Was the Worldview of the Early Imāmiyya Deterministic and Dualistic? :
Analysis of Ḥadīth Literature Written During the Minor Occultation

Takahiro HIRANO

Doctoral Student,
Graduate School of Humanities and Sociology, the University of Tokyo
Research Fellow of Japan Society for the Promotion of Science

Abstract

This study verifies the assumption made by researchers that the characteristics of the early Imāmiyya consist of determinism and dualism. As a result, I will demonstrate that some of the early Imāmī scholars ideologically positioned themselves between determinism and free will, and at least for legal matters, their doctrines cannot be characterized by dualism. First, I verify that some books written during the period of the Minor Occultation (874-941) are the earliest ones that we have sufficient access to for review. In this paper, I analyze three ḥadīth literature compiled by al-Barqī, al-Ṣaffār, and al-Kulaynī and three Qur'anic commentaries written by Furāt, ʿAlī b. Ibrāhīm al-Quumī, and al-ʿAyyāshī.

Disputes on free will and determinism have been evident in the Muslim community since the Umayyad period. While four of the six literature written during this period criticized the Qadariyya who believe in free will, they did not discuss any critical arguments about determinism. However, two of the literature contend that there is a middle ground between free will and determinism, by criticizing both of these two positions. I insist that there were disputes on determinism and free will among the early Imāmiyya as among the Sunni contemporary scholars. Therefore, we cannot generalize the early Imāmī worldview as deterministic.

If we describe Imāmī thought as dualistic, we can also characterize Sunni thought as somewhat dualistic. As the legal classification of Muslims into four groups (a family of imams, Imāmī believers, *mukhālif*, and *nāṣib*) demonstrates, early Imāmī worldview about this world was far removed from dualism. I conclude that Imāmī legal doctrines cannot be characterized as dualistic, even if their worldviews about the hereafter are dualistic.

I. Introduction

According to the Shīʿī belief, after the death of the Prophet Muḥammad, ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib, who was the son of the Prophet's uncle and the husband of his daughter Fāṭima, became his successor, or the first imam. Over time, various sects have emerged among the Shīʿa, and today most Shīʿī believers belong to the Imāmiyya (*Ithnā ʿAshariyya*). This group believes that the total number of imams is

limited to twelve. The Occultation (*ghayba*) of the twelfth imam, al-Qāʾim al-Mahdī, is one of the most critical incidents for the Imāmiyya. The Minor Occultation (*al-ghayba al-ṣughrā*), on the one hand, refers to the situation from 260/874 until 329/941 when the twelfth imam was believed to guide the Imāmī community through contact with his four successive representatives (sg. *safīr*, pl. *sufarāʾ*). The Major Occultation (*al-ghayba al-kubrā*), on the other hand, is the situation from 329/941 until his return, during which he has never elected his representatives and had direct contact with his followers.

A few previous researchers think that the early Imāmiyya is characterized by its "dualism." Amir-Moezzi indicates that literature written by early Imāmī scholars includes a dualistic vision of the world influenced by gnostic doctrines (Amir-Moezzi 2016, 92, 123-4).[1] According to him, the doctrine of imams revolves around two central axes. The first axe is the vertical one that may be characterized by the two complementary poles defined by pairs such as *ẓāhir/bāṭin* (apparent/hidden; exoteric/esoteric), *nabī/walī* (prophet/imam), tanzīl/taʿwīl (literal revelation/spiritual interpretation), Muḥammad/ʿAlī, and so on. The second axe is the horizontal one that are characterized by the two opposite poles that are also defined by pairs such as imams/enemy of imams, *ʿaql/jahl* (literal intelligence/ignorance), *aṣḥāb al-yamīn/aṣḥāb al-shimāl* (people of the right hand/ people of the left hand), *walāya/barāʾa* (love of imams/hatred of enemy of imams), and so on (Amir-Moezzi 1994, 127-128).[2]

Vilozny analyzes *al-Maḥāsin* by Aḥmad b. Muḥammad al-Barqī (d. 274/888 or 280/894) and insists that Imāmī believers are elected and their fates are determined by Allāh before creation. He also states that everything in this world must be linked to either of the two poles such as *ʿaql/jahl*, good/evil/ Imāmī/non-Imāmī, and that the deterministic and dualistic notions are the most important aspects of the early Imāmiyya (Vilozny 2017, 14, 43). According to him, a predestinarian election of one group out of many leads inevitably to a binary dualistic relationship between the elect and the unelect (Vilozny 2017, 53). He also suggests the influence of Zoroastrian texts on al-Barqī (Vilozny 2017, 170-172).

Their studies contributed greatly to elucidating the early Imāmī worldview, but they seemed to overlook the variety and ambiguity of Imāmī traditions (sg. *ḥadīth*). They also tend to explain the early Imāmī thought by linking them to pre-Islamic religious groups that have dualistic views, such as Gnosticism, and Zoroastrianism[3]. This study will re-examine the "determinism" and "dualism" that

---

[1] As for the relationship between the gnostic movements and the Imāmiyya, Amir-Moezzi stated that the lack of direct sources for the two first centuries of Islam makes the study of this relation difficult (Amir-Moezzi 2016, 124).

[2] *ʿAql* literally means intelligence, or reason and *jahl* means ignorance. As Amir-Moezzi shows, the meanings of *ʿaql* have four dimensions in Imāmī traditions: cosmogonic, ethical-epistemological, spiritual, and soteriological. So, Amir-Moezzi calls *ʿaql* hiero-intelligence. *Jahl* is an opposite concept to *ʿaql* (Amir-Moezzi 1994, 6-13). *Walāya*, in its technical sense, has three principal meanings: the imamate, love of the imam, and theology of the metaphysical imam (Amir-Moezzi 2011, 270).

[3] Corbin, a pioneer of Islamic Studies in western countries, is one of the first scholars who contended that Shiism is truly the gnosis of Islam (Corbin 1993, 27). Halm, an authority on Shīʿī Islamic studies, also advocated that non-Muslim views such as Jewish, Gnostic or Iranian, entered the Shīʿa (Halm 1991, 19). Some western researchers still have similar views. Amir-Moezzi suggests the relationship between

Vilozny and Amir-Moezzi find in early Imāmī sources. In this study, I demonstrate that early Imāmī worldview cannot be generalized simply as determinism and dualism.

II. Examination of the Sources

In this chapter, I show our sources and criterion to classify them. Vilozny uses only *al-Maḥāsin* by al-Barqī as his main source and analyzes the Imāmī worldview by reconstructing traditions collected by al-Barqī. To achieve the goal of this study, we need to use other literature written by contemporary Imāmī scholars. Amir-Moezzi studies all the literature until the start of the eleventh century to which he can gain access. I will now consider how Amir-Moezzi classifies the early sources which were all written by Imāmī scholars with a tendency toward traditionalism that developed in Qom before the impact of rationalism founded by al-Shaykh al-Mufīd (d.413/1022).[4] These extant traditionalist sources were only Qur'anic commentaries by traditions (*tafsīr bi-al-ma'thūr*) and collections of traditions. These sources rarely include the author's own opinion, but simply arrange traditions by subject or Qur'anic verse.

Amir-Moezzi establishes his unique criteria for separating these sources into basic and secondary sources. The main criterion is the degree of esoteric aspects. Those sources that contain almost purely esoteric material are classified as basic. Those that also contain exoteric aspects are classified as secondary. We can list his basic and secondary sources as follows (Amir-Moezzi 1994, 21-22).

1. Basic sources

Baṣā'ir al-Darajāt by Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al-Ṣaffār al-Qummī (d. 290/902-903); *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* and *Rawḍa al-Kāfī* by Muḥammad b. Ya'qūb al-Kulaynī (d. 329/940); *Kitāb al-Ghayba* by al-Nu'mānī (d. 360/970); and several books on the esoteric doctrines by al-Shaykh al-Ṣadūq (d. 381/991). Other works by al-Shaykh al-Ṣadūq were classified as secondary sources, given the smaller number of esoteric, or mystical traditions.

2. Secondary sources

A. Works whose esoteric aspects are not immediately evident. Those include *Kitāb al-Maḥāsin* by al-Barqī (d. 274/887 or 280/893), as well as literature ascribed to the fourth, sixth and eleventh imams.

B. Sources whose attachment to esoteric non-rational Imāmism (that is, to what Amir-Moezzi considered the original doctrine) is only partial. This group includes the Qur'anic commentaries of the three commentators like Furāt (d. the first quarter of the tenth century), 'Alī b. Ibrāhīm

---

Shī'ī groups and gnostic movements, especially the adepts of Mani, Bardasanes, and Marcion (Amir-Moezzi 2016, 124).

[4] Many western scholars pointed out that since the start of the eleventh century, Imāmī doctrines had been rationalized by Mu'tazilī-oriented scholars such as al-Mufīd through adapting the Mu'tazilī principles (Madelung 1970, 13-30). Āya Allāh al-'Uẓmā 'Alī al-Khāmene'ī, however, criticized this view and gave an Imāmī understanding of the rationalism in the eleventh century. See, al-Khāmene'ī, 1995.

al-Qummī (d. 307/919), and al-‘Ayyāshī (d. 320/932). Three other texts in this category are *Kāmil al-Ziyārāt* by Ibn Qūlawayh (d. 369/979) and the collections of traditions by al-Khazzāz al-Rāzī and Ibn ‘Ayyāsh al-Jawharī respectively.

C. Early sources whose authenticity and integrality have not yet been established with certainty. Examples include *Nahj al-Balāgha* attributed to the first imam ‘Alī and compiled by al-Sharīf al-Raḍī (d. 406/1016), and *Ithbāt al-Waṣiyya li-al-Imām ‘Aī b. Abī Ṭālib*, attributed to al-Mas‘ūdī (d. 346/956).

There are some problems with this method of classifying the early sources. He failed to take the chronological considerations of literature into account.[5] Considering the limitations of previous studies, the method of classifying literature relying on chronological order is more objective than on whether its contents are esoteric or exoteric. I contend that it is important to use the pre-Buyid sources written during the period of the Minor Occultation to approach the early Imāmī doctrines, as Vilozny points out the importance of studying pre-Buyid literature (Vilozny 2017, 24), and Amir-Moezzi himself points out that the appearance of the Buyids (334/945-447/1055) marked the marginalization of the early esoteric doctrines.[6] The Buyids conquered Baghdad, one of the centers of Imāmī activity, in 334/945, soon after the Major Occultation had begun. To study the earliest Imāmī doctrines, we should use sources written prior to the appearance of the Buyids, which almost coincided with the end of the Minor Occultation.

Unfortunately, the works during the Minor Occultation are the earliest ones that we are able to use for this study of the early Imāmī literature. If possible, we should use sources written before the Minor Occultation too. However, the authenticity of sources ascribed to the imams is uncertain. It is claimed that disciples of imams especially, from the time of the sixth imam al-Ṣādiq (d. 148/765), compiled more than four hundred books, called *al-Uṣūl al-‘Arba‘ Mi’a*. Among them, only sixteen very small

[5] In *The Spirituality of Shī‘ī Islam*, he classified the early sources in almost the same way. Therefore, Crow criticized Amir-Moezzi, contending that "relying on this touchstone for privileging a more esoteric primordiality might be problematic (Crow 2012, 309-310)". There are some problems with his method of classifying the early sources. Amir-Moezzi treated al-Kulaynī's *Uṣūl* and *Rawḍa* as the original traditions but excluded al-Kulaynī's *Furū‘* because of its exoteric aspects. If he could exclude *Furū‘* from basic sources, he should also have excluded some chapters, such as *Kitāb Faḍl al-Qur’ān*, and *Kitāb al-‘Ishr* in *Uṣūl* because their contents are very exoteric and shared by the Sunni Muslims. The classification of the secondary sources into groups A, B, and C is also problematic. It is appropriate to deal with C as secondary sources. Because their authenticity is not established, we should avoid using them as basic sources even though we can refer to them as secondary sources. However, if the authenticity of *Nahj al-Balāgha* is regarded as weak, other sources ascribed to the imams, which Amir-Moezzi placed in group A, could actually be classified in group C because of their uncertain authenticity. The collection by al-Barqī, also placed in category A, has both esoteric and exoteric aspects, but the Qur’anic commentaries of Furāt, ‘Alī b. Ibrāhīm al-Qummī, and al-‘Ayyāshī have similar characteristics. Therefore, the distinction between groups A and B is very ambiguous. In fact, Amir-Moezzi did not distinguish between these two categories when he published *The Spirituality of Shī‘ī Islam* in 2011. In this paper, I avoid using the terms, "esoteric" and "exoteric," because both of them are just analytical concepts that are not derived from Imāmī traditions (Hirano 2018, 117-118)

[6] Especially after the time of al-Shaykh al-Mufid (d. 413/1022), the methods of interpreting the Qur’an and the traditions and even some doctrines changed drastically (Amir-Moezzi 2014, 202).

books (*al-Uṣūl al-Sitta ʿAshar*) remain in existence today. However, we do not know the authenticity of these books well because very little research on these books exists.

Therefore, our basic sources are the Qur'anic commentaries of Furāt, ʿAli b. Ibrāhīm al-Qummī, and al-ʿAyyāshī and the collections of traditions by al-Barqī, al-Ṣaffār, and al-Kulyanī. All these sources include the arrangements of traditions without any evaluation of their authenticity as sound (*saḥīḥ*), good (*ḥasan*), and weak (*ḍaʿīf*). These literature contain many weak (*ḍaʿīf*) traditions according to the criteria established by later Imāmī scholars. However, this does not mean that Imāmī scholars during the Minor Occultation failed to examine the authenticity of traditions at all, because their way of choosing traditions in their books reflects their attitude toward their authenticity.[7]

III Determinism or Free Will

In this chapter, I demonstrate how Imāmī scholars during the Minor Occultation reacted to the views of free will and determinism in Islam. During the Umayyad period, disputes arose between determinists and supporters of free will. Al-Qadariyya upheld free will and denied *qadar* (Allāh's decree), while al-Jabriyya (or al-Mujbira) upheld that humans do not have the power to act because Allāh forces them to act or humans have the power to act, although their actions are ineffective (Watt 1973, 5, 117-118). Al-Muʿtazila also believed in free will (Watt 1948, 66-68). According to Imāmī traditions, some of the early Imāmī theologians, such as Zurāra b. Aʿyan (d. 148-150/765-767) and Ḥishām b. al-Ḥakam (d. 179/795-796), were reported to have discussed this issue during the times of the imams (Watt 1973, 193; Modarressi, 1993 111-112; Bar-Asher 1999, 10-11). Therefore, our sources reflect the disputes between free will and determinism.

All Imāmī scholars during the period of the Minor Occultation except al-Ṣaffār mentioned the name of al-Qadariyya in their books. Al-Barqī cited one tradition in which the seventh imam al-Kāẓim (d. 183/799) explained *qadar* and *qaḍāʾ* (both of which mean Allāh's decree) and criticized al-Qadariyya because they did not believe in some Qur'anic verses.[8] Furāt cited one tradition, according to which Allāh will crucify al-Qadariyya on the Day of Resurrection (Furāt 2011, vol.2, 534-535). Al-ʿAyyāshī and al-Kulaynī cited almost the same tradition in which Imam al-Ṣādiq said, "May Allāh curse al-Qadariyya, May Allāh curse al-Ḥarūriyya, May Allāh curse al-Murjiʾa, May Allāh curse al-

---

[7] For example, Furāt cited 29 traditions transmitted from Zayd b. ʿAlī, who was not regarded as an imam in the Imāmiyya. He might have had sympathy for some of the Zaydī doctrines (Hirano 2017, 97-120). Although al-Barqī, al-Kulaynī, Ali b. Ibrāhīm al-Qummī, and al-ʿAyyāshī dealt with a wide variety of subjects including legal rules and theological teachings, Furāt and al-Ṣaffār focused on doctrines and history related to the Prophet and imams. The collection of traditions by al-Ṣaffār contains many more esoteric traditions than other sources. Despite these individual characteristics, we will use these sources comprehensively to show the worldview of the early Imāmiyya.

[8] According to another tradition cited by al-Barqī, *qadar* and *qaḍāʾ* are created by Allāh (al-Barqī 2011, vol.1, 382). Al-Ṣaffār also cited the same tradition as the latter (al-Ṣaffār 2005-6, vol.1, 468).

Murji'a."[9] Al-Kulaynī devoted one chapter to this problem, as we will see later.

'Alī b. Ibrāhīm al-Qummī explained the belief of al-Qadariyya explicitly by citing one tradition transmitted by Abū al-Jārūd (d. between 150/767-160/777) from the fifth imam al-Bāqir (d. 114/733).[10] Interpreting the Qur'anic verse (7/30) [11], "Indeed, they have taken the devils for their friends, instead of Allāh, and they think that they are on the right path," the imam said, "They are al-Qadariyya, who believe that there is no *qadar* and advocate that they are able to guide and deviate [themselves]. This (guiding and deviating) is [entrusted] to them. If they hope, they are guided, and if they hope, they deviate. They are the Zoroastrians of this community (*hum Majūs hādhih al-umma*)" ('Alī b. Ibrāhīm al-Qummī 2014, 214). The belief ascribed to al-Qadariyya by 'Alī b. Ibrāhīm al-Qummī is that they believe in free will by denying *qadar*. He blamed al-Qadariyya by calling them the Zoroastrians in the Muslim community.[12]

He also criticized al-Mu'tazila in the preface of his book, saying, "Refutations from the Qur'an against them are many. Al-Mu'tazila believe that we create our action while Allāh has no work (*ṣan'*), intention (*mashī'a*), and intent (*irāda*) in it. What Iblīs hopes exists, and what Allāh hopes does not exist. They advocate that they are creators ('Alī b. Ibrāhīm al-Qummī 2014, 26)." 'Alī b. Ibrāhīm al-Qummī cited one tradition as a refutation, in which Imam al-Ṣādiq said, "Allāh is more just (*a'dal*) than forcing them to act and then punishing them for it" ('Alī b. Ibrāhīm al-Qummī 2014, 27). In this way, 'Alī b. Ibrāhīm al-Qummī accused them of their belief in free will.

Nevertheless, the fact that Imāmī scholars during the Minor Occultation blamed both al-Qadariiya and al-Mu'tazila does not mean that all of them adopted the deterministic view. Indeed, Furāt, al-'Ayyāshī, al-Barqī, and al-Ṣaffār did not explicitly criticize determinism.[13] However, 'Alī b. Ibrāhīm al-Qummī, by citing ten Qur'anic verses, explicitly criticized al-Mujbira, who believed that "we cannot act, but are forced. When acting, Allāh produces actions for us." The summary of his criticism is that "if they advocate so and then believe in the reward and the punishment, they ascribe injustice (*jawr*) to Allāh because Allāh would punish His slaves neither depending on acquisition (*iktisāb*) nor action (*fi'l*)." According to him, Allāh would be regarded as unjust if He would punish people while He forced them to act regardless of their will; therefore, the belief of al-Mujbira is regarded as invalid

---

[9] This expression is cited from al-'Ayyāshī. Al-Ḥarūriyya in this tradition indicates one of the Khārijī groups. In the tradition cited by al-Kulaynī, al-Ḥarūriyya is replaced by al-Khawārij (al-'Ayyāshī 1991, vol.1, 534-535; al-Kulaynī 2007, vol.2, 228-229). Al-Murji'a is cursed twice in this tradition.

[10] Abū al-Jārūd is the eponymous founder of one of the sub-sects of Zaydī Shī'ism (Bar-Asher 1999, 46-50).

[11] I refer to the translation of the Qur'an by Mufti Taqi Usmani in this study. See, www.darululoom-deoband.com/urdu/books/tmp/1395458980%20Quran%20Translation%20Mufti%20Taqi%20Usmani.pdf #search=%27taqi+usmani+quran%27 (accessed on 13 September 2018).

[12] This tradition about al-Qadariyya is not peculiar to the Imāmiyya. According to a Sunni version, the Prophet Muḥammad said, "Al-Qadariyya are Zoroastrians of this community (al-Qadariyya Majūs hādhi al-umma)." See, al-Shahrastānī 1948, vol.1, 11.

[13] Some western scholars pointed to a deterministic approach in early Imāmī traditions. Aside from Vilozny, Bar-Asher also pointed this out (Bar-Asher 1999, 10-11).

('Alī b. Ibrāhīm al-Qummī 2014, 26).

'Alī b. Ibrāhīm al-Qummī advocated the middle position between al-Qadariyya and al-Mujbira. In the former tradition about Mu'tazilī thought, al-Ṣādiq was asked whether Allāh entrusts a matter (*amr*) to slaves. He replied, "Allāh is greater than this." Then he was asked whether Allāh forces them, so he replied, "Allāh is more just (*a'dal*) than forcing them to act and then punishing them for it." He was asked whether there is a position between these two positions (*bayn hātayn al-manzilatayn manzila*), and he replied, "Yes," and "[This position is] a secret among secrets of what is between the sky and the earth ('Alī b. Ibrāhīm al-Qummī 2014, 26-27)."

In another tradition cited by 'Alī b. Ibrāhīm al-Qummī, the same imam was asked, "Is there a position between *jabr* and *qadar*?" He replied, "Yes," and "[This is] one of Allāh's secrets ('Alī b. Ibrāhīm al-Qummī 2014, 27)." While both *jabr* and *qadar* mean Allāh's decree, *jabr* obviously represents thought of al-Mujbira, and *qadar* stands for that of al-Qadariyya in this tradition. As I mentioned above, al-Kulaynī devoted one chapter to this question, titled "*Jabr* and *Qadar*, and the matter between the two matters (*al-amr bayn al-amrayn*)." Al-Kulaynī supported in this chapter that Allāh neither forces slaves to act nor entrusts them to choose their own action, but the truth lies between these two (al-Kulaynī 2007, vol.1, 89-92). According to one tradition, after explaining this principle, al-Ṣādiq said, "On this (a position between *jabr* and *qadar*), the truth is what is between them. Only the *al-'ālim* (the one who knows) knows it (al-Kulaynī 2007, vol.1, 91)." In Islamic theological literature, *al-'ālim* usually means Allāh, but the term can also indicate the Prophet and imams in Imāmī traditions. So, this tradition is interpreted as saying that the truth is between free will and determinism, but no one knows the details probably except the Prophet and imams.

This chapter concludes that determinism is not a characteristic of the early Imāmiyya. Although al-Barqī, al-Ayyāshī, and Furāt criticized only the view of al-Qadariyya and seemed to hold a deterministic view, al-Kulaynī and 'Alī b. Ibrāhīm al-Qummī tried to establish the middle path by criticizing both al-Qadariyya and al-Mujbira. This means that there was no consensus between determinism and free will among the early Imāmī scholars.

IV. The Dualism

The dualistic worldview is regarded as an Imāmī characteristic by some western researchers, who suggest that pre-Islamic religions, such as Manichaeism, Gnosticism, and Zoroastrianism influenced the early Imāmiyya (Corbin 1993, 27, Amir-Moezzi 2016, 123-124; Vilozny, 2017 170-172). In my view, dualism cannot always outline early Imāmī thought. This chapter will demonstrate that the somewhat dualistic view is not peculiar to the Imāmiyya in Islam and that the Imāmī worldview was more complicated than previous studies thought.

1. Dualistic View in Islam

Islam is a strict monotheism, and Muslims must worship only one God. However, the dualistic worldview does not always contradict Islamic teachings.[14] In the Qur'an, there is a verse stating, "And from everything, We have created [a lot of] pairs" (51/49). This verse obviously admits that being pairs is one principle in all creations. Ibn Kathīr (d.774/1373), one of the most authoritative Sunni commentators of the Qur'an, interpreted this verse by stating, "All the things are in pairs, the heaven and earth, night and day, sun and moon, land and sea, light and darkness, faith and disbelief, death and life, unhappiness and happiness, Paradise and Hellfire, toward animals and plants (Ibn Kathīr n.d., vol.4, 209)." In *Tafsīr al-Jalālayn*, a famous Sunni Qur'anic commentary, the authors adopted the same opinion, interpreting "pairs of twos" in this verse as "two kinds (*ṣinfayn*), such as man and woman, sky and earth (al-Maḥallī & al-Suyūṭī 2003, 566)."

It is true that dualistic worldviews (Imāmī /non-Imāmī, imams/their followers, good/evil, prophet/imam, *nubūwa/walāya*, and so on) are seen in early Imāmī sources. These views, however, are not peculiar to the Imāmiyya because Sunni scholars also have similar opinions by interpreting the Qur'anic verse. So, dualistic worldview in the Imāmiyya can be understood in the Islamic perspective too.

2. *"Imāmī," "Mukhālif,"* and *"Nāṣib"*

Concerning Imāmī law, Imāmī legal rules are far removed from the dualistic view, although Vilozny saw the dualism even in the legal matters because Allāh seems to accept only the deeds of Imāmī believers and reject the deeds of others on the Day of Resurrection (Vilozny 2017, 85-88). He thinks that early Imāmī scholars distinguished people into two groups: Imāmī believers and others.[15] However, this dualistic view is true only in the context of the hereafter because Allāh's acceptance of deeds is about rewards in the hereafter, not about legal issues in this world. In this chapter, I demonstrate that the dualism cannot be applied to Imāmī legal matters, by focusing on the distinction of Muslims in Imāmī law. In fact, Imāmī scholars distinguish people into five or more groups in legal matters.

Sunni and Imāmī Scholars divide people into Muslims and infidels (sg. *kāfir*). Infidels are also divided into a few categories such as people of the scripture (*ahl al-kitāb*), *dhimmī*, *ḥarbī*, and so on.[16]

---

[14] According to Gnoli, dualism should not be conceived as opposed to monotheism. See, G. Gnoli, "Dualism," in *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/dualism (accessed on 13 February 2018).

[15] He contends that only Imāmī believers were elected by Allāh. According to him, this notion of election is related to determinism and dualism in early Imāmī worldview (Vilozny 2017, 57-109, 209).

[16] *Dhimmī*s are infidels who live in territories under Islam and pay tax to a Muslim ruler. *Ḥarbī*s are infidels who do not live in territories under Islam. As for classification of infidels in Sunni law, see Cahen, "Dhimma," in *Encyclopaedia of Islam Second Edition*, http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/entries/encyclopaedia-of-islam-2/dhimma-SIM_1823?s.num=1&s.f.s2_parent=s.f.book.encyclopaedia-of-islam-2&s.q=dhimma (accessed on 13

Furthermore, the Imāmī scholars divided people who embrace Islam into four groups: the family of imams, Imāmī believers, *mukhālif*, and *nāṣib*. The Imāmī believers are also called *mu'min*, or people of *walāya* (*ahl al-walāya*). *Mukhālif* means a non-Imāmī Muslim who is not hostile toward the imams even if he does not recognize the imams. *Mukhālif* is also called simply Muslim. *Nāṣib* means a person who is hostile toward the imams while embracing Islam in appearance. They are not regarded as Muslims in this world and the hereafter as they have already departed from Islam because of their hostility toward the imams (Kohlberg 1985, 99). In this section, I focus on the distinction among Imāmī, *mukhālif*, and *nāṣib*, and in the next section, I will analyze the legal doctrines applied only to the family of imams.

With regard to the qualification of witnesses, the Imāmī believers are distinguished from other Muslims in the matter of a will (*waṣiyya*). This is one of the few legal doctrines that al-Ṣaffār discussed. Al-Ṣaffār cited one tradition on being a witness of a will during travel. According to this tradition, Imam al-Ṣādiq stated, "When he is a traveler and death draws near him, [the evidence] shall be two just people from his religion (min dīni-hi). If you do not find [them], [the evidence shall be] from two people who read the Qur'an, not from people of *walāya* (al-Ṣaffār 1426[2005-6], vol.2, 513)." Al-Ṣādiq in this tradition interpreted the Qur'anic verse "When death draws near one of you at the time of making a will, the evidence between you shall be of two just witnesses from among you, or of two others not from you, if you are traveling on the earth and the trauma of death visits you" (5/106). "Two others not from you" in the Qur'ān are usually interpreted as people of the scripture (*ahl al-kitāb*) by later Imāmī scholars (al-Ṭūsī 2006-7, vol.9, 209-210). So, Muslims who do not belong to the Imāmiyya seem to be treated equivalently to people of the scripture in this tradition.

A classification into three categories is also found in a discussion of *zakāt*. One type *of zakāt* is the duty of paying, for example, 2.5 % of the gold and silver that one has possessed for one year. The rate of *zakāt* is based on the kinds of possessions one has. The other type of *zakāt* is called *zakāt al-fiṭr*, which one must pay on the day of *'īd al-fiṭr*. The rate of *zakāt al-fiṭr* is fixed and is imposed on all Muslims including children and slaves. In this study, the former is referred to as simply *zakāt* and the latter as *zakāt al-fiṭr*. *Ṣadaqa* sometimes means *zakāt*, but usually indicates a voluntary donation. According to a tradition cited by al-Kulaynī, the recipients of *zakāt* are limited, and only Imāmī believers can receive *zakāt* except for two cases.

Zurāra and Muḥammad b. Muslim[17] said to Abū 'Abd Allāh [Imam al-Ṣādiq] (peace be on him) "What do you think about a word of Allāh, saying 'Ṣadaqāt (which means *zakāt* in this context) are only to be given to the poor, the needy, those employed to collect them, those whose hearts are to

[17] Zurāra b. A'yan was one of the most prominent disciples of Imam al-Ṣādiq and also known as an Imāmī theologian. Muḥammad b. Muslim was also a close disciple of the imam (al-Kashshī 2009, 103-121).

be won (al-muallafa qulūbu-hum), in the cause of the slaves, and those encumbered with debt, in the way of Allāh, and to a wayfarer' (9/60)? Is each of them given [*zakāt*] even if he does not know (lā yaʿrif)?" [The imam] said, "The imam gives [*zakāt*] to all of them because they confessed obedience to him." I (Zurāra) said, "Even if they do not know?" [The imam] said, "Oh Zurāra, if [the imam] gives [*zakāt*] only to the one who knows excluding the one who does not know (law yuʿṭī man yaʿrif dūn man lā yaʿrif), there is no place for *zakāt* (lam yūjad lahā mawḍiʿ). He gives [*zakāt*] to the one who does not know in order that the one likes the religion and it becomes firm in him. However, today you and your companions must not give [*zakāt*] except to the one who knows. So give [*zakāt*] to knowing Muslims who you find (man wajadta min hāʾulāʾ al-muslimīn ʿārifan) and do not give [*zakāt*] to people (nās). A portion for those whose hearts are to be won and for slaves is general (*ʿāmm*), and the leftovers are special (*khāṣṣ*)." (al-Kulaynī 2007, vol.3, 284) [18]

This tradition is apparently difficult to understand because it contains some technical terms from Imāmī theology. Both "the one who knows" and "the one who does not know" are often used in Imāmī literature. These expressions are obviously derived from "the one who knows his imam (man yaʿrif imāma-hu)" and similar expressions. Al-Kulaynī devoted one chapter to this subject, the title of which is "*zakāt* is given only to *ahl al-walāya* (al-Kulaynī 2007, vol.3, 312)." Therefore, it is obvious that the one who knows indicates only *ahl al-walāya*, that is, Imāmī believers.

　　"General (*ʿāmm*)" and "Special (*khāṣṣ*)" are also used as technical terms in Imāmī theology. The *ʿāmm* are Muslims who do not believe the Imāmī doctrines and the *khāṣṣ* are Imāmī believers (Amir-Moezzi 1994, 28, 88). "People" (*nās*) means the same as the *ʿāmm*. "Those whose hearts are to be won" (*al-muallafa qulūbu-hum*) is used not only in Imāmī literature but also in Sunni texts, usually referring to infidels whose hearts are inclined toward Islam. But, according to al-ʿAyyāshī, "those whose hearts are to be won" means people who have converted to Islam in appearance but are still skeptical about the faith (al-ʿAyyāshī 1991, vol.2, 97).

　　Taking the meanings of these terms into account, the intention of the tradition becomes clear. Among the recipients of *zakāt* stipulated by the Qurʾan, those whose hearts are to be won and slaves, whether they are Imāmī or not, can receive *zakāt*, whereas others can receive *zakāt* only if they are Imāmī. Although the later Imāmiyya inherited this legal doctrine, they excluded non-Imāmī slaves from the qualified recipients, so that only those whose hearts are to be won can receive *zakāt* even if they do not belong to the Imāmiyya (al-Shīrāzī 1388[2009], vol.1, 119).

　　As for *zakāt al-fiṭr*, the rules differed from those just described for *zakāt*. Al-Kulaynī cited traditions that allowed the Imāmī believers to give *zakāt al-fiṭr* to Muslims or those who did not belong to *ahl al-walāya* (al-Kulaynī 2007, vol.4, 105). According to this opinion, giving *zakāt al-fiṭr* to

---

[18] al-ʿAyyāshī also cited almost the same tradition of Imam al-Ṣādiq, transmitted by Zurāra (al-ʿAyyāshī 1991, vol.2, 96-97).

mukhālif is not forbidden. We do not find a tradition about paying *zakāt al-fiṭr* to *nāṣib*. However, in the chapter of *ṣadaqa* in *al-Kāfī*, there is a tradition, in which the imam allowed his followers to give *ṣadaqa* to non-Imāmī Muslims but prohibited them from giving it to the *nāṣib* (al-Kulaynī 2007, vol.4, 12). As I mentioned, the *nāṣib* are no longer regarded as Muslims in Imāmī traditions. According to Furāt, the *nāṣib* must pay *jizya* (tax imposed on *dhimmī*s) to the twelfth imam after his return (Furāt al-Kūfī 2011, vol.1, 292-293, vol.2, 550). This may be the reason why they cannot receive even *ṣadaqa*. In discussions of *zakāt* and *ṣadaqa*, distinctions between the Imāmī believers, *mukhālif*, and *nāṣib* are very clear, which is strictly opposed to the dualistic worldview.

3. Legal Rules Applied Only to Imams or Their Family Members

In addition to the classifications of those who embrace Islam into Imāmī, *mukhālif*, and *nāṣib*, the family of imams is also distinguished from others in legal issues, so as for legal matters, Imāmī scholars distinguished Muslims into four groups: the family of imams, Imāmī believers, *mukhālif*, and *nāṣib*.

The typical instance distinguishing the family of imams from others concerns pilgrimages to mausoleums of the imams and their family. One place famous for pilgrimages is the mausoleum of the third imam al-Ḥusayn. Al-Kulaynī devoted one chapter, titled "*Kitāb al-Ziyārāt*" to explain the merits of pilgrimages to the mausoleums of the Prophet Muḥammad, Fāṭima, and each imam (al-Kulaynī 2007, vol.3, 316-340). The doctrine of visiting their mausoleums has been a characteristic of the Imāmiyya since their early days.[19]

In *zakāt*, special rules are imposed on imams or their family members. The Imāmī believers must give *zakāt* only to other Imāmī people who are qualified to receive it. However, giving *zakāt* to the Prophet and imams or their family—that is the Hāshimites—is prohibited.

Al-Kulaynī cited ten traditions in a chapter titled "*Ṣadaqa* to the Hāshimites, their freedman (*mawlā*), and their kinship." The first three traditions prohibited giving *ṣadaqa* to the Hāshimites. The fourth tradition discussed the lawfulness of giving *ṣadaqa* to their freedmen. However, according to the fifth tradition, the *ṣadaqa* that may not be given to the Hāshimites is not *ṣadaqa* (which means voluntary donation) at all but *zakāt*. According to the sixth tradition, those who may not receive *zakāt* do not include the Hāshimites but only the Prophet and imams. The last four traditions deal with other issues (al-Kulaynī 2007, vol.4, 38-39). Therefore, there were two opinions as to people who could not receive *zakāt*, either all the Hāshimites or only the Prophet and imams[20].

---

[19] Visiting the tombs of imams are very important even for modern Imāmī believers. For example, one of the most authoritative scholars, Sayyid 'Alī al-Sīstānī, issued a fatwa to recommend pilgrimages to their mausoleums. https://www.sistani.org/arabic/qa/0507/ (accessed on 28 November 2018)

[20] The Sunni scholars also prohibit the Hāshimites from receiving *zakāt* (al-Ḥajāwī 1424[2003], 79-80). So, this prohibition is not peculiar to the Imāmiyya, but prohibiting only the Prophet and imams from receiving *zakāt* is unique to the Imāmiyya. In later Imāmī literature, Imāmī scholars usually held the former opinion (al-Ṣādiq al-Ḥusaynī al-Shīrāzī 2009, 119; al-Muḥaqqiq al-Ḥillī 1983, vol.1, 63).

We can find a similar example in the discussion of menopause.[21] Two varieties of traditions on this topic were transmitted by al-Kulaynī, defining the age of menopause as fifty or sixty years, with the exception of the Qurayshite women (al-Kulaynī 2007, vol.3, 62). We cannot find any further information on this point in the literature from the Minor Occultation. Through interpreting these traditions, later Imāmī scholars usually said that the age of menopause is fifty years for general women, but sixty years for the Qurayshite women only (al-Khū'ī 1990, vol.1, 56; al-Shīrāzī 2009, vol.1, 24). Above all, it is clear that some rules are specific only to the Prophet and imams or their family members.

V. Conclusion

We cannot generalize the early Imāmiyya as deterministic. As Vilozny pointed out, it is true that a somewhat deterministic view was taken in many traditions by al-Barqī and some contemporary scholars, but al-Kulaynī and 'Alī b. Ibrāhīm al-Qummī advocated the middle ground between al-Qadariyya and al-Mujbira, while the details were said to have been hidden. This indicates that there were disputes on determinism and free will among the early Imāmiyya as among the Sunni contemporary scholars.

We cannot generalize the early Imāmiyya simply as dualism, either. In fact, some of the early Imāmī doctrines about the hereafter can be described as dualistic, but their worldview about this world reflected in their legal matters was more complex than dualism. In fact, we cannot explain by dualism the Imāmī classification of people who embrace Islam into four groups. I contend that if we could characterize Imāmī thought as dualistic, we could also characterize Ahl al-Sunna as dualistic because Sunni scholars also had the dualistic view that everything is created in pairs.

Bibliography

al-'Ayyāshī, *Tafsīr al-'Ayyāshī*, Beirut: Mu'assasa al-A'lā, 1991, vol.1, 534-535.

al-Barqī, Muḥammad b. Khālid, *al-Maḥāsin*, 2 vols, n.p.: al-Majma' al-'Ālamī li Ahl al-Bayt, 2011.

Furāt, al-Kūfī, *Tafsīr Furāt*, 2 vols, Beirut: Mu'assasa al-Ta'rīkh al-'Arabī, 2011.

al-Ḥajāwī, Mūsā b. Aḥmad, *Zād al-Mustaqni' fī Ikhtiṣār al-Muqni'*, Riyāḍ: Madār al-Waṭan li al-Nashr, 1424[2003].

al-Ḥillī, Abū al-Qāsim al-Muḥaqqiq, *Sharā'i' al-Islām: fī Masā'il al-Ḥalāl wa-al-Ḥarām*, 4 vols, Beirut: Dār al-Aḍwā', 1983.

Therefore narrowing the prohibition only to the Prophet and the imams has not been followed by most Imāmī scholars.

[21] Recognizing the time of menopause is very important for women because they are forbidden from performing some rituals during their menstrual period. After menopause, they must perform obligatory prayers every day and fast on all days of Ramadan.

Ibn Kathīr, al-Qurashī al-Dimashqī, *Tafsīr al-Qur'ān al-'Aẓīm*, 4 vols, Beirut: Dār al-Qalam, n.d.

al-Kashshī, Muḥammad b. 'Umar, Rijāl al-Kashshī, Beirut: Mu'assasa al-A'lā li-al-Maṭbū'āt, 2009

Khāmene'ī, Sayyid 'Alī, *al-Shaykh al-Mufīd: al-Riyāda wa al-Ibdā'*, Beirut: Dār al-Thaqalayn, 1995.

al-Khū'ī, Abū al-Qāsim, *Minhāj al-Ṣāliḥīn*, 2 vols, Qom: Madīna al-'Ilm, 1990.

al-Kulaynī, Muḥammad b. Ya'qūb, *Kitāb al-Kāfī*, 8 vols, Beirut: Manshūrāt al-Fajr, 2007.

al-Qummī, 'Alī b. Ibrāhīm, *Tafsīr al-Qummī*, Beirut: Mu'assasa al-A'lā, 2014

al-Ṣaffār, Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al-Qummī, *Baṣā'ir al-Darajāt fī Faḍā'il Āl Muḥammd*, 2 vols, Qom: Intishārāt al-Maktaba al-Ḥaydariyya, 1426[2005-6]

al-Shahrastānī, Abū al-fatḥ, *al-Milal wa al-Niḥal*, 3 vols, Beirut: Dār al-Sūrā, 1948.

al-Shīrāzī, al-Ṣādiq al-Ḥusaynī, *Sharḥ Tabṣira al-Muta'allimīn*, 2 vols, Qom: Dār al-Tafsīr, 1430[2009].

al-Sīstānī, "al-Ziyāra," https://www.sistani.org/arabic/qa/0507/ (accessed on 28 November 2017).

Al-Maḥallī, Jalāl al-Dīn, & al-Suyūṭī, Jalāl al-Dīn, *Tafsīr al-Jalālayn*, Beirut: Dār al-Khayr, 2003.

al-Ṭūsī, Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al-Shaykh al-Ṭā'ifa, *Tahdhīb al-Aḥkām fī Sharḥ al-Muqni'a*, 10 vols, Tehran: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyya, 1385 [2006-7].

Amir-Moezzi, M.A., *The Divine Guide in Early Shi'ism: The Sources of Esotericism in Islam*, transl. by David Streight, Albany: State University Press of New York Press, 1994.

——————, "Al-Šayḫ al-Mufīd (M. 413/1022) et la question de la falsification du Coran," in *Controverses sur les écritures canoniques de l'islam*, Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 2014, 199-223.

——————, "Notes on Imāmī *Walāya*," in *Spirituality of Shi'i Islam*, London/New York: I.B. Tauris Publishers, 2011, 231-275.

——————, *The Silent Qur'an and the Speaking Qur'an: Scriptural Sources of Islam between History and Fervor*, transl. by E. Ormsby, New York: Columbia University Press, 2016.

Bar-Asher, M., *Scripture and Exegesis in Early Imāmī Shiism*, Leiden: Brill, 1999.

Corbin, H., *History of Islamic Philosophy*, transl. by Kegan Paul International Ltd, London, New York: The Institute of Ismaili Studies, 1993, first published as *Histoire de la philosophie islamique* in 1964.

Crow, K., "Critical Notice: Shi'i Spirituality－A Response to Amir-Moezzi," *Journal of Shi'a Islamic Studies* 5-3, 2012, 295-316.

Halm, H., *Shiism*, transl. by J. Watson, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1991, first published as *Die Schia* in 1987.

Hirano, T., "Zaydī Elements in the *Tafsīr* of Furāt al-Kūfī," (in Japanese), *Religious Studies*, 2017, 97-120.

———, "Esotericism and Exotericism in the Early Imāmiyyah: Analysis of *Tafsīr*s and the Collections of *Ḥadīth*s in the Minor Occultation," (in Japanese), *The World of Monotheistic Religions* 9, 2018,

115-133.

Kohlberg, E., "Non-Imāmī Muslims in Imāmī Fiqh," *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 6, 1985.

―――, "al-Uṣūl al-arbaʿumi'a," *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 10, 1987, 128-166.

Gnoli, G., "Dualism," in *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/dualism (accessed on 13 February 2018).

Gleave, R., "Between Ḥadīth and Fiqh: The "Canonical" Imāmī collections of Akhbār," *Islamic Law and Society* 8.3, 2001, 350-382.

Madelung, W., "Imâmism and Muʿtazilite Theology," in *Le shîʿisme imâmite*, ed. by T. Fahd, Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1970, 13-30.

Modarressi, H., *Crisis and Consolidation in the Formative Period of Shiʿite Islam*, Princeton, New Jersey: The Darwin Press, 1993

Usmani, M. T., *Quran-e-Karim*, www.darululoom-deoband.com/urdu/books/tmp/1395458980%20Quran%20Translation%20Mufti%20Taqi%20Usmani.pdf#search=%27taqi+usmani+quran%27 (accessed on 22 December 2018)

Vilozny, R., *Constructing a Worldview: Al-Barqī's Role in the Making of Early Shīʿī Faith*, Turnhout: Brepols, 2017.

Watt, M., *Free Will and Predestination in Early Islam*, London: The Burleigh Press, 1948

―――, *The Formative Period of Islamic Thought*, Edinburgh: The University Press, 1973.