



| Research Article



## The Evidentiary Authority of the Mursal Narrations of Muḥammad ibn Abī ‘Umayr: A Critical Examination of Sayyid al-Khoei’s Methodology

**Nour Kazim Khalil Abbas**

College of Education, University of Kut, Wasit, Iraq

**Dr. Hussein Sattar**

College of Art and foreign languages, University of Kashan, Iran

**Ms. Kawthar Yousefi Najafabadi**

College of Art and foreign languages, University of Kashan, Iran

**Abstract:** This study aims to investigate the evidentiary authority of mursal (interrupted) narrations within Imami rijāl studies through an examination of the mursal narrations transmitted by Muhammad ibn Abī ‘Umayr and a critical analysis of the methodology adopted by Sayyid Abū al-Qāsim al-Khoei in dealing with them. The study employs analytical, critical, and comparative approaches while utilizing inductive methods to trace narrations and analyze chains of transmission.

The study reaches several important conclusions. Most notably, it demonstrates that the famous claim attributed to Muhammad ibn Abī ‘Umayr—namely, that “he narrates only from trustworthy transmitters”—lacks conclusive proof both in terms of its chain of transmission and its semantic implications. The study further reveals that Sayyid al-Khoei’s methodology represents a significant methodological transformation in the science of rijāl, shifting the discipline from a framework based primarily on acceptance and transmission to one grounded in critical analysis and scholarly scrutiny.

The research also identifies a substantial methodological gap between al-Khoei’s approach and that of earlier scholars in their treatment of mursal narrations. Moreover, it demonstrates that this methodological divergence carries far-reaching juristic implications, requiring the reexamination of numerous legal conclusions that were originally based upon such narrations.

The study recommends conducting comprehensive inductive investigations into the mursal narrations transmitted by all members of the group known as the Companions of Consensus (Aṣḥāb al-Ijmā‘), organizing specialized academic seminars to examine the jurisprudential implications of critical rijāl methodologies, and developing new mechanisms for dealing with mursal narrations that combine rigorous critical analysis with the practical requirements of legal deduction.

**Keywords:** Mursal Narrations, Evidentiary Authority of Mursal Reports, Imami Rijāl Studies, Muhammad ibn Abī ‘Umayr, Companions of Consensus, Sayyid al-Khoei, Critical Methodology.



This is an open-access article under the [CC-BY 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) license

## Introduction

All praise is due to Allah, Lord of the Worlds, and blessings and peace be upon our Master Muhammad and his pure and immaculate Household.

The science of rijāl occupies a central position within the Imami intellectual tradition, serving as the principal criterion by which the authenticity and weakness of narrations are evaluated. It constitutes the foundation upon which jurists rely in the process of deriving legal rulings. Among the most challenging issues within this discipline is the question of mursal narrations—reports in whose chains of transmission one or more narrators are omitted. Such omissions render judgments regarding their authenticity difficult and necessitate precise standards and carefully formulated criteria [1]–[9].

If mursal narrations generally constitute a methodological challenge, then the mursal reports transmitted by major trustworthy narrators—particularly Muhammad ibn Abī ‘Umayr, one of the foremost figures among the Companions of Consensus—present an even more complex issue. This is because many leading scholars accepted his mursal narrations on the basis of the well-known assertion that:

“He narrates only from trustworthy transmitters.”

Consequently, numerous jurists relied upon these narrations in deriving legal rulings, and such reports came to occupy a foundational position in many areas of Islamic jurisprudence.

However, this established position did not remain immune from scholarly criticism and reassessment, especially with the emergence of the renewed critical methodology represented by Sayyid Abū al-Qāsim al-Khoei in his renowned biographical encyclopedia, *Mu‘jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth* (Dictionary of the Narrators of Hadith). In this work, al-Khoei challenged many widely accepted assumptions within rijāl studies, among the most significant of which was the claim attributed to Muhammad ibn Abī ‘Umayr [5].

The importance of the present study arises from its attempt to examine this issue through a critical, analytical, and comparative framework. It begins with an examination of Muhammad ibn Abī ‘Umayr and his mursal narrations, proceeds to an analysis of al-Khoei’s methodology in criticizing such narrations, and concludes with a comparison between his approach and those of other leading scholars, together with an exploration of the jurisprudential consequences that result from these methodological differences.

## Research Problem

The central problem of this study lies in the methodological conflict surrounding the treatment of mursal narrations transmitted by highly respected narrators, particularly Muhammad ibn Abī ‘Umayr, who is regarded as one of the most prominent members of the Companions of Consensus.

This disagreement is not merely theoretical in nature; rather, it has direct practical implications for the process of legal deduction, since many legal rulings found in juristic literature were established on the basis of these narrations after their evidentiary authority had been accepted in accordance with the claim that:

“He narrates only from trustworthy transmitters.”

The research problem may therefore be divided into three principal dimensions:

#### First Dimension

This dimension concerns the authenticity of the claim attributed to Ibn Abī ‘Umayr. Is this assertion established through a reliable chain of transmission? Does it definitively indicate that every individual from whom he narrated was trustworthy without exception?

#### Second Dimension

This dimension concerns the methodology employed in dealing with this claim. Scholars have differed significantly in their treatment of it, ranging from complete acceptance to skepticism, and from expansive application to restrictive interpretation.

#### Third Dimension

This dimension concerns the consequences arising from this methodological disagreement. How does the acceptance or rejection of mursal narrations affect the legal rulings derived from them? Does questioning their authority undermine a substantial body of established juristic conclusions?

### **Significance of the Study**

The significance of this study stems from its examination of one of the most controversial issues in Imami rijāl scholarship, namely the evidentiary authority of mursal narrations, due to its direct relationship with the authentication of hadith reports and the process of legal deduction (*istinbāt*).

The importance of the study is further enhanced by its focus on the critical methodology of Sayyid Abū al-Qāsim al-Khoei, whose approach represented a major methodological transformation in contemporary rijāl studies. His methodology introduced a rigorous analytical framework that challenged a number of inherited assumptions that had long been accepted without sufficient scrutiny.

Moreover, the study acquires particular significance because of the extensive number of narrations transmitted by Muhammad ibn Abī ‘Umayr and the substantial reliance placed upon them by jurists in the formulation of legal rulings. Consequently, determining the evidentiary status of these narrations is of considerable importance both theoretically and practically.

The significance of the study may be summarized as follows:

#### Scholarly Significance

The study addresses one of the most important unresolved issues in rijāl studies, namely the authority of mursal narrations. Because this issue remains the subject of scholarly disagreement, it continues to represent a fertile field for academic research and critical analysis.

#### Methodological Significance

The study highlights the development of rijāl methodologies across different historical periods by comparing the approaches of early scholars with those of later scholars, particularly the critical methodology adopted by Sayyid al-Khoei.

#### Applied Significance

The findings of the study have direct implications for legal deduction, since the acceptance or rejection of mursal narrations affects the evidentiary basis of numerous legal rulings and consequently influences the validity of the rulings derived from them.

### Critical Significance

The study contributes to the development of constructive academic criticism through a balanced reassessment of one of the most widely accepted assumptions within rijāl scholarship.

### Objectives of the Study

The present study seeks to achieve a number of scientific and methodological objectives, including the following:

Introducing Muhammad ibn Abī ‘Umayr and clarifying his scholarly standing and rijāl status within the Imami tradition.

Examining the concept of mursal narrations and their evidentiary authority within Imami rijāl studies.

Investigating the validity of the claim that Ibn Abī ‘Umayr narrated exclusively from trustworthy transmitters and analyzing the implications of this claim.

Identifying the methodological foundations upon which Sayyid al-Khoei based his criticism of the evidentiary authority of Ibn Abī ‘Umayr’s mursal narrations.

Conducting a comparative analysis between al-Khoei’s methodology and the approaches adopted by both earlier and later scholars.

Clarifying the jurisprudential implications resulting from accepting or rejecting mursal narrations in the process of legal deduction.

Contributing to the advancement of rijāl studies through a critical scholarly approach grounded in analysis, comparison, and objective evaluation.

### Research Methodology

This study adopts a critical analytical-comparative methodology.

The analytical method is employed in examining the statements of scholars concerning Muhammad ibn Abī ‘Umayr and his mursal narrations, as well as in analyzing the methodological principles upon which their conclusions are based.

The comparative method is utilized to compare Sayyid al-Khoei’s approach with those adopted by other scholars regarding the evidentiary authority of mursal narrations.

The inductive method is employed through the collection and examination of narrations, rijāl texts, and practical scholarly applications related to the issue under investigation.

In addition, the descriptive method is used to present the concepts, principles, and theoretical foundations associated with rijāl studies and mursal narrations.

Through the integration of these methodologies, the study seeks to provide a comprehensive understanding of the issue and to arrive at balanced and academically grounded conclusions.

### Research Hypotheses

The study proceeds on the basis of the following hypotheses:

#### First Hypothesis

The claim that Muhammad ibn Abī ‘Umayr narrated exclusively from trustworthy transmitters is not established through a reliable chain of transmission and therefore cannot serve as an absolute basis for accepting all of his mursal narrations.

#### Second Hypothesis

Sayyid al-Khoei's criticism of the evidentiary authority of Ibn Abī 'Umayr's mursal narrations represents a significant methodological development grounded in analytical criticism and differs fundamentally from the approaches adopted by many earlier scholars.

### Third Hypothesis

Differences in methodological approaches to mursal narrations necessarily lead to differences in juristic conclusions and therefore require the reassessment of numerous legal rulings that were established on the basis of such narrations.

## Preliminary Discussion

### Muhammad ibn Abī 'Umayr: His Biography and Scholarly Status

Muhammad ibn Abī 'Umayr is among the most distinguished narrators in the history of Imami hadith transmission. He occupies a unique position within rijāl scholarship and is widely regarded as one of the foremost transmitters whose narrations have been relied upon by jurists and hadith scholars throughout the centuries.

His full name is:

Muhammad ibn Abī 'Umayr Ziyād ibn 'Īsā al-Azdī al-Baghdādī.

He was one of the eminent companions of both Imam Mūsā al-Kāzīm (peace be upon him) and Imam 'Alī al-Riḍā (peace be upon him) and was counted among the most prominent scholars and jurists of his time.

The biographical authorities unanimously praised him and emphasized his trustworthiness, integrity, piety, and distinguished scholarly standing [1]–[6].

### Al-Najāshī's Evaluation

Al-Najāshī states:

“Muhammad ibn Abī 'Umayr was among the most distinguished individuals of our community, the most devout, and the most reliable. Both the general public and the scholarly elite held him in high esteem.” [1].

### Shaykh al-Ṭūsī's Evaluation

Shaykh al-Ṭūsī describes him as:

“Trustworthy, eminent, highly respected, and of great standing.” [2].

These evaluations indicate the extraordinary confidence that early scholars placed in Ibn Abī 'Umayr and explain the central role that his narrations came to occupy within the Imami hadith tradition.

### His Position Among the Companions of Consensus (Aṣḥāb al-Ijmā')

Muhammad ibn Abī 'Umayr is generally regarded as one of the narrators included among the group known as the Companions of Consensus (Aṣḥāb al-Ijmā').

This designation refers to a select group of narrators concerning whom scholars claimed consensus regarding their reliability, trustworthiness, and scholarly excellence.

The inclusion of Ibn Abī 'Umayr among this group significantly contributed to the widespread acceptance of his narrations and strengthened confidence in the reports transmitted through him.

However, an important methodological question arises:

Does membership in the Companions of Consensus necessarily imply the acceptance of all narrations transmitted by a narrator, including his mursal reports?

This question later became one of the central issues debated among rijāl scholars and served as a major point of disagreement between Sayyid al-Khoei and many earlier authorities [1]–[4].

## Chapter One

The Mursal Narrations of Muhammad ibn Abī ‘Umayr and the Foundations of Their Evidentiary Authority

### First Topic

The Concept of Mursal Narrations and Their Position in Imami Hadith Studies

The term mursal (interrupted) narration occupies a significant place in the sciences of hadith and rijāl due to its direct relationship with the issue of evidentiary authority. Scholars have differed regarding its definition and legal status, and these differences have had a substantial impact on the acceptance or rejection of numerous narrations.

Linguistically, the word *irsāl* denotes releasing, sending forth, or leaving something unrestricted. In technical usage among hadith scholars, a mursal narration refers to a report in which one or more transmitters have been omitted from the chain of transmission.

Imami scholars have proposed several definitions of mursal narration [7]–[9], [14]. The most widely accepted definition describes it as:

“A narration in which the chain of transmission is interrupted due to the omission of one or more narrators, whether the omission occurs at the beginning, middle, or end of the chain.”

The importance of this issue arises from the fact that the omitted narrator remains unidentified. Consequently, it becomes impossible to determine his reliability, trustworthiness, or weakness. This uncertainty led many scholars to reject mursal narrations as independent evidence unless supported by additional corroborating factors.

Nevertheless, some scholars accepted certain categories of mursal narrations when transmitted by highly reliable narrators whose trustworthiness and scholarly standing were beyond dispute. Among the most prominent examples cited in this regard are the mursal narrations of Muhammad ibn Abī ‘Umayr [10]–[13].

### Second Topic

The Origin of the Claim: “He Narrates Only from Trustworthy Transmitters”

The acceptance of Ibn Abī ‘Umayr’s mursal narrations is fundamentally rooted in a famous statement attributed to early rijāl scholars, namely:

“Muhammad ibn Abī ‘Umayr narrates only from trustworthy transmitters.”

This statement became one of the most influential principles in later rijāl scholarship and served as the primary justification for accepting his mursal narrations despite the absence of complete chains of transmission.

Supporters of this view relied upon several considerations.

#### First Consideration

The exceptional scholarly standing enjoyed by Ibn Abī ‘Umayr among early scholars.

The overwhelming praise directed toward him by major authorities such as al-Najāshī and Shaykh al-Ṭūsī led many scholars to conclude that a narrator of such integrity would not knowingly transmit from unreliable individuals.

#### Second Consideration

His inclusion among the Companions of Consensus (*Aṣḥāb al-Ijmā‘*).

Many scholars argued that the consensus concerning his trustworthiness necessarily implied confidence in the sources from whom he narrated.

### Third Consideration

Reports indicating that Ibn Abī ‘Umayr suffered persecution during the Abbasid period.

Historical accounts state that he was imprisoned and subjected to severe punishment. During this period, many of his books and written collections were allegedly lost or destroyed. As a result, he was compelled to rely heavily upon memory when transmitting narrations.

According to supporters of the theory, this circumstance explains why many of his narrations appear in mursal form and provides a reasonable explanation for the omission of intermediate transmitters.

### Third Topic

Arguments Advanced by Scholars Who Accept the Evidentiary Authority of His Mursal Narrations

Those who maintain the authority of Ibn Abī ‘Umayr’s mursal narrations rely upon a number of arguments.

#### First Argument: His Extraordinary Reliability

The most important argument is the exceptional degree of trust placed in him by early scholars.

Al-Najāshī states:

“He was the most trustworthy of people among both the elite and the general public.”

Similarly, Shaykh al-Ṭūsī repeatedly emphasized his reliability and scholarly distinction.

Advocates of this position argue that such overwhelming confidence renders it highly unlikely that Ibn Abī ‘Umayr would knowingly transmit from an unreliable source.

#### Second Argument: The Testimony of Earlier Scholars

A number of jurists explicitly accepted the mursal narrations of Ibn Abī ‘Umayr and relied upon them in legal deduction.

The repeated practical reliance upon these narrations by generations of scholars was regarded as evidence supporting their acceptance.

#### Third Argument: The Nature of His Scholarly Method

Supporters contend that Ibn Abī ‘Umayr exercised great caution in selecting his sources.

According to this perspective, the omission of names from his chains of transmission should not be interpreted as evidence of weakness but rather as a consequence of circumstances affecting the preservation of his books and written records.

#### Fourth Argument: Scholarly Practice

Many classical jurists accepted his mursal narrations in actual legal practice.

This widespread practical acceptance was viewed as constituting a form of scholarly endorsement that strengthens their evidentiary value.

#### Critical Evaluation of These Arguments

Despite their influence, these arguments are not immune from criticism.

The principal weakness in these arguments lies in the fact that they rely largely upon assumptions regarding Ibn Abī ‘Umayr’s conduct rather than direct evidence establishing the reliability of every narrator omitted from his chains of transmission.

Furthermore, personal trustworthiness does not necessarily guarantee that every source utilized by a narrator was equally trustworthy.

For this reason, later critical scholars reexamined the foundations of these arguments and questioned whether they were sufficient to justify the unconditional acceptance of all mursal narrations attributed to Ibn Abī ‘Umayr.

This reassessment reached its most systematic form in the writings of Sayyid Abū al-Qāsim al-Khoei, whose methodology represented a significant departure from earlier approaches.

## **Chapter Two**

### **Sayyid al-Khoei’s Methodology in Criticizing the Evidentiary Authority of Ibn Abī ‘Umayr’s Mursal Narrations**

The question of whether the mursal narrations of Muhammad ibn Abī ‘Umayr possess evidentiary authority occupies a central place in Sayyid al-Khoei’s rijāl methodology.

Unlike many earlier scholars, al-Khoei approached the issue through a comprehensive critical framework based upon the principles of hadith authentication rather than inherited scholarly assumptions.

His methodology may be summarized by the principle that:

The reliability of a narrator does not establish the reliability of unnamed transmitters omitted from the chain of transmission.

This principle became the foundation upon which he rejected the automatic acceptance of mursal narrations regardless of the stature of the narrator who transmitted them.

## **Chapter Two**

### **Sayyid al-Khoei’s Methodology in Rejecting the Evidentiary Authority of Ibn Abī ‘Umayr’s Mursal Narrations**

#### **First Topic**

##### **Al-Khoei’s Position Regarding the Claim: “He Narrates Only from Trustworthy Transmitters”**

Sayyid Abū al-Qāsim al-Khoei subjected the famous claim that Muhammad ibn Abī ‘Umayr narrated exclusively from trustworthy transmitters to a comprehensive critical examination. He argued that the statement could not serve as a valid basis for accepting all of Ibn Abī ‘Umayr’s mursal narrations [5].

According to al-Khoei, scholarly claims of this nature must be evaluated according to the same standards applied to all other historical and hadith reports. Consequently, neither widespread acceptance nor repeated citation by later scholars is sufficient to establish a claim unless it is supported by reliable evidence.

Al-Khoei therefore maintained that the statement:

“He narrates only from trustworthy transmitters”

does not possess a chain of transmission capable of establishing its authenticity with certainty. Since the statement itself lacks sufficient evidentiary support, it cannot be used as an independent proof for accepting all narrations transmitted by Ibn Abī ‘Umayr.

#### **Second Topic**

##### **Al-Khoei’s Critique of the Evidences Used to Establish the Claim**

Al-Khoei carefully analyzed the arguments advanced by scholars who accepted the authority of Ibn Abī ‘Umayr’s mursal narrations and concluded that these arguments were insufficient to establish the desired conclusion.

##### **First Criticism**

The trustworthiness of the narrator does not necessarily imply the trustworthiness of every person from whom he narrates.

Al-Khoei emphasized that there is a fundamental distinction between affirming the reliability of a narrator and affirming the reliability of all his teachers and sources.

A narrator may be completely trustworthy while still transmitting reports from individuals whose reliability has not been established.

Consequently, the reliability of Ibn Abī ‘Umayr himself cannot automatically validate all unnamed individuals omitted from his chains of transmission.

### Second Criticism

Historical evidence demonstrates that Ibn Abī ‘Umayr transmitted from some narrators whose reliability is disputed.

Al-Khoei argued that the available rijāl evidence reveals instances in which Ibn Abī ‘Umayr narrated from individuals who were not universally recognized as trustworthy.

This observation weakens the claim that he narrated exclusively from reliable transmitters.

### Third Criticism

The practical acceptance of a narration does not necessarily establish its authenticity.

Al-Khoei rejected the argument that the repeated use of a narration by jurists constitutes proof of its validity.

In his view, scholarly reliance upon a report may result from numerous factors unrelated to the authenticity of its chain of transmission.

Therefore, practical acceptance alone cannot serve as an independent proof of reliability.

### Third Topic

#### Al-Khoei’s Methodological Principle in Evaluating Mursal Narrations

One of the most important principles adopted by al-Khoei may be summarized as follows:

Every narration must be evaluated through its own chain of transmission.

According to this principle, the acceptance or rejection of a narration depends upon the reliability of its transmitters and the continuity of its chain.

When a chain contains an unidentified narrator, or when one or more transmitters have been omitted, the narration cannot be regarded as reliable unless corroborating evidence exists.

Consequently, al-Khoei maintained that mursal narrations are not automatically authoritative merely because they originate from a trustworthy narrator.

Instead, each narration must be examined independently according to established standards of hadith criticism.

This methodological approach represents one of the defining characteristics of al-Khoei’s contribution to contemporary rijāl studies.

#### Comparison Between Al-Khoei’s Methodology and Earlier Approaches

A comparison between al-Khoei’s methodology and that of many earlier scholars reveals significant differences.

#### Earlier Scholars

Many earlier jurists tended to accept Ibn Abī ‘Umayr’s mursal narrations on the basis of:

His exceptional scholarly standing.

His inclusion among the Companions of Consensus.

The claim that he narrated only from trustworthy transmitters.

Long-standing juristic practice.

Al-Khoei's Approach

By contrast, al-Khoei insisted upon:

Independent verification of each narration.

Examination of the actual chain of transmission.

Rejection of unsupported assumptions.

Reliance upon objective criteria of authentication.

As a result, his methodology introduced a higher level of critical scrutiny into rijāl scholarship.

### **Chapter Three**

Jurisprudential Consequences of the Disagreement Concerning the Evidentiary Authority of Ibn Abī 'Umayr's Mursal Narrations

#### **First Topic**

The Impact of the Disagreement on Legal Deduction

The debate concerning the authority of Ibn Abī 'Umayr's mursal narrations is not merely a theoretical dispute within rijāl studies.

Rather, it has direct consequences for the process of legal deduction and the formulation of juristic rulings.

A considerable number of legal rulings found in classical and contemporary jurisprudential works are based, either wholly or partially, upon narrations transmitted by Ibn Abī 'Umayr.

Accordingly, accepting or rejecting these narrations may influence the legal conclusions derived from them.

#### **Second Topic**

Areas Most Affected by the Disagreement

The influence of this disagreement extends to numerous fields of Islamic jurisprudence, including:

Acts of Worship ('Ibādāt)

Questions relating to prayer, fasting, almsgiving, pilgrimage, purification, and other devotional matters.

Transactions (Mu'āmalāt)

Issues involving contracts, commercial dealings, financial obligations, and civil transactions.

Personal Status Law

Matters concerning marriage, divorce, inheritance, guardianship, and family relations.

Judicial and Penal Rulings

Questions involving evidence, testimony, judicial procedures, and legal penalties.

Because mursal narrations appear throughout these areas, methodological differences concerning their authority inevitably affect juristic outcomes [5], [9], [15].

#### **Third Topic**

## The Necessity of Reassessing Certain Juristic Conclusions

One of the most significant implications of al-Khoei's methodology is the necessity of reassessing legal rulings that depend exclusively upon mursal narrations whose evidentiary authority cannot be independently established.

This does not necessarily mean that such rulings are incorrect.

Rather, it means that their evidentiary foundations require renewed examination according to rigorous scholarly standards.

Where corroborating evidence exists, a ruling may remain valid.

Where no supporting evidence exists, further investigation becomes necessary.

## General Evaluation of Al-Khoei's Methodology

The methodology developed by Sayyid al-Khoei represents one of the most influential developments in contemporary Imami rijāl scholarship.

Among its strengths are:

Reliance upon objective standards of authentication.

Rejection of assumptions unsupported by evidence.

Emphasis on methodological consistency.

Commitment to analytical and critical evaluation.

At the same time, some scholars have argued that the strict application of these principles may lead to the rejection of narrations long accepted within the juristic tradition.

Consequently, debate continues regarding the appropriate balance between historical scholarly practice and rigorous critical analysis.

## Results

The study reached the following conclusions:

The claim that Muhammad ibn Abī 'Umayr narrated exclusively from trustworthy transmitters is not established through conclusive evidence.

The evidentiary authority of his mursal narrations cannot be accepted unconditionally on the basis of this claim alone.

Sayyid al-Khoei's methodology represents a major methodological shift in rijāl studies from reliance on inherited assumptions toward critical analysis and evidentiary verification.

Significant differences exist between al-Khoei's methodology and the approaches adopted by many earlier scholars.

These methodological differences have direct implications for legal deduction and may require the reassessment of certain juristic conclusions.

The development of rijāl studies requires continuous critical engagement with inherited methodologies while preserving scholarly objectivity and intellectual balance.

## Recommendations

The study recommends the following:

Conducting comprehensive inductive studies of the mursal narrations transmitted by all members of the Companions of Consensus.

Organizing specialized academic conferences and seminars devoted to the methodological implications of contemporary rijāl criticism.

Encouraging further comparative research between classical and contemporary approaches to hadith authentication.

Promoting greater transparency among jurists regarding methodological and chain-of-transmission disagreements when relying upon mursal narrations in legal argumentation.

This study is not intended to undermine the rijāl heritage. Rather, it seeks to promote a proper understanding of that heritage, encourage constructive criticism, and contribute to its development in a manner that preserves its authenticity while ensuring its continued vitality and effectiveness.

All praise is due to Allah, Lord of the Worlds, and blessings and peace be upon our Master Muhammad and his pure and immaculate Household.

## References

- [1] A. ibn 'A. Al-Najāshī, *Rijāl al-Najāshī*, M. al-Shubayrī al-Zanjānī, Ed., 6th ed. Qom: Mu'assasat al-Nashr al-Islāmī, 1416 AH.
- [2] M. ibn al-Ḥ. Al-Ṭūsī, *Rijāl al-Ṭūsī*, J. al-Fayyūmī, Ed., 1st ed. Qom: Mu'assasat al-Nashr al-Islāmī, 1415 AH.
- [3] M. ibn 'U. Al-Kashshī, *Ikhtiyār Ma'rifat al-Rijāl*, Ḥ. al-Muṣṭafawī, Rev. Mashhad: University of Mashhad Press, 1348 Sh.
- [4] Al-Ḥ. ibn Y. Al-Ḥillī, *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl fī Ma'rifat al-Rijāl (Summary of Statements on the Evaluation of Narrators)*, J. al-Fayyūmī, Ed., 1st ed. Qom: Mu'assasat Nashr al-Faqāhah, 1417 AH.
- [5] A. al-Q. Al-Khoei, *Mu'jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth wa Tafṣīl Ṭabaqāt al-Ruwāt (Dictionary of the Narrators of Hadith and Detailed Classification of Narrator Generations)*, 5th ed. Qom: Markaz Nashr Āthār al-Shī'ah, 1413 AH.
- [6] M. ibn al-Ḥ. Al-Ṭūsī, *Fihrist Kutub al-Shī'a (Catalogue of Shi'i Books)*, J. al-Fayyūmī, Ed., 1st ed. Qom: Maktabat al-Muḥaqqiq al-Ṭabāṭabā'ī, 1420 AH.
- [7] J. Al-Subḥānī, *Kulliyāt fī 'Ilm al-Rijāl (Fundamentals of Rijāl Studies)*, 4th ed. Qom: Imām al-Ṣādiq Foundation, 1422 AH.
- [8] M. Al-Dāmād, *Dirāsāt fī 'Ilm al-Dirāyah (Studies in the Science of Hadith Methodology)*, 2nd ed. Qom: Markaz al-Nashr al-Islāmī, 1416 AH.
- [9] 'A. Al-Gharawī, *Al-Faqīh wa al-Ḥadīth: A Study of Juristic Methodologies in Dealing with Hadith*. Qom: Markaz Fiqh al-A'imma al-Athār.
- [10] M. ibn Y. Al-Kulaynī, *Al-Kāfī*, A. A. al-Ghaffārī, Ed., 8th ed. Tehran: Dār al-Kutub al-Islāmiyyah, 1407 AH.
- [11] M. ibn 'A. Al-Ṣadūq, *Man Lā Yahḍuruḥu al-Faqīh*, A. A. al-Ghaffārī, Ed., 2nd ed. Qom: Mu'assasat al-Nashr al-Islāmī, 1413 AH.
- [12] M. ibn al-Ḥ. Al-Ṭūsī, *Tahdhīb al-Aḥkām*, Ḥ. al-Mūsawī al-Kharsān, Ed., 4th ed. Tehran: Dār al-Kutub al-Islāmiyyah, 1365 Sh.
- [13] M. ibn al-Ḥ. Al-Ṭūsī, *Al-Istibṣār fīmā Ikhtulifa min al-Akhbār*, Ḥ. al-Mūsawī al-Kharsān, Ed., 1st ed. Tehran: Dār al-Kutub al-Islāmiyyah, 1390 AH.
- [14] M. H. Al-Ḥakīm, *Uṣūl al-Ḥadīth wa Aḥkāmuhu fī 'Ilm al-Dirāyah*. Qom: Mu'assasat Āl al-Bayt li-Iḥyā' al-Turāth.
- [15] M. B. Al-Ṣadr, *Durūs fī 'Ilm al-Uṣūl*, vol. 1. Qom: Dār al-Kitāb al-Islāmī.