

Examination and Evaluation of the Views of Rijāl Scholars on ‘Abd Allāh b. Qāsim with Emphasis on His Traditions

Mohammadebrahim Roshanzamir

Associate Professor, Department of Qur’anic Sciences and Ḥadith, Razavi University of Islamic Sciences, Mashhad, Iran. Email: roshanzamir@razavi.ac.ir

Muṣṭafa Mahdawi Arjmand

PhD Candidate in Qur’anic Sciences and Ḥadith, Razavi University of Islamic Sciences, Mashhad, Iran. (Corresponding Author). Email: mahdawi.argmand@gmail.com

Received: 30/12/2022

Accepted: 18/03/2023

Introduction

‘Abd Allāh b. Qāsim Ḥaḍramī is one of the transmitters of ḥadīth in Shī‘ī sources who has attracted the attention of rijāl scholars due to his relatively extensive activity in narrating ḥadīths and accusations such as exaggeration (ghulūw), falsehood (kadhib), being a Wāqifī, and narrating from exaggerators (ghulāt). His name appears in the chains of transmission of ḥadīths either without a title or with titles such as Ḥaḍramī, Ḥārithī, and Ja‘farī, which has raised questions about whether these refer to a single individual or distinct personalities. The present study aims to examine and evaluate the views of early and later rijāl scholars regarding ‘Abd Allāh b. Qāsim and to analyze the ḥadīths attributed to him, seeking to answer two main questions: first, the level of credibility of ‘Abd Allāh b. Qāsim based on historical and ḥadīth-related data; second, the methodology of rijāl scholars in evaluating him. By comparing rijāl data and the content of his traditions, this study endeavors to clarify his position in the chain of ḥadīth transmission and to elucidate the approach of rijāl scholars in dealing with transmitters and ḥadīth books. The significance of this research lies in critiquing previous views, particularly claims of his reliability (wathāqa), and providing a more comprehensive analysis of his biography and traditions.

Materials and Methods

This research was conducted using a descriptive-analytical method and relied on library sources. Primary data were collected from authoritative rijāl sources such as Rijāl al-Najāshī, Rijāl al-Shaykh al-Ṭūsī, Rijāl Ibn al-Ghaḍā‘irī, Mustadrakāt ‘Ilm Rijāl al-Ḥadīth, as well as ḥadīth collections such as al-Kāfī, Biḥār al-Anwār, Wasā’il al-Shī‘a, and Baṣā’ir al-Darajāt. Initially, the views of early and later rijāl scholars regarding ‘Abd Allāh b. Qāsim were extracted and categorized. These views were examined under five main themes: 1) the unity or distinction of ‘Abd Allāh b. Qāsim (without title), Ḥaḍramī, Ḥārithī, and

Ja'farī; 2) the accusation of being a Wāqifī; 3) the duality of exaggeration (ghulūw) and falsehood (kadhib) versus claims of virtue and perfection; 4) narrating from exaggerators (ghulāt); 5) the fame of his book and its implication for reliability. Subsequently, the traditions attributed to him were analyzed in terms of content and chain of transmission to assess the validity of the accusations against him. To analyze the question of unity or distinction, rijāl and Isnadary evidence, such as shared teachers (mashāyikh) and students, and common descriptions (e.g., “al-Baṭāl”), were considered. In examining the accusations, the content of his traditions was compared with the criteria for ghulūw in rijāl sources. Additionally, the chains of transmission of his traditions and the number of traditions transmitted by the transmitters of his book were analyzed to evaluate the fame of his book. These methods enabled a more precise evaluation of ‘Abd Allāh b. Qāsim’s credibility and the methodology of rijāl scholars.

Results and Findings

The findings of the study indicate that ‘Abd Allāh b. Qāsim (without title), Ḥaḍramī, and Ḥārithī are likely the same individual, whereas ‘Abd Allāh b. Qāsim Ja'farī, due to his direct tradition from Imām al-Ṣādiq (‘A. S.) and differences in generation, is a distinct personality. Evidence for unity includes similar descriptions in the works of al-Najāshī and Ibn al-Ghaḍā’irī, shared epithets such as “al-Baṭāl,” and overlap in teachers and students (e.g., Mūsā b. Sa’dān and ‘Abd Allāh b. Sinān). Conversely, evidence for distinction, such as separate entries in some rijāl sources and differences in attributes (Kūfī and Baṣrī), is less compelling. Regarding the accusation of being a Wāqifī, a tradition from Firaq al-Shī’a by al-Nawbakhtī, which refers to the belief in the continued life of Mūsā b. Ja'far (‘a), supports al-Shaykh al-Ṭūsī’s view, although some sources, such as Qāmūs al-Rijāl, find insufficient evidence for this accusation. Concerning the accusations of ghulūw and kadhib, analysis of his traditions shows that their content, such as interpreting Qur’anic verses in favor of the virtues of the Ahl al-Bayt or narrating ḥadīths about the supernatural powers of the Imāms, could be considered ghulūw from the perspective of some rijāl scholars. However, this accusation depends on the ijtihādī principles of the rijāl scholars and is not definitively provable for those who do not consider such content as ghulūw. Furthermore, the presence of jurisprudential and devotional traditions from him refutes accusations of permissiveness (ibāḥa) or ghulūw in essence, though ghulūw in the attributes of the Imāms is more plausible. Regarding narrating from exaggerators, although most of his teachers are reliable (thiqa), his tradition from individuals such as Yūnus b. Zabyān confirms al-Najāshī’s accusation. Finally, the fame of his book, due to its transmission by transmitters such as Mūsā b. Sa’dān and ‘Alī b. Ma’bad, who are themselves weak or unknown, cannot serve as evidence of his

reliability. These findings indicate a relative weakness in ‘Abd Allāh b. Qāsim’s position in the chain of ḥadith transmission and highlight the influence of the ijtihādī principles of rijāl scholars in evaluating him.

Conclusion

This study demonstrates that ‘Abd Allāh b. Qāsim Ḥaḍramī is most likely the same as ‘Abd Allāh b. Qāsim (without title) and Ḥārithī, but Ja‘farī is a distinct personality. The accusation of being a Wāqifī is supported by traditional evidence, but the accusations of ghulūw and kadhib depend on the ijtihādī principles of rijāl scholars and cannot be definitively proven. His tradition from exaggerators, though limited, is valid, and the fame of his book, due to the weakness of its transmitters, does not constitute evidence of reliability. Therefore, not only is ‘Abd Allāh b. Qāsim’s reliability unproven, but there are incomplete indications of his weakness. These results underscore the need to reconsider the methodology of rijāl scholars and emphasize the importance of analyzing the content of traditions alongside rijāl data. Future research could focus on a comparative analysis of his traditions and those of his contemporary transmitters to further clarify his credibility and status.

Keywords: ‘Abd Allāh b. Qāsim, Ḥaḍramī, Wāqifī, Ghālī, Kadhdhāb.