

Assessing the Authenticity of the *Ahl al-Bayt's* Supplications: A Case Study of *Du‘ā’ ‘Arafa*¹

Hamid Khani (Farhang Mihrwash)
Islamic Azad University

Abstract

Among the prominent supplicatory works of the Shī‘ī tradition is *Du‘ā’ ‘Arafa*, attributed to Imam al-Ḥusayn b. ‘Alī (d. 61/680). The text of this supplication (*du‘ā’*), which lacks a chain of transmission (*isnād*) and contains various omissions and additions in different manuscripts, can only be found in works dating from after the seventh/thirteenth century. This absence from earlier works has led to long-standing debates about the validity of attributing, at least some parts of this *du‘ā’*, to Imam al-Ḥusayn. This study aims to demonstrate, through the application of internal and external methods of analysis to historical texts, that *Du‘ā’ ‘Arafa* is authentic and rooted in the teachings of the Family of the Prophet (*Ahl al-Bayt*), likely originating from Imam Ja‘far b. Muḥammad al-Ṣādiq (d. 148/765). Furthermore, this study intends to provide a theoretical model for examining the authenticity of other supplications, attributed to the *Ahl al-Bayt*, that sometimes lack *isnāds* and whose authenticity cannot be determined by traditional methods employed in biographical evaluation (*rijāl*) and other sciences of *ḥadīth*.

Keywords: Shī‘ī supplicatory literature, *ḥadīth* dating, stylistic analysis of supplications, *Du‘ā’ ‘Arafa*, Imam al-Ḥusayn, Imam Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq.

¹ This article was originally published in Farsi in *Ḥadīth Pazhūhī* 5/10 (2013-2014): 57-94, titled “Difā‘ az Iṣālat-i Ad‘iya-yi Ahl-i Bayt: Muṭāla‘a-yi Mawridī-yi Du‘ā-yi ‘Arafa.”

Introduction

An important portion of the narrations and teachings of the *Ahl al-Bayt* have been transmitted through their supplications (*ad'īya*). In addition to complete works produced directly by the *Ahl al-Bayt*, such as *al-Ṣaḥīfa al-sajjādiyya al-kāmila*, many of their *ad'īya* can be found in the corpora of their sayings. In contemporary times, efforts have been made to compile these *ad'īya*. However, the question of the authenticity of *ad'īya* attributed to the *Ahl al-Bayt* has always been considered an unresolved issue, that has received little attention. Muslim scholars have sometimes deemed it impossible for these supplications to have originated from anyone other than the infallibles (*ma'ṣūmūn*), either based on the sublimity of their content or their rhetorical beauty. Nevertheless, this view has not always been accepted and has faced criticism.

Among the critiques of this reasoning, one can point to a noteworthy statement by Ayatollah Sayyid Ruhollah Khomeini (d. 1409/1989), where he states that the door remains open for questioning the *isnāds* and the textual implications of *ad'īya*.² This is because the *isnāds* for *ad'īya*—including *al-Ṣaḥīfa al-sajjādiyya*—are typically weak (*ḍa'īf*), and the sublimity of content and eloquence of expression, aside from not necessarily guaranteeing the certainty of their issuance from an infallible, are not consistently present throughout all passages of the *ad'īya*. Furthermore, one cannot rely on the fact that the Imāmī jurists have accepted these works and *ad'īya*, as there is a difference between general acceptance of such *ad'īya*, as a whole, and detailed acceptance of each of their individual components.

This critical approach certainly has its merits. Since some narrations of *ad'īya* lack *isnāds* or have multiple disconnections in their *isnāds*, examining their authenticity through traditional biographical (*rijālī*) methods is impossible. Biographical scholars can usually only classify the *Ahl al-Bayt*'s *ad'īya* as weak, according to their own criteria.

² Sayyid Rohullah Khomeini, *al-Makāsib al-muḥarrama* (Ismā'īliyan: 1410/1989), 320.

If we were to examine the narrations of *ad'īya* using conventional and traditional methods of *ḥadīth* sciences, we would reach more or less the same aforementioned conclusion as Ayatollah Khomeini. This means nothing other than acknowledging that we have been unable to find an acceptable way to defend the authenticity of an important portion of the *Ahl al-Bayt's* teachings, namely, *ad'īya*.

The aim of this study is to find a solution to this very problem. Through a case study of *Du'ā' 'Arafa*, we intend to demonstrate that by utilising modern methods of textual analysis and other historical sciences, we can discuss the identity and attribution of ancient texts, such as supplications, and demonstrate the authenticity of this important and significant portion of Shī'ī teachings.

1. Problem Statement

Du'ā' 'Arafa is a literary and rhyming (*musajja'*) text of approximately 3,200 words, with minor variations in transmission. Its content acknowledges God's position and affirms humanity's place in existence, offers praise and gratitude for God's abundant blessings upon humanity, recalls the difficulties and tribulations one has endured throughout life—from the beginning of creation until the present—and strives to attract divine mercy while seeking peace and well-being from Him, as humanity's most important request. In its existing form, the supplication contains a core text mentioned in all versions—of approximately 2,400 words—and an appendix found in some versions—of about 800 words.

1.1 The Status of *Du'ā' 'Arafa* in Shī'ī Culture

This supplication can be found in Shī'ī supplicatory prayer books from the seventh/thirteenth century onwards.³ It is said that Imam al-Ḥusayn recited it on the Day of 'Arafa during the *ḥajj* season.⁴ We have limited information about the history of this *du'ā'*, consisting of brief

³ Sayyid Raḍī al-Dīn 'Alī b. Mūsā Ibn Ṭāwūs, *Iqbāl al-a'māl*, ed. Jawād Qayyūmī (Maktab al-I'lām al-Islāmī: 1414/1993), 2:74 ff.

⁴ Ibid.

explanations that the narrators of this *du'ā'* reportedly provide about the content of their narration. These explanations are mainly narrated through two brothers, Bishr and Bashīr, sons of Ghālib al-Asadī.⁵ Apparently, they both provided some explanations that included what the Imam did before, after, and while delivering *Du'ā' 'Arafa*.⁶ According to these explanations, the *du'ā'* was delivered on the Day of 'Arafa on the land of 'Arafāt. The Imam is said to have left his tent along with his relatives and friends and, with tranquillity and serenity, while engaging in remembrance of God, they turned toward the plain of 'Arafāt. Then, weeping and beseeching, they recited this supplication. As people heard the Imam's voice, they gradually abandoned their own supplications, gathered around him and—moved by the Imam's eloquent *du'ā'*—chose to listen to it and say “Amen,” instead of their individual prayers.⁷

Shī'ī scholars of *ḥadīth* have recommended the recitation of this *du'ā'*, alongside many others, on the Day of 'Arafa. They have said that its recitation is beneficial whether in the plain of 'Arafāt or elsewhere.⁸ It is worth noting that in the devotional literature of the Islamic world, there are approximately ten examples of short and long *ad'īya* for recitation on the Day of 'Arafa. Among the more well-known examples is a *du'ā'* for the Day of 'Arafa found in *al-Ṣaḥīfa al-sajjādiyya* as well as a *du'ā'* reported from the Prophet Muḥammad, according to both Sunnī and Shī'ī sources.⁹ Among these supplications, *Du'ā' 'Arafa*, attributed

⁵ Ibrāhīm b. 'Alī al-Kaf'amī, *al-Balad al-amīn*, lithograph ed., calligraphy by Aḥmad Najafī Zanjānī (Ṣadūq: 1383/1963), 258.

⁶ For a report of all these explanations, see Muḥammad Bāqir b. Muḥammad Taqī al-Majlisī, *Biḥār al-anwār* (Wafā': 1403/1983), 95:213. See *Ibid.*, 214 for mention of the said explanations in the margins of *al-Balad al-amīn*; cf. the printed version of this same work by al-Kaf'amī which lacks those explanations.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 213.

⁸ Shaykh 'Abbās al-Muḥaddith al-Qummī, *Mafātīḥ al-jinān*, lithograph ed., calligraphy by Ṭāhir Khushniwīs (Daftar-i Nashr-i Farhang-i Islāmī: 1370 Sh./1991), 258.

⁹ See respectively: Supplication 47 of *al-Ṣaḥīfa al-sajjādiyya*; Mālik b. Anas,

to Imam al-Ḥusayn, has gained in recent centuries an important ritual status in Shīʿī culture.

Attention to *Duʿāʾ ʿArafa* increased from around the eleventh/seventeenth century—the Safavid era—as evidenced by the commentaries written on this supplication from this time onwards. The early commentaries include al-ʿAllāma al-Majlisī’s commentary in *Bihār al-anwār*,¹⁰ *Sharḥ Ṣadr al-afāḍil* titled *Hidāyat al-mustabshirīn*,¹¹ and the *Versified Commentary*¹² of Ḥuwayzī.¹³ Among contemporaries too, some have written commentaries on this supplication, such as Abū l-Qāsim al-Shaʿrānī’s *The Duʿāʾ ʿArafa of Abū ʿAbdullāh*, and Muḥammad Taqī Jaʿfarī’s *The Supplication of Imam al-Ḥusayn in the Plain of ʿArafāt*. To all these must be added numerous commentaries written outside the sphere of Shīʿī devotional literature about the approximately 800-word appendix of this *duʿāʾ*—though not as part of *Duʿāʾ ʿArafa*, but rather as a private prayer attributed to Ibn ʿAṭāʾullāh al-Iskandarānī (d. 709/1309).¹⁴ Similarly, this supplication has been translated into Persian several times in the contemporary period, either inde-

al-Muwattaʾa, ed. Muḥammad Fuʿād ʿAbd al-Bāqī (Dār Iḥyāʾ al-Turāth al-ʿArabī: n.d.), 1:214-5; Muḥammad b. ʿAlī al-Ṣadūq, *Man lā yaḥḍuruh al-faqīh*, ed. ʿAlī Akbar Ghaffārī (Jāmiʿat al-Mudarrisīn: 1404/1983), 2:542-3.

¹⁰ al-Majlisī, *Bihār al-anwār*, 47:373 ff., 64:142, 95:227.

¹¹ Ahmad Husayni Eshkavari, *Fihrist-i Nuskhahā-yi Khaṭṭī-yi Kitābkhāna-yi ʿUmūmī-yi Āyat Allāh al-ʿUẓmā Najafī Marʿashī* (Kitābkhāna-yi Marʿashī: 1354 Sh./1975-), no. 5342.

¹² Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī, *Amal al-āmil*, ed. Sayyid Aḥmad Ḥusaynī (Maktabat al-Andalus: 1385/1965), 2:111.

¹³ See also Mohammad Mahdi Karbaschi, “Barrasī-yi Matn, Sanad, Shurūḥ, wa Nusakh-i Khaṭṭī-yi Maṣādir-i Awwaliyya-yi Qismat-i Duwwum-i Duʿāʾ-yi ʿArafa-yi Sayyid al-Shuhadāʾ” (Masters diss., Dānishkada-yi ʿUlūm-i Ḥadīth: 1385 Sh./2006), 100 ff.

¹⁴ ʿAbd al-Majīd al-Sharnūbī, *Sharḥ al-ḥikam al-ʿaṭāʾiyya*, digital reprint of 1304/1887 (Cairo edition), available at www.al-mostafa.com, accessed August 2011, 195 ff.; Aḥmad b. Muḥammad Ibn ʿAjība, *Īqāz al-himam* (Dār al-Maʿārif: n.d.), 470 ff.

pendently or within supplicatory prayer books, namely, the translation of 'Abd al-Karīm Bī-Āzār Shīrāzī.¹⁵

Shī'ī scholars have long referred to passages from this supplication to explain ethical and theological concepts.¹⁶ It even appears that some of its phrases were so well-known that they became proverbial,¹⁷ or were used as opening statements at the beginning of speeches.¹⁸ Shī'īs have taken pride in it as one of the outstanding Shī'ī legacies with profound mystical content.¹⁹

1.2 Different Versions of *Du'ā*' *Arafa*

Regarding the different versions of the *du'ā*', the oldest works in which it appears are Sayyid Ibn Ṭāwūs's (d. 664/1266) *Iqbāl al-a'māl* and Ib-rāhīm b. 'Alī al-Kaf'amī's (d. 905/1499) *al-Balad al-amīn*. Al-Kaf'amī attributes his narration to Sayyid Ibn Ṭāwūs's *Miṣbāḥ al-zā'ir*,²⁰ an attribution that cannot be traced in the existing printed and manuscript copies of *Miṣbāḥ al-zā'ir*. One possibility is that al-Kaf'amī erred in citing *Miṣbāḥ al-zā'ir* as his source and that he saw the supplication in *Iqbāl al-a'māl*. Some have also suggested that Sayyid Ibn Ṭāwūs had two works titled *Miṣbāḥ al-zā'ir*, and this supplication was in the greater *Miṣbāḥ al-zā'ir*, while only the lesser *Miṣbāḥ al-zā'ir* has survived.²¹

¹⁵ 'Abd al-Karīm Bī-Āzār Shīrāzī, *Du'ā-yi Rūz-i 'Arafa (Rūz-i Shinākht)* (Daftar-i Nashr-i Farhang-i Islāmī: 1373 Sh./1994).

¹⁶ For example, see 'Abd 'Alī b. Jum'a al-Ḥuwayzī, *Nūr al-thaqalayn* (Ismā'īli-yān: 1370 Sh./1991), 3:238-9.

¹⁷ For example, see Fakhr al-Dīn Muḥammad b. 'Umar al-Rāzī, *al-Tafsīr al-kabīr* (al-Maṭba'at al-Bahiyya: n.d.), 5:238.

¹⁸ See Hidāyatullah Mustarḥamī's introduction to vol. 109 of al-Majlisī's *Bihār al-anwār*.

¹⁹ For example, see Khomeini, *Waṣīyyat-nāma* (Qadr-i Wilāyat: 1374 Sh./1995), 5.

²⁰ al-Majlisī, *Bihār al-anwār*, 95:214, citing al-Kaf'amī's marginal note on *al-Balad al-amīn*.

²¹ Etan Kohlberg, *A Medieval Muslim Scholar at Work: Ibn Tawus & His Library* (Brill: 1992), 47; Karbaschi, "Barrasī-yi Matn," 30-2.

Of these two, the version in most copies of *Iqbāl al-a‘māl* includes that 800-word appendix at the end of the *du‘ā’*,²² which is absent in *al-Balad al-amīn*. On the other hand, in the margins of *al-Balad al-amīn*, one can find explanations quoted from the aforementioned Bishr and Bashīr;²³ a marginal note that we can assume al-Kaf‘amī wrote himself, and which *Iqbāl al-a‘māl* lacks in content and substance. Later traditionists have striven to edit the text of the supplication and purge it of errors and textual variants, such that the most eloquent version of the supplication can be found in al-Muḥaddith al-Qummī’s (d. 1359/1940) *Mafātīḥ al-jinān*.²⁴ Moreover, they have chosen either to include or omit the aforementioned appendix found in copies of *Iqbāl al-a‘māl*, just as they have chosen either to include or exclude the explanations mentioned in *al-Balad al-amīn*.

1.3 Main Questions of Discussion

Firstly, what studies have been conducted thus far to examine the authenticity of *Du‘ā’ ‘Arafa*’s issuance from an infallible Imam? Secondly, what ambiguities still remain regarding the attribution of this *du‘ā’* to an infallible? Thirdly, what methods can be employed to gain confidence in the authenticity of this *du‘ā’*? To answer these questions, we will first review the most important theoretical studies concerning the attribution of *Du‘ā’ ‘Arafa* to Imam al-Ḥusayn. Then, by reviewing some unanswered questions about the *du‘ā’*’s authenticity, we will attempt to introduce and pursue methods for advancing and completing this study.

2. Literature on the Attribution of *Du‘ā’ ‘Arafa*

2.1 Views of Early Scholars

If we wish to understand the historical background of discussions about the attribution of the *du‘ā’* to Imam al-Ḥusayn, the earliest place

²² Ibid., 157-65; cf. Sayyid Ibn Ṭāwūs, *Iqbāl al-a‘māl*, 2:87, footnote 2.

²³ al-Majlisī, *Biḥār al-anwār*, 95:214.

²⁴ al-Muḥaddith al-Qummī, *Mafātīḥ al-jinān*, 261 ff.

we find an opinion, albeit brief, is Sayyid Ibn Ṭāwūs's *Iqbāl al-a'māl*. In this work, he decisively refers to this *du'ā'* as "the supplication of our master al-Ḥusayn on the Day of 'Arafa."²⁵ His statement reflects no doubt about this attribution. However, he does not explain how he received this *du'ā'* nor does he mention his intermediaries back to the Imam.

The history of critical discussion about the attribution or non-attribution of at least part of *Du'ā' 'Arafa* to the Imam goes back to the twelfth/eighteenth century, when al-'Allāma al-Majlisī, in *Biḥār al-anwār*, expressed his skepticism about attributing the appendix of the *du'ā'* to the Imam.²⁶ He found this appendix more consistent with the disposition of some Sufis, than with the character of Imam al-Ḥusayn. Al-Majlisī's basis for criticism was attention to the content and themes of the *du'ā'*'s appendix. Although he does not name the Sufi he has in mind, he insists on his claim to the point where he states that there are only two possibilities: either Sayyid Ibn Ṭāwūs mistakenly included the ending in the original supplication, or the copyists of his works found this addition elsewhere and added it to the original text of the *du'ā'*. He considers the second possibility more likely because, from al-Majlisī's perspective, Sayyid Ibn Ṭāwūs did not include this appendix in *Miṣbāḥ al-zā'ir*, and moreover al-Majlisī himself had not seen it in the ancient copies of *Iqbāl al-a'māl* that were in his possession.

In contrast to al-Majlisī's criticism, numerous scholars in subsequent centuries have approved the very same passages—which al-Majlisī considered Sufi-like—and have regarded them as containing sublime teachings. Among these scholars, one can point to Muḥammad Mahdī al-Narāqī²⁷ and Mullā Hādī al-Sabzawārī.²⁸ This

²⁵ Sayyid Ibn Ṭāwūs, *Iqbāl al-a'māl*, 2:74.

²⁶ al-Majlisī, *Biḥār al-anwār*, 95:227.

²⁷ Muḥammad Mahdī b. Abī Dharr al-Narāqī, *Jāmi' al-sa'ādāt*, ed. Muḥammad Kalāntar (Maṭba'at al-Nu'mān: n.d.), 3:116-7 and 122.

²⁸ Hādī b. Mahdī al-Sabzawārī, *Sharḥ al-asmā' al-ḥusnā*, lithograph offset, calligraphy by Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭūbā (Baṣīratī: n.d.), 1:51 and 209.

trend continues into the contemporary period.²⁹ For example, al-Muḥaddith al-Qummī shows no sign of doubts about the authenticity of the supplication and includes it—including the appendix³⁰—in *Mafātīḥ al-jinān*,³¹ based on Sayyid Ibn Ṭāwūs's *Iqbāl al-a'māl*. Many other contemporary scholars also consider the sublimity of the supplication's contents as the primary evidence for the validity of its attribution to Imam al-Ḥusayn.

2.2 Contemporary Discussions

The most serious and ongoing contemporary discussion regarding *Du'ā' 'Arafa* concerns the attribution of its appendix to Imam al-Ḥusayn. In this regard, some scholars, like Muḥammad Kāẓim Furqānī,³² have attempted to present their understanding of the philosophical concepts mentioned in this appendix, as being in harmony with the authentic teachings of the *Ahl al-Bayt*. On the other hand, while accepting the attribution of the *du'ā'* to Imam al-Ḥusayn, critics, like Muḥammad Mahdī Ruknī,³³ have tried to deny the presence of such concepts in the *du'ā'* and consider the Imam's status as being above “belief in the unity of existence” and similar Sufi-like views.

Meanwhile, Ḥusayn Turābī attempted, through studying the appendix of *Du'ā' 'Arafa* and reviewing various contemporary opinions about it, to defend the view that this section was composed by Ibn 'Aṭā'ullāh al-Iskandarānī and therefore should not be considered the words of an infallible Imam.³⁴ These efforts culminated in Mohammad

²⁹ Karbaschi, “Barrasī-yi Matn,” 52 ff.

³⁰ Muḥaddith al-Qummī, *Mafātīḥ al-jinān*, 271.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 261 ff.

³² Muḥammad Kāẓim Furqānī, “Irfān-i Sayyid al-Shuhadā',” *Mishkāt* 82 (1383 Sh./2004).

³³ Muḥammad Mahdī Ruknī Yazdī, “Āyā Du'ā'-yi 'Arafa Waḥdat-i Wujūd rā Bayān Mikunad?” *Mishkāt* 83 (1383 Sh./2004), 54-8.

³⁴ Ḥusayn Turābī, “Pazhūhishī Darbāra-yi Dhayl-i Du'ā'-yi 'Arafa,” *Miqāt-i Hajj* 51 (1384 Sh./2005), 48.

Mahdi Karbaschi's Master's thesis examining the attribution of the appendix of *Du'ā' 'Arafa* to Imam al-Ḥusayn.

Like Turābī, Karbaschi's starting point was the ambiguity arising from the possible attribution of the *du'ā's* appendix to Ibn 'Aṭā'ullāh al-Iskandarānī, author of *al-Ḥikam al-'aṭā'iyya*. Although Karbaschi's approach focused more on studying ancient manuscripts, he essentially shared the same concern as Turābī before him: to determine who authored the appendix. The problem lies in the fact that this section of *Du'ā' 'Arafa* exactly matches the text of the supplication as it appears in *al-Ḥikam al-'aṭā'iyya*,³⁵ making it possible—and according to Turābī, certain³⁶—that al-Iskandarānī himself composed the *du'ā's* appendix, which copyists may then have inserted into copies of Sayyid Ibn Ṭāwūs's *Iqbāl al-a'māl*, as al-Majlisī suspected.

Karbaschi first seeks the solution in studying the manuscripts of Sayyid Ibn Ṭāwūs's *Iqbāl al-a'māl* and *Miṣbāḥ al-zā'ir*.³⁷ Given the absence of manuscripts of *Miṣbāḥ al-zā'ir* containing this supplication, his focus shifts to manuscript studies of *Iqbāl al-a'māl*. Karbaschi's study, of more than 44 manuscripts of this work, indicates the presence of the supplication in most manuscripts.³⁸

Nevertheless, the possibility of scribal interference cannot be ruled out. What ultimately proves decisive in Karbaschi's study is *Zawā'id al-fawā'id*, written by Sayyid Ibn Ṭāwūs's son, Abū l-Qāsim 'Alī, who quotes extensively from his father's works, especially *Iqbāl al-a'māl*.³⁹ If it can be proven that one of the passages transmitted from *Iqbāl al-a'māl* to this work is *Du'ā' 'Arafa*, including its appendix, we can conclude that this appendix was not the result of scribal additions, but was included by Sayyid Ibn Ṭāwūs himself. However, based on the existing

³⁵ al-Sharnūbī, *Sharḥ al-ḥikam*, 470-1.

³⁶ Turābī, "Pazhūhishī Darbāra-yi Dhayl-i Du'ā-yi 'Arafa," 52.

³⁷ Karbaschi, "Barrasī-yi Matn," chapter 1.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 121.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 18 ff.

manuscripts of this work, the possibility of reaching a precise judgment appears to be ruled out.⁴⁰

Similarly, Karbaschi, after mentioning evidence supporting the attribution of the ending to Ibn al-Iskandarānī, still views it as no more than a weak possibility.⁴¹ He cites, as an example, the presence of a considerable volume of phrases from the core section of *Du‘ā’ ‘Arafa* in the intimate prayers of Dhū l-Nūn al-Miṣrī.⁴² He argues that the mere presence of a *du‘ā’* in someone’s works does not indicate that the text belongs to them.⁴³ Nevertheless, he ultimately leans towards rejecting the attribution of the appendix to Imam al-Ḥusayn.⁴⁴

Karbaschi’s study appears to offer the most serious research to date regarding the question of attributing *Du‘ā’ ‘Arafa*’s appendix to Imam al-Ḥusayn. However, the question of attributing the main supplication to the Imam lies outside the scope of his research. Additionally, he does not provide any convincing explanation for the absence of the complete text of *Du‘ā’ ‘Arafa* in approximately 15 manuscripts, or the presence of the main text, minus the appendix, in some other manuscripts. Similarly, Karbaschi’s study does not give special consideration to the age of the manuscripts and their general dates of composition.

2.3 Remaining Ambiguities

Du‘ā’ ‘Arafa is an ancient historical text and, like all such texts, requires analysis of its authenticity. From a historical perspective, the reliability of an ancient text is directly related to the temporal distance between the original event and its recorder. As mentioned, this supplication cannot be found in any texts predating the seventh/thirteenth century. This means there is approximately a 600-year gap between the original incident and the earliest surviving record of the

⁴⁰ Ibid., 121.

⁴¹ Ibid., 123-4.

⁴² For the intimate prayers, see: Aḥmad b. ‘Abdullāh Abū Nu‘aym al-Iṣfahānī, *Ḥilyat al-awliyā’* (Dār al-Kutub al-‘Arabī: 1405/1984), 9:332 ff.

⁴³ Karbaschi, “Barrasī-yi Matn,” 43.

⁴⁴ Ibid., 128.

event.

Another ambiguity relates to the fact that Sayyid Ibn Ṭāwūs never disclosed his intermediary sources back to the first transmitters of the *du'ā'*. Undoubtedly, Sayyid Ibn Ṭāwūs himself was among the most prominent Shi'ī *ḥadīth* scholars, and particularly one of the greatest and most renowned scholars in the field of Islamic supplicatory literature. However, this does not necessarily mean that the sources he had access to contain the most accurate and flawless transmissions. It is entirely possible, as al-Majlisī considers probable, that even the surviving manuscripts of Sayyid Ibn Ṭāwūs's own works may have undergone alterations, corruptions, and similar changes over time.

On the one hand, the oldest source containing the text of *Du'ā' 'Arafa* is itself late, and on the other hand, it is unclear through whose hands the text passed during this period, how it reached Sayyid Ibn Ṭāwūs, and what developments or changes it may have undergone in the process. To defend the authenticity of *Du'ā' 'Arafa*, a method must be found to demonstrate that although this supplication has only reached us through a late transmission, the text was not fabricated in later periods. Rather, various pieces of evidence confirm its attribution to the era of the *Ahl al-Bayt*.

Furthermore, our knowledge about the earliest listeners or scribes of the supplication is very limited, amounting to just two names: Bishr and Bashīr. The scholars of biographical evaluation (*rijāl*) provide very little information about them. It seems these two narrators only heard a few statements from the Imam and afterwards established no relationship with him or anyone else for the purpose of hearing *ḥadīth*. While such a case might occasionally occur, its occurrence is strange and requires examination. Apart from these two narrators, whose names we have merely found, we know nothing about the other transmitters of *Du'ā' 'Arafa* in the period before Sayyid Ibn Ṭāwūs.

Another potential objection that might be raised regarding the attribution of the supplication to the Imam, is its length. The Imam was surely not delivering an eloquent speech to the public in a loud and resonant voice but rather was engaged in private supplication. Although one can accept that others were present in the vicinity and

heard the Imam's voice, it is difficult to accept that while the Imam was reciting the supplication, an individual could have written every word down at that speed—an individual who had apparently come to 'Arafāt for supplication during the *ḥajj* season, and whose primary concern would have been the *ḥajj* rituals. A similar objection has previously been raised by some Sunnis in criticising the attribution of the long sermons of *Nahj al-balāgha* to Imam 'Alī b. Abī Ṭālib (d. 40/661),⁴⁵ and unfortunately, despite the criticism of this view from various other perspectives, no effort has yet been made to scientifically examine the practical possibility of delivering these long sermons and the methods used by the ancients to record them.

Another objection concerns the available technologies for recording during that era, which did not allow for extensive and accurate documentation of events. These recording technologies were limited to writing technologies that were very primitive: a few pieces of leather or occasionally leaves and clay tablets, an inkwell and a quill, or a sharpened piece of wood. It is difficult to accept that someone could quickly record an event as it occurred with such tools, even if they were observing the Imam from the beginning of his intimate supplication to God.

To put it simply, there is a difference between recording a sermon or letter from Imam 'Alī during his caliphate, by scribes officially tasked with preserving these works, and recording a supplication recited in a private gathering, in a mournful tone, during days when everyone had gathered during the *ḥajj* to receive the spiritual rewards of the Day of 'Arafa, with tools that were inadequate for fast writing, and listening to someone who continued his speech after each sentence without intending to pause or repeat for the scribes. Similarly, it is not easy to accept that someone could hear and memorise a supplication, of about 3,000 words or more, in one sitting and then for such a person with such mental brilliance to leave no trace in history.

The main issue is that we still lack precise information about how

⁴⁵ For example, see Aḥmad Zakī Ṣafwat, *Tarjamat 'Alī b. Abī Ṭālib* (Maṭba'at al-'Ulūm: 1932), 131.

such reports were recorded. Perhaps the method of delivering major sermons in the periods close to early Islam was somewhat different from what we have assumed. However, our current understanding of how long reports were preserved, through memorisation, seems less defensible, and achieving a clearer picture of the issue requires further consideration of the evidence. To defend the authenticity of *Du'ā' 'Arafa* and other similar texts, an extensive study of ancient methods of transmitting long reports in Islamic culture is necessary.

Besides these, numerous passages from *Du'ā' 'Arafa* appear in other *ad'iya*, either as short independent supplications or as sayings attributed to major religious figures. For example, 'Alī b. Yūsuf al-Ḥillī (alive in 705/1305) included a large portion of the opening passages of *Du'ā' 'Arafa* in a supplication for the thirtieth day of each month (*Īrān Rūz*).⁴⁶ Undoubtedly, al-Ḥillī never knew this supplication as part of the Imam's *Du'ā' 'Arafa*, for if he had, he would certainly have mentioned its attribution to him. Many other similar cases can be found.⁴⁷ Although it is possible that the composers of these texts drew from the sayings of the *Ahl al-Bayt*, it is also possible that texts composed by others were sometimes attributed to the *Ahl al-Bayt*, either intentionally or unintentionally. To prove the authenticity of *Du'ā' 'Arafa*, we must also find a way to demonstrate the unity of this text and show that all its different parts are authentic, rather than being pieces taken from other texts and assembled together.

3. Textual Characteristics

To demonstrate the unity of *Du'ā' 'Arafa*, it is necessary to review its text, to understand the overall structure and the author's main purpose. For this, we must first identify the text's motif and then study the *du'ā'*'s paragraph structure.

⁴⁶ 'Alī b. Yūsuf al-Ḥillī, *al-'Adad al-qawiyya*, ed. Mahdī Rajā'ī (Maktabat al-Mar'ashī: 1408/1987), 371 ff.

⁴⁷ Karbaschi, "Barrasī-yi Matn," chapter 2.

3.1 Motif

To understand the motif of *Du‘ā’ ‘Arafa*, it is essential to consider the meaning of ‘*arafa* itself. Based on the contemporary common understanding, few doubt that ‘*arafa*, from the same root as *ma‘rifa* (knowledge) means recognition, and that the Day of ‘Arafa means the Day of Recognition.⁴⁸ Yet a more precise understanding may be achieved by reviewing the general *ad‘iya* prescribed for this day.

Whether short or long, all *ad‘iya* of the Day of ‘Arafa contain human acknowledgment and confession regarding the position of oneself and God in existence.⁴⁹ On this basis, in Islamic culture, the Day of ‘Arafa was inevitably considered a day for confession before the divine court. In other words, in the ancient ritual calendar of Islamic culture, the Day of ‘Arafa was the Day of Confession. Yet in later periods, the status of confession and its importance on this day gradually faded from memory.

More evidence for this claim is provided by the traditions that reflect Prophet Adam’s confession of his sin on this day.⁵⁰ A review of the content of the *du‘ā’* attributed to the Imam confirms this same meaning. This *du‘ā’*, like all ‘*Arafa* supplications, is a supplication for confession.

3.2 Text Structure

The simplest way to paragraph *Du‘ā’ ‘Arafa* is to consider its segmentation by the narrators. Based on the placement of the narrator’s explanations, *Du‘ā’ ‘Arafa* can be divided into three major sections. The first comprises the initial words attributed to the Imam, until the point where it is said that his tears flowed and he raised his hands in supplication (up to the phrase “O God, make me fear You...” (*allāhumma*

⁴⁸ For one reference, see ‘Alī Shari‘atī, *Tahlīlī az Manāsik-i Hajj* (Ilhām: 1383 Sh./2004), 105; Bī-Āzār, *Du‘ā-yi Rūz-i ‘Arafa*, 5.

⁴⁹ For instance, see the previously mentioned supplications for the Day of ‘Arafa.

⁵⁰ ‘Alī b. Ibrāhīm al-Qummī, *al-Tafsīr*, ed. Ṭayyib Mūsawī Jazā’irī (Dār al-Kitāb: 1404/1983), 1:44.

ij'alnī akhshāk). The second section begins with the words attributed to the Imam following the narrators' middle explanations, until the end of the text transmitted in al-Kaf'amī's *al-Balad al-amīn* (from the previous phrase until "My God, I am the poor one..." (*ilāhī ana al-faqīr*)). The final section contains the appendix which appears in some versions of *Iqbāl al-a'māl* and is also included in al-Iskandarī's *al-Hikam al-'atā'iyya*, as his own work, but is not found in al-Kaf'amī's work.

In this study, we will not use this method for division. We assume that the *du'ā'*, along with its appendix, forms a coherent whole, and with this assumption, we attempt to extract its structure. However, as will be observed, even when we consider the main text and appendix as a coherent structure, we still have the same three distinct sections when considering the content. Of these three, the first two sections—the main text—are present in both ancient versions of the supplication, but the third section or appendix can only be found in Sayyid Ibn Ṭāwūs's *Iqbāl al-a'māl*.

1. *The Opening Intimate Discourse*: The first section of the supplication is an intimate discourse with God, with the theme of confessing God's exalted position in existence and humanity's unstable position within it, along with establishing and reinforcing this belief through numerous and detailed reasons for God's exalted position, His countless blessings, and the impossibility of adequately expressing gratitude to Him.
2. *The Main Body*: The theme of the second section is acknowledging the position of God and humanity in existence, the status of the Day of 'Arafa, the Prophet's role in obtaining divine mercy, and supplication. This section, with approximately 1,600 words, is the most extensive part of the supplication. It begins where Bishr and Bashīr reported that tears flowed from the Imam's eyes, and he raised his hands in supplication. This section contains an introduction and four chapters. The introduction to this section can be considered among the *jawāmi' al-du'ā'* (compre-

hensive supplications), which are brief prayers with comprehensive and all-encompassing requests. The first chapter's subject is acknowledging God's position in existence, whilst the second chapter's subject is acknowledging humanity's position in existence. The third chapter draws attention to the status and value of the Day of 'Arafa before God. The fourth chapter presents general requests to God and is, in effect, the conclusion of the entire second section.

3. *The Appendix*: The appendix is a completely independent intimate discourse that cannot be firmly connected to the previous section. In previous sections of the supplication, following extensive groundwork (divine praise, divine glorification, and confession), requests were made, reaching their peak with the request for the most fundamental need—salvation from hell-fire—and then concluding with blessings upon the Prophet. Now it appears that an entirely new discussion begins: asking God for epistemological guidance. The theme of this supplication is acknowledging humanity's complete poverty (*faqr*), a poverty that accompanies humans not only in practical spheres but also in the realm of acquiring knowledge.

3.3 Structural Analysis

Now we can analyse the text's coherence by examining its macro-structure. As observed, the arrangement of the three sections follows a logical sequence, free from semantic leaps and discontinuities.⁵¹ When reading these three sections consecutively, one never gets the impression they are three unrelated texts. This indicates that the work was composed with a coherent mindset. In other words, factors such as scribal errors and inaccuracies have not resulted in several unrelated text fragments being viewed as a single work.

⁵¹ For further explanation of this point, see Mihrwash, "Huwiyyat wa Intisāb-i Şaḥīfa-yi Sajjādiyya, bā Tikya bar Shākhişaha-yi Matn," (Masters diss., Dānishgāh-i Imām-i Şādiq: 1382 Sh./2003), 98 ff.

Nevertheless, each of these three sections has such a coherent internal structure that they could be each recited as an independent *du‘ā*. For example, if only the first section was given to an uninformed person, as a supplication, they would not assume that the text was incomplete or in need of further explanation or continuation. The other sections appear similarly self-contained. Therefore, the possibility cannot be completely ruled out that separate supplications were first created and then a coherent mindset arranged them together. For this very reason, it seems that numerous passages from each section can also be used as independent supplications. Any further precise commentary about the text’s unity requires careful examination of the above possibilities, considering both internal and external textual evidence.

4. The Narrators of the *Du‘ā*

As previously mentioned, in the few surviving later sources, the two brothers Bishr and Bashīr are identified as the narrators of *Du‘ā* ‘*Arafa*’ from Imam al-Ḥusayn. We will now examine historical evidence to gain a better understanding of these two figures, their relationship with the Imam, and the possibility that they recorded the *du‘ā*.

4.1 Bishr and Bashīr

Like all other little-known narrators, the best way to gain a general understanding of these two individuals is to study the surviving narrations from them. At first glance, the few surviving narrations from these two brothers are heavily intermingled. It appears that both Bishr and Bashīr narrated from Imam al-Ḥasan b. ‘Alī (d. 50/670), Imam al-Ḥusayn, and Imam ‘Alī b. al-Ḥusayn, Zayn al-‘Ābidīn (d. 95/713). The possibility of scribal errors (*taṣḥīf*) between Bishr/Bashīr, as well as between al-Ḥasan/al-Ḥusayn, is so high that one cannot be certain which of the narrations attributed to either narrator or Imam are correct and which are corrupted. Perhaps by carefully examining historical narrations and attempting to deduce the chronological order of events, we can propose a hypothesis to resolve the problem of scribal corruption

and distinguish and reconstruct the biographies of these two narrators.

Given the complete confusion in the surviving reports about these two brothers, the first step is to find key clues that can help distinguish between their narrations and explain their relationship with the *Ahl al-Bayt*; clues where the possibility of fabrication and motivations for distortion are less likely to arise. We can identify two key reports of this kind, which speak of Bishr being unknown to Imam al-Ḥusayn in the last month of his life. If we analyse other surviving evidence based on these two reports, we can largely distinguish between the surviving reports from Bishr and Bashīr. Based on the distinction made between the narrations of these two brothers using the above criterion, we will first present a picture of Bashīr's life and then turn to Bishr.

4.1.1 Bashīr b. Ghālib al-Asadī

Based on all available evidence, we can hypothetically say that Bishr was the younger brother, though with greater social influence. He also transmitted most of the narrations he heard from the *Ahl al-Bayt* to his brother Bashīr. Due to the scarcity of his narrations and later scholars' lack of trust in the transmitters of his works, Bashīr gradually fell into obscurity. Meanwhile, Bishr, in addition to his numerous transmissions from the Imams and prominent figures from among the Companions' descendants, emerged as an influential figure in the political activities of his time. Moreover, with his multiple children and narrators, he had a better chance of preserving his works.

Despite being few in number, Bashīr's narrations fall into several categories. Some of them, based on the above hypothesis, have been attributed to Bashīr due to scribal corruption of Bishr's name, which can be detected by carefully examining all the evidence. Others, besides being considered "weak" according to traditional scholarly criteria and dismissed due to intermediaries accused of fabrication,⁵² do not align with historical evidence and contextual clues extracted from

⁵² See "disconnected" in Muḥammad b. Ismā'īl al-Bukhārī, *al-Tārikh al-kabīr* (n.p.: 1398/1978), 2:101.

other narrations or have been attributed to other individuals as well. Finally, only a small number of these narrations can be considered authentic. Looking at these few narrations, we find Bashīr merely as a transmitter of Bishr's works and a more peripheral figure.⁵³ It is not without reason that Muḥammad b. Ismā'īl al-Bukhārī (d. 256/870) identifies him only as a transmitter of his brother's works.⁵⁴ We now intend to better understand him by reviewing two reports that appear to be authentic.

The first report is Muḥammad Ibn Ḥibbān's (d. 354/965) statement that Bashīr narrates from Imam 'Alī.⁵⁵ The second report, if it can be considered authentic—despite all the criticisms suggesting it is fabricated and all its textual corruptions⁵⁶—describes the presence of people from Antioch meeting with Imam al-Ḥasan. They discussed their governor with the Imam, and Bashīr reported the account of this meeting. In some narrations, the person being addressed in Bashīr's presence is identified as Imam al-Ḥusayn. However, if this event did take place, it was undoubtedly people from Antioch coming to Imam al-Ḥasan, who was the Caliph at the time, since a discussion with Imam al-Ḥusayn about their city's governor would not make sense.

These are the only two reports that can be considered to contain information about Bashīr's life. If we trust these reports, we must conclude that Bashīr had minimal contact with the caliphate administration during the caliphates of Imam 'Alī and Imam al-Ḥasan in Kūfa, and afterward permanently withdrew from Kūfa's political sphere. After that, he can only be recognised as a reporter of his brother's statements. His social position in Kūfa and his family connection with the

⁵³ For example, see Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm al-Nu'mānī, *al-Ghayba*, ed. Fāris Ḥassūn (Anwār al-Hudā: 1422/2001), 240-41.

⁵⁴ al-Bukhārī, *al-Tārīkh*, 2:101. See also 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *al-Jarḥ wa-l-ta'dīl* (n.p.: 1371/1952), 2:377.

⁵⁵ Muḥammad Ibn Ḥibbān, *al-Thiqāt* (n.p., 1393/1973), 4:72.

⁵⁶ 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. 'Alī Ibn al-Jawzī, *al-Mawḍū'āt*, ed. 'Abd al-Raḥmān Muḥammad 'Uthmān (n.p.: 1386/1966), 2:90-1; also, Aḥmad b. 'Alī Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī, *Lisān al-mīzān* (A'lāmī: 1390/1971), 2:29.

Ahl al-Bayt were not so significant that years later, when Imam al-Ḥusayn first met his brother, Bishr, Imām al-Ḥusayn would recognise his brother as his relative.

4.1.2 Bishr b. Ghālib al-Asadī

Bishr b. Ghālib al-Asadī was among the Shī‘ī scholars of Kūfa in the second half of the first/seventh century, whose name appears in reports from the time of Imam al-Ḥusayn, al-Mukhtār al-Thaqafī (d. 67/687), and al-Ḥajjāj b. Yūsuf (d. 95/714). His complete lineage can be found in Ibn Ḥibbān’s work.⁵⁷ Al-Ardabīlī’s mention of his *kunya* (teknonym) as Abū Ṣādiq⁵⁸ stems from a textual corruption or error.⁵⁹

Bishr should be considered among the generation of Successors (*tābi‘ūn*). In addition to Bishr’s numerous narrations from Imam al-Ḥusayn, it is said that he also transmitted reports from Abū Hurayra,⁶⁰ Muḥammad b. al-Ḥanafīyya⁶¹ and, in later sources, his narrations from Ibn al-‘Abbās are also mentioned.⁶² Given his numerous narrations from Imam al-Ḥusayn through direct transmission, it is entirely natural that Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al-Ṭūsī (d. 460/1067) counted him among the Imam’s companions.⁶³ He appears to have been recognised as an authoritative Qur’ānic exegete as well, as Muḥammad b. Jarīr al-Ṭabarī (d. 310/923) included one of his opinions in his exegesis.⁶⁴ Even

⁵⁷ Ibn Ḥibbān, *al-Thiqāt*, 4:69.

⁵⁸ al-Ardabīlī, Muḥammad b. ‘Alī, *Jāmi‘ al-ruwāt* (Dār al-Aḍwā’: 1403/1983), 2:393.

⁵⁹ Muḥammad Taqī al-Shūshtarī, *Qāmūs al-rijāl* (Jāmi‘at al-Mudarrisīn: 1419/1998), 11:368.

⁶⁰ Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *al-Jarḥ wa al-ta‘dīl*, 2:363.

⁶¹ Muḥammad b. Sulaymān al-Kūfī, *Manāqib amīr al-mu‘minīn*, ed. Muḥammad Bāqir Maḥmūdī (Majma‘ Iḥyā’ al-Thaqāfa al-Islāmiyya, 1412/1991), 1:195-196.

⁶² Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al-Ṭūsī, *al-Amālī* (Dār al-Thaqāfa: 1414/1993), 247-8.

⁶³ al-Ṭūsī, *al-Rijāl*, ed. Jawād Qayyūmī (Jāmi‘at al-Mudarrisīn: 1415/1994), 99.

⁶⁴ Muḥammad b. Jarīr al-Ṭabarī, *al-Tafsīr* (Dār al-Fikr: 1415/1995), 26:159.

during the brief opportunity he had to meet with Imam al-Ḥusayn before his martyrdom, he asked exegetical questions,⁶⁵ which further demonstrates his interest in this field of knowledge. Occasionally, indirect debates took place between him and Sa'īd b. Jubayr (d. 95/714),⁶⁶ and Sa'īd's responses to his statements indicate a similarity in their social standing within the same generation of Kūfan scholars. Moreover, Bishr's own independent judgments and opinions, that are reported in various sources,⁶⁷ indicate that he was a noteworthy figure as both a Successor and a scholar. Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī (d. 852/1449) found him described as a "learned, virtuous and highly esteemed scholar" in a section of *Rijāl al-Kashshī* that apparently has not reached us.⁶⁸ The name of Bishr b. Ghālib became so renowned and respected in later periods that even forgers would try to use it to make their narrations appear credible.⁶⁹

Bishr was the one who accompanied Imam al-Ḥusayn to a stopping point near Mecca. Apparently, when he had come to Mecca for pilgrimage and the Imam was intending to leave Mecca, he reported to him that "the hearts of the Iraqis are with you, but their swords are with the Umayyads."⁷⁰ In this report, the Imam first inquires about Bishr's name, lineage, and tribe. As reflected in this report, the manner of the Imam's conversation with him indicates that in the last month of the Imam's life, he did not yet know Bishr and encountered him as a stranger. In addition, according to some other narrations, the Imam addresses him during his questioning as "brother of Banī Asad" (*akhā*

⁶⁵ For these questions, see Aḥmad Ibn Aʿtham, *al-Futūḥ*, ed. ʿAlī Shīrī (Dār al-Aḍwāʾ: 1411/1991), 5:70; Muḥammad b. Yaʿqūb al-Kulaynī, *al-Kāfi*, ed. ʿAlī Akbar Ghaffārī (Islāmiyya: 1363 Sh./1984), 2:611.

⁶⁶ Muḥammad b. Jarīr al-Ṭabarī, *al-Tafsīr*, 26:159.

⁶⁷ For example, see al-Ṭūsī, *al-Ghayba*, ed. ʿIbād Allāh Tihirānī and ʿAlī Aḥmad Nāṣiḥ (Muʿassasat al-Maʿārif al-Islāmiyya: 1411/1990), 462-3.

⁶⁸ Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, *Lisān al-mizān*, 2:29.

⁶⁹ ʿAbdullāh Ibn ʿAdī, *al-Kāmil fi ḍuʿafāʾ al-rijāl*, ed. Yaḥyā Mukhtār Ghazāwī (Beirut: 1409/1988), 5:130.

⁷⁰ Ibn Aʿtham, *al-Futūḥ*, 5:69-70.

banī asad),⁷¹ which again suggests the newness of their acquaintance.

When considering all the narrations indicating meetings between the Imam and Bishr, it appears this encounter was their only meeting, and Bishr was present along with ‘Abdullāh b. al-Zubayr’s group.⁷² ‘Abdullāh b. al-Zubayr had himself, like the Imam, refused to pledge allegiance to Yazīd b. Mu‘āwiya and had earlier fled to Mecca.⁷³ Apparently during this meeting, he had decided to accompany the Imam for a stage of the journey, to bid him farewell. In addition to ‘Abdullāh b. al-Zubayr’s repeated questions to the Imam about various jurisprudential matters, Bishr also posed various questions to the Imam during this meeting, with each answer being narrated separately as an independent tradition—so independently that it is difficult to imagine all these questions were exchanged during a single journey. According to these narrations, despite Bishr’s discouraging reports about the social corruption of Arabs and non-Arabs in Kūfa, the Imam remained optimistic about the future and the support of the Kūfans and their unity under the rule of the *Ahl al-Bayt* during that meeting⁷⁴ and therefore did not take ‘Abdullāh b. al-Zubayr’s concerns seriously, citing instead the letters from the Kūfans.⁷⁵

⁷¹ al-Kulaynī, *al-Kāfī*, 2:611.

⁷² For ‘Abdullāh b. al-Zubayr’s presence, see: ‘Abdullāh b. Muḥammad Abū al-Shaykh al-Iṣfahānī, *Ṭabaqāt al-muḥaddithīn bi-Iṣbahān*, ed. ‘Abdulghafūr Bilūshī (n.p.: 1412/1991), 2:186-7; Muḥammad b. Abī Bakr al-Barrī, *al-Jawhara fī nasab al-nabī wa aṣḥābihi al-‘ashara*, ed. Muḥammad Tūnjī (Maktabat Nūrī: 1402/1981), 38-9. For the Imam’s private meeting with ‘Abdullāh and their lengthy conversation, and ‘Abdullāh’s advice to the Imam that “be like one of the doves of the sanctuary” (*kun ḥamāman min ḥimām al-ḥaram*), see Ja‘far b. Muḥammad Ibn Qūlawayh, *Kāmil al-ziyārāt*, ed. Jawād Qayyūmī (Nashr al-Faqāha: 1417/1996), 150-1.

⁷³ Regarding him, see H.A.R. Gibb, “Abd Allah b. al-Zubayr,” *Encyclopedia of Islam*, 2nd edition (Brill: 1965-1995), I:54.

⁷⁴ al-Nu‘mān al-Maghribī, *Sharḥ al-akhbār*, ed. Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ḥusaynī Jalālī (Jāmi‘at al-Mudarrisīn: n.d.), 3:488-9.

⁷⁵ Ismā‘īl Ibn Kathīr, *al-Bidāya wa-l-nihāya*, ed. ‘Alī Shīrī (Dār Iḥyā’ al-Turāth al-‘Arabī: 1408/1988), 8:174; cf. al-Kūfī, *Manāqib*, 2:262.

It must have been during this same meeting that someone reported to the Imam that “some people have wept over Mu‘āwiya’s death,” and Bishr heard the Imam’s curse and response to them.⁷⁶ The narrations transmitted from the Imam, through Bishr, regarding the rewards for the supporters of the *Ahl al-Bayt* should also be considered as belonging to this same gathering; narrations that entirely reflect the passion and sentiment of a prominent political leader calling for public cooperation.⁷⁷ It is reported that during the journey Bishr asked the Imam about drinking while standing and received the answer when the caravan stopped.⁷⁸ Imam Muḥammad b. ‘Alī al-Bāqir (d. 114/733), who was also in that caravan, later referred to his grandfather’s answer to this question.⁷⁹ This report supports the previous assumption that Bishr and ‘Abdullāh b. al-Zubayr travelled part of the way with the Imam.

Bishr’s numerous reports of his encounter with the Imam primarily indicate his fascination with the Imam’s personality during this brief period, a fascination that began late and ended early. Perhaps it was due to this belated recognition of the Imam’s personality that it is said Bishr would later, after the tragedy of Karbala, embrace the Imam’s burial soil while lamenting⁸⁰—regretting that he had lost the opportunity to help. Perhaps he could not predict the Imam’s early martyrdom and the complexity of the situation in Kūfa in such a short time, otherwise he might have joined the Imam’s caravan.

In the aftermath of ‘Āshūrā’, there are various reports about Bishr’s

⁷⁶ al-Nu‘mān al-Maghribī, *Sharḥ al-akhbār*, 3:103.

⁷⁷ For example, see Aḥmad b. Muḥammad al-Barqī, *al-Maḥāsin*, ed. Jalāl al-Dīn Muḥaddith, (Islāmiyya: 1370/1951), 1:61; al-Nu‘mān al-Maghribī, *Sharḥ al-akhbār*, 3:447.

⁷⁸ al-Barqī, *al-Maḥāsin*, 2:580. For another version of the incident, see Muḥammad b. Khalaf Wakī‘ al-Qāḍī, *Akhbār al-quḍāt* (‘Ālam al-Kutub: n.d.), 3:16.

⁷⁹ Ibid.

⁸⁰ Muḥammad Ibn Sa‘d, “*Tarjamat al-Imām al-Ḥusayn wa Maqataluhū*,” in *al-Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā*, ed. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz Ṭabāṭabā‘ī (Āl al-Bayt: 1415/1994), 8:88.

presence. It is said that Bishr met with Imam Zayn al-‘Ābidīn in Medina shortly before the arrest of Ḥarmala and other killers of Imam al-Ḥusayn, and heard the Imam’s curse upon Ḥarmala, which was later fulfilled by Mukhtār.⁸¹ Multiple reports reflect the cooperation of his students—such as ‘Abdullāh b. Sharīk al-‘Āmirī⁸²—and his associates—like his servant Abū ‘Umar Dīnār, known as Ṣāhib Ḥanafīyya⁸³—with Mukhtār’s uprising. However, it appears that during Mukhtār’s rule, he was imprisoned and tried to conceal his identity—“he was a man in disguise” (*kāna rajulan mutanakkiran*)—and was freed after Mukhtār’s defeat.⁸⁴ If he was among the few Shī‘ī followers who remained loyal to Imam Zayn al-‘Ābidīn and did not become Kaysānī or support Mukhtār, one would expect him to have transmitted more narrations from the Imam. Yet, his narrations from the Imam are few.

Reports of his cooperation with Ḥajjāj b. Yūsuf, or the high status he held with Ḥajjāj, seem somewhat strange given his background. Perhaps his position, as one of the nobles of the Banī Asad of Kūfa, necessitated such connections. In any case, debates between him, as one of the nobles of Banī Asad, and the leaders of other tribes in Ḥajjāj’s presence have been recorded.⁸⁵ His cooperation with Ḥajjāj apparently continued until the final days of his life, which al-Ṭabarī reports among the political events of 76/695. During this time, in the war against Shabīb b. Yazīd, the leader of the Ṣufrī Kharijites, he was one of Ḥajjāj’s army commanders and was in charge of the left wing of the army.⁸⁶ Despite strong resistance, his army was defeated and he

⁸¹ Muḥammad b. Ja‘far Ibn Namā al-Ḥillī, *Muthīr al-aḥzān* (Maṭba‘at al-Ḥaydariyya: 1369/1950), 121.

⁸² For his biography, see Mihrwash, “Mashīkha-yi Abān b. Taghlib dar Ṭabaqa-yi Ṣāḥāba wa Tābi‘īn,” *Ḥadīth Pajūhī* 3/5 (1390 Sh./2011), 210-3.

⁸³ For his biography, see ‘Abdullāh b. Muḥammad Ibn Abī Shayba, *al-Muṣannaḡ*, ed. Kamāl Yūsuf Ḥūt (Maktabat al-Rushd: 1409/1988), 8:59; al-Bukhārī, *al-Tārīkh*, 3:246.

⁸⁴ Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al-Ṣaffār, *Baṣā’ir al-darajāt* (A‘lamī: 1404/1984), 268-9.

⁸⁵ Muḥammad b. Jarīr al-Ṭabarī, *al-Tafsīr*, 26:159.

⁸⁶ Idem., *Tārīkh al-umam wa-l-mulūk* (A‘lamī: 1403/1983), 5:72, 74.

and his companions were killed to the last man.⁸⁷

The branches and details of reports concerning the relationship between Imam al-Ḥusayn and Bishr b. Ghālib have increased over time. Sometimes in newer versions, stories appear that had no precedent before. One example of this is the story of the Imam's predictions about the future of his uprising during 'Abdullāh b. Zubayr's meeting with Imam al-Ḥusayn in the presence of Bishr.⁸⁸ Similarly, reports indicating conversations between the Imam and Bishr about the events of the end of times should be considered of the same category. It appears that 'Abdullāh b. Sharīk al-ʿĀmirī, as one of Bishr's most important narrators, played a significant role in adding certain concepts to his reports. Being himself one of the companions of Mukhtār and a Kaysānī,⁸⁹ he relates numerous concepts and teachings from Bishr, narrating from Imam al-Ḥusayn regarding opposition to the Umayyads and encouragement to support the *Ahl al-Bayt*.⁹⁰

4.2 The Possibility of Name Corruption Among the Narrators of *Du'ā' Arafa*

With these premises in mind, we can better examine the position of Bishr and Bashīr in narrating a *du'ā'* from Imam al-Ḥusayn during the days of *ḥajj*. Bashīr is an unknown Kūfan figure with limited connection to the family of the Prophet's household, and only during their residence in Kūfa. Bishr also only met with the Imam in the final year of his life, at the beginning of his departure from the sanctuary. Thus, the possibility of him narrating the Imam's *du'ā'* is also ruled out. He could not have reported the *du'ā'*—during the *ḥajj* days—before becoming acquainted with the Imam in the last month of his life, whereas the *ḥajj* certainly did not take place that year, as Imam al-

⁸⁷ Ibid., 5:75.

⁸⁸ For two different versions, see al-Kūfī, *Manāqib*, 2:262 and Muḥibb al-Dīn Aḥmad b. 'Abdullāh al-Ṭabarī, *Dhakhā'ir al-ʿuqbā* (Maktabat al-Qudsī: 1356/1937), 151.

⁸⁹ See Mihrwash, "Mashīkha-yi Abān," 212.

⁹⁰ For examples of such reports, see al-Nu'mānī, *al-Ghayba*, 240-1.

Ḥusayn departed from Mecca towards Kūfa on the eighth of Dhū l-Hijja—one day before the Day of ‘*Arafa* in the year 60/680.⁹¹

Now the question arises: if neither Bishr nor Bashīr narrated this *du‘ā*’ from Imam al-Ḥusayn, is the *du‘ā*’ itself fabricated and the words of a non-infallible wrongly or deliberately attributed to Imam al-Ḥusayn? In reality, such a hypothesis is invalid. As we shall see, it appears this problem arose due to name corruption.

The family of Ibn Ghālib al-Asadī was a prominent family in Kūfa with distinguished figures across several generations. It seems that name corruption between different members of this family has caused narrators to be confused with other ancestors. Based on this hypothesis, *Du‘ā*’ ‘*Arafa* is indeed a transmitted text, though belonging to another Imam. The distinguished literary author of the *du‘ā*’ is a prominent and widely recognised figure in the Islamic world: Imam al-Ṣādiq. Apparently, the sharing of the narrator’s name with his grandfather’s name, and the shared *kunya* between Imam al-Ṣādiq and Imam al-Ḥusayn, has led to such confusion over time.

It appears that Bishr b. Ghālib also had a son called Ghālib, named after his own father. Ghālib b. Bishr, like his father and children, was among the narrators of *ḥadīth*, and his name appears in some narrations as a student of Sa‘īd b. al-Musayyib.⁹² We can say with relative certainty that the narrations attributed to Imam al-Bāqir,⁹³ that were transmitted by ‘Abdullāh and Ishāq b. Ghālib from their father, are narrations that this same Ghālib b. Bishr heard from Imam al-Bāqir. These ‘Abdullāh and Ishāq b. Ghālib were themselves among the prominent companions of Imam al-Ṣādiq, and both were literary figures, poets, jurists, and narrators of numerous works from him.⁹⁴ Finally, Bishr b. Ghālib b. Bishr b. Ghālib, who narrates from Ibn Shihāb

⁹¹ Muḥammad b. Jarīr al-Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh*, 4:286; See “... one day before *al-Tarwīya*” in Ibn Qūlawayh, *Kāmil al-ziyārāt*, 152.

⁹² See for example al-Kulaynī, *al-Kāfi*, 2:265; 7:347; 8:244.

⁹³ See for example: al-Ḥusayn b. Sa‘īd al-Ahwāzī, *al-Zuhd*, ed. Ghulām Riḍā ‘Irfāniyān (al-Maṭba‘at al-‘Ilmiyya: 1399/1979), 33.

⁹⁴ For these two, see Hossein Modarressi *Tabataba’i*, Tradition and Survival:

al-Zuhrī⁹⁵ and whom most *ḥadīth* scholars consider unknown (*majhūl*),⁹⁶ must be the son of this same Ghālib b. Bishr. Given his narration from Ibn Shihāb al-Zuhrī and considering that his grandfather Bishr was killed in 76/695, we can determine that he was of the same generation as Imam al-Ṣādiq.

It appears that a mistake has occurred, with confusion between multiple narrators from one family and between two Imams from the *Ahl al-Bayt*. More precisely, there seems to be confusion between Bishr and Bashīr, the sons of Ghālib al-Asadī, and ‘Abdullāh and Ishāq, the sons of another Ghālib al-Asadī—who was the son of Bishr the Successor (*tābi‘ī*). These ‘Abdullāh and Ishāq were both prominent narrators and students of Imam al-Ṣādiq, and they particularly strove to record and transmit his lengthy sermons and wise sayings. Indeed, one can find several sermons of the Imam that these two recorded and narrated.⁹⁷

On the other hand, Imam al-Ṣādiq also shared a similar *kunya* with Imam al-Ḥusayn: Abū ‘Abdullāh. It is possible that this similarity in the *kunyas* of the two Imams, along with the similarity in the names of the narrators’ fathers and the resulting confusion, led firstly to the *du‘ā’* narrated by ‘Abd al-Malik and Ishāq b. Ghālib being mistakenly attributed to their grandfather Bishr and his brother Bashīr; and secondly, to the main *du‘ā’*, which was from the sayings of Imam al-Ṣādiq, being incorrectly attributed to Imam al-Ḥusayn. For such a mistake to occur, it would have been sufficient for just one of the copyists, over

A Bibliographical Survey of Early Shiite Literature (Oneworld: 2003), 141-2

⁹⁵ ‘Abdullāh b. Muḥammad Ibn Abī al-Dunyā, *Makārim al-akhlāq*, ed. Majdī Sayyid Ibrāhīm (Maktabat al-Qur’ān, 1411/1990), 44.

⁹⁶ For example, see Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī, *Tahdhīb al-tahdhīb* (Dār al-Fikr: 1404/1984), 2:28-9.

⁹⁷ See for example al-Ṣaffār, *Baṣā‘ir*, 432-3; al-Kulaynī, *al-Kāfi*, 444-5; al-Ṣadūq, *al-Tawḥīd*, ed. Hāshim Ḥusaynī Tihirānī (Ṣadūq: 1387/1967), 44-5; idem., *Ilal al-sharā‘i‘* (al-Maktabat al-Ḥaydariyya: 1385/1966), 1:119-20. For an example of the sermons of the *Ahl al-Bayt* that his father reported, see *Ibid.*, 8:72 ff.

the many centuries of the *du‘ā*’s transmission, to have relied on the fame of the narrators and the *du‘ā*’s author, and recorded it as something like: “... from the two sons of Ghālib, from Abū ‘Abdullāh.” This narrator’s intention in referring to the two sons of Ghālib was to refer to those two famous Shī‘ī narrators from among the companions of Imam al-Ṣādiq—narrators so well-known at the time of the work’s composition that the author never imagined anyone would have difficulty identifying them. Similarly, his intention in referring to Abū ‘Abdullāh was the famous Imam from whom most Shī‘ī narrations are transmitted: al-Ṣādiq. However, the passage of time and the loss of contextual clues led to a misunderstanding of this author’s statement and a corruption of the name of the *du‘ā*’s author.

5. Evidence Supporting the Attribution of *Du‘ā* ‘Arafa to Imam al-Ṣādiq

We now intend to strengthen the above hypothesis by presenting evidence demonstrating that *Du‘ā* ‘Arafa is a text belonging to the second/eighth century, originating from Imam al-Ṣādiq. This text was only attributed to Imam al-Ḥusayn and other narrators due to a textual corruption, and although its *isnād* is disconnected, we can still present multiple pieces of evidence indicating that it is from the sayings of the *Ahl al-Bayt* and is a transmitted supplication (*ma’thūr*).

Our evidence for proving the authenticity of the prayer and its issuance from Imam al-Ṣādiq falls into three categories. First, evidence showing that this *du‘ā*’ could not have been issued earlier than the second/eighth century. Second, evidence indicating that the main *du‘ā*’ could not have been composed later than the second/eighth century either. Finally, evidence demonstrating that the likelihood of the *du‘ā*’s issuance from Imam al-Ṣādiq is greater than from any other scholar of the second/eighth century. We shall now consider each of these categories of evidence in turn.

5.1 *Du‘ā* ‘Arafa’s Dissimilarity to First/Seventh Century Texts

Upon examining the *du‘ā*’, it becomes apparent that it was issued in a

multilingual environment. Within the main text of the *du'ā'*, the supplicant mentions that “O God, today, the cries of many people rise to Your threshold in different languages” (*fa-ilayka 'ajjat al-aṣwāt bi-ṣunūf al-lughāt*). This statement clearly evokes the Day of 'Arafā and the extensive presence of Muslims from various parts of the world. It is implausible that during Imam al-Ḥusayn's era, the plain of 'Arafāt was this populous and multilingual.

The time between Imam al-Ḥusayn's era and the conquests was very brief, and political power was held by the Umayyads. The Umayyads had no interest in promoting Islam, as they wanted to collect poll tax (*jizya*) from non-Arabs. In the first/seventh century, after the conquest of Palestine and the Levant, conversion to Islam was not encouraged;⁹⁸ new Muslims were even still subjected to poll tax, lest anyone choose Islam to escape taxation.⁹⁹ Moreover, as we know, accepting a new religion is very different from political submission to a regime. One cannot expect that within about thirty years of the conquest of Iran and Rome, such a large population from the conquered territories would have become such devoted Muslims that many of them would travel to *hajj*. It was not until the second/eighth century, during Imam al-Ṣādiq's lifetime, that the crowding at 'Arafāt and Mash'ar necessitated juridical discussion about the permissibility of passing through surrounding hills and mountains, rather than through them directly.¹⁰⁰ The questions posed to Imam al-Ṣādiq on this matter had not been asked of previous Imams, indicating these were emerging issues during Imam al-Ṣādiq's time.

Apart from this, at least at first glance, there is evidence suggesting *Du'ā' 'Arafā's* content and form are incompatible with first/seventh

⁹⁸ W.L. Cleveland, *A History of the Modern Middle East* (Westview Press: 1999), 15.

⁹⁹ Ahmad Pakatchi, “Jizya,” in *Dā'irat al-Ma'ārif-i Buzurg-i Islāmī*, vol. 18, ed. Kāẓim Mūsawī Bujnūrdī et al. (Markaz-i Dā'irat al-Ma'ārif-i Buzurg-i Islāmī: 1389 Sh./2010), 104.

¹⁰⁰ See *ḥadīth* No.7 in al-Kulaynī, *al-Kāfī*, 4:471.

century texts. The text of the *du‘ā* is extensive, containing many requests to God. There are narrations indicating that some Companions were surprised upon hearing lengthy supplications containing multiple requests.¹⁰¹ They recalled that such practices were never common during the Prophet’s time. Even if these narrations are fabricated, they could indicate that in the first/ seventh century, and even later than the Companions’ era, there was still opposition to the intellectual movement promoting long supplications. Although this alone cannot prove that the Day of ‘Arafa *du‘ā* is a text from later than the first/seventh century, it can be considered as evidence alongside other indicators.

Finally, for *Du‘ā* ‘Arafa to belong to the first/seventh century would require its similarity to *ḥadīth* literature (*adabiyāt-i riwāyī*);¹⁰² yet such similarity does not exist. If we consider the surviving *ad‘iya* from the Noble Prophet as representative of first/seventh century *ad‘iya*, we see that firstly, these *ad‘iya* are very brief, and never exceeding 200 words; secondly, they lack rhythm and rhyme (*saj‘*); thirdly, the requests are expressed in a very simple, basic, and pragmatic manner; and fourthly, the *ad‘iya* do not present numerous and multiple requests but mainly focus on a specific desire.¹⁰³

5.2 Evidence Indicating the Text Belongs to the Second/Eighth Century

Words in any language are either born or borrowed from another culture; they undergo multiple changes in meaning and may then fall into disuse. Obsolete words are not used in later writings, and their usage in ancient texts is subject to misunderstanding because their precise meanings are not known, so they are interpreted based on context. It

¹⁰¹ Sulaymān b. Aḥmad al-Ṭabarānī, *al-Du‘ā*, ed. Muṣṭafā ‘Abd al-Qādir ‘Aṭā (Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyya: 1413/1993), 37-8.

¹⁰² For this term, see Mihrwash, “Gūna Shināsī-yi Ta‘lifāt-i Du‘ā’i-yi ‘Ālimān-i Musalmān Tā Zamān-i Ibn Ṭāwūs,” wa Siyri Taḥawwul-i ān, *Pajūhish-i Qur‘ān wa Ḥadīth* 2 (1386 Sh./2008), 57.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, 58-9.

appears that *Du‘ā’ ‘Arafa* also contains some ancient words that were difficult for later generations to understand. Among these is the word *tāmūr* in the phrase “and what is contained within the *tāmūr* of my chest” (*wa mā ishtamala ‘alayhi tāmūru ṣadri*) from the *du‘ā’*.

Tāmūr appears to be a Syriac word meaning “hermitage,”¹⁰⁴ which through semantic expansion came to be used in Arabic to mean house, place, or container of anything. This word, with this meaning, can also be found in pre-Islamic poetry close to the early Islamic period,¹⁰⁵ which indicates its usage in Arabic culture near the time of early Islam. In *Du‘ā’ ‘Arafa*, the word is used with this same meaning. However, it seems that from around the third/ninth century onward, many different opinions emerged about its meaning. The various meanings attributed to it in this later period are: notebook, blood, ribcage, and lion’s den.¹⁰⁶ Most of these interpretations are uninformed guesses about the original meaning of the word and attempts to discover its meaning based on sentence context. This itself indicates that from around the third/ninth century onward, the precise meaning of the word was not known and had fallen into disuse. Its rare later uses are formulaic expressions surviving from earlier periods.¹⁰⁷ In fact, later users did not actively employ this word. Rather, they used ancient phrases that contained it, where the whole expression carried a specific meaning.

On the other hand, the general atmosphere of *Du‘ā’ ‘Arafa* necessi-

¹⁰⁴ See ‘Abdullāh b. Muslim Ibn Qutayba, *Gharīb al-ḥadīth*, ed. ‘Abdullāh al-Jabūrī (Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyya: 1408/1988), 1:389.

¹⁰⁵ See Aws b. Ḥajar, *Dīwān*, ed. Muḥammad Yūsuf Najam (Dār Beirut: 1400/1980), 47.

¹⁰⁶ See respectively Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī, *Tahdhīb al-tahdhīb*, 10:131 quoting from Abū Zur‘a al-Dimashqī (d. 282/895); Ibn Qutayba, *Gharīb al-ḥadīth*, 1:389; Ibn Abī Uṣaybi‘a, Aḥmad b. Qāsim, *‘Uyūn al-anbā’ fī ṭabaqāt al-a‘tibbā’*, ed. Nizār Riḍā (Dār Maktabat al-Ḥayāt: n.d.), 52; Ibn al-Athīr, ‘Alī b. Muḥammad, *Asad al-ghāba* (Dār al-Kitāb al-‘Arabī: n.d.), 2:292.

¹⁰⁷ For example, see ‘Alī b. al-Ḥasan Ibn ‘Asākir, *Tārīkh madīnat Dimashq*, ed. ‘Alī Shīrī (Dār al-Fikr: 1415/1995), 35:395.

tates expressing meanings in simple language, free from literary affectations. The use of the word *tāmūr* in the *du‘ā* occurs completely naturally within a meaningful context that is free from affectation and verbal embellishment. We can confidently accept that this word was incorporated into this context when it was still in common use. Therefore, the text containing this phrase must belong to a period when this ancient word had not yet fallen into disuse, that is, before the third/ninth century.

Additionally, the *du‘ā* contains certain concepts expressed in their primitive and simple terminology, which could indicate the *du‘ā*'s antiquity. To explain: concepts and meanings themselves have their own history. They are born through social movements, under the influence of great thinkers, and similar factors. Initially, the terms referring to them take crude and primitive forms, and gradually become refined.

One example of these concepts in Shī‘ī culture is the concept of *tawassul* (seeking intercession) through the *Ahl al-Bayt*. While the essence of this concept certainly has an authentic and ancient position in Shī‘ī thought, the common terms used to refer to it have evolved over time. The widespread discussion among non-Shī‘īs about the possibility of the Prophet's intercession (*shafā‘a*), and the possibility of *tawassul* to obtain *shafā‘a*, dates back to the time of Imam al-Bāqir, when he was asked “is what the people of Kūfa narrate from you regarding the Prophet's intercession correct or not?”¹⁰⁸ In the first/seventh century and for long after, the concept of intercession was not yet common among non-Shī‘ī circles. Thus, there were not yet multiple terms with specific technical meanings to refer to this concept. During these periods, the Shī‘īs used different expressions, such as “turning to the Prophet,” “asking God through his mediation,” and so on. Gradually, as the culture of intercession became more widespread, the use of other terms also became common in Islamic culture. For this reason, in *al-Kāfi* by Kulaynī (d. 329/941), the actual word *tawassul* itself is

¹⁰⁸ Sulaymān b. Aḥmad al-Ṭabarānī, *al-Mu‘jam al-awsaṭ*, ed. Ṭāriq b. ‘Awaḍ Allāh b. Muḥammad and ‘Abd al-Muḥsin b. Ibrāhīm Ḥusaynī (Dār al-Ḥaramayn: 1415/1994), 2:307.

never used despite its numerous references to the culture of intercession.¹⁰⁹ It seems unlikely that this term, which refers to one of the fundamental and authentic concepts of Shi'ism, was common yet al-Kulaynī did not use it.¹¹⁰

In *Du'ā' 'Arafa*, for seeking intercession through the Prophet, the simple expression “we turn to You... through Muḥammad” (*natawaj-jahu ilayk ... bi-Muḥammadin*) is used; a completely basic expression that indicates an ancient period. This manner of expression can serve as evidence for attributing the text to a period before the fourth/tenth century, and to an era predating the composition of al-Kulaynī's *al-Kāfi*. If *Du'ā' 'Arafa* was a text from later than the first half of the second/eighth century, one would expect to find multiple instances of the term *tawassul* used in various contexts. The presence of such basic expressions further confirms the text's attribution to the era of the early Imams and its authenticity.

Finally, *Du'ā' 'Arafa* uses the word *raḥmān* as a description for God, not as His name: a feature more consistent with the text being from after the first/seventh century. Apparently, in early Islamic culture, the word *raḥmān* was initially the name for the one God in southern and central Arabia.¹¹¹ Even some claimants to prophethood in early Islam who arose from Yamāma and Yemen presented themselves as recipients of revelation from Raḥmān.¹¹² This name was so prevalent in early Islam that people would ask the Prophet about mentioning God by this name. By divine command, people were given the choice to call upon God as either Allāh or Raḥmān, since He has many beautiful names.¹¹³ On the other hand, the Meccans, who knew their god by the

¹⁰⁹ Except for one instance, which is due to manuscript variations; see al-Kulaynī, *al-Kāfi*, 4:74.

¹¹⁰ See Mihrwash, “Jāyigāh-i Tawassul dar Farhang-i Islāmī” (*Baṣīrat*: 1389 Sh./2011), 170-2.

¹¹¹ Arthur Jeffery, *The Foreign Vocabulary of the Quran* (Gorgias Press: 2009), the entry on Raḥmān.

¹¹² For example, see Ibn Kathīr, *al-Bidāya*, 6:375.

¹¹³ Q 17:110.

name of Allah and sought intercession from idols to draw closer to Him, apparently expressed their aversion, and objection to, identifying God by the name Raḥmān.¹¹⁴ Thus in early Islamic culture, Raḥmān emerged as an important divine name alongside Allāh, most prominently displayed in the *basmala*: “In the name of God—the Raḥmān—who is also merciful.” Various companions of the Prophet and first-generation successors emphasised this understanding that Raḥmān is one of the divine names.¹¹⁵ The Qur’ānic uses of the word *raḥmān* also present it as a name of God, not as a description of Him.¹¹⁶

However, over time with the widespread acceptance of Islam among Arabs and their recognition of the unity of Allāh and Raḥmān, the prevalence of the name Allāh reduced the usage of the name Raḥmān. Thus, Raḥmān came to be commonly understood merely as one of God’s attributes. Under these circumstances, Muslim exegetes in the later generations of the successors introduced Raḥmān, alongside Raḥīm, as an attribute of God. It was around the early decades of the second/eighth century that Raḥmān was interpreted as an attribute in contrast to Raḥīm. Exegetes in this intellectual climate explained that the attribute Raḥmān refers to God’s universal mercy, while Raḥīm refers to His specific mercy. Among the earliest theorists of this thinking, one can point to al-Ḍaḥḥāk b. Muzāḥim al-Hilālī (d. 105/724), the famous exegete from the generation of successors.¹¹⁷

Turning to *Du‘ā’ ‘Arafa*, we see this divine name—the Raḥmān—used as an attribute and in contrast with the attribute Raḥīm. In a passage near the end of the main supplication, God is referred to as “the Raḥmān of this world and the hereafter, and the Raḥīm of both” (*yā Raḥmān al-dunyā wa-l-ākhirā wa Raḥīmahumā*). This phrase undoubtedly uses the word Raḥmān as an attribute for God, not as a name. The

¹¹⁴ Q 13:30; Q 25:60.

¹¹⁵ al-Ṭabarī, *al-Tafsīr*, 1:89; Abū Ḥātim Muḥammad b. Idrīs al-Rāzī, *al-Tafsīr*, ed. As‘ad Muḥammad Ṭayyib (al-Maktabat al-‘Aṣriyya: n.d.), 1:26.

¹¹⁶ Gardet, L., “Basmala,” *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd edition (Brill: 1965-1995), 1:1084.

¹¹⁷ Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *al-Jarḥ wa al-ta‘dīl*, 1:28, 8:2683.

use of such an attribute for God cannot date back to before the early decades of the second/eighth century. This usage undoubtedly occurred at a time when, following the theorising of figures like al-Ḍaḥḥāk b. Muzāḥim and the general spread of these views, Raḥmān was considered an attribute of God, not His name.

Now is the time to piece together the evidence above to form a more precise picture of the period when *Du‘ā’ ‘Arafa* took shape. First, the supplication emerged in a multilingual environment that appears to date back at least to the late first/seventh century. Second, the use of Raḥmān as an attribute of God must also be connected to a time after the early decades of the second/eighth century. Third, the supplication contains ancient words and primitive terms that cannot be later than the second/eighth century. As observed, this evidence indicates that *Du‘ā’ ‘Arafa* emerged in the second/eighth century—neither earlier nor later.

6. Evidence Indicating the Main Supplication’s Issuance from Imam al-Ṣādiq

Regarding evidence that the main supplication of *Du‘ā’ ‘Arafa* can be attributed to Imam al-Ṣādiq, we should first note that there are narrations indicating discussions about the legitimacy of gathering for supplication on the Day of ‘Arafa in the middle of the second/eighth century. Questions were posed about this to both Imam al-Ṣādiq and some other followers of the successors. Some, like Imam al-Ṣādiq, saw no issue with it,¹¹⁸ while others, such as Mālīk b. Anas (d. 179/795) or slightly later, Abū Sulaymān al-Dārānī (d. 215/820), explicitly called these gatherings an innovation (*bid‘a*).¹¹⁹

From studying these reports, it becomes clear that the position of

¹¹⁸ al-Kulaynī, *al-Kāfi*, 2:487.

¹¹⁹ ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Ismā‘īl Abū Shama al-Maqdisī, *al-Bā‘ith ‘alā inkār al-bida‘ wa-l-ḥawādith*, ed. Uthmān Aḥmad ‘Anbar (Dār al-Hudā: 1398/1978), 9:263.

figures, like Mālik b. Anas, regarding Muslims gathering for supplication on the Day of ‘Arafa was a response to Imam al-Ṣādiq’s position. Although he does not explicitly name the Imam, by labelling such gatherings as an innovation (*bid‘a*), he seeks to critique a perspective that Imam al-Ṣādiq was the main proponent of. On the other hand, it can naturally be accepted that Imam al-Ṣādiq, who himself promoted such gatherings, would also prepare programs for them, including teaching a supplication to be recited during them.

On this basis, the recording of the supplication by two literary companions of the Imam, namely ‘Abd al-Malik and Ishāq b. Ghālib al-Asadī, was not coincidental. Just as they were responsible for recording other sermons of the Imam, they were present in the desert at Imam al-Ṣādiq’s command with prior preparation and recorded the supplication. The complete similarity in writing style between this supplication and other sermons these two narrators transmitted from Imam al-Ṣādiq supports this hypothesis—a matter whose details must be sought in another independent study. In other words, contrary to the assumption that the *du‘ā’* was transmitted purely orally as a lengthy report, it must be acknowledged that the writers of the supplication were the same people to whom Imam al-Ṣādiq entrusted the writing and recording of his other sermons, and from the very beginning, the supplication was transmitted in written form.

7. Dating the Appendix of *Du‘ā’ ‘Arafa*

Although, as previously mentioned, the content of the appendix can be considered a continuation of the content of the main supplication, the appendix must nevertheless be considered independent from the main supplication in several aspects.

7.1 Key Phrases for Dating the Appendix

Firstly, the sons of Ghālib al-Asadī themselves narrate that when the Imam finished the first section, he concluded by repeatedly saying “O Lord, O Lord” (*yā rabbi yā rabbi*) Then, at sunset, he returned from ‘Ar-

aḥādith with his companions and proceeded to Mash‘ar.¹²⁰ This report itself indicates that the Imam’s discourse concluded with the end of the main supplication. Secondly, Sufi expressions such as poverty (*iftiqār*), others (*aghyār*), and similar terms appear in the appendix with their technical meanings as used by the Sufis.¹²¹ These expressions are more consistent with later Sufi thought, than with the literature of the *Ahl al-Bayt* in the first two centuries of Islam. As evidence, the numerous traditions of the *Ahl al-Bayt* in Kulaynī’s *al-Kāfi* are devoid of these terms, indicating that such terminology has no precedent in the language and literature of the *Ahl al-Bayt*, even among the later Imams. This is the same point that, as mentioned earlier, had caught the attention of al-‘Allāma al-Majlisī. Thirdly, the term *tawassul* is used in the appendix, where one makes their *faqr* (poverty) a means of approaching God. As we mentioned, *tawassul* is also an expression whose use in Islamic literature should be associated with the period after the fourth/tenth century. Based on all these pieces of evidence, we must confirm the aforementioned judgment of Turābī and Karbaschi regarding the rejection of attributing this portion of the supplication to the *Ahl al-Bayt*.

7.2 Comparative Stylistics of the Main Text and Appendix

Several other pieces of evidence and indicators can be shown that demonstrate the stylistic differences between the author of the main text and the appendix. Firstly, in the main text, the breaks (*fawāṣil*)—in the technical sense used in Qur’ānic sciences—change less frequently than in the appendix. In other words, the number of rhyming

¹²⁰ al-Majlisī, *Biḥār al-anwār*, 95:213, citing manuscripts of *al-Balad al-amīn* by al-Kaf‘amī.

¹²¹ For some of the earliest technical uses of these two terms among Sufis, see respectively: Muḥammad b. Ḥusayn al-Sulamī, *al-Tafsīr*, ed. Sayyid ‘Imrān (Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyya: 1421/2001), 2:103; Qushayrī, *al-Risāla*, ed. ‘Abd al-Ḥalīm Maḥmūd and Maḥmūd b. Sharīf (Dār al-Sha‘b: 1409/1989), 146. Also, for some other examples, see Turābī, “Pazhūhishī Darbāra-yi Dhayl-i Du‘ā-yi ‘Arafa,” 54.

sentences in the main text is much greater. This means that if we consider each rhyming section as a paragraph—or in Qur’ānic sciences terminology, a section (*rukū‘*)—the number of sentences in each section of the main text is much higher than the number of sentences in each section of the appendix. Put differently, key themes in the main text are supported by a greater number of sentences (usually 7-8 sentences), whereas in the appendix, topics change frequently—usually after just two or three supporting sentences. The main text reflects the spirit of a calm and confident individual, while the appendix shows an agitation and excitement that manifests itself through frequent topic changes. Thirdly, the main text and appendix differ in terms of the author’s focus on literary techniques. In the main text, the greatest emphasis for creating an artistic text is placed on the device of associated meanings (*murā‘āt nazīr*);¹²² whereas the creator of the appendix pursues this goal by presenting paradoxical images.¹²³ Thirdly, the nature of the presence of the human self (*nafs*) also differs in the main text and appendix. The supplicant’s chief emphasis in the main text is on expressing God’s blessings and favours. His own presence in the main text is very secondary and subtle. Conversely, in the appendix, self-talk (*ḥadīth nafs*) is much more common. In other words, in the appendix of *Du‘ā’ ‘Arafa*, the supplicant’s main focus is on expressing his or her own spiritual states, whereas in the main supplication, the supplicant’s emphasis is on expressing his or her devotion to God.

In addition, the text of the appendix contains many allusive expressions and indirect, veiled requests, whereas the main text lacks such expressions and contains direct requests. Finally, the majority of the appendix is devoted to expressing the supplicant’s personal religious experiences, while in the main supplication there is much less focus on expressing this. Based on all this evidence, one cannot accept that the main text and the appendix form a unified text.

¹²² For a study of a short section as an example, see Mihrwash, “Huwiyyat,” 27-9.

¹²³ See throughout the appendix of *Du‘ā’ ‘Arafa*.

7.3 Dating the Appendix

Based on the above evidence, we can now date the appendix. It appears that the appendix was composed in the period after al-Kulaynī, that is, after the first decades of the fourth/tenth century, when the term *tawassul* became commonly used in its conventional religious meaning. However, a more precise dating requires an independent study.

The conclusion of the discussion about dating *Du'ā' 'Arafa* is that the main text most likely belongs to the second/eighth century and was issued by Imam al-Ṣādiq. The appendix must have been composed at least about two centuries after the main text, that is, after the fourth/tenth century.

Conclusion

We have seen that through a linguistic and historical study of the text of *Du'ā' 'Arafa* one can largely compensate for the deficiencies of traditional methods of *ḥadīth* science and find a way to ensure the authenticity of the *du'ā'*'s issuance from an Infallible. As we have seen, based on the mentioned evidence, one can date the formation of this *du'ā'* to some time in the second/eighth century, which is consistent with its issuance from Imam al-Ṣādiq, not from Imam al-Ḥusayn. Secondly, Imam al-Ḥusayn's connection with Bishr and Bashīr during the *ḥajj* season and the Day of 'Arafa seems impossible, whereas it is very natural to imagine Imam al-Ṣādiq and his family and close students, such as the sons of Ghālib b. Bishr b. Ghālib al-Asadī, performing this ritual together during the *ḥajj* season and on the Day of 'Arafa. Thirdly, in addition to transmitting *Du'ā' 'Arafa*, 'Abdullāh and Ishāq b. Ghālib al-Asadī showed great attention to recording other lengthy sermons of Imam al-Ṣādiq, which could also indicate their interest in recording such a *du'ā'*. Fourth, 'Abdullāh and Ishāq b. Ghālib al-Asadī were both poets and men of letters, and one would expect them more than anyone else to appreciate the artistic value of *Du'ā' 'Arafa* and strive to preserve it. Fifth, one can accept that Imam al-Ṣādiq—who, unlike his contemporaries such as Mālik b. Anas and some others, was among

the promoters of congregation and group supplication at ‘Arafāt—would himself plan to participate in such ceremonies and, similar to other instances of planned preservation and recording of his sermons by the Ibn Ghālib family, would entrust the recording of this supplication to them as well.

Finally, one can hypothesise that in one of the *ḥadīth* books *Du‘ā’ ‘Arafa* might have been narrated with an *isnād* like: “... from the two sons of Ghālib al-Asadī, from Abū ‘Abdullāh...” Later traditionists and copyists might then have made mistakes in identifying the two sons of Ghālib al-Asadī and the person with the *kunya* of Abū ‘Abdullāh. On the one hand, they might have confused the two sons of Ghālib al-Asadī, who were among the companions of the earlier Imams, with their grandsons who were companions of Imam al-Ṣādiq. On the other hand, they might have confused Imam al-Ḥusayn with Imam al-Ṣādiq, both of whom shared the *kunya* of Abū ‘Abdullāh.

As emphasised earlier, the nature of this study is based on cumulative hypotheses, and therefore complementary studies are necessary to discover new evidence and analyses, that either supports or refutes the aforementioned hypothesis. Among these studies could be a comparative stylistic analysis of the text of *Du‘ā’ ‘Arafa* with other sermons and statements that ‘Abdullāh and Ishāq b. Ghālib al-Asadī have narrated from Imam al-Ṣādiq. Additionally, efforts to date a larger number of words and expressions from *Du‘ā’ ‘Arafa* would be very beneficial.

In any case, whatever the outcome of future studies, we can now confidently say that *Du‘ā’ ‘Arafa*, attributed to Imam al-Ḥusayn, has its roots in the teachings of the *Ahl al-Bayt* and is a transmitted (*ma‘thūr*) *du‘ā’*. Although the passage of time has caused a minor textual corruption in recording the name of the *du‘ā’*’s composer and its two main narrators, various pieces of evidence indicate its belonging to the era of the *Ahl al-Bayt*’s presence. Furthermore, we have learnt that, contrary to what is frequently assumed, the transmission of lengthy narrations, such as the supplications of the *Ahl al-Bayt*, was not originally oral in nature but was often the result of careful advance planning to ensure the accuracy of written recording, and possibly reviewed by the

infallible Imam himself. On this basis, we can be much more optimistic about many other transmitted texts that are only found in later books and were previously thought to have no reliable narrative foundation, although of course examining the authenticity of each text is the subject of separate studies.

Bibliography

- Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī, Muḥammad b. Idrīs, al-Tafsīr, ed. As'ad Muḥammad Ṭayyib, al-Maktabat al-‘Aṣriyya: n.d.
- Abū Nu‘aym al-Iṣfahānī, Aḥmad b. ‘Abd Allāh, *Ḥilyat al-awliyā’*, Dār al-Kutub al-‘Arabī: 1405/1984.
- Abū Shama al-Maqdisī, ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Ismā‘īl, *al-Bā‘ith ‘alā inkār al-bida‘ wa-l-ḥawādith*, ed. Uthmān Aḥmad ‘Anbar, Dār al-Hudā: 1398/1978.
- Abū l-Shaykh al-Iṣfahānī, ‘Abdullāh b. Muḥammad, *Ṭabaqāt al-muḥaddithīn bi-Iṣbahān*, ed. ‘Abdulghafūr Bilūshī, n.p.: 1412/1991.
- al-Ahwāzī, al-Ḥusayn b. Sa‘īd, *al-Zuhd*, ed. Ghulām Riḍā ‘Irfāniyān, al-Maṭba‘at al-‘Ilmiyya: 1399/1979.
- ‘Alī, Jawād, *al-Mufaṣṣal fī tārikh al-‘Arab qabl al-Islām*, Maktabat al-Nihda: 1388/1968.
- al-Ardabilī, Muḥammad b. ‘Alī, *Jāmi‘ al-ruwāt*, Dār al-Aḍwā’: 1403/1983.
- Aws b. Ḥajar, *Dīwān*, ed. Maḥmūd Yūsuf Najm, Dār Biyrūt: 1400/1980.
- al-Barqī, Aḥmad b. Muḥammad, *al-Maḥāsin*, ed. Jalāl al-Dīn Muḥaddith, Islāmiyya: 1370/1951.
- al-Barrī, Muḥammad b. Abī Bakr, *al-Jawhara fī nasab al-nabī wa aṣḥābihi al-‘ashara*, ed. Muḥammad Tūnjī, Maktabat Nūrī: 1402/1981.
- Bī-Āzār Shīrāzī, ‘Abd al-Karīm, *Du‘ā’-i Rūz-i ‘Arafa (Rūz-i Shinākht)*, Daftar-i Nashr-i Farhang-i Islāmī: 1373 Sh./1994.
- al-Bukhārī, Muḥammad b. Ismā‘īl, *al-Tārikh al-kabīr*, n.p.: 1398/1978.
- Cleveland, W. L., *A History of the Modern Middle East*, Westview Press: 1999.
- Furqānī, Muḥammad Kāẓim, “‘Irfān-i Sayyid al-Shuhadā’,” *Mishkāt* 82

(1383 Sh./2004).

Gardet, L., "Basmala," In vol. 1, *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd edition, Brill: 1965-1995.

Gibb, H. A. R., "Abd Allah b. al-Zubayr," In vol. 1, *Encyclopedia of Islam*, 2nd edition, Brill: 1965-1995.

al-Ḥā'irī al-Māzandarānī, Muḥammad b. Ismā'īl, *Muntahā al-maqāl*, ed. Āl al-Bayt, Mu'assasat Āl al-Bayt: 1416/1995.

al-Ḥillī, 'Alī b. Yūsuf, *al-'Adad al-qawīyya*, ed. Mahdī Rajā'ī, Maktabat al-Mar'ashī: 1408/1987.

al-Ḥurr al-'Āmilī, Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan, *Amal al-āmil*, ed. Sayyid Aḥmad Ḥusaynī, Maktabat al-Andalus: 1385/1965.

Husayni Eshkavari, Ahmad, *Fihrist-i Nuskhahā-yi Khaṭṭī-yi Kitābkhāna-yi 'Umūmī-yi Ayatollah al-'Uzmā Najafī Mar'ashī*, Kitābkhāna-yi Mar'ashī: 1354 Sh./1975–onwards.

al-Ḥuwayzī, 'Abd 'Alī b. Jum'a, *Nūr al-thaqalayn*, Ismā'īliyān: 1370 Sh./1991.

Ibn Abī al-Dunyā, 'Abdullāh b. Muḥammad, *Makārim al-akhlāq*, ed. Majdī Sayyid Ibrāhīm, Maktabat al-Qur'ān: 1411/1990.

Ibn Abī Ḥātim, 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad, *al-Jarḥ wa-l-ta'dīl*, n.p.: 1371/1952–onwards.

Ibn Abī Shayba, 'Abdullāh b. Muḥammad, *al-Muṣannaf*, ed. Kamāl Yūsuf Ḥūt, Maktabat al-Rushd: 1409/1988.

Ibn Abī Uṣaybi'a, Aḥmad b. al-Qāsim, *'Uyūn al-anbā' fī ṭabaqāt al-aṭibbā'*, ed. Nizār Riḍā, Dār Maktabat al-Ḥayāt: n.d.

Ibn 'Adī, 'Abdullāh, al-Kāmil fī ḍu'afā' al-rijāl, ed. Yaḥyā Mukhtār Ghazāwī, Beirut: 1409/1988.

Ibn 'Ajība, Aḥmad b. Muḥammad, *Īqāz al-himam*, Dār al-Ma'ārif: n.d.

Ibn 'Aṭā'ullāh al-Iskandarānī, Aḥmad b. Muḥammad, al-Ḥikam al-'aṭā'iyya, in Ibn 'Ajība, *Īqāz al-himam*, Dār al-Ma'ārif: n.d.

Ibn A'tham, Aḥmad, *al-Futūḥ*, ed. 'Alī Shīrī, Dār al-Aḍwā': 1411/1991.

Ibn al-Athīr, 'Alī b. Muḥammad, *Asad al-ghāba*, Dār al-Kitāb al-'Arabī: n.d.

Ibn 'Asākir, 'Alī b. al-Ḥasan, *Tārīkh madīnat Dimashq*, ed. 'Alī Shīrī, Dār al-Fikr: 1415/1995.

Ibn Bābawayh, Muḥammad b. 'Alī, *Ṭal al-sharā'i'*, al-Maktabat al-

- Ḥaydariyya: 1385/1966.
- Ibn Bābawayh, Muḥammad b. ‘Alī, *al-Tawḥīd*, ed. Hāshim Ḥusaynī Tihirānī, Ṣadūq: 1387/1967.
- Ibn Bābawayh, Muḥammad b. ‘Alī, *Man lā yaḥḍuruḥu al-faqīh*, ed. ‘Alī Akbar Ghaffārī, Jāmi‘at al-Mudarrisīn: 1404/1983.
- Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī, Aḥmad b. ‘Alī, *Lisān al-mīzān*, A‘lamī: 1390/1971.
- Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī, Aḥmad b. ‘Alī, *Tahdhīb al-tahdhīb*, Dār al-Fikr: 1404/1984.
- Ibn Ḥibbān, Muḥammad, *al-Thiqāt*, n.p.: 1393/1973.
- Ibn al-Jawzī, ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. ‘Alī, *al-Mawḍū‘āt*, ed. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān Muḥammad ‘Uthmān, n.p.: 1386/1966.
- Ibn Kathīr, Ismā‘īl, *al-Bidāya wa-l-nihāya*, ed. ‘Alī Shīrī, Dār Iḥyā’ al-Turāth al-‘Arabī: 1408/1988.
- Ibn Namā al-Ḥillī, Muḥammad b. Ja‘far, *Muthīr al-aḥzān*, Maṭba‘at al-Ḥaydariyya: 1369/1950.
- Ibn Qūlawayh, Ja‘far b. Muḥammad, *Kāmil al-ziyārāt*, ed. Jawād Qayyūmī, Nashr al-Faqāha: 1417/1996.
- Ibn Qutayba, ‘Abdullāh b. Muslim, Gharīb al-ḥadīth, ed. ‘Abdullāh al-Jabūrī, Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyya: 1408/1988.
- Ibn Sa‘d, Muḥammad, “*Tarjamat al-Imām al-Ḥusayn wa Maqataluhū*,” In *al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā*, ed. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz Ṭabāṭabā‘ī, Āl al-Bayt: 1415/1994.
- Ibn Ṭāwūs, Sayyid Raḍī al-Dīn ‘Alī b. Mūsā, *Iqbāl al-a‘māl*, ed. Jawād Qayyūmī, Maktab al-‘Ilām al-Islāmī: 1414/1993.
- Ja‘farī, Muḥammad Taqī, *Niyāyish Imam Ḥusayn dar Ṣaḥrā-yi ‘Arafāt*, n.p.: 1361 Sh./1982.
- Jeffery, Arthur, *The Foreign Vocabulary of the Quran*, Gorgias Press: 2009.
- al-Kaf‘amī, Ibrāhīm b. ‘Alī, *al-Balad al-amīn*, lithograph ed., calligraphy by Aḥmad Najafī Zanjānī, Ṣadūq: 1383/1963.
- Karbaschi, Mohammad Mahdi, “Barrasī-yi Matn, Sanad, Shurūḥ, wa Nusakh-i Khaṭṭī-yi Maṣādir-i Awwaliyya-yi Qismat-i Duwwum-i Du‘ā-yi ‘Arafa-yi Sayyid al-Shuhadā’,” MA thesis, Dānishkada-yi ‘Ulūm-i Ḥadīth, 1385 Sh./2006.
- al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, Aḥmad b. ‘Alī, *Tārīkh Baghdād*, Dār al-Kutub al-

- ‘Ilmiyya: n.d.
- Khomeini, Sayyid Ruhollah, *al-Makāsib al-muḥarrama*, Ismā‘īliyān: 1410/1989.
- Khomeini, Sayyid Ruhollah, *Waṣīyyat-nāma*, Qadr-i Wilāyat: 1374 Sh./1995.
- Kohlberg, Etan, *A Medieval Muslim Scholar at Work: Ibn Tawus & His Library*, Brill: 1992.
- al-Kūfi, Muḥammad b. Sulaymān, *Manāqib amīr al-mu’minīn*, ed. Muḥammad Bāqir Maḥmūdī, Majma‘ Iḥyā’ al-Thaqāfa al-Islāmiyya: 1412/1991.
- al-Kulaynī, Muḥammad b. Ya‘qūb, *al-Kāfi*, ed. ‘Alī Akbar Ghaffārī, Islāmiyya: 1363 Sh./1984.
- al-Majlisī, Muḥammad Bāqir b. Muḥammad Taqī, *Bihār al-anwār*, Wafā’: 1403/1983.
- Mālik b. Anas, *al-Muwatta’*, ed. Muḥammad Fu’ād ‘Abd al-Bāqī, Dār Iḥyā’ al-Turāth al-‘Arabī: n.d.
- Mihrwash, Farhang, “Gūna Shināsī-yi Ta‘līfāt-i Du‘ā’ī-yi ‘Alimān-i Musalmān Tā Zamān-i Ibn Ṭāwūs, wa Siyri Taḥawwul-i ān,” *Pajūhish Qur’ān wa Ḥadīth* 2 (1386 Sh./2008).
- Mihrwash, Farhang, “Huwiyyat wa Intisāb-i Ṣaḥīfa-yi Sajjādiyya, bā Tikya bar Shākhiṣaha-yi Matn,” Masters diss., Dānishgāh-i Imām-i Ṣādiq: 1382 Sh./2003.
- Mihrwash, Farhang, “Jāyigāh-i Tawassul dar Farhang-i Islāmī,” in *Gustara-yi Du‘ā-Pazhūhī*, Baṣīrat: 1389 Sh./2010.
- Mihrwash, Farhang, “Mashīkha-yi Abān b. Taghlib dar Ṭabagha-yi Ṣaḥāba wa Ṭabī‘īn,” *Ḥadīth Pajūhī* 3/5 (1390 Sh./2011).
- Modarressi Tabataba’i, Hossein, *Tradition and Survival, A Bibliographical Survey of Early Shiite Literature*, Oneworld: 2003.
- al-Muḥaddith al-Qummī, ‘Abbās, *Mafātīḥ al-jinān*, lithograph ed., calligraphy by Ṭāhir Khushniwīs, Daftar-i Nashr-i Farhang-i Islāmī: 1370 Sh./1991.
- al-Narāqī, Muḥammad Mahdī b. Abī Dharr, *Jāmi‘ al-sa‘ādāt*, ed. Muḥammad Kalāntar, Maṭba‘at al-Nu‘mān: n.d.
- al-Nu‘mān al-Maghribī, *Sharḥ al-akhbār*, ed. Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ḥusaynī Jalālī, Jāmi‘at al-Mudarrisīn: n.d.

- al-Nu'mānī, Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm, *al-Ghayba*, ed. Fāris Ḥassūn, Anwār al-Hudā: 1422/2001.
- Pakatchi, Ahmad, "Jizya," in *Dā'irat al-Ma'ārif-i Buzurg-i Islāmī*, vol. 18, ed. Kāẓim Mūsawī Bujnūrdī et al., Markaz-i Dā'irat al-Ma'ārif-i Buzurg-i Islāmī: 1389 Sh./2010.
- al-Qummī, 'Alī b. Ibrāhīm, *al-Tafsīr*, ed. Ṭayyib Mūsawī Jazā'irī, Dār al-Kitāb: 1404/1983.
- al-Qushayrī, 'Abd al-Karīm b. Hawāzin, *al-Risāla*, ed. 'Abd al-Ḥalīm Maḥmūd and Maḥmūd b. Sharīf, Dār al-Sha'b: 1409/1989.
- al-Rāzī, Fakhr al-Dīn Muḥammad b. 'Umar, *al-Tafsīr al-kabīr*, al-Maṭba'at al-Bahiyya: n.d.
- Ruknī Yazdī, Muḥammad Mahdī, "Āyā Du'ā-yi 'Arafa Waḥdat-i Wujūd rā Bayān Mīkunad?" *Mishkāt* 83 (1383 Sh./2004), 54-8.
- al-Sabzawārī, Hādī b. Mahdī, *Sharḥ al-asmā' al-ḥusnā*, lithograph offset, calligraphy by Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭūbā, Baṣīratī: n.d.
- al-Sabzawārī, Hādī b. Mahdī, *Sharḥ al-asmā' al-ḥusnā*, lithograph offset, calligraphy by Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭūbā, Baṣīratī: n.d.
- al-Şaffār, Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan, *Başā'ir al-darajāt*, A'lamī: 1404/1984.
- al-Şahīfa al-sajjādiyya al-kāmila*, attributed to Imam 'Alī b. Ḥusayn, lithograph ed., calligraphy by 'Abd al-Raḥīm Afshārī Zanjānī, Jāmi'at al-Mudarrisīn: 1404/1984.
- Şafwat, Aḥmad Zakī, *Tarjamat 'Alī b. Abī Ṭālib*, Maṭba'at al-'Ulūm, 1932.
- al-Sha'rānī, Abū l-Qāsim, *Du'ā-yi 'Arafa-yi Ḥaḍrat-i Abā 'Abdillāh*, Rūh: 1383 Sh./2004.
- al-Sharnūbī, 'Abd al-Majīd, *Sharḥ al-ḥikam al-'atā'iyya*, digital reprint of 1304/1887 (Cairo edition), available at www.al-mostafa.com, accessed August 2011.
- Sharī'atī, 'Alī, *Taḥlīlī az Manāsik-i Ḥajj*, Ilhām: 1383 Sh./2004.
- al-Shūshtarī, Muḥammad Taqī, *Qāmūs al-rijāl*, Jāmi'at al-Mudarrisīn: 1419/1998.
- al-Sulamī, Muḥammad b. Ḥusayn, *al-Tafsīr*, ed. Sayyid 'Imrān, Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyya: 1421/2001.
- al-Ṭabarānī, Sulaymān b. Aḥmad, *al-Du'ā'*, ed. Muṣṭafā 'Abd al-Qādir 'Aṭā, Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyya: 1413/1993.

- al-Ṭabarānī, Sulaymān b. Aḥmad, *al-Muʿjam al-awsaṭ*, ed. Ṭāriq b. ʿAwaḍ Allāh b. Muḥammad and ʿAbd al-Muḥsin b. Ibrāhīm Ḥusaynī, Dār al-Ḥaramayn: 1415/1994.
- al-Ṭabarī, Muḥammad b. Jarīr, *Tārīkh al-umam wa-l-mulūk*, Aʿlamī: 1403/1983.
- al-Ṭabarī, Muḥammad b. Jarīr, *al-Tafsīr*, Dār al-Fikr: 1415/1995.
- al-Ṭabarī, Muḥibb al-Dīn Aḥmad b. ʿAbdullāh, *Dhakhāʾir al-ʿuqbā*, Maktabat al-Qudsī: 1356/1937.
- Turābī, Ḥusayn, “Pazhūhishī Darbāra-yi Dhayl-i Duʿā-yi ʿArafa,” *Mīqāt-i Ḥajj* 51 (1384 Sh./2005).
- al-Ṭūsī, Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan, *al-Ghayba*, ed. ʿIbād Allāh Tihirānī and ʿAlī Aḥmad Nāṣiḥ, Muʿassasat al-Maʿārif al-Islāmiyya: 1411/1990.
- al-Ṭūsī, Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan, *al-Amālī*, Dār al-Thaqāfa: 1414/1993.
- al-Ṭūsī, Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan, *al-Rijāl*, ed. Jawād Qayyūmī, Jāmiʿat al-Mudarrisīn, 1415/1994.
- Wakīʿ al-Qāḍī, Muḥammad b. Khalaf, *Akhbār al-quḍāt*, ʿĀlam al-Kutub: n.d.