

Bada and Its Role in the Debates over Shi`i Doctrine

Cemil Hakyemez

Abstract

This article examines the sense and significance of *bada*. I investigate when and who devised this concept, discuss its use as a proof in debates among the Shi`ahs concerning the Imamate after going through several transformations, and analyze the Shi`i theologians' efforts to interpret it in line with the doctrine of *naskh* (abrogation) in order to demonstrate that *bada* is not one of the bases upon which Shi`i belief is grounded.

Introduction

The notion of *bada*, defined as "God's changing of His mind" or "God's abrogation of His earlier decision," has been widely debated by Muslim theologians and within the Shi`i branch of Islam, in which it was elaborated upon the most. Due to the debates revolving around the Shi`i doctrine of Imamate (supreme leadership), *bada* assumed different meanings at different times. However, the scholars who studied it tended to limit themselves to citing its literal sense as a term and its emergence as a principle. Yet this issue begs an in-depth discussion in the context of the notion-history relationship.¹ Hence, this study investigates its religio-political background, when and how it arose, what kinds of processes of justification and transformation it underwent, which meanings it assumed at different times, and the real nature of the ongoing debates within the Shi`i tradition.

The Arabic word *shi`ah* is a collective name for those Muslim groups who believe that the Prophet appointed `Ali ibn Abi Talib as caliph, with a

Cemil Hakyemez has a Ph.D. in the history of Islamic sects and is a research assistant in the Department of the History of Islamic Sects, Hitit University Theology School, Çorum, Turkey.

sacred text and divine designation, and that the Imamate belongs exclusively to `Ali's progeny via his wife Fatimah (the Prophet's daughter).² Viewed by the Shi`ahs as one of Islam's most important pillars, the doctrine of Imamate depends upon the image of a divinely designated and infallible Imam to whom Allah gave the revealed knowledge of everything needed by the Muslim community. In other words, the principle of a divinely designated Imam is a *sine qua non* of the Imamate theory.

I argue that *bada* is a result of this doctrine. If the notion of God's pre-designation of the Imams did not exist, the Shi`ah would not have paid any attention to the idea that "God changed His mind." In addition, they would not have been shocked by the unexpected death of an Imam whom they believed to be divinely appointed, nor would they have claimed that God had changed His mind and appointed another Imam. Perhaps they would have considered the subject within the exclusive context of *naskh* (abrogation). Thus, we can safely say that *bada* has a relationship with the doctrine of the "God's pre-designation of the Imam."

The word *bada* literally means "becoming manifest and clear, appearance, the arising of knowledge after being absent, the dawn of an idea in the mind."³ As a technical term, it is defined as the happening of an incident that God had willed to take place in a certain way, in contrast to the way in which it actually occurred as a result of God changing His mind. In short, the term indicates possible changes in God's attributes of omniscience, will, and creation.⁴

The term *naskh*, which literally means removing an earlier edict by a later sacred text, is often used as a synonym for *bada*.⁵ In the case of *bada*, the subject matter is the coming-true of the opposite of what a report revealed by God states. In the former case, God establishes an edict but then replaces it with another one. However, *bada* involves changing God's mind as reflected in His reports regarding His servants. Therefore, al-Shahristani attributes different meanings to *bada*. The first one relates to knowledge (*ilm*), meaning the occurrence of something in contradiction to the way God had willed. The second one signifies that God first makes a judgment but then finds it mistaken and rectifies it. The third (and final) one is related with "injunction" (*amr*), indicating that God commands something first and later commands the opposite. When discussing this last meaning, al-Shahristani criticizes those groups "who discard abrogation and hold out the notion that discrepant divine commands abolish each other in different times, i.e., *bada*."⁶

Although the debates on *bada* focus on its terminological sense, there are some reflections on its literal meaning. In particular, some important theologians of the Ithna `Ashariyyah⁷ (Twelver Shi`ahs) prefer to interpret it as “appearance.” This inclination also has some reasons, and we will touch on them in their proper context.

Originating from the esoteric interpretation of Islam, *bada*, besides being associated with these debates on the Imamate, also has a dimension of divine will.⁸ Due to the sensitivities involved, *bada* long remained at the center of severe disputations among Muslim scholars. As clarified by Shi`i theologian Ibn al-Rawandi (d. 298/910),⁹ the exponents of *bada* rely on the following verse: “Allah blots out or confirms what He pleases: with Him is the Mother of the Book” (Qur’an 13:39). The scholars of hadith grounded their belief on the following narrations: “Visitation of relatives prolongs the lifespan. Charity fends off the inevitable trouble.” `Umar prayed that: “O my God! If you have written me among the wretched, please erase my name from there and write it among the felicitous.”¹⁰

The Emergence of *Bada*

The Shi`ahs passed through several stages, three of which played a decisive role in the formation of this notion. The first stage is composed of the claims made by the Kaysaniyyah, a group that consisted largely of those Kufans who adopted Muhammad ibn al-Hanafiyyah as their leader. The second stage began when Isma`il, the expected successor of his father Ja`far al-Sadiq (the sixth Imam), died before his father. A similar incident took place nearly one century later: `Ali al-Hadi’s son, who had been seen as his father’s successor, died before his father. The third (and final) stage began when Ithna `Ashari Shi`is started to give *bada*, which they no longer needed to use in its literal sense as *naksh* (abrogation), a meaning of which the rest of the Muslim community could approve.

The Kaysaniyyah of Kufah were the first group to speak of *bada*. Along with other similar groups, they clashed with the Umayyads and harbored an excessive love for the Ahl al-Bayt (the Prophet’s household). This set the ground for the flourishing of extreme beliefs.¹¹ According to the early sources dealing with the history of Islamic groups, the Kaysaniyyah accepted the claim that God could change His mind. Moreover, given that the fundamental principle holding the various Kaysaniyyah groups together is the Imamate of Muhammad ibn al-Hanafiyyah, the second is that they consider *bada* permissible (*ja`iz*) for God.¹² As al-Tabari reports from Abu Mihnaf,¹³ a group

who supported Mukhtar ibn `Ubayd al-Thaqafi's rebellion against the Umayyads organized meetings in Hind ibn Layla's home and claimed that `Abd Allah ibn Nawf knew the future, believed in prophecy and *bada*, and interpreted several Qur'anic verses according to their own agendas.

On the other hand, it seems that although Mukhtar was not very involved with "eccentric" beliefs like *bada*, as opposed to the claims of his Kufan supporters, such views were nevertheless ascribed to him. According to a report supporting this view,¹⁴ Mukhtar was alleged to have told his partisans that it had been revealed to him that they would defeat the troops commanded by Mus`ab ibn Zubayr. However, his supporters suffered a great defeat. Returning to Mukhtar, the survivors shrieked: "Why did you promise us a victory over our enemy?" He responded that "God Almighty had promised this to me, but He changed His mind" and then recited: "Allah blots out or confirms what He pleases: with Him is the Mother of the Book" (13:39). Those who ascribe *bada* to Mukhtar hold that if what he promised came true, he took it as a proof for the truth of his cause; if it did not come true, he said that "*bada* occurred for our sovereign Lord." Some reports claim that Mukhtar, who makes no distinction between *bada* and *naksh*, accepts *naksh* in regard to legal issues just as he approves of the possibility of *bada* in respect to divine reports.¹⁵

Although it is claimed that Mukhtar was the first one to bring some views like *bada* to the fore, in fact his enemies used his supposed association with them to discredit him. On the other hand, he was surrounded by ignorant people who misunderstood Islam. Mukhtar wrote rhythmical prose and poems and did not produce works with extremist tendencies.¹⁶ Just because some of his Kufan sympathizers put forward such claims does not mean that he thought the same way. The fact that the people whom Mukhtar rallied around himself belonged to Kufan groups that considered Muhammad ibn al-Hanafiyyah as their true leader caused such views to be ascribed to him as well. So, one can safely say that these claims were set forth by Mukhtar's allies.

Such beliefs as *mahdi* (messianism),¹⁷ *wasaya* (tutelage), *raj`ah* (resurrection of the Prophet's household),¹⁸ and *bada* arose after Muhammad ibn al-Hanafiyyah died (d. 82/701).¹⁹ The Kaysaniyyah, who regarded him as their first leader, exercised a deep influence over the later Kufan groups through their ideas, which had been considered unusual until then.²⁰ Take, for example, the reports of Abu al-Khattab Muhammad ibn Abi Zaynab al-Asadi's revolt against Caliph Mansur, in which he is reported to have told his followers: "Fight them; your reeds serve the function of lance and sword

against them. Their lances, swords, and arms cannot harm and injure you.” Then he sent them to the battlefield in groups of ten. Seeing that about thirty of their friends had died, they said to Abu al-Khattab: “You see what our enemy does to us. We also see that the reeds in our hands do no harm to them. Their arms produced the due damage in us and killed our men.” In response, he said: “I am not to be blamed if Allah has changed His mind regarding you.”²¹

Mughirah ibn Sa`id (d. 119/737), a *ghulat* (Shi`i extremist) from Kufah, reportedly advanced similar thoughts,²² even maintaining that God’s mind might change over time.²³ From all of this, it becomes clear that some groups in Kufah began to assert *bada* during the second half of the first Islamic century. Although this notion came to the fore every now and then in association with the events mentioned above, its full formulation (after Mukhtar’s death) came about when Isma`il, Ja`far al-Sadiq’s son and expected successor, unexpectedly died before his father.²⁴ But one cannot maintain that they completely adopted the claims of the Kufan *ghulat*.

Associating *Bada* with the Imamate

As it was being formulated from the mid-second century AH onward, the Imamate theory received a severe jolt when Isma`il ibn Ja`far died unexpectedly. As his father’s expected successor, this event came as a terrible and long-standing shock to those Shi`ah who believed that the Imamate would continue until the end of the world. Some groups could not accept his death and tried to explain it by arguing that God had changed His mind. On the other hand, saying that God had changed His mind on such a vital issue troubled them, because such an assertion would cast doubt on their claim that their Imams were infallible and divinely pre-designated by God.

The Kufan Shi`ah rallied around Isma`il, claiming that his father had appointed him as his successor before his death. Some of those who admitted Isma`il’s death argued that his father left a divine text about his son’s Imamate; however, after his son’s death, he said: “God changed His opinion regarding my son Isma`il as He never did about anything else.” Another group who had acknowledged Ja`far al-Sadiq’s Imamate eventually rejected it because of his son’s untimely death. They also blamed him for saying: “God backed out on His word concerning that of which He had informed me.” So they renounced *bada* and espoused al-Butriyyah²⁵ and then Sulayman ibn Jarir, who adopted similar beliefs.²⁶ Hence, some of Ja`far al-Sadiq’s adherents tried to cover up this thorny problem with *bada*. In the end, `Abd

Allah al-Fattah, another of Ja`far al-Sadiq's sons, was accepted as Imam in place of his father thanks to his primacy in age. Almost all of the Shi`ah approved of his Imamate.²⁷

However, this situation changed rather quickly, because `Abd Allah died seventy days after his father and left no son to continue the Imamate. The Shi`ah who believed in the Imamate's continuity were thrown into chaos once again.²⁸ After a period of great turbulence, fortune turned in the direction of Musa al-Kazim (d. 183/799) and an important segment agreed on his Imamate.²⁹ The debates concerning the Imamate, which occurred during the time of Musa al-Kazim and his father Ja`far al-Sadiq, persisted in the following generations of Imams who were believed to be divinely appointed. However, because both Musa al-Kazim and `Ali al-Rida (d. 203/818) lacked Ja`far al-Sadiq's charisma, their influence was not as great as that of their ancestors had been.³⁰

About one century after Isma`il ibn Ja`far's death, a similar event happened in wake of the death of `Ali al-Hadi (the tenth Imam, d. 254/868). As a result, the Imamate position lost its former control and extreme ideas appeared and began to spread. It also caused a deep succession crisis.³¹ `Ali al-Hadi had proclaimed his son Muhammad as his successor, but the son died before the father. Then `Ali named his other son, Hassan al-`Askari (d. 260/874), as his successor and said to him: "O my son, give thanks to God, Who created a (good) affair regarding you."³²

The conflict most often revolved around the infallible knowledge of the Unseen claimed for the Imam. Once again, some Shi`ah resorted to the thought that "God can change His mind unpredictably." In other words, God first willed the Imamate of Muhammad ibn `Ali but then changed His mind and willed that his brother Hassan ibn `Ali should hold the post. The following report, which allegedly goes back to Abu Hashim al-Ja`fari, states:

When his son Abu Ja`far (Muhammad) died, I was beside Abu al-Hassan (`Ali al-Hadi). I was thinking that Abu Ja`far and Abu Muhammad (Hassan al-`Askari) are like Musa ibn Ja`far and Isma`il ibn Ja`far in this age; their story is the same. Just when I was about to say that Abu Muhammad was expected after Abu Ja`far, Abu al-Hassan (`Ali al-Hadi) turned to me and said: "Yes, Aba Hashim. The unknown thing concerning Abu Muhammad [coming] after Abu Ja`far became clear for God (*bada li Allah*). His situation is like that of Musa, i.e., *bada* occurred after Isma`il's death. Abu Muhammad (Hassan al-`Askari) will be my successor."³³

Some of the Shi`i groups that remained attached to the Imamate of Muhammad, `Ali al-Hadi's son, claimed that he had not really died. Putting forward claims about Muhammad that were similar to those made by Isma`il ibn Ja`far's followers, they denied *bada* and claimed that his father had concealed him out of fear that his enemies might harm him and that he was *al-qa'im al-mahdi* (the Hidden [twelfth] Imam).³⁴

All of this proves that claims of *bada* remained, along with other issues, at the core of the post-Ja`far al-Sadiq debates among the Shi`ah. Both the Imamates of Musa al-Kazim (the seventh Imam) and Hassan al-`Askari (the eleventh Imam) were based on *bada*. Such Shi`i figures as Hisham ibn al-Hakam (d.179/795), Hisham ibn Sa'im al-Jawaliqi, Muhammad ibn `Ali ibn Nu`man al-Ahwal, Yunus ibn `Abd al-Rahman (d. 208/823), and many others³⁵ tended to maintain this claim.³⁶ Al-Hakam supposedly advanced *bada*, arguing that God's knowledge of creatures begins with their existence.³⁷ One of the luminaries of the age, the Mu`tazili scholar and thinker al-Jahiz (d. 255/868), asked the Shi`ah about their proofs concerning *raj`ah* (resurrection) and *tanasukh* (reincarnation) as well as on what grounds they were asserting *bada*.³⁸ The Shi`i groups that engaged in the Imamate debates interpreted several narrations to support the similar case arising from `Ali al-Hadi's death.

The Shi`i theologians' focus on *bada* earned this concept an important position. Uniting first around the leadership of Ja`far al-Sadiq and Musa al-Kazim, and then around one of Musa's sons, the Shi`ah majority referred to several narrations from the Imams to support this notion. At the same time, these narrations give us some clues as to how they understood *bada*. In a report narrated by Saffar al-Qummi (d. 290/902), Ja`far al-Sadiq is reported to have said: "When God had changed His mind regarding something in His knowledge, He indeed informed and presented it to the Imams before us."³⁹

Although there are many reports about *bada*, they lack cohesion. One reason for this is that such reports exist in early Shi`i sources. That is, events and reports were written down immediately and without a careful examination of their accuracy. The lack of agreement and ongoing disputes within the groups also contributed to the rise of contradictory reports. One outcome of this was the report about Hassan al-`Askari's Imamate in Ithna `Ashari literature. In fact, Ithna `Ashari scholars made serious efforts to explain away such reports.

On the one hand, such reports speak of God changing His mind; on the other hand, they include the following words: "When God wills something, He first measures it out (*taqdir*); afterwards, He predestines it and, lastly,

performs it.”⁴⁰ In addition, because the Shi`ah accept *naksh*, there are reports related to it. For instance, when discussing why the Companions disagreed about “rubbing the feet (*mash al-qadam*) as part of ablution,” Muhammad Baqir reported: “The Prophet kept silent when his Companions asked him: ‘You command us something and we move toward it; afterward, you say something different.’” Thereupon, God sent down: ‘Say (O Muhammad): I am not a new thing among the Messengers, nor do I know what will be done with me or with you. I only follow that which is revealed to me, and I am but a plain warner’” (46:9).

Those who opposed the Ithna `Asharis criticized them severely for accepting *bada*. In an attempt to respond to such criticism, some Shi`i theologians who were influenced by the Mu`tazilah claimed an identity between *bada* and *naskh*. But such Ithna `Ashari scholars of hadith and Qur`anic exegesis as `Abd Allah ibn Ja`far al-Himyari al-Qummi⁴¹ and Muhammad ibn Mas`ud ibn Muhammad ibn `Ayyash al-Sulami al-Samarqandi (d. 320/932)⁴² retained the tradition of quoting such reports in their books.

In sum, the claims of *bada* that arose in the late first century AH engendered disputes among the Shi`ah concerning the Imamate following Ja`far al-Sadiq’s death. After disappearing for a while, it resurfaced after `Ali al-Hadi’s death. As a result, several allegedly forged narrations appeared in Ithna `Ashari books.

The Ithna `Ashariyyah and *Bada*

The Ithna `Ashariyyah is one of the most important Shi`i groups that believe in the existence and necessity of the Imamate for all time and, citing divine pre-designation, that the twelve Imams (i.e., `Ali ibn Abi Talib and those of his descendents who came through Husayn ibn `Ali) are infallible and perfect.⁴³ The formation of this group started about twenty years after Hassan al-`Askari (d. 260/873), the eleventh Imam, died.

Although the issue of *bada* first surfaced in the time of Ja`far al-Sadiq and `Ali al-Hadi, the Ithna `Ashariyyah claim that it actually appeared during the time of the Prophet. They usually divide *bada* into two types: reasonable and unreasonable. As we shall elaborate in the following pages, they maintain that *bada*, in the sense of changing an earlier decision as a result of acquired knowledge later on, cannot be ascribed to God. As for reasonable *bada*, their theologians held different views about it.⁴⁴

However, they understood this concept quite differently. In fact, after the Ithna `Asharis established themselves, their theologians defined *bada* as

naksh, for they no longer had any reason to regard it as “God changing His mind.” This is because many narrations were allegedly fabricated to establish the Twelve Imams’ validity. As a result, their place in Shi`i theology was consolidated. Nevertheless, *bada* played a crucial role in designating the Imamates of Musa al-Kazim and Hasan al-`Askari. Therefore, Shaykh Mufid (d. 413/1022) faced no difficulty in pointing to the wrongness of grounding belief in *bada*.⁴⁵

Bada had another, but less crucial, impact on Imamite theology: explaining why the Mahdi, the Prophet’s “true successor” who is expected to salvage the global Muslim community, has not come yet.⁴⁶ Unable to explain this, despite the passage of so many years, the Ithna`Ashari theologians based their replies on certain narrations, one of which claims that “God planned his emergence to take place in 70 AH. However, He postponed it until 140 AH because the murder of Husayn, the Prophet’s grandson, angered Him. However, when the information He had granted was divulged, He did not assign another date for this event.”⁴⁷ In fact, this narration hints that *bada*, in the sense of God changing His mind, could easily find support among the Ithna`Ashariyyah of that time.

Abu al-Hasan al-Ash`ari (d. 324/935), a Sunni theologian who witnessed the formation of the Ithna`Ashariyyah school of thought, categorized the Shi`ah into three groups based on whether God would change His mind after hearing something. He thinks that the first group would regard it as quite normal for God to change His mind, for they argue that He wills to do something at one time and then changes His mind because something new appears to Him. That He commands something concerning the Shari`ah and then abrogates it stems from His change of mind about the issue. If God has not informed any of His creatures as to what He knows, He is entitled to change His mind. But if He has already informed His servants about a particular issue, He is not so entitled. The second group considers it permissible for God to change His mind about something until it occurs. Just as they consider it reasonable for Him to change His mind concerning that which He has told His servants, it is also conceivable for Him to change His mind about something even after informing His servants about it. The third group rejects the entire concept of *bada*, saying that it is unthinkable for God to do such a thing.⁴⁸

The Mu`tazili theologian Abu al-Husayn al-Khayyat (d. 300/912) reports that except for the few Shi`ah who established a friendship with the Mu`tazilah, the Shi`ah as a whole accepted *bada* when dealing with divine reports. He disproves Ibn al-Rawandi’s assertion that there is a complete identity

between the Shi`i understanding of *bada* and the Mu`tazili interpretation of *naksh*. The difference between the two is merely nominal, for the meaning is the same.⁴⁹ For al-Khayyat, this definition is far from true in respect to the general Shi`ah community. Moreover, *bada* and *naksh* are different. He draws a clear distinction between adopting *naksh* as regards divine injunctions and prohibitions and espousing *bada* as regards divine reports. Hence, al-Khayyat is convinced that the majority of the Ithna `Ashariyyah believe that God may report that He will do something and then may decide not to do it. For him, those who consider *bada* to be the same as *naksh* formed a tiny minority within the overall Shi`ah community.⁵⁰ Among this tiny minority are such early Ithna `Ashari theologians as Hasan ibn Musa al-Nawbakhti (d. 310/922), Abu Sahl Isma`il ibn `Ali al-Nawbakhti (d. 311/923), and Ibn Qibbah al-Rhazi,⁵¹ for they contributed the most to interpreting *bada* as *naksh*. In his *Naqd Kitab al-Ishad*, Ibn Qibbah expresses his deep anguish over the ascription of *bada* to him, contending that whoever claims that God changes His mind in accordance with changing affairs is an unbeliever.⁵²

What is meant by the “majority of the Shi`ah” are the masses belonging to various schools along with those who came under Qom’s influence and thus derived all of their proofs from the Imams’ reports. Consisting of many divergent groups, the Shi`ah of that time faced a considerable potential of *ghulat* (extremists). These people must have been the ones who imputed every kind of *bada* to God. Al-Ash`ari is most likely to have referred to them as the second group. The “Shi`i Qum school” and al-Ash`ari, both of whom can be placed into the first division, believe in a limited *bada*, as can be seen in the following reports. They came together with the theologians under the title of the Imamiyyah (or Ithna `Ashariyyah).⁵³ We can learn about their views on *bada* from the reports conveyed by their leader al-Kulayni (d. 329/941), an Ithna `Ashari scholar of hadith.

Al-Kulayni devoted a chapter to *bada* in his *Al-Kafi*,⁵⁴ in which he quotes many of the Imams’ reports, to highlight its importance. However, the reports related to Isma`il ibn Ja`far’s imamate are not found among them. In one report, it is narrated that al-Rida (the eighth Imam) said: “God sent no prophet who did not promulgate the impermissibility of drinking wine and the permissibility of *bada* for God.”⁵⁵ Two similar narrations claim that worshipping God is best done by *bada*.⁵⁶

The reports narrated by al-Kulayni stress *bada*’s importance, provide some information about its definition and nature, and emphasize that God does not change His mind concerning those issues that He has revealed to His servants. According to another of his reports:

God has two kinds of knowledge. No one can know His secret knowledge except Himself. The other knowledge is that which He revealed to His servants, such as angels, messengers, and the rest of humanity. God may change His opinion regarding the secret knowledge (i.e., the knowledge He did not divulge to His servants).⁵⁷

Another narration states that “God can change His opinion in relation to the knowledge secret to Himself, which He did not reveal to anyone.”⁵⁸ In brief, these narrations imply that God changes only those of His opinions about which He has not informed His servants. Thus, al-Kalayni rejects the extremists’ claim that God may change His mind after learning something new. In one of the reports he narrated about *bada*, he states: “When Ja`far al-Sadiq was asked if a thing that does not exist in God’s knowledge happens one day, he replied: ‘No! God degrades one who says so.’”⁵⁹

As pointed out above, the early Ithna `Ashariyyah adopted two interpretations of *bada*. Being in close interaction with the Mu`tazilis, the theological wing tried to keep away from *bada* outside of *naksh*. The Akhbari school,⁶⁰ being quite removed from theology, considered *bada* as limited to the borders established by al-Kulyani’s narrated reports. However, Ibn Babawayh (d. 381/991) tried to reconcile these two attitudes.

The Ithna `Asharis’ conception of *bada* underwent a considerable transformation in the hands of Ibn Babawayh. Although he attached some importance to the narrations, he brought this school of thought closer to theology by retaining the *bada* narrations transmitted by al-Kulayni and using the proofs provided by Shi`i theologians. For instance, he took up the narration regarding Isma`il ibn Ja`far, one that al-Kulayni had dared not use in relation to *bada*. In addition, he tried to dictate the literal sense of *bada*, which had been largely conceived of in its technical sense as God changing His mind. By taking *bada* in the sense of “becoming apparent and clear,” he attempted to rescue his school of thought from the accusation that some of the Imams had been pre-designated through *bada*.

Like many other adversaries of the Ithna `Asharis who challenged *bada*, the Zaydis argued that the idea, which was put forward in relation to the Imamates of Isma`il ibn Ja`far and Muhammad ibn `Ali, contradict the claim that the Imams’ names and numbers are pre-designated. Ibn Babawayh rejected this claim, despite the existence of reports related to *bada*, and asked the Zaydis: “In what proof are you grounding the claim that Ja`far ibn Muhammad appointed his son as Imam? Who reported and accepted it? This is the fabrication of a group who claimed the Imamate of Isma`il, and this

claim thus has no ground.” To him, the remark that “God changed His opinion about nothing as He did about my son Isma`il” means “Nothing of the divine will became as clear regarding anything else as when it killed my son Isma`il before me, clarifying that he could not become Imam because of his incapacity.” For Ibn Babawayh, any *bada* associated with the Imamate means disclosing Isma`il ibn Ja`far’s unsuitability for the Imamate.⁶¹

Ibn Babawayh asserted that it is impossible for God to change His mind out of regret and that only ignorant people can accept such a belief. For him, God Almighty is far exalted above that. He defined the type of *bada* that is acceptable for God as: “God begins creating something and completes its creation before something else. He then exterminates this thing and begins creating another thing.” In other words, He first lays down an edict and then changes it, as shown when He changed the prayer direction (*qiblah*) and how long a divorced woman had to wait before she remarried. For him, abrogating the earlier revealed books with the Qur’an is another type of *bada*.⁶²

The most important scholar after Ibn Babawayh to deal with *bada* is the theologian Shaykh Mufid (d. 413/1022). Like Ibn Babawayh, he views *bada* as *naksh* in relation to the legal issues and in its literal sense understands it in respect to divine reports. He argues that there is no difference between the Shi`ah and the Sunnis in relation to this subject.⁶³ Furthermore, he claims that a religion brought by a prophet can be abrogated only by another prophet. Therefore, the claim that the Imams receive revelation like the prophets is *kufr* (unbelief). He maintains that all of the Ithna`Asharis think like this.⁶⁴

We have already pointed out that Mufid takes *bada* in its literal sense of “appearing.” When discussing a report he attributes to Ja`far al-Sadiq, he is the first to argue that the Ithna`Ashari view on *bada* depends upon narration (*sam`*) instead of reason. For him, reports came from the Imams themselves about this doctrine. The underlying point about *bada* is “becoming apparent.” According to him, what is meant by “But something will confront them from Allah, which they could never have counted upon” (39:47), is that of God’s acts, those things that are outside of their calculations and dispositions appeared for them. And what is meant by “For the evils of their deeds will confront them, and they will be confronted [and] completely encircled by that which they used to mock!” (39:48) is that the punishment for their actions will become apparent and clear for them. Mufid remarks that the Arabs say “it appeared from such a person” as well as “a good deed or eloquent word appeared for such a person.”⁶⁵

Mufid also notes that not all of God's actions can be classified as *bada*; those actions that are to be so qualified should be those that are far above human reason. To him, "the *bada* of God" are those things that are not supposed to emerge. However, the term *bada* cannot be used in regard to those things that are known and very likely to appear.⁶⁶

Most of the Ithna`Ashari theologians, including Shaykh Mufid, rely largely upon Mu`tazili formulations in elaborating their thesis of *bada*. Some of the Mu`tazilah associate *bada* with the principle of *aslah* (the best). Accordingly, God does the best for His servants and His plans are founded on what is most suitable and useful for them.⁶⁷ Mufid tends to take the narration regarding Isma`il ibn Ja`far in this context. He writes: "What Ja`far al-Sadiq meant with his words 'God changed His opinion regarding my son Isma`il as He never did on anything else' is that God distanced death from him because such an occurrence was feared to take place. God bestowed grace upon him by distancing death from him."⁶⁸ Mufid says that the reports about this subject came from Ja`far al-Sadiq.

According to the narration, Ja`far is reported to have said: "Death was inscribed for Isma`il two times. I asked God to prevent it, and He did so." Otherwise, God does not change His mind after He designates someone as a prophet or an Imam or honors someone with having belief. Mufid remarks that God cannot be accused of such *bada*, as it is established by the consensus of the Shi`i jurists.⁶⁹ He argues that Ja`far al-Sadiq severely criticized qualifying God with such types of *bada*: "Whoever thinks that God changes His mind out of regret becomes unbeliever in our presence" and "I completely dissociate myself from the person who assumes that what is yesterday unknown to God appears (i.e., becomes known) for Him today."⁷⁰

Mufid elaborates upon this issue in association with the question of *ajal* (the fixed term):

Something is sometimes written depending on a condition, and the situation changes about the matter in this case. God says: "Then God decreed a stated term. And there is in His presence another determined term" (6:2). This verse shows that *ajal* comes about in two ways. The first one is conditional, which accepts diminution and expansion. The following verses indicate this: "Nor is a part cut off from his life but is in a decree ordained" (35:11) and "If the peoples of the towns had but believed and feared Allah, We should indeed have opened up for them all kinds of blessings from heaven and earth" (7:96). These verses condition the lengthening of their lifespan depending upon their goodness and keeping away from sin.

Similarly, in 71:10 and onward, God Almighty made the prolongation of nations' lifetime and the bestowing of blessings conditional upon their repentance. If they do not repent, their lifespan will be lowered and they will be terminated by the punishment of God.⁷¹

In short, Mufid tries to say that such lengthening and diminishing of fixed lifetimes are examples of God changing His mind.

Abu Ja`far al-Tusi (d. 460/1067), who summarizes the Ithna `Asharis' views of *bada* up to his time, explains *bada* as *naksh*, just as the Mu`tazilah had understood it. If it is connected with what is existent, it means "a change of conditions," because *bada* literally means "becoming apparent." It is natural that, in the context of God's actions, anything, the conditions of which we know or do not know, may contradict our surmises.⁷²

Al-Tusi also takes the report "there occurred *bada* about Isma`il from God" as "there occurred *bada* in relation to this issue from the side of God" because people had thought that Isma`il ibn Ja`far would become the Imam after Ja`far al-Sadiq. However, upon the former's death, they realized that their surmise was groundless and came to terms with Musa ibn Ja`far's Imamate. Similarly, they thought that Muhammad ibn `Ali al-Hadi would become Imam after his father. Yet it became clear after his death that God's decree had not pre-designated him as Imam. The same holds true for Isma`il ibn Ja`far. In other words, God did not pre-designate him and then change His mind, because one cannot conceive of God doing such a thing.⁷³

Abu Salah Halabi (d. 447/1055), another Ithna `Ashari, tends to elucidate his school of thought's conception of *bada* more technically. For him, legal *naksh* does not necessitate a change of mind. He lays down three conditions for *bada*: the enjoined issue should be the same as the prohibited one, the method and the time should be the same, and the moral obligation should be imposed upon the same person. For him, *bada* takes place only when these three conditions unite. On the other hand, *naksh* is something different because the enjoined issue is not the same as the prohibited one. For example, the prohibition of hunting on Saturdays during the time of Prophet Moses is different from the same prohibition during the time of Prophet Muhammad. Therefore, Halabi argues, the necessary conditions for *bada* are incomplete because of the dissimilarity between the two cases.⁷⁴

In sum, we can say that *bada* underwent several transformations from the emergence of the Ithna `Asharis onward. If we discard the extreme claims prevailing in the grassroots, we can divide the early Ithna `Asharis into two groups: those who accept a limited *bada* and those who take *bada*

as outright *naksh*. However, it seems that they tend to pass by without touching on the *bada* claims about the Imamates of Isma`il ibn Ja`far al-Sadiq and Muhammad ibn `Ali al-Hadi. Ibn Babawayh, who did address these reports, tends to do so from the viewpoint of the term's literal sense and strives to free the reports from the context of the debates over the Imamate. Mufid also tries to follow a similar course by discussing the issue in connection with the question of divine munificence (*lutf*). On the other hand, both of them remark that, technically, *bada* and *naksh* have the same meaning.

The following generations of Ithna `Ashari scholars say little new about the issue. The latest point arrived at is summed up by M. Rida Muzaffar, who remarks:

A notion like the emergence of an idea which did not exist earlier cannot be thought of God. In the Qur'an, it is stated that "Allah blots out or confirms what He pleases: with Him is the Mother of the Book" [13:39]. So, God may obliterate what He disclosed in accordance with the conditions and then re-disclose it distinctly. In addition, *bada* is similar to the abrogation of earlier laws with the Shari`ah as well as to the abolishment of some decrees revealed to him in the later revelations.⁷⁵

Conclusion

My paper demonstrates that Shi`i theologians have held several conceptions and interpretations of *bada* over time due to special and temporal events. This notion, which first emerged among the Kaysaniyyah groups in Kufah in a very simple form, was later used as a proof during debates over the Imamate theory. The various interpretations espoused by different Shi`i groups resulted in disputes over its nature. Of many contradicting claims, there arose such views that no kind of *bada* is permissible for God. These claims also caused several reports to enter Shi`i literature.

However, the criticisms leveled against the Shi`ah because of such claims made by their adversaries stimulated their theologians to explain the doctrine in a more rational way. Especially after the doctrine of the Twelve Imams was established, Ithna `Ashari theologians began to argue that *bada* means the same as *naksh* and therefore cannot be used to ground the belief in the Imams' pre-designation. Reinterpreting the reports about the Imamates of Isma`il ibn Ja`far and Muhammad ibn `Ali, they asserted that in such a context, *bada* is not "a change of God's mind concerning the Imams' appointment," but rather pointed to the very clarity of their situation. Thus, they endeavored to restore and promote the term's literal sense. This also

forms the latest phase of the Shi`i interpretation of *bada*, because since then no important change has taken place in regard to it.

It is clear that the Shi`i theologians who addressed and gave final shape to *bada* thought more clearly and felt that establishing an early Shi`i version of *bada* seemed problematic in both religious and theological terms. While interacting with Mu`tazili theologians, Shi`i theologians carved out a more reasonable and acceptable model of *bada*. In addition, the latest position regarding this concept proves that it is necessary to prefer rational methods over narrations and reports while elaborating upon theology.

Endnotes

1. For more information about the doctrine-history relationship, see Hasan Onat, *Emeviler Dönemi Sû Hareketleri ve Günümüz Sûlîgi* (Ankara: 1993), 1.
2. Ibid., 15.
3. Sayyid Sharif Jurjani, "Bada," in *Al-Ta`rifat* (n.p.: n.d.), ed. Abdulmuin el-Hafnâ, 52; Shaykh Mufid, *Tashih al-I`tiqad* (Qum: 1413 AH), 65.
4. Abu al-Fadl Jamal al-Din Muhammad ibn Mukarram al-Ansari ibn Manzur, *Lisan al-`Arab* (Beirut: 1375-76/1955-56), 1:42; Fakhr al-Din ibn Muhammad ibn Ahmad al-Najafi, *Majma` al-Bahrayn* (Shi`i Lexicon) (n.p.: n.d.): 1:46; Ignaz Goldziher, "Beda," *Islâm Ansiklopedisi* (Ankara: 1979): 2:433; Avni Ilhan, "Beda," *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi* (henceforth, DIA) (Istanbul: 1992): 5:290; Mahmoud Ayoub, "Divine Preordination and Human Hope: A Study of the Concept of *Bada* in Imamî Shi`i Tradition," *JAOS* (1998): 4:623-24; Ilyas Üzüüm, "İsnâaseriyye," *DIA*, 23:149.
5. See Abu al-Fath al-Shahristani, *Al-Milal wa al-Nihal*, ed. by Muhammad Fahmi Muhammad (Beirut: 1992), 146.
6. The Shi`ah are divided into subgroups based upon the number of the Imam they follow. The Ithna`Ashariyyah (Twelvers) appeared in the late third century AH.
7. Cf. Afzal Sumar, "Bada: Change in Divine Destiny and Decree," *Hawza Ilmiyya of London* (London: 2005), 2.
8. See Abu al-Husayn Khayyat, *Kitab al-Intisar* (Beirut: 1957), 93.
9. Ibn Qutaybah, *Ta`wil Mukhtalaf al-Hadith* (*Hadis Müdafası*, Turkish tr. M. Hayri Kirbasoglu) (Istanbul: 1989), 64-65.
10. Mustafa Öz, "Gâliye," *DIA*, 13:334; Ibrahim Coskun, "İmâmiyye Siasında Ehl-i Beyt Sevgisinin Ezoterik İnancılara Dönüşümü," *Marife* 4, no. 3 (2004): 141.
11. See Abu Mansur `Abd al-Qahir Tahir ibn Muhammad al-Baghdadi, *Al-Farq bayn al-Firâq*, ed. Muhammad Muhiy al-Din `Abd al-Hamid (Beirut: 1990/1411), 38; Abu Muzaffar al-Isfarayani, *Al-Tabsir fî al-Din wa Tamyiz al-Firqah al-Najiyah `an al-Firâq al-Halikin*, ed. Kamal Yusuf al-Hut (Beirut: 1403/1983), 30.

12. Abu Ja`far Muhammad ibn Jarir al-Tabari, *Ta`rikh al-Umam wa al-Muluk*, ed. Muhammad Abu al-Fadl Ibrahim al-Tabari (Cairo: n.d.), 6:103-04.
13. For the narration, see al-Baghdadi, *Al-Farq bayn al-Firaq*, 50-52.
14. Al-Shahristani, *Al-Milal wa al-Nihal*, 146-47.
15. For detailed information on Mukhtar, see Onat, *Emeviler Dönemi Siî*, 93-114.
16. The title *mahdi* is given to the figure who is believed to appear just before the end of the world to restore justice in a world replete with oppression.
17. *Raj`ah* refers to the return of a dead or disappearing leader before the end of the world.
18. William Thomson, "Islâm ve Mezhepler," Turkish tr. Adil Özdemir, DEÜİFD (Izmir: 1983), 1:317; Hasan Onat, *Shi`ism in the Twentieth Century and the Islamic Revolution of Iran* (Ankara: 1996), 7; Cemil Hakyemez, "Mehdî Düşüncesinin İtikadîleşmesi Üzerine," *Gazi Üniversitesi Çorum İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* (Çorum) 3, no. 5 (2004): 131; Siddik Korkmaz, *Tarihin Tahrifi: İbn Sebe Meselesi* (Ankara: 2005), 180.
19. M. Ali Büyükkara, "İmamiyye Sia`sinin Hadis Usulünde 'Mezhebi Bozuk' Raviler (II)," *İslâmî Arastirmalar* 17, no. 4 (2004): 354.
20. Abu Muhammad Hasan ibn Musa Nawbakhti, *Firaq al-Shi`ah* (Istanbul: 1931), 59.
21. For more information on Mughirah ibn Sa`id's life and views, see Mehmet Atalan, *Sîlîğın Farklılaşma Sürecinde Ca`fer es-Sadik'in Yeri* (Ankara: 2005), 152-57.
22. Taqiy al-Din Ahmad ibn `Ali ibn `Abd al-Qahir al-Maqrîdî, *Al-Mawa`iz wa al-İtibar bi Dhikr al-Hirât wa al-Athar*, 2 vols. (Beirut: n.d.), 2:349.
23. Cf. Muhammad Rida Muzaffar, *Aqa'id al-İmamiyah* (Cairo: 1381), 25; E. Ruhi Figlali, *Çağımızda İtikadî İslâm Mezhepleri* (Ankara: 1993), 160; İhsan İlâhî Zâhir, *Sia'nin Kur'an, İmamet ve Takiyye Anlayışı*, Turkish trans. Sabri Hizmetli and Hasan Onat (Ankara: 1984), 56; Ahmad al-Katib, *Siada Siyasal Düşüncesinin Gelişimi*, Turkish tr. Mehmet Yolcu (Ankara: 2005), 102-03; Sayin Dalkiran, "Muhammed b. El-Hanefiyye ve Adina Olusan Firkalar," *Dinî Arastirmalar* 7, no. 19 (2004): 157.
24. One of the major Zaydi branches.
25. Sulayman ibn Jarir was one of the most important Zaydis to criticize the Shi`ah for *bada*. He accepted Ja`far al-Sadiq and his sons as Imams. He told his adherents: "The leaders of the Rafidites laid down two principles, thanks to which they can never detect their Imams' lies: *bada* and *taqiyyah* (dissimulation). The Imami Imams claim for themselves the prophets' position regarding the knowledge of what happened and will happen by means of *bada*. They tell their adherents that such-and-such will occur tomorrow and the days following. If their prediction takes place as they claimed it would, they say: 'We foretold to you that this would take place this way. We also know of what God informed His messengers, by God's benevolence. We have the same means between us and God as those that exist between God and His messengers,

allowing them to get knowledge from God.' If what they foretell does not come true, they claim that 'God changed His mind (*bada*) regarding its occurrence.'" Nawbakhti, *Firaq al-Shi`ah*, 55-56.

26. *Ibid.*, 55 and 65-66.
27. *Ibid.*, 66.
28. Hisham ibn Salim al-Jawaliqi reports that one day he and a group of Shi`ah asked `Abd Allah al-Fattah some questions about Islamic law. However, they were shocked by the ignorance manifested in his answers and thus doubted his Imamate. While wandering around Kufah, thinking whether they should join the Murji`iyah, Qadariyyah, Zaydiyyah, or Kharijiyyah, they came across Musa Kazim and posed the same questions to him. And his answers showed that his was a shoreless ocean (i.e., an erudite scholar of the Islamic sciences). See Abu Ja`far Muhammad ibn Ya`qub al-Kulyani, *Al-Usul min al-Kafi* (Tehran: 1365), 1:351-52.
29. Cf. Büyükkara, "Imamiyye Sia'sinin Hadis Usulünde 'Mezhebi Bozuk' Raviler (II)," *Islâmî Arastirmalar*, no. 17/3 (2004): 355.
30. Cf. Ahmad al-Katib, *Siada Siyasal Düsiincenin Gelisimi*, 125; Said Amir Arjomand, "The Crisis of the Imamate and the Institution of Occultation in Twelver Shi`ism: A Sociohistorical Perspective," *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, no. 28 (1996): 501.
31. Al-Kulayni, *Al-Kafi*, 1:326.
32. *Ibid.*, 1:327.
33. Nawbakhti, *Firaq al-Shi`ah*, 78-79.
34. Yunus, an adherent of Musa ibn Ja`far, produced many compilations and compositions on the Shi`ah, among them *Kitab al-Wasaya* and *Kitab al-Bada*. See Muhammad ibn Ishaq ibn al-Nadim, *Al-Fihrist*, ed. Rida Tajaddud (Beirut: 1988), 276.
35. Khayyat, *Kitab al-Intisar*, 14; Qadi Abu al-Husayn `Abd Allah ibn Ahmad `Abd al-Jabbar, *Al-Mughni fi Abwab al-Tawhid*, eds. Tawfiq al-Tawil and Sa`id Zayid (n.p.: n.d.), vol. 20, book 1, p. 38.
36. Al-Baghdadi, *Al-Farq bayn al-Firaq*, 67. Hisham ibn al-Hakam's view that "Allah's knowledge of the things in the universe comes about after His creation of them" is parallel to his assertion that "Allah may change His decision." Goldziher, "Beda," 345; Wilferd Madelung, "Beda," *Encyclopedia Islam* (London: 1989), 3:354.
37. Abu `Uthman `Amr ibn Bahr al-Jahiz, *Rasa'il al-Jahiz* (Beirut: 1991), 453.
38. Muhammad ibn Hassan ibn Farrukh al-Saffar al-Qummi, *Basa'ir al-Darajat al-Kubra*, ed. Mirza Mohsin (Tehran: 1374 AH), 414.
39. Ahmad ibn Muhammad ibn Khalid al-Barki, *Kitab al-Mahasin* (Tehran: 1370/1950), 244.
40. *Ibid.*, 299.
41. It is stated that `Abd Allah ibn Ja`far al-Himyari composed *Kitab al-Tawhid wa al-Bada*. See Abu al-`Abbas Ahmad ibn `Ali ibn Ahmad al-Najashi, *Rijal*

- al-Najashi* (Qum: 1407 AH), 19; Abu Ja`far Muhammad ibn Hassan al-Tusi, *Al-Fihrist* (Najaf: n.d.), 102.
42. It is reported that `Ayyashi wrote a book entitled *Kitab al-Bada*. See al-Najashi, *Rijal*, 250-252; al-Tusi, *Al-Fihrist*, 137-39.
 43. Shaykh Abu `Abd Allah Muhammad ibn Muhammad ibn al-Nu`mani al-`Uqbari al-Baghdadi Mufid, *Awa'il al-Maqalat fi Madhahib al-Mukhtarat*, ed. F. al-Zanjan (Tabriz: 1371 AH), 10; *Al-Fusul al-Mukhtarah min al-`Uyun wa al-Mahasin* (Beirut: 1405/1985), 239-40.
 44. Cf. Avni Ilhan, "Sia'da Usulu'd-Din," *Üblik Sempozyumu* (Istanbul: 1993), 412.
 45. Shaykh Mufid, *Al-Fusul al-Mukhtarah*, 251.
 46. Cf. Abdulaziz Abdulhussain Sachedina, *Islamic Messianism: The Idea of the Mahdi in Twelver Shi'ism* (State University of New York Press: 1981), 108.
 47. Abu `Abd Allah Muhammad ibn Ibrahim al-Nu`mani, *Kitab al-Ghaybah*, ed. `Ali Akbar al-Ghufari (Tehran: 1397), 293.
 48. Abu al-Hasan `Ali ibn Isma`il al-Ash`ari, *Maqalat al-Islamiyin wa Ikhtilaf al-Musallin*, ed. M. Muhiy al-Din `Abd al-Hamid (Beirut: 1990), 1:113.
 49. Originally a Baghdadi Mu`tazili, Ibn al-Rawandi later on joined the Shi`ah due to the possible influence of the views of Hisham ibn al-Hakam and Abu `Isa al-Warraaq. See Osman Aydinli, *Mu'tezilî İmamet Düşüncesinde Farklılaşma Süreci* (Ankara: 2003), 181.
 50. Khayyat, *Kitab al-Intisar*, 14 and 93.
 51. For their contribution to Shi`i thought, see Cemil Hakyemez, *Gaybet İnancı ve Süllükteki Yeri* (unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Ankara, 2006, 118-23 and 125-28).
 52. Abu Ja`far Muhammad ibn `Ali ibn Babawayh al-Qummi (Shaykh Saduq), *Kamal al-Din wa Tamam al-Ni`mah* (Qum: 1395/1975), 1:106.
 53. The term *Imamiyah* was first used by Hasan ibn Musa al-Nawbakhti (310/922) to refer to those Shi`ah who believed in the Twelve Imams. In his view, the Imamiyyah is one of the fourteen sects that appeared after Hasan al-Askari's death in (260/874). However, so as not to confuse readers who are unfamiliar with Shi`i terminology, I use the term *Ithna Ashariyyah* exclusively to refer to this group.
 54. Al-Kulayni, *Al-Kafi*, 1:146-49.
 55. *Ibid.*, 1:148.
 56. *Ibid.*, 1:146.
 57. *Ibid.*, 1:147.
 58. *Ibid.*
 59. *Ibid.*, 1:148.
 60. For more information on the Akhbariyyah, consult Mazlum Uyar, *Ahbârîlik: İmâmiye Sîsî'nda Düşünce Ekolleri* (Istanbul: 2000).
 61. Ibn Babawayh, *Kamal al-Din*, 69-71; *Tawhid* (Qum: 1389), 333-36; and *Risalat al-I'tiqadat al-Imamiyah*, Tr. trans. E. Ruhi Figlali (Ankara: 1978), 41.
 62. Ibn Babawayh, *Tawhid*, 333-36 and *Risalat al-I'tiqadat*, 41.

63. Mufid, *Awa'il al-Maqalat*, 53.
64. *Ibid.*, 38.
65. Shaykh Abu `Abd Allah Muhammad ibn Muhammad ibn al-Nu`mani al-`Uqbari al-Baghdadi Mufid, *Sharh `Aqa'id al-Saduq aw Tashih al-Itiqad* (Tabriz: 1945), 24.
66. *Ibid.*, 24-25.
67. Sachedina, *Islamic Messianism*, 154 and Wilferd Madelung, "Imamism and Mu'tazilite Theology," *Religious Schools and Sects in Medieval Islam* (London: 1985), 23. For more information about the Mu'tazili principle of *aslah*, consult Osman Aydinli, *Islam Düsiüncesinde Aklilesme Süreci* (Ankara: 2001), 207-10.
68. Shaykh Mufid, *Al-Fusul al-Mukhtarah*, 251.
69. Shaykh Mufid, *Sharh `Aqa'id al-Saduq*, 24-25 and *Al-Fusul al-Mukhtarah*, 251.
70. Shaykh Mufid, *Awa'il al-Maqalat*, 94.
71. Shaykh Mufid, *Sharh `Aqa'id al-Saduq*, 24-25.
72. Abu Ja`far Muhammad ibn Hassan al-Tusi, *Kitab al-Ghaybah*, ed. `Ibad Allah Tehrani and `Ali Ahmad Nasih (Qum: 1417 AH), 429-30.
73. Al-Tusi, *Kitab al-Ghaybah*, 201-02.
74. Taqiy al-Din Abu al-Salah al-Halabi, *Taqrib al-Ma`arif* (Qum: 1404 AH), 112.
75. Muzaffar, *`Aqa'id al-Imamiyah*, 24-25.