of Nāṣir Kabīr Uṭrūsh; who was a resident of Medina (see: Umari, 1422 AH: 382); but during the period of Mutiwakkil Abbasi, when the Shi'a faced many strictures, such as the destruction of the graves of Imāms (AS) (see: Ohadi Haʿiri, 2006: the entire text), some Alawites, such as ʿAlī ibn Hassan and Hassan ibn ʿAlī Nāṣir li al-Ḥaqq, who was a child, was brought to Iraq from Hejaz under protection and settled in Muʿaskar, that is, Samarra. Therefore, the father of Nāṣir Uṭrūsh was called Hassan ibn ʿAlī ʿAskarī (see: Umari, 1422 AH: 348; Ibn Taqtaqi, 1418 AH: 277) or Abul Hassan al-ʿAskarī (see: Uṭrūsh, 1418 AH: 72). Even some of Uṭrūsh's sons, like Ḥusayn ibn ʿAlī ʿAskarī and also Hassan ibn ʿAlī himself, called Uṭrūsh with the title of ʿAskarī on this occasion (See Ibn ʿInabah, 1417 AH: 285).

ʿAlī ibn Hassan ʿAskarī is a Ḥadīth narrator; and as an example, he narrated from ʿAlī ibn Ja'far (AS); and there are his narrations in Zaydī sources (e.g. see: Uṭrūsh, 1418 AH: 72). Also, in Shi'a sources, there are narrations from him under the title "ʿAlī ibn al-Hassan ibn ʿAlī ibn Umar" (e.g. see: Arizi, 2009: 103 and 345; Sadūq, ʿUyūn, nd, 1: 61; Khazaz Razi, 1401 AH: 237; Tabari, Ibn Rostam, nd: 153).

ʿAlī ibn Hassan narrated from these narrators: his father, Hassan ibn ʿAlī; Ḥusayn ibn Zayd ibn ʿAlī; ʿAlī ibn Ja'far al-Sadūq (AS); Abu Ja'far ibn Yazīd ibn al-Naḍr al-Khorasani; Abu Ḍamra Anas ibn Zīyād al-Laythi; Ibrahim ibn Raja Al-Shaybāni; and Abu Hāshim Al-Muhammadi. Apart from Nāṣir Uṭrūsh and his brothers, several narrators have narrated from ʿAlī ibn Hassan; such as: Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad al-Hashemi; ʿAlī ibn Mahzīyār; Yazīd ibn al-Naḍr al-Khorasani; and others (see: ʿAlam Al-Hudā, 2018: 92).

Many other narrations are also found with the title "ʿAlī ibn al-Hassan ibn ʿAlī"; which are common between the father of Nāṣir Uṭrūsh and ʿAlī ibn Faḍāl and others (see: Khoei, 1413 AH: the entries of ʿAlī ibn Hassan ibn ʿAlī) that should be distinguished; to know the main number of traditions of Father Uṭrūsh.

Apart from the description of a poet (see: Amin Amoli, 1421 AH, 187: 8), in some few sources and by some people such as his grandson, Seyyed Morteza, ʿAlī ibn Hassan has been described as follows: "He was a virtuous scholar" (See: ʿAlam Al-Hudā, 2018: 93); but in the rijālī books and translations as well as Imāmīyyah sources, he is somehow

unknown, and there is no research about him. Now we only know that Nāṣir's father is Uṭrūsh, according to the Ḥadīth, and he died around 275 AH and there has been no weakening or confirmation of him. Of course, some scholars, like Sheikh Tūsī, in his Rijāl, have mentioned the name of ʿAlī ibn Hassan in the narrators section from Imām Jawad (AS) (see: Tūsī, 1415 AH: 376), but he has not made any corrections about him.

Conclusion

The narrators from Sheikh Sadūq to ʿAskarī are similar in three categories of interpretation Isnād; but these methods also have important differences; which are: 1- Isnād of Tafsīr manuscripts reach the 11th Imām (AS); of course, this connection is Muḍūʿ. 2- Isnād of Tafsīr ʿAskarī in the book of Iḥtijāj reaches Imām Hādī (AS); similar to this sanad, it can also be seen in the Isnād of the narratives of Sadūq; and this connection is also one of the writings of the copyists of Sadūq's works. 3- Isnād of Sadūq does not directly reach the essence of the Book of Tafsīr. Also, the Isnād of the narrations of Sadūq, apart from their two ways, which are different in different sources of Sadūq; some of them that have been edited reach the 11th Imām; and some others reach Imām Hādī (AS). And some others go back to Hassan ibn ʿAlī Nāṣirī from his father; in fact, all these documents are from Hassan ibn ʿAlī ʿAskarī Nāṣirī Uṭrūsh.

The Isnād of Tafsīr of ʿAskarī has several types of gaps and time intervals from the manuscripts to the final narrators.

Rijālī review of the narrators of Tafsīr Isnād from Sheikh Sadūq to ʿAskarī and his father, in addition to Sahl Dībājī as one of the possible narrators of ʿAskarī's Tafsīr, shows that most of the narrators of this section of Tafsīr Isnād are unknown in the Imāmīyyah sources, and the rest of them have not been confirmed either.

References

'Alam Al-Hudā, Ali (2018). ***Al-Masā'il Al-Nāsirīyāt,*** Qom: Dar al-Hadith.

Al-Bahrāni, Abdullah (nd). ***'Awālim al-'Uloom,*** Qom: Al-Imam Al-Mahdi.

Al-Dailamī, Muhammad (1369 AH). ***Āl-e Muhammad's Beliefs,*** Egypt: Al-Thaqafa al-Islamiya.

Al-Dānī, Abu 'Amr (1407 AH). ***Al-Muhkam,*** Damascus: Dar al-Fikr.

Al-Husseini, Mohsen (1415 AH). ***'Uddaht al-Rijāl,*** Qom: Al-Hidāya li 'Ihyā' al-Turāth.

Ali bin Hossein (1423 AH). ***Dīwan al-Imam al-Sajjād (AS),*** Beirut: Al-'A'lamī.

Ali bin Hossein (nd). ***Nudbat al-Imam al-Sajjād (AS),*** np: Muhammad al-Kazem print.

Amin 'Āmilī, Mohsen (1421 AH). ***'A'yān al-Shī'a,*** Beirut: Dar al-Ta'āruf.

Amoli, Owliyaullh (1969). ***History of Royan,*** Tehran: Iranian Culture Foundation.

'Arīdī, Ali (1989). ***Masā'il Ali bin Ja'far***, np: Al-Mu'tamar lil Imam Redā (AS).

Askarī, Hassan (1409 AH). ***Al-Tafsīr al-Askarī,*** Qom: np.

Bahrānī, Yusuf (1429 AH). ***Lu'lu'at al-Bahrain***, Bahrain: Al-Fakhrawi.

Bin Sharrar, Sina (2014). ***Sheikh Sadūq or Sheikh Kazūb,*** np: Internet version.

Dirāyatī, Mustafa (2012). ***Catalogers of Iranian Manuscripts,*** Tehran: National Library.

Hakim Jashmi, Mohsen (nd). ***Jalā' al-Absār***, np.

Hārounī, Yahyā (2017). ***Al-'Ifāda,*** Tehran: Mīrāth-e Maktūb.

Hashemi, Fatemeh (2006). ***Examination of Authenticity and Validity of Tafsīr Askarī's (AS) Narrations,*** Mashhad: Research Foundation.

Hillī, Hassan (1417 AH). ***Summary of Al-Aqwāl,*** Qom: Al-Fiqahah.

Hurr Āmilī, Muhammad (1403 AH). ***Al-Fawā'd al-Tūsīya***, Qom: np.

Ibn al-Nadīm, Muhammad (1417 AH). ***Al-Fihrist***, Beirut: Dar al-Ma'rafa.

Ibn 'Anba, Ahmad (1417 AH). ***'Umda al-Tālib***, Qom: Ansarian.

Ibn Dāwood Hillī, Hassan (nd). ***Al-Rijāl***, Qom: Sharif Razi.

Ibn Esfandiar, Mohammad (1987). ***History of Tabaristan***, Tehran: Padideh.

Ibn Ghadā'irī, Ahmad (1422 AH). *Rijāl*, Qom: Dar al-Hadith.

Ibn Shahrāshoob, Muhammad (1379 AH). *Manāqib*, Qom: Allāmeh.

Ibn Shahrāshoob, Muhammad (nd). *Ma'ālem al-'Ulamā*, Qom: np.

Ibn Taqtaqī, Muhammad (1418 AH). ***Al-Asīlī,*** Qom: Mar'ashī Library.
Ibn 'Uqda, Ahmad (2003). ***Fadā'il***, Qom: Dalil-e Ma.
Jafarian, Rasoul (2008). ***History of Shiism in Iran,*** Tehran: Ilm.
Khatīb Baghdadi, Ahmad (1422 AH). ***History of Baghdad,*** Beirut: Dar al-Ghar.
Khazāz Rāzī, Ali (1401 AH). ***Kifāyat al-Athar,*** Qom: Bidar.
Khoei, Abu al-Qasim (1413 AH). ***Mu'jam Rijāl,*** np: Ayatollah Khoei.
Lotfi, Mehdi (2007). "Sand of Tafsīr Askarī (AS)", ***Qur'an and Hadith Studies,*** 1(1).
Majlisī, Mohammad Baqir (1403 AH). ***Bihar al-Anwar,*** Beirut: Al-Risāla and Dar al-Ihyā'.
Mar'ashī, Zahīr al-Din (1984). ***Ta'rīkh Tabaristān,*** Tehran: Gostareh.
Masoudi, Ali (1385 AH). ***Morūj al-Dhahab,*** Egypt: al-Tijārīyah al-Kubrā.
Memari, Davoud (1998). "Place and basics of text criticism in Hadith sciences", ***Mashhad Faculty of Theology*** 39.
Mousavi Taniani, Akbar (2014). "Critical review of views on the religion of Nasser the Great and his family", **History of Islam,** 16(2).
Muntajabuddin, Ali (1987). ***Fihrist,*** Qom: Mar'ashī Library.
Najāshī, Ahmad (1418 AH). ***Rijāl,*** Qom: Islamic Publishing House.
Nouri, Hossein (1382 AH). ***Mostadrak al-Wasa'il,*** Beirut: Āl-Bayt (AS), Tehran: Offset Printing.
Ostadi, Kazem, D (2021). "Formal Report of the sanads of the commentary of Imam Hassan Askari (AS)", ***Hadith Research***.
Ostadi, Kazem, R (2021). "Analysis of the content of the stories of the narrators of Tafsir Askari (AS)", ***Iranian-Islamic Studies***, 10(2).
Ostadi, Kazem, T (2021). "Sanad and rijāl examination of the Tafsir of Askari (AS) until Sheikh Sadouq", ***Qur'an and Religious Enlightenment***, 1(3).
Ostadi, Kazem, Th. (2021). "Introducing and reviewing the oldest manuscripts of Askari's commentary", ***Seven Heavens***, 82.
Ostadi, Kazem, Z (2021). "Introducing the Qur'anic works of Nasser Lil Haq Utrūsh with emphasis on his interpretation", ***Iranian -Islamic Studies***, 10(3).
Ostadi, Reza (1985). "A discussion about the interpretation of Imam Hasan al-Askari (AS)", ***Noor-e Ilm***, 13, 1985.
Ovhadi, Morteza (2016). "Examination and Criticism of the misconceptions on the Authenticity and Narrations of Sadūq", ***Qur'an and Hadith Sciences Research***, 14(4).
Ovhadi, Parvindokht (2005). "Shia's conditions during the Abbasid Mutawakkil's period", ***Shi'a Studies,*** 13.
Sadūq, Muhammad (1379 AH)). ***Ma'ānī al-Akhbār,*** Qom: Teachers Association.
Sadūq, Muhammad (1389 AH). ***Khisāl,*** Tehran: Al Sadūq.
Sadūq, Muhammad (1413 AH). ***Man lā Yahzaruh Al-Faqīh,*** Qom: Islamic Publishing House.
Sadūq, Muhammad (1978). ***Al-Tawheed,*** Qom: Hosseini Publishing House.
Sadūq, Muhammad (1983). ***Sifāt al-Shī'a,*** Tehran: A'lamī.
Sadūq, Muhammad (1997). ***Amālī,*** Tehran: Ketabchi.
Sadūq, Muhammad (nd). ***'Ilal al-Sharā'i',*** Najaf: Al-Haidarīya.
Sadūq, Muhammad (nd). ***'Uyūn Akhbār al-Ridā,*** Tehran: Jahan.
Seyyed Kobari, Alireza (2008). ***Shia Seminaries***, Tehran: Amir Kabir.
Shoushtari, Mohammad Taqi (1401 AH). ***Al-Akhbār al-Dakhīla,*** Tehran: Al-Sadooq.
Shoushtari, Mohammad Taqi (1410 AH). ***Qamoos Al-Rijāl,*** Qom: Al-Islami.
Tabarī, Ibn Rostam (nd). ***Dalā'il al-Imāma,*** Qom: Bi'tha.
Tabarī, Muhammad (nd). ***Ta'rīkh al-Tabarī,*** Beirut: np.
Tabrisī, Ahmed (736 AH). ***Manuscript of Al-Ihtijāj,*** Ardakan Seminary Library, no. 177.
Tehrani, Agha Bozorg (1408 AH). ***Al-Dhari'a***, Qom: Ismailian.
Tūsī, Muhammad (1414 AH). ***Al-'Amālī,*** Qom: Dar al-Thiqāfa.
Tūsī, Muhammad (1415 AH). ***Rijāl,*** Qom: Teachers Association.
Tūsī, Muhammad (1417 AH). ***Al-Fihrist,*** Qom: np.
Tūsī, Muhammad (1425 AH). ***Kitāb al-Ghaibah,*** Qom: Al-Ma'ārif al-Islāmīya.
'Umrī, Ali (1422 AH). ***Al-Majdī,*** Qom: Mar'ashī Library.
Unknown (8th century). ***Rilsāla fi Tarājim Ulamā' al-Zaidi,*** Najaf: Manuscripts of Kāshf al-Ghitāh Library, no. 1573, 8th century.
Utrūsh, Hassan (1418 AH). ***Al-Basāt,*** Sa'da: School of Al-Turāth al-Islami.
Utrūsh, Hassan (1423 AH). ***Al-Ihtisāb,*** Sa'da: School of Al-Turāth al-Islami.
Vardikolaei, Taghi (2009). ***History of Alevis of Tabaristan,*** Qom: Dalil-e Ma.