Al-Dāraquṭnī's (d. 385 AH) *Faḍāʾil al-Ṣaḥāba*: Mild anger and the history of emotions in religious merits literature

Nancy Khalek
Brown University
nancy_khalek@brown.edu

Abstract

This essay analyses the sole extant chapter of a fourth/tenth-century *Faḍāʾil al-Ṣaḥaba* work by the *ḥadīth* critic and scholar Al-Ḥasan ʿAlī ibn ʿUmar ibn Aḥmad Ibn Mahdī ibn Masʿūd al-Dāraquṭnī (d. 385/995). As scholars have noted, *faḍāʾil* literature beyond the chapters on religious merits of the Companions in the *Ṣaḥīḥayn* is among a number of sub-genres of tradition-based literature (alongside, for example, *targhīb wa tarhīb*), which tends largely to be comprised of weak, non-canonical *ḥadīth*. This has generally been interpreted as evidence of the acceptability of "lower standards" for the inclusion of *ḥadīth* in exhortatory or edifying literature (lower when compared to standards for the authentication of *ḥadīth* in relation to law). This conceptualization both centres law as the dominant lens through which to view the reception of *ḥadīth* in general, and contributes to the marginalization of *faḍāʾil* literature as merely folk-loric. Using a history of emotions perspective to elucidate the nature and mechanisms of edification and pious instruction in *faḍāʾil* texts, this essay argues that far from being marginal, *faḍāʾil* works were central to the formation of emotional communities and to the construction of pious subjects in the Būyid period. Al-Dāraquṭnī's fragmentary text reflects how a well-known and highly respected fourth-century *ḥadīth* scholar capitalized on the emotional resonances and sectarian ambiguities made available by the abundance of non-legal and non-prophetic *ḥadīth* generated during the second and third centuries AH.

Keywords: Emotion, Religious merits/*Faḍāʾil*, *Ḥadīth*, Genre, Sectarianism

This article examines a brief fragmentary text entitled *Faḍāʾil al-ṣaḥāba wa-manāqibuhum wa-qawl baʿḍihim fī baʿḍ* (The Merits of the Companions and their Virtuous Deeds, and the Sayings of Some of them about One Another) compiled by the famous Sunni *ḥadīth* critic al-Ḥasan ʿAlī ibn ʿUmar ibn Aḥmad ibn Mahdī ibn Masʿūd al-Dāraquṭnī (d. 385/995).[1] A Būyid-era scholar, al-Dāraquṭnī was best known for his scholarship on the *Ṣaḥīḥayn* of al-Bukhārī and Muslim. This brief portion of his *Faḍāʾil* – an otherwise lost

---

1 Al-Dāraquṭnī, *Faḍāʾil al-ṣaḥāba wa-manāqibuhum wa-qawl baʿḍihim fī baʿḍ*, ed. Muḥammad ibn Khalīfa al-Rabbāḥ (Medina: Maktabat al-Ghurabāʾ al-Athariyya, 1998), hereafter referred to as the *Faḍāʾil*.

compilation of *āthār*/traditions comprised of sayings of the Companions and family members of the Prophet – has been largely overlooked by contemporary scholars.[2] I begin my analysis of this text with a discussion of *Faḍāʾil*/religious merits literature in general, noting the nature of the *ḥadīth* and *āthār* upon which most *Faḍāʾil* literature is based, in order to assess how al-Dāraquṭnī's fragmentary *Faḍāʾil* text fits into, or stands out from, the broader religious merits genre. I then proceed to a brief discussion of how the text compares to al-Dāraquṭnī's other works, noting the methodological tendencies al-Dāraquṭnī displays in this compilation. Turning to the contents of the text itself, it becomes clear that in compiling his rather polemical *Faḍāʾil*, al-Dāraquṭnī capitalized on a history of intra-Shii competition among so-called Batrī Zaydīs and proto-Imāmīs, which generated a number of the accounts in the work. These reports include depictions of contentious interactions between well-known Zaydīs and prominent ʿAlids, including the fifth and sixth Imāms Muḥammad al-Bāqir (d. 114/732) and Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq (d. 148/765). In the final part of the essay, I suggest the utility of reading texts like al-Dāraquṭnī's *Faḍāʾil* from the perspective of the history of emotions, in response to the preponderance of accounts featuring expressions of mild anger (and associated emotions such as suspicion and frustration), and suggest that, due in large part to the genre's polemical function, the emotional range of religious merits literature could include the representation of negative affects as well as more traditionally positive ones.

I. How typical was al-Dāraquṭnī's *Faḍāʾil al-Ṣaḥāba*?

Faḍāʾil/religious merits literature on the Companions of the Prophet comprises largely non-legal *ḥadīth* that describe the favour Muḥammad bestowed on specific Companions or which enumerate various Companions' meritorious qualities. *Faḍāʾil* are typically linked to *manāqib*, and while the two categories/concepts overlap, classical definitions suggest that *faḍīla* or excellence tends to suggest a judgement that is externally conferred. It may be hierarchical (as in the merits of animals over vegetables, or of humans over animals, and of some people over others) or even accidental, as in the case of an act of grace or bounty or favour affecting an individual's status, wealth, rank, or power.[3] *Manāqib* is a category generally reserved for personal qualities that are the opposite of *mathālib*/vices, and indicates personal virtues or excellences that merit praise, such as generosity of action or conduct, a good disposition, or some other internal quality. Due to a certain conceptual slippage between these two sets of characteristics, medieval scholars sometimes used the terms interchangeably or in conjunction with one another.

The reason for the creation and circulation of *Faḍāʾil al-ṣaḥāba* was, first and foremost, "pious partisanship". The earliest narratives on *Faḍāʾil al-ṣaḥāba* (as featured in chapters, for example, of the *Ṣaḥīḥayn*) constructed a hierarchy of excellence in which the distinguishing character traits and pious deeds of

---

2 Aside from a brief reference to the work in A. Osman, "ʿAdālat al-Ṣaḥāba: the construction of a religious doctrine", *Arabica* 60, 3–4, 2013, 272–305.
3 See "Faḍīla", and "Manākib", *Encyclopaedia of Islam* 2.

exemplary figures were enumerated. These traditions were the byproduct of early religio-political succession disputes, and by the third/ninth century, *Faḍā'il al-ṣaḥāba* compilations served as repositories of traditions that refuted "Shīʿite denigration of all the Companions who did not support ʿAlī's claim to leadership".[4] More elaborate compilations of *Faḍā'il al-ṣaḥāba* eventually developed, especially after the fourth/tenth century, into a full-fledged literary genre.[5]

Third- and early fourth-century compilations dedicated exclusively to *Faḍā'il al-ṣaḥāba* were usually arranged according to the identity of the Companion or Companions whose merits were being elucidated in a given chapter or subsection of a work.[6] Two of the earliest stand-alone compilations in the genre are the *Faḍā'il al-ṣaḥāba* of al-Nasā'ī (d. 303), and the much more extensive *Faḍā'il al-ṣaḥāba* by Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal (d. 241), the latter having been compiled and augmented by Ibn Ḥanbal's son ʿAbdallāh (d. 290). In these two works, the emphasis is on pronouncements by Muḥammad about his Companions. Merit or excellence was a matter of judgements made by the Prophet as he enumerated his preferences and expressed praise for this or that Companion's mercy, dutifulness, knowledge, or suchlike. A typical example from al-Nasā'ī's *Faḍā'il al-ṣaḥāba,* in the section on the Companion Ubayy ibn Kaʿb, lists the following superlative qualities:

> According to Anas, the Prophet said: The most merciful in my community is Abū Bakr, the most severe with respect to the commands of God is ʿUmar, the most sincere in his humility is ʿUthmān, the most learned in the Book of God is Ubayy ibn Kaʿb, the most dutiful is Zayd ibn Thābit, and the most learned with respect to the permitted and the prohibited is Muʿādh ibn Jabal. And verily, for every faithful community there is someone who is the most trustworthy, and that is Abū ʿUbayda ibn al-Jarrāḥ.[7]

Al-Nasā'ī's collection of 284 traditions was apparently compiled to allay suspicions about his alleged Shii sympathies, since he had previously transmitted a series of reports on the virtues of ʿAlī and refused to narrate any *Faḍā'il* about Muʿāwiya.[8] In Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal's much more extensive (over 2,000 traditions) *Faḍā'il al-ṣaḥāba*, which includes both prophetic *ḥadīth* and non-prophetic

---

4 J. Brown, *Ḥadīth: Muhammad's Legacy in the Medieval and Modern World* (Oxford: Oneworld, 2009), 36.

5 G.H.A. Juynboll, *Muslim Tradition: Studies in Chronology, Provenance, and Authorship of Early Ḥadīth* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 12.

6 For a discussion of the organizational structure of *Faḍā'il* works, see S. Lucas, "Al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī and the Companions of the Prophet: an original Sunnī voice in the Shīʿī century", in Maurice Pomeranz and Aram Shahin (eds), *The Heritage of Arabo-Islamic Learning: Studies Presented to Wadad Kadi* (Boston: Brill, 2015), 240.

7 Al-Nasā'ī, *Faḍā'il al-ṣaḥāba*, ed. Fārūq Ḥamāda (Morocco: Dār al-Thaqāfa, 1984), 134–5. A similar report has been examined in a different but related context in A. Afsaruddin, "In praise of caliphs: re-creating history from the Manāqib literature", *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 31/3, 1999, 339.

8 The transmission of *ḥadīth* praising ʿAlī allegedly led to al-Nasā'ī's death, since he was severely beaten by a group of anti-ʿAlids in Damascus. See al-Nasā'ī, *Faḍā'il al-ṣaḥāba*, 40. This position would be deemed *tashayyuʿ ḥasan* according to N. Husayn, "The

traditions/*āthār*, there is one brief section entitled "On the saying of ʿAlī and others that the best of this *umma* after its Messenger are Abū Bakr and ʿUmar", but the vast majority of the text is divided into chapters arranged according to the names of the Companions whose merits are being described, much like al-Nasāʾī's *Faḍāʾil al-ṣaḥāba*.

In al-Dāraquṭnī's *Faḍāʾil*, the extant chapter of which comprises 84 traditions, there is one subheading that is similar to that in Ibn Ḥanbal's: "What was narrated by the family of Abī Ṭālib and the descendants of ʿAlī about Abū Bakr and ʿUmar". Unlike Ibn Ḥanbal or al-Nasāʾī, however, al-Dāraquṭnī's *Faḍāʾil* is centred exclusively on the views and proclamations of later, non-prophetic figures. In addition to this structural departure – with respect to overall framing and narrative perspective – the anecdotes in al-Dāraquṭnī's *Faḍāʾil* differ from earlier compilations in that they are not overtly laudatory. While other *Faḍāʾil* works enumerated the meritorious qualities of various Companions in terms of precedence in conversion, abstemiousness, prayerfulness, or other qualities like those in the report from al-Nasāʾī cited above,[9] the majority of the reports in al-Dāraquṭnī's chapter attest only indirectly, if at all, to the meritorious qualities of a given Companion or member of the *ahl al-bayt* (family of the Prophet). Rather, after the first 18 reports (on ʿAlī's deference towards the first two caliphs), nearly all the subsequent anecdotes in the chapter describe varyingly confrontational scenes of second-century intra-Shii tension. Contemporary Shii biographical sources, such as the *Rijāl* of al-Kashshī (d. 340/951–2), contain similar anecdotes depicting, for example, well-known Zaydī figures in dispute with the fifth and sixth Imāms, with the former regularly failing to acknowledge the authority and knowledge of the latter.[10] The same tense Zaydī–Imāmī relationship, this time geared towards Sunni audiences and drawn from a variety of disparate sources, is a notable feature of this portion of al-Dāraquṭnī's *Faḍāʾil.* The dominant affective register of these interactions is a mild sense of anger, if not irritation, which could also manifest as suspicion, exasperation, or frustration. An attentiveness to this range of negative emotions helps elucidate the variety of affective tendencies that animated partisan piety in the Būyid era, a period of Shii political and intellectual ascendancy.

Insofar as modern scholars have considered al-Dāraquṭnī's *Faḍāʾil*, they have framed it as "a clear response to Shīʿī claims", for the purpose of "demonstrating that the Companions held each other in high esteem".[11] This assessment is generally correct, though it stops short of explicating the intra-sectarian background that supplied the terms and imagined conditions in which that esteem was articulated. Al-Dāraquṭnī capitalized on reports that filtered out of an earlier era of

---

memory of ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib in early Sunnī thought" (PhD dissertation, Princeton University, 2016), 48.

9 A. Afsaruddin, *Excellence and Precedence: Medieval Islamic Discourse on Legitimate Leadership* (Leiden: Brill, 2002).

10 Muḥammad ibn ʿUmar al-Kashshī, *Rijāl al-Kashī* (Beirut: Muʾassasat al-Aʿlamī lil-Maṭbūʿāt, 2009), 171. See also M. Dann, "Contested boundaries: the reception of Shīʿite narrators in the Sunnī *Ḥadīth* tradition" (PhD dissertation, Princeton University, 2015), 91.

11 Osman, "ʿAdālat al-Ṣaḥāba", 283.

intra-Shii contestation that was absorbed into Sunni tradition.[12] These included numerous reports that described Zaydī interlocutors accusing the Imāms of harbouring animosity for Abū Bakr and ʿUmar; the fifth and sixth Imāms expressing anger or irritation when forced to articulate their views of succession; and contentious interactions featuring prominent ʿAlids who had been embroiled in various dissident movements or rebellions in the first half of the second/eighth century. Rather than the positive traits that elicited Muḥammad's praise or favour that we find in earlier *Faḍā'il* works, al-Dāraquṭnī's fourth-century *Faḍā'il* makes its argument for the validity of caliphal succession by recapitulating the religio-political conflicts of the second/eighth century, using reports in which those whom we may categorize as Batrī Zaydīs sought to distinguish themselves from their Imāmī rivals.

By al-Dāraquṭnī's day, in fourth-/tenth-century Būyid-controlled Baghdad,[13] increasingly polarized sectarian groups continued either to denigrate the first two caliphs or pejoratively characterize the fifth and sixth Imāms as *rāfiḍī*s, a catch-all derogatory term used to denigrate Imāmī Shiis.[14] For most Sunnis, *rafḍ* was defined as the outright repudiation of Abū Bakr and ʿUmar as legitimate caliphs.[15] Al-Dāraquṭnī, facing the "same orthodox litmus test as other scholars of his time ... ranking the *rāshidūn* caliphs", espoused a view that the term also indicated a refusal to rank ʿUthmān over ʿAlī in the order of succession.[16] When pressed to put forward his own views on succession, as reported by his student in *As'ilat al-Sulamī*, he said:

A number of the scholars in Baghdad disagreed among themselves; some of them said ʿUthmān was more meritorious, and some said ʿAlī was more meritorious. So they came to me seeking to resolve this matter and asked me about it. I refrained from answering, and said, "Staying silent on the matter is best". But then I decided against staying silent, and said, "Summon them to speak about what they wish". Then I told the one who had come to me seeking an opinion, "Return to them and say, Abū al-Ḥasan says the following: ʿUthmān ibn ʿAffān was more worthy (*afḍal*) [of the caliphate] than ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib, by the agreement of the plurality of the Companions of the Messenger of God. That is the

12   On the phenomenon of "sectaries" absorbed into Sunni tradition, C. Melchert, "Sectaries in the Six Books", *The Muslim World* 82/3–4, 1992, 287–95. Melchert notes that of those sectaries whose transmissions were absorbed into Sunni *ḥadīth* compilations, most were "the sort usually identified as Zaydiyya" (291). See also Dann, "Contested boundaries".
13   The Būyids were a Zaydī Shii dynasty, though there is little evidence that al-Dāraquṭnī was affected by a personal relationship with Būyid authorities.
14   E. Kohlberg, "The term 'Rāfiḍa' in Imāmī Shīʿī usage", *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 99/4, 1979, 677–9.
15   Kohlberg, "The term 'Rāfiḍa'", 677. Kohlberg affirms the pejorative sense of the term when used by Sunnis and provides a few examples of Shii attempts to bestow the term with more positive connotations.
16   J. Brown, "Criticism of the proto-*ḥadīth* canon: Al-Dāraquṭnī's adjustment of the Ṣaḥīḥayn", *Journal of Islamic Studies* 15/1, 2004, 4 and n. 20 on p. 7.

pronouncement of the people of the *Sunna*, and that is the first thing the people of *rafḍ* would deny".[17]

II. Al-Dāraquṭnī's methodology

More will be said on the intellectual environment in which al-Dāraquṭnī's *Faḍā'il* was compiled, but aside from its structure and tone, another way to assess a short text like the *Faḍā'il* is to consider it in light of the scholar's reputation and his other works. Al-Dāraquṭnī was born in Baghdād and his early studies took place in Baṣra, Kūfa, and Wāsiṭ. He was a staunch Shāfiʿī and an opponent of *kalām*. As a *ḥadīth* scholar, his towering contribution was his study of the *Ṣaḥīḥayn* of al-Bukhārī and Muslim, about which he composed numerous works.[18] These included but were not limited to a biographical compilation on the non-Companion transmitters in the *Ṣaḥīḥayn* and a supplementary *ḥadīth* compilation of reports he thought should have been included in them. In addition to studies on Bukhārī and Muslim, al-Dāraquṭnī's most substantive works were his lengthy compilation of flawed traditions (collected by his student al-Barqānī and entitled *ʿIlal al-ḥadīth*) and a similarly elaborate work on *ḥadīth* with a single *isnād* or rare narrations of better-known *ḥadīth*.[19] In terms of his methodology, Jonathan Brown has noted al-Dāraquṭnī's "methodological sternness and demand for accuracy",[20] as he was "one of the most respected and critically stringent *ḥadīth* scholars of the fourth/tenth century".[21] Brown also notes that al-Dāraquṭnī's rigour ought to be seen in "the context of the changing science of *ḥadīth* evaluation and its religious and legal environment", and concludes that above all else, al-Dāraquṭnī was "a master of form" whose "approach to *ḥadīth* criticism centered solely on the processes and vagaries of transmission, to the exclusion of ideological content".[22]

Brown's analysis of al-Dāraquṭnī's method was aimed at explicating the scholar's approach to the *Ṣaḥīḥayn* in order to demonstrate that while he suggested correctives for certain *isnād*s, he did not reject the validity of the traditions in those two collections. When we apply this understanding of al-Dāraquṭnī's *isnād*-critical method to the *Faḍā'il,* it becomes clear that (even though we

17 Al-Dāraquṭnī, *Faḍā'il*, 12. My thanks to Andrew McLaren at Columbia University for his thoughts on the passage. The phrase is literally: "the first knot untied with respect to *rafḍ*" and my translation here is idiomatic.
18 For an overview see Brown, "Criticism".
19 Al-Dāraquṭnī also composed other minor works on "the minutiae of *ḥadīth* criticism", including a list of impugned transmitters, entitled *Kitāb al-ḍuʿafā' wa-l-matrūkīn*, a work on transmitters whose names were conflated, entitled *al-Mukhtalif wa-l-muʾtalif fī asmā' al-rijāl*, a book on the dyslexic errors of *ḥadīth* transmitters, entitled *Taṣḥīf al-muḥaddithīn*, and a book on *ḥadīth* scholars who transmitted from their classmates, entitled *Kitāb al-mudabbaj*. For the information in this paragraph see J. Brown, "al-Dāraquṭnī", *Encyclopaedia of Islam* 3.
20 Brown, "Criticism", 3.
21 J. Brown, "Critical rigor vs. juridical pragmatism: how legal theorists and ḥadīth scholars approached the backgrowth of "Isnāds" in the genre of ʿIlal al-ḥadīth", *Islamic Law and Society* 14/1, 2007, 20.
22 Brown, "Criticism", 36.

are dealing in that text with a set of non-prophetic, non-legal traditions, nearly all of which were transmitted with less-than-*ṣaḥīḥ isnād*s) al-Dāraquṭnī's penchant for locating corroborating traditions and auxiliary (or bolstering) narrations very much applied. In his *Faḍāʾil,* the vast majority (65/84) of the *isnād*s feature what *ḥadīth* critics would deem deficiencies (such as unknown or problematic transmitters). Yet more than half of these are corroborated by alternative, occasionally stronger, narrations.[23] Doubtless it was al-Dāraquṭnī's expertise in the study of flawed traditions (*ʿilal*), which he had applied to both the *Ṣaḥīḥayn* and to the "corpus of *ḥadīth*s he received from his teacher Ibrāhīm b. al-Ḥusayn al-Karajī"[24] that aided him as he sifted through variant narrations to compile his *Faḍāʾil.*

Considering al-Dāraquṭnī's rigorous approach to the Sunni *ḥadīth* canon and to *isnād* analysis in particular, it is reasonable to wonder why he felt compelled to assemble this collection of problematically attested traditions on the views of the Companions and the *ahl al-bayt*. Al-Dāraquṭnī (like al-Nasāʾī before him and like his student al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī, d. 405) was accused of having ʿAlid sympathies/*tashayyuʿ* on the basis, according to al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, of having memorized the *dīwān* of al-Sayyid al-Ḥimayrī, whose poetry included both condemnation of the *salaf* and praise of ʿAlī.[25] While in itself, *tashayyuʿ* was not a negative characteristic, and could simply imply love or esteem for the family of the Prophet, al-Dāraquṭnī had also exhibited a consistent level of tolerance for fellow *muḥaddithūn* who were more ambivalent than he in their judgements of the Companions' behaviour during the crises that plagued the early community.[26] He was known, for example, to have praised other scholars who were either accused of *tashayyuʿ* or who were Shiis themselves, including al-Nasāʾī (d. 303) and Ibn ʿUqda (d. 332), respectively. In his *Faḍāʾil*, therefore, al-Dāraquṭnī was engaging in an effort to establish appropriate boundaries for Sunni reverence for the family of the Prophet within the purview of the consolidating Sunnism of his day, a process that entailed co-opting universally revered figures like Muḥammad al-Bāqir and Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq. This helps account for his reliance on later traditions that included portrayals of the fifth and sixth Imāms.[27]

There was, of course, no lack of pro-ʿAlid tradition in Sunni traditionist circles. Jonathan Brown has characterized pro-ʿAlid Sunni *ḥadīth* (many with *isnād*s that included Shii transmitters) as "generally innocuous, with no sectarian edge", since they "urged goodly and pious behavior" and were "widely

23   Muḥammad ibn Khalīfa al-Rabbāḥ, the editor of the 1998 edition of the *Faḍāʾil*, documents details on the chains of transmission extensively in his footnotes.

24   Brown, "Critical rigor", 20.

25   Al-Dāraquṭnī, *Faḍāʾil*, 11–13. Al-Ḥākim also received some suspicion because of his inclusion of two pro-ʿAlī *ḥadīth* in his *Mustadrak*, and because of the fact that he disparaged Muʿāwiya. On the latter claims see Lucas, "An original Sunnī voice", 237.

26   H. Motzki, *The Origins of Islamic Jurisprudence: Meccan Fiqh before the Classical Schools* (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 54–71, especially 68.

27   A.R. Lalani, *Early Shīʿī Thought: The Teachings of Imām Muḥammad al-Bāqir* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2003), 96–107 on the co-opting of the Imāms in Sunni tradition. See also T. Bernheimer, *The ʿAlids: The First Family of Islam, 750–1200* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2013).

transmitted for pietistic purposes".[28] I would suggest, however, that in the heightened sectarian and intellectual context of the fourth/tenth century, al-Dāraquṭnī's compilation was differently inflected, if not more explicitly polemical, than the work of his proto- and earlier Sunni predecessors in the *Faḍāʾil* genre, coinciding as it did with a proliferation of Shii *Faḍāʾil* literature. Al-Dāraquṭnī's work came on the heels of heresiographical intra-sectarian treatises by proponents of Shiism, such as the *Kitāb firaq al-Shīʿa* and *Al-radd ʿalā al-ghulāt* by al-Nawbakhtī (d. between 300 and 310/912–22). Further, his contemporary Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī (d. 380) had produced a treatise entitled *Faḍāʾil al-Shīʿa*, among other similar hagiographical works, while Ibn Shādhān (d. 420) had compiled both a *Faḍāʾil amīr al-muʾminīn ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib* and *Miʾat manqaba min manāqib amīr al-muʾminīn ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib*.[29] Around the same period, Sunni-adjacent or Sunni scholars would compile still other works dedicated to enumerating the religious merits of ʿAlī, including Ibn ʿUqda (d. 332), the famous Zaydī Shii traditionist from Kūfa who compiled a *Faḍāʾil amīr al-muʾminīn*, and Ibn Mardawayh (d. 410), a "Sunni proponent of *tafḍīl* ʿAlī" who, like al-Nasāʾī before him, compiled a work entitled *Manāqib ʿAlī*.[30] Notably, Al-Dāraquṭnī's representation of ʿAlī and the *ahl al-bayt* in his *Faḍāʾil* does not include (at least in the surviving portion) the most politicized traditions about ʿAlī that were transmitted by either his predecessors or his contemporaries, including the *ḥadīth al-munāshada*, the *ḥadīth al-ṭayr*, and the *ḥadīth al-manzila* – three famous pro-ʿAlid traditions that extolled the virtues of ʿAlī in terms of his unique relationship with the Prophet.[31] The transmission of these more politicized traditions could, as they had done in the case of al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī, lead to accusations of being a "hardline Shīʿī/rāfiḍī".[32]

As contemporary scholarship on *ḥadīth* transmission has demonstrated, the weakness of the *isnād*s for the *āthār* which al-Dāraquṭnī gathered in his *Faḍāʾil* (relative to standards for the transmission of legal *ḥadīth*), while problematic for some later *ḥadīth* critics, would have been of little concern to others. When it came to non-legal matters such as etiquette/manners, matters of piety such as *targhīb wa-tarhīb* (exhortation and dissuasion), and *Faḍāʾil al-aʿmāl* (the virtues of actions), many *ḥadīth* scholars reconciled themselves to a position of compromise. They accepted earlier generations' transmission of such reports

---

28 Brown, *Ḥadīth*, 140–1.
29 On the "explosion of polemical exchange" in this period, Afsaruddin, "In praise", 342 and R. Mottahedeh, *Loyalty and Leadership in an Early Islamic Society* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980), 39.
30 Husayn, "The memory of ʿAlī", 126–7 and 138 on Ibn Mardawayh's pro-ʿAlī tendencies. Ibn ʿUqda was a Jārūdī Zaydī, but was still considered trustworthy by some Sunnī scholars. Husayn, "The memory of ʿAlī", 123–4. Husayn posits that Sunni traditionalists may have passed on censored versions of reports on ʿAlī from Ibn ʿUqda.
31 Husayn, "The memory of ʿAlī", 92 ff and 122 ff. According to Scott Lucas, the three traditions most commonly narrated in the *Ṣaḥīḥayn* and the *Muṣannaf* of Ibn Abī Shayba regarding Ali were the *manzila ḥadīth*, the *rāya ḥadīth*, and an explanation of Ali's nickname, Abū Turāb. S. Lucas, *Constructive Critics, Ḥadīth Literature, and the Articulation of Sunnī Islam: The Legacy of the Generation of Ibn Saʿd, Ibn Maʿīn, and Ibn Ḥanbal* (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 264. See also Husayn, "Memory of ʿAlī", 265–71.
32 Lucas, "An original Sunnī voice", 237.

even if they had problems with their *isnād*s such as interruptions, confused or missing names, or transmission by sectaries with dubious reputations. As Brown notes, the Baṣran *ḥadīth* critic ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. al-Mahdī (d. 198) was quoted by al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī (d. 405) as saying:

> If reports are related to us from the Prophet concerning rulings and what is licit or prohibited, we are severe with the *isnād*s and we criticize the transmitters. But if we are told reports dealing with the virtues of actions (*Faḍā'il al-aʿmāl*), their rewards and punishments, permissible things or pious invocations, we are lax with the *isnād*s.[33]

Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī (d. 463) also justified transmission of these traditions by appealing to the practice of Ibn Ḥanbal, in a chapter of the former's *Al-Kifāya fī maʿrifat uṣūl ʿilm al-riwāya* entitled "Strictness in legal *ḥadīth* and laxity in the virtues of actions". In terms very similar to Ibn al-Mahdī's, Ibn Ḥanbal cites the permissibility of laxity with *isnād*s for those traditions which "do not create a rule or remove one".[34] Christopher Melchert's assessment on the issue of laxity with non-legal *ḥadīth* and strictness with legal ones is more nuanced. In his analysis of the *Musnad* of Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal, he notes that Ibn Ḥanbal "presumably saw fit to include most of [the *ḥadīth* deemed weak in the *Musnad*] because they had parallels elsewhere…Aḥmad accepted as sound what was corroborated, rejected as dubious what was not".[35] As we have seen, for many of the problematically attested reports in the extant chapter of the *Faḍā'il,* al-Dāraquṭnī's method was rather similar to Ibn Ḥanbal's in this regard. A final way *ḥadīth* critics accounted for this practice was to "look the other way" if a transmitter held problematic beliefs but was known to have refrained from proselytizing about them.[36] While it was not a unanimously held position among Sunni scholars,[37] approval for the transmission of dubious non-legal *ḥadīth* and *āthār* was more common for traditions on *Faḍā'il* than for other genres or topics.[38] Much like *Faḍā'il al-aʿmāl* and *targhīb wa-tarhīb*, *Faḍā'il*

---

33 J. Brown, "Even if it's not true it's true: using unreliable Hadiths in Sunni Islam", *Islamic Law and Society* 18, 2011, 7. Melchert, "Sectaries", 29, quoting Yaḥyā ibn Saʿīd al-Qaṭṭān in a similar vein. C. Melchert, "The Musnad of Aḥmad Ibn Ḥanbal: How it was composed and what distinguishes it from the Six Books", *Der Islam* 82/1, 2005, 32–51. S. Lucas, "Where are the legal *Ḥadīth*?": a study of the Muṣannaf of Ibn Abī Shayba", *Islamic Law and Society* 15, 2008, 283–314.

34 Brown, "Even if it's not true", 10, 13. Brown also cites evidence by Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr (d. 463) and much later, al- Suyūṭī (d. 911), for the endurance of this view. See also Brown, *Ḥadīth*, 102.

35 C. Melchert, "The Musnad of Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal", 45–7.

36 For a convenient summary of Sunni views on the transmission and value of Companion *āthār* and of weak *ḥadīth*, see ʿAbd al-Majīd Maḥmūd ʿAbd al-Majīd, *Al-Ittijāhāt al-fiqhiyya ʿinda aṣḥāb al-ḥadīth fī l-qarn al-thālith al-hijrī* (Cairo: Dar al-ʿUlum, 1979), 185–231, 240, 255, 260, and 269–76. We find a similar discussion in al-Nawawī's *Irshād ṭulāb al-ḥaqā'iq ilā maʿrifat sunan khayr al-khalā'iq* (Damascus: Dar al-Faruq, 2009), 107–8.

37 Brown, "Even if it's not true", 18–19.

38 According to Jonathan Brown's calculations, in the *Jāmiʿ* of al-Tirmidhī, for example, over half (52%) the traditions on the virtues of the early Muslims lack corroboration,

literature was aimed at cultivating piety.[39] In one contemporary study of al-Dāraquṭnī's life and work, in which the *Faḍāʾil* is briefly catalogued, the preponderance of weak *isnāds* attached to the traditions in the text is attributed to the probability that al-Dāraquṭnī "was of the school of thought that considered it permissible to work with weak *ḥadīth* on matters of *Faḍāʾil*".[40]

III. The contents of Al-Dāraquṭnī's *Faḍāʾil al-ṣaḥāba*

The extant chapter of al-Dāraquṭnī's *Faḍāʾil* consists of 84 reports describing a series of interactions between two sets of figures. On the one hand are ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib and ʿUmar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb (the first 18 reports of the chapter). On the other hand are a number of second/eigth-century Zaydīs interacting with the fifth and sixth Shii Imāms, Muḥammad al-Bāqir (d. 114) and Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq (d. 148) or other prominent ʿAlids such as Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥanafiyya (the remaining 66 reports). Following a brief description of the first, shorter portion, I will focus this analysis on several of the more confrontational encounters in the second, lengthier portion of the extant text.

The chapter begins with a series of 18 anecdotes that describe ʿAlī's fondness for a certain garment that had belonged to ʿUmar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb. These reports, some of which describe ʿAlī's praise of ʿUmar as *nāṣiḥ Allāh*,[41] have a clear sectarian purpose. They serve as a rejoinder to numerous Shii traditions that describe ʿAlī behaving more justly than ʿUmar during the reign of the latter, and to others which portray ʿAlī as more knowledgeable than ʿUmar about the *sunna* of the Prophet.[42] The Zaydī Ibn ʿUqda's (d. 332/3) *Faḍāʾil amīr al-muʾminīn* is an obvious counterpoint, as it contains chapters expressly aimed at exalting ʿAlī as the "most knowledgeable", the "soundest in judgment", and the "closest of all people to the Messenger of God".[43] A number of

---

a higher percentage than those on legal subjects, for which the range of uncorroborated traditions ranges from 7–17%. Other subjects that have a higher percentage of less reliable *ḥadīth* (ranging from 27–50%) are similarly concerned with history, piety, or exhortation, including *fitan*, pious invocations (*daʿwāt*), or etiquette/manners. Brown, "Even if it's not true", 8

39 John Renard, *Seven Doors to Islam: Spirituality and the Religious Life of Muslims* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996), 76.

40 ʿAbdallāh ibn Ḍayf Al-Raḥīlī, *Al-Imām al-Dāraquṭnī wa-āthāruhu al-ʿilmiyya* (Al-Aluka.net, 2000), 230.

41 Al-Dāraquṭnī, *Faḍāʾil,* 35–42, nos 5–17. On Sunni depictions of ʿAlī as pro-Abū Bakr and ʿUmar, see Husayn, "Memory of ʿAlī", 91 and 122, esp. n. 389, and 123–4, with most of the references being much later than al-Dāraquṭnī. Husayn does mention al-Dāraquṭnī as being "invested in portraying ʿAlī and his family as pious Sunnīs", though on the basis of a report in Ibn ʿAsākir's *Tārīkh madīnat Dimashq*, vol. 42 (Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1995), 431.

42 See, for example, an incident reported in the *Amālī of al-Ṭūsī*, in which Umar is seen as deferring to ʿAlī's authority and spiritual superiority. Muḥammad Bāqir ibn Muḥammad Taqī Majlisī, *Biḥār al-anwār*, vol. 31 (Beirut: Muʾassasat al-Aʿlamī lil-Maṭbuʿāt, 2008), 51. In another incident, ʿAlī informs ʿUmar about Prophetic *sunna* regarding tacit consent in the acceptance of a marriage proposal. Majlisī, *Biḥār al-anwār*, 52.

43 Ibn ʿUqda al-Kūfī, *Faḍāʾil amīr al-muʾminīn*, ed. ʿAbd al-Razzāq Muḥammad Ḥusayn Fayḍ al-Din (Beirut: Muʾassasat Āl al-Bayt li-iḥyāʾ al-Turāth, 2000).

repetitive anecdotes appear in succession, describing ʿAlī's tendency to wear a garment described as "the cloak of my bosom companion (khalīlī) ʿUmar, may God be pleased with him".[44] This purported friendship between ʿAlī and ʿUmar stands in sharp contrast, however, to other narratives embedded in this section that describe less conciliatory interactions between ʿAlī or other members of the Ahl al-Bayt and ʿUmar. In one tense incident that took place during the caliphate of ʿUmar, ʿAlī's son al-Ḥusayn insults the caliph while the latter is on the *minbar* of the Prophet's mosque and tells him to "get down from my father's *minbar*".[45] ʿAlī quickly interjects with the disavowal, "By God, I did not tell him to say that", to which ʿUmar replies, "By God, I did not accuse you of doing so".[46] While ʿAlī is portrayed as having stepped in quickly, the incident is hardly construed as a harmonious one. ʿUmar's response is fairly curt and the other main character in the scenario, al-Ḥusayn, is likewise only briefly mentioned. A second awkward incident occurs in another report relayed by Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq from his father, Muḥammad al-Bāqir, about a conversation that took place after ʿUmar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb had been stabbed, but before he had succumbed to his fatal wounds. The injured ʿUmar sent an unnamed messenger to question a group of Companions who had participated in the Battle of Badr and who were gathered together to discuss what had happened. The messenger asked, "By God, are you pleased by this act?" The group, presumably supporters of ʿAlī, is said to have hesitated, remaining silent until ʿAlī interjected, "[Tell him] I swear we are not, our love for you is such that we would extend your life with our own".[47]

The second set of anecdotes, making up the bulk of the chapter, refrains from enumerating even superficial niceties and instead manifests the well-documented phenomenon of persistent inquiries put to prominent ʿAlids by impertinent interrogators. Scholars of Shiism have described the atmosphere in which such interrogations took place as one of "severe hostility and mistrust", characterizing it as typical of a period of speculation [the second/eighth century] about the beliefs of the Imāms.[48]

---

44 Al-Dāraquṭnī, Faḍā'il, 36–7, no. 6. There is a corroborating report in Ibn Abī Shaybā's *Muṣannaf.*

45 In a later source, *Al-Ṣawāʿiq al-muḥriqa* by al-Haytamī (d. 974), the incident occurs during the reign of Abū Bakr.

46 Al-Dāraquṭnī, Faḍā'il, 34–5, no. 4. The earliest version I have found of this report is in al-ʿIjlī's (d. 261) *Maʿrifat al-thiqāt* (Medina: Maktabat al-Dār, 1985), 302–3. There is a longer and more elaborate narration of this tradition cited by several later scholars, including Ibn Ḥajar, in *Al-Iṣāba fī tamyīz al-Ṣaḥāba,* where it features a kinder response from ʿUmar. See Husayn, "Memory of ʿAlī", 265.

47 Al-Dāraquṭnī, Faḍā'il, 43–4, no. 19. Contrast the tone of this report with Shii sources that describe the day of Umar's death as a day of celebration, or ʿīd, in reports narrated by the eleventh Imām, Ḥasan ibn ʿAlī al-ʿAskarī (d. 260), in Majlisī, *Biḥār al-anwār* 31: 46–7. This source also includes a discussion on discrepancies about the date of Umar's death. In other reports, the day of Umar's death (designated, after the aforementioned discussion, as the 9th of Rabīʿ al-Awwal) is deemed an auspicious one during Muḥammad's lifetime in a report narrated by ʿAlī himself. Majlisī, *Biḥār al-anwār* 31: 49.

48 M. Momen, *Introduction to Shiʿi Islam* (Oxford: G. Ronald, 1985), 65. See also H. Modarressi, *Crisis and Consolidation in the Formative Period of Shiʿite Islam:*

In these reports, we find representations of prominent ʿAlids espousing Sunni-compliant views of the early succession disputes, a trope which would become more common in later Sunni literature. As Michael Dann has noted, texts like Abū Nuʿaym al-Iṣfahānī's *Ḥilyat al-awlīyāʾ*, Ibn ʿAsākir's *Tārīkh Madīnat Dimashq,* and al-Dhahabī's *Siyar aʿlām al-nubalāʾ* "almost universally" portray the Imāms "as distancing themselves from or condemning positions associated with *rafḍ*".[49] This literature includes accounts of activist Zaydīs who "spared no effort in condemning the so-called 'Rāfiḍīs' who were their chief competitors for legitimacy among the various pro-ʿAlid factions of the 8th century".[50] This intra-Shii competition was a major determinant in the formation of early sectarianism, leading some to argue that the defining feature of activist Zaydī Imāms was not their support for, or participation in, the revolt of Zayd ibn ʿAlī, but their opposition to the so-called *Rāfiḍa* "as an object of hostility".[51]

Al-Dāraquṭnī's text demonstrates the utility of these second/eighth-century, usually intra-Shii accounts, for the co-optation of revered Imāms in his *Faḍāʾil*. In one account, a man named Ḥabīb al-Asadī reports that he saw a group of people from Kūfa and the Jazīra approach the fifth Imām to inquire about his views on Abū Bakr and ʿUmar. Al-Bāqir is said to have turned to Ḥabīb and said, "Look at the people of my country, asking me about Abū Bakr and ʿUmar, may God be pleased with them both. As far as I am concerned, they have precedence over (*afḍal min*) ʿAlī".[52] In another case, ʿAlī's son, Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥanafiyyah[53] (d. 81), is reported to have answered in a similar vein:

> Sālim ibn Abī Jaʿd[54] said, "I had a nagging question regarding Abū Bakr (*kāna fī qalbī min Abī Bakr shayʾ*), so I asked Ibn al-Ḥanafiyya, "Was Abū Bakr the first person to accept Islam?" He said, "No". So I said, "Then by what measure was he elevated and given precedence?" He said, "He

---

Abū Jaʿfar Ibn Qiba Al-Rāzī and His Contribution to Imamite Shiʿite Thought (Princeton: Darwin Press, 1993), 98 and n. 243. See also N. Hurvitz, "Where have all the people gone? A critique of medieval Islamic historiography", in Dror Zeʾevi and Ehud R. Toledano (eds), *Society, Law, and Culture in the Middle East:* "*Modernities*" *in the Making* (Berlin: DeGruyter Open, 2015), 63. For examples of interrogation of the Imāms in anti-Umayyad reports, see Majlisī, *Biḥār al-Anwār*, 46: 509–10, citing *Manāqib āl Abī Ṭālib* by Ibn Shahrāshūb describing an incident in which al-Bāqir is questioned about his knowledge of the Torah, Gospels, Psalms, and the Quran, among other issues.

49   Dann, "Contested boundaries", 53.
50   Dann, "Contested boundaries", 53.
51   Dann, "Contested boundaries", 53.
52   Al-Dāraquṭnī, *Faḍāʾil,* 79, no. 58. This report is also in al-Lālikāʾī's (d. 418) *Sharḥ uṣūl iʿtiqād ahl al-sunna*, report no. 2468.
53   Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥanafiyya was considered the Imām and *mahdī* by the Kaysāniyya.
54   Sālim Ibn Abī Jaʿd al-Kūfī, a *tābiʿī* who died between 97 and 101 AH was, according to Ibn Ḥajar, generally considered a trustworthy transmitter in spite of "occasional oversights and errors". See Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb*, vol. 2 (Beirut: Dār Iḥyāʾ al-Turāth al-ʿArabī, 1993), 253.

accepted Islam, and he was the best of them with respect to Islam, until God took him unto himself".[55]

The expression "the best of those who remained" was a standard one in *Faḍā'il*-based disputes regarding precedence of conversion.[56] What I wish to note here is less the content of the actual dialogue than the representation of interiority with respect to Sālim ibn Abī Jaʿd, who expresses his doubt about the ʿAlid's views with the phrase "there was something in my heart", which I have interpreted as an expression of misgiving or doubt.[57] This expression of misgiving sets the stage for a similar interaction, this time featuring Sālim ibn Abī Ḥafṣa, a well-known Batrī Zaydī from Kūfa who died in 137 or 140 AH. Ibn Abī Ḥafṣa visits Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq on the latter's sickbed, and hears him say, "I swear that I affiliate with Abū Bakr and ʿUmar/*atawallāhumā*.[58] I swear, if I should hold in my [heart] any belief other than this, then I should be deprived of the intercession of Muḥammad on the Day of Resurrection".[59] In a second encounter with the same Sālim Ibn Abī Ḥafṣa, we find a brief glimpse into the Batrī Zaydī interlocutor's interior monologue, as well as al-Dāraquṭnī's gloss on Sālim himself:

> From Ibrāhīm ibn Ḥammād, who said: I heard from my uncle, from Ḥajjāj, who said: I heard Muḥammad ibn Ṭalḥa, from Khalf ibn Ḥawshab, from Sālim ibn Abī Ḥafṣa, *who was among the leaders of those who disparaged Abū Bakr and ʿUmar*, that he said: "I visited Abū Jaʿfar when he was ill and he said – and *I saw that he was saying this on my account* – "I swear that I affiliate with Abū Bakr and ʿUmar, and that I love them both. I swear that if there should be anything other than this in my heart, that I [should] not receive the intercession of Muḥammad on the Day of Resurrection".[60]

In this last account, suspicion regarding the Imām's allegiance is not voiced to the figure on the receiving end of the interrogation, though the audience receiving the report does have the benefit of the interlocutor's unspoken scepticism as well as the characterization of Sālim ibn Abī Ḥafṣa as a "leader among those

---

55 Al-Dāraquṭnī, *Faḍā'il,* 93–4, no. 81. A parallel report is found in the *Muṣannaf* of Ibn Abī Shayba though the phrase "I had something in my heart" is missing from Ibn Abī Shayba's version.

56 Afsaruddin, *Excellence and Precedence.*

57 A similar expression of misgiving is used in a different report from Yaḥyā b. Saʿīd al-Qaṭṭān in a description of a similar interaction with Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq, with the expression "*fī nafsī minhu shay*'" which Michael Dann has rendered as "I was uncomfortable". See Dann, "Contested boundaries", 53.

58 The translation of *tawallā* as "affiliation" may not fully capture all of the dimensions of the term, though I use it here as *tawallā* is often contrasted with *barā'a* or "dissociation". See E. Kohlberg, "Barā'a in Shīʿī doctrine", *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 7, 1976, 139–75.

59 Al-Dāraquṭnī, *Faḍā'il,* 56, no. 32. A parallel for this report is in al-Lālikā'ī's *Sharḥ uṣūl iʿtiqād ahl al-sunna*, #2466.

60 Al-Dāraquṭnī, *Faḍā'il,* 89, no. 72. Emphasis added.

who disparaged/criticized Abū Bakr and ʿUmar.[61] The phrase here is *min ruʾūs man yantaqiṣ Abā Bakr wa-ʿUmar*.[62] Al-Dāraquṭnī cited another more emotive report detailing the same incident, in which the context is the Imām's increasing frustration with Sālim, where the Imām exclaims, "Oh Sālim! Would a man curse his own grandfather? Abū Bakr is my grandfather. May I be deprived of the intercession of Muḥammad on the Day of Resurrection [if I believe otherwise]. I am innocent of the enemies of them both [Abū Bakr and ʿUmar]".[63]

The Batrī Zaydī position is generally characterized as a moderate one in which ʿAlī was deemed more meritorious (*afḍal*) than Abū Bakr and ʿUmar even as the caliphates of Abū Bakr and ʿUmar were deemed legitimate, a position that could put them at odds with proto- or early Imāmīs. Najam Haider has actually described Sālim Ibn Abī Ḥafṣa as an "ambiguous" figure who "hover[ed] at the edges of multiple communal identities".[64] Similarly, Dann notes that "although [Ibn Abī Ḥafṣa] was counted as a companion of Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq in Imāmī sources, there was clearly a great deal of friction between him and members of the Imāmī community in Kūfa, who counted him among the Batrīs".[65] In keeping with one hypothesis as noted above, Ibn Abī Ḥafṣa's categorization as a Batrī (by Imāmī Shiis) seemed to stem less from his position on caliphal legitimacy and more from his "criticism of Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq for the equivocating practice of precautionary dissimulation (*taqiyya*), claiming that he [Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq] spoke in seventy different ways and always had a way out".[66] Hossein Modarressi has also described Sālim as someone who "quoted *ḥadīth* from Muḥammad al-Bāqir but was not on good terms with Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq and his followers".[67] He was known to badger, annoy, or otherwise provoke the Imām under the pretence of sincere interaction.[68] One incident that highlights Sālim's reputation is reported, for example, in the *Amālī* of al-Mufīd (d. 413), where Ibn Abī Ḥafṣa visits Jaʿfar, this time after the latter's father (al-Bāqir) has died:

61 Implicit is the suggestion of hiding one's identity out of caution or *taqiyya*/dissimulation, which is made explicit in other reports, e.g. nos 47 and 74. See E. Kohlberg, "Some Imāmī views on Taqiyya", *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 95/3, 1975, 395–402.

62 On this term as a designation for a leader within a legal or theological community that indicated "authority" or "coercive power" see Mottahedeh, *Loyalty and Leadership*, 135.

63 Al-Dāraquṭnī, *Faḍāʾil*, 56–7, no. 33. This report is quoted in the *Faḍāʾil al-ṣaḥāba* of Ibn Ḥanbal, no. 176, and by his son ʿAbdallāh in the *Sunna*, no. 1303. See Al-Dāraquṭnī, *Faḍāʾil*, 57, n. 2. The ancestral connection here refers to al-Ṣādiq's mother's lineage from Abū Bakr. See also Al-Dāraquṭnī, *Faḍāʾil*, 57–8, no. 34 for a reference to al-Ṣādiq saying Abū Bakr begat him twice, since Jaʿfar's mother Umm Farwa was the great-granddaughter of Abū Bakr on her father's side, while her mother Asmāʾ was the granddaughter of Abū Bakr.

64 N. Haider, *The Origins of the Shīʿa: Identity, Ritual, and Sacred Space in Eighth-Century Kūfa* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 227. Other ambiguous figures, accepted by Sunnis despite their Shii views, include: al-Aʿmash, Ḥakam b. ʿUtayba, and al-Ḥasan b. Ṣāliḥ. Haider, *Origins*, 227.

65 Dann, "Contested boundaries", 89 and 91. See also al-Kashshī, *Rijāl al-Kashshī*, 171.

66 Dann, "Contested boundaries", 94.

67 H. Modarressi, *Tradition and Survival: A Bibliographical Survey of Early Shīʿite Literature* (Oxford: Oneworld, 2003), 105–6.

68 Haider, *Origins*, 227. See also Dann, "Contested boundaries", 92, n. 94.

Sālim ibn Abī Ḥafṣa said: When Abū Jaʿfar Muḥammad b. ʿAlī al-Bāqir died, I told my companions, "Wait for me until I go visit Jaʿfar ibn Muḥammad and give my condolences to him". So I went and gave my condolences to him and said *innā lillāh wa-innā ilayhi rājiʿūn*, gone is one who used to say "the Messenger of God said", and no one would ever ask about what was between him and the Messenger of God.[69] No, by God, no one the likes of him will ever be seen again". Then Sālim said, Abū ʿAbdallāh fell silent for a long time. Then he said, "God has said, Truly, whoever gives *ṣadaqa* even as small as the seed of one date, I will cultivate it for him, just as one of you cultivates a young foal, until I make it (as large as) Mount Uḥud on his behalf'. [Sālim continued], So I left and went back to my companions and said I've never seen anyone stranger than this. We used to think it a mighty thing that Abū Jaʿfar would say "The Messenger of God said" without any intermediary, and Abū ʿAbdallāh just said to me "God said" without an intermediary![70]

Sālim ibn Ḥafṣa is not the only prominent Zaydī figure to appear in al-Dāraquṭnī's text. In another report, we find the following confrontation between Muḥammad al-Bāqir and Kathīr al-Nawwāʾ "al-Abtar"[71] (the derogatory appellation by which the Batrī Zaydīs were named).[72]

Kathīr al-Nawwāʾ asked Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī (al-Bāqir) whether Abū Bakr and ʿUmar wrongfully deprived the *ahl al-bayt* of their rights, and was told "No, by God, they did not deprive us of our rights by one iota". Kathīr persisted and asked, "Swear to me – have you really accepted their authority?" Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī's reply was, "Yes, Kathīr! In this life and the next". Upon making this pronouncement Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī struck his own neck and said, "Whatever misery befalls you is on my conscience. May God and his messenger declare me innocent of al-Mughīra ibn Saʿīd and Bayān, for the two of them lie about the *ahl al-bayt*".[73]

Kathīr, like Sālim ibn Abī Ḥafṣa, is described in Imāmī sources as not "recognizing [al-Bāqir's] full rank as *imām* and sole authority in religion and as criticizing him for ambiguities in his teaching".[74] Michael Dann has posited that

---

69   Meaning al-Bāqir would quote the Prophet directly without any intermediary transmitters.
70   See Majlisī, *Biḥār al-Anwār*, 47: 21, citing the *Amālī* of al-Mufīd. For an interesting discussion of this phenomenon and a creative solution to it, see E. Kohlberg, "An unusual Shīʿī Isnād", *Israel Oriental Studies* 5, 1975, 142–9.
71   W. Madelung, "Batriyya or Butriyya", *Encyclopaedia of Islam* 2.
72   Al-Kashshī, *Rijāl al-Kashshī*, 173, on the origins of the term "Butriyya".
73   Al-Dāraquṭnī, *Faḍāʾil*, 53–4, no. 31. This account is also found in Ibn Saʿd's *Ṭabaqāt* and al-Lālikāʾī's *Sharḥ* – each with a different *isnād*. The reference here is to the Mughīriyya, who are "sometimes accounted among the *ghulāt*/extremists of the Imāmiyya and sometimes among the Zaydiyya" for their rejection of Abū Bakr and ʿUmar, and who were ultimately repudiated by Muḥammad al-Bāqir. See W. Madelung, "al-Mughīriyya", *Encyclopaedia of Islam* 2.
74   Madelung, "Batriyya or Butriyya".

"although the intricacies of such intra-Shīʿite debates left few traces in Sunnī literature, some proto-Sunnī figures seem to have been aware of them".[75] Al-Dāraquṭnī, indeed, seems to have been acutely aware of the polemical value of these traces. When the antagonist in an anecdote is a figure like Sālim ibn Abī Ḥafṣa or Kathīr al-Nawwāʾ, it is clear that it is at Zaydī expense that the fifth or sixth Imām's reputation is being rehabilitated and co-opted for a Sunni audience.[76]

Turning back to questions about the genre of *faḍāʾil* itself, it becomes clear that by limiting his framework to what later figures said about one another, al-Dāraquṭnī kept his *faḍāʾil* compilation firmly rooted in the soil of reports that were *less* likely to extol the merits of the early caliphs themselves, and *more* likely to reflect arguments and confrontations that were the byproduct of earlier intra-Shii tension. In other words, the negative tenor of these encounters stems from the context in which they were likely produced: the second/eighth-century environment in which strands of anti-authoritarian Zaydism and proto-Imāmī quietism vied with one another. Zaydī Imāms and leaders, including Muḥammad al-Nafs al-Zakiyya and his father ʿAbdallāh b. Al-Ḥasan (both d. 145) are depicted as expressing marked displeasure and hastening to distinguish themselves from the so-called *rāfiḍa*. In another report, Ibrāhīm b. ʿAbdallāh ibn al-Ḥasan al-Muthanna categorizes the *rāfiḍa* as "those who have betrayed us, just as the Ḥarūriya (a Khārijite group) betrayed ʿAlī".[77] Picking up on these tensions, al-Dāraqutnī selected and capitalized on reports that included representations of conflict between Zaydīs and early Imāmīs, some of which were more attenuated than others. Occasionally, it is simply the use of the vocative that is meant to indicate incredulity or displeasure, as in al-Ṣādiq's exclamation "Oh Sālim!" when Ibn Abī Ḥafṣa expresses scepticism about the Imām's use of the appellation "al-Ṣiddīq" to describe Abū Bakr.[78] The same vocative appeared when Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq asked Ibn Abī Ḥafṣa, "Oh Sālim! Would a man curse his own grandfather?"[79] At other times, florid protestations that an Imām would rather "forego the intercession of the Prophet on the Day of Judgment" than criticize the first two caliphs depict exasperation on the part of al-Bāqir or al-Ṣādiq, sometimes resulting in blanket accusations of heresy against "anyone who criticized Abū Bakr and ʿUmar".[80] In one particularly tense scene, Muḥammad al-Bāqir relays a conversation in which a man approaches his father, ʿAlī Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn, demanding his opinion of Abū

---

75 Dann, "Contested boundaries", 92.
76 While initially somewhat confusing in its inclusion of these nuanced intra-Shii disputes, al-Dāraquṭnī's *Faḍāʾil* was part and parcel of Sunnī "orthodox" consolidation in which both "traditional hardline ʿUthmānī and Rāfiḍī positions that repudiated ʿAlī and the first two caliphs, respectively, had to be excluded as too extreme from [a] newly evolving consensus that sought to subsume as many dissenting groups as possible". Afsaruddin, "In praise of caliphs", 342.
77 Al-Dāraquṭnī, *Faḍāʾil*, 58–9, no. 36, and 80–81, no. 60.
78 Al-Dāraquṭnī, *Faḍāʾil*, 51–2, nos. 28 and 29.
79 Al-Dāraquṭnī, *Faḍāʾil*, 56, no. 33, see also 68, no. 46, where the vocative is employed in addressing Kathīr al-Nawwāʾ.
80 See, among others, Al-Dāraquṭnī, *Faḍāʾil*, 56, no. 32 and on heresy, 70, no. 48.

Bakr and ʿUmar, and is cursed by the Imām, who begins his reply with the oath, "May your mother be bereft of you!/*Thakilatka ummuka!*[81]

As I have mentioned, the misrepresentation and co-optation of the fifth and sixth Imāms in later medieval Sunni articulations of legitimate leadership and communal unity has been noted by modern scholars. However, most discussions of this phenomenon reference sources much later than al-Dāraquṭnī, such as Ibn ʿAsākir's (d. 571) *Tārīkh madīnat Dimashq*, Muḥibb al-Dīn al-Ṭabarī's (d. 694) *Al-Riyāḍ al-naḍira fī manāqib al-ʿAshara*, or al-Dhahabī's (d. 748) *Siyar Aʿlām al-nubalā'*.[82] In a discussion of the term *tawallā*, for example, Hamid Algar has argued that the appearance of the word in al-Ṭabarī's *Al-Riyāḍ al-naḍira* demonstrates "the use of Shii terminology [such as *tawallā* and *tabarra'a*] to subvert Shii doctrines while promoting their Sunnī counterparts", suggesting "a deliberate manipulation, at a time and by hands unknown, of Shii concepts and beliefs with the aim of presenting a central figure of Shīʿism as fundamentally opposed to its main tendencies".[83]

This brief compilation of reports gathered by al-Dāraquṭnī, therefore, represents an early instantiation of what would become an enduring polemical trend. In al-Dāraquṭnī's text, the precise meaning of the complex concept of *tawallā* (love, affiliation) is not explored, but the affect with which it is asserted is decidedly negative. Rather than an expression of fealty, the use of *tawallā* or *tabarra'a* is more in the form of an oath.[84] What comes across most strongly in these incidents is not love for or devotion to the first two caliphs so much as the anger or irritation of al-Bāqir and al-Ṣādiq in particular, who use *tawallā* as a perfunctory corollary to *tabarra'a* as they argue with impertinent Zaydī figures who seem intent on catching them out in acts of mere dissimulation, and are made to declare their dissociation from broad swaths of people who persist in denying the legitimacy of the first two caliphs.[85]

IV. Emotional communities, al-Dāraquṭnī's *Faḍā'il*, and genre

In light of its distinguishing structure and tone, it is worth asking whether al-Dāraquṭnī's compilation was, in spite of its title, really much of a *faḍā'il* text at all. Though it has some unique characteristics, I would ultimately

81   Al-Dāraquṭnī, *Faḍā'il*, 84–5, no. 66.
82   Hamid Algar, "Sunnī claims to Imam Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq", in Omar Ali-de-Unzaga (ed.), *Fortresses of the Intellect: Ismāʿīlī and Other Studies in Honour of Farhad Daftary* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2011), 78 and Lalani, *Early Shīʿī Thought.* In a brief discussion of the Prophet's turban, for example, Sean Anthony cites al-Tabarī's *Al-Riyāḍ al-naḍira* when he considers that later medieval Sunnī *faḍā'il* and *manāqib* absorbed traditions about the turban that had been "popular among the Shīʿa if not originating among them altogether" (S. Anthony, *The Caliph and the Heretic: Ibn Sabaʿ and the Origins of Shīʿism* (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 230.
83   Algar, "Sunnī claims", 80, citing a number of reports in Ṭabarī's *Al-Riyāḍ al-naḍira* which also appear in al-Dāraquṭnī's *Faḍā'il,* without citing the latter since Ṭabarī himself cites them on the authority of Ibn Sammān as they appear in al-Zamakhsharī's *Muwāfiqa.*
84   On the use of *tabarra'a* in oaths, see Mottahedeh, *Loyalty and Leadership*, 62–72.
85   For example, al-Dāraquṭnī, *Faḍā'il,* 88–9, no. 71, and 95, no. 83 in which al-Ṣādiq refers to the "people of Iraq who claim that I disparage Abū Bakr and ʿUmar as *khubathā*'/ evildoers".

argue that it remains within the broader genre, even as it shifts the boundaries of *faḍāʾil* literature itself. Primarily, al-Dāraquṭnī's *Faḍāʾil* unequivocally shares the polemical motivation of other Sunni *Faḍāʾil al-ṣaḥāba* compilations: to justify the hierarchy of early caliphal succession as a matter of relative merit. The surviving portion of the compilation is devoid of the prophetic *ḥadīth* typical of other *Faḍāʾil al-ṣaḥāba* compilations, yet in spite of having been mostly lost to us, we know that the text was nevertheless received as a work centred on praising early figures. In his *Minhāj al-sunna*, for example, Ibn Taymiyya (d. 653) mentioned the ninth, now lost chapter of the work, referring to it as "*Thanāʾ al-ṣaḥāba ʿalā al-qarāba wa thanāʾ al-qarāba ʿalā al-ṣaḥāba*", additionally confirming that the compilation was limited to explicating the views of the Companions about the family members of the Prophet and vice versa.

Further, while some of the narratives in the brief compilation are unusual, al-Dāraquṭnī was not the first to relate them. He lived at a time in which the stand-alone genre of *Faḍāʾil al-ṣaḥāba* was still being formed, and there were thousands of *Faḍāʾil al-ṣaḥāba* traditions of varying quality to sift through. A number of the reports al-Dāraquṭnī selected for his *faḍāʾil* text had appeared interspersed among several earlier *faḍāʾil* and non-*faḍāʾil* compilations, including the *Muṣannaf* of Ibn Abī Shayba (d. 235), the *Faḍāʾil al-ṣaḥāba* of Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal (d. 241), Ibn Saʿd's (d. 230) *Ṭabaqāt*, and the *Kitāb al-Sharīʿa* by al-Ājurrī (d. 320). Al-Dāraquṭnī's primary innovation, then, was to gather these earlier traditions under the unique framing rubric of "Sayings of the Companions and *Ahl al-Bayt* about one another", thereby extending the narrative purview of *Faḍāʾil al-ṣaḥāba* from one in which the Companions were the objects of a primarily Prophet-centric discourse into one in which Companions and later figures (including *tābiʿīs*/Successors and the Imāms themselves) became discursive agents as well.

One reason to consider the text a somewhat transitional *faḍāʾil* work, leaning away from mere praise and veering towards a kind of soft polemic aimed at reconciling (rather than simply ranking or comparing) the Companions and the *ahl al-bayt* is its apparent impact on the genre of *faḍāʾil*-inflected polemic. Al-Dāraquṭnī may have been the first to employ later figures' "Sayings" as his over-arching framing device, but other scholars followed suit. Al-Lālikāʾī's (d. 418) *Sharḥ uṣūl iʿtiqād ahl al-sunna wa-l-jamāʿa* would adapt the "they said/they said" rubric as a chapter subheading, containing one entitled *Mā ruwiya ʿan ʿAlī wa-ahl al-bayt fī faḍl Abī Bakr*, concluding with a substantial section on religious merits interspersed with other chapters condemning *ghuluww*/Shii extremism[86] and elaborating on the Sunni tradition of the *ḥadīth al-ʿashara*/the "Ten Promised Paradise".[87] In his *Al-Riyāḍ al-naḍira fī*

---

86   Wadad Al-Kadi, "The development of the term Ghulāt in Muslim literature with special reference to the Kaysāniyya", in Albert Dietrich (ed.), *Akten des VII. Kongresses für Arabistik und Islamwissenschaft, Göttingen, 15. bis. 22. August 1974* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1976), 310–15. See also Afsaruddin, "In praise of caliphs", 342 on the equation of *ghuluww* with *rafḍ* in Zaydī and Sunni sources from the mid-ninth century onwards.

87   Al-Dāraquṭnī, *Faḍāʾil,* 47, no. 3. See also M. Yazigi, "*Ḥadīth* al-ʿAshara, or the political uses of a tradition", *Studia Islamica* 86, 1997, 159–67.

manāqib al-ʿashara, Aḥmad al-Muḥibb al-Ṭabarī cites a similarly structured, slightly later work entitled *Ma rawāhu kullu farīq fī-l-ākhar* by Abū Saʿīd Ismāʿīl ibn ʿAlī ibn Ḥasan al-Sammān (d. 445).[88] That title is a variation, based on a reference in a *mukhtaṣar* of al-Sammān's work by al-Zamakhsharī. Al-Sammān's tract was likely entitled *Kitāb al-muwāfaqa bayna ahl al-bayt wa-l-ṣaḥāba*. The *Muwāfaqa* is the closest early corollary to al-Dāraquṭnī's *Faḍā'il*, and 13 of the 84 reports in al-Dāraquṭnī's *Faḍā'il* correspond to narratives in al-Sammān's *Muwāfaqa*.[89] Much later, even more explicitly polemical works would continue employing the "Sayings about One Another" structure, such as Abū Ḥāmīd al-Maqdisī's (d. 888) *Al-Radd ʿalā al-rāfiḍa*, a polemical tract with numerous subsections that follow the same structure, with a chapter entitled, for example, *Mā ruwiya ʿan ʿAlī wa-ahl al-bayt fī faḍl Abī Bakr*.[90] The well-worn disputative strategy of using the pronouncements of one's rivals to bolster one's own views was not exclusive to Sunni *faḍā'il* or polemical literature, and Shii scholars also co-opted Sunni figures (e.g. the Companion Abū Dharr al-Ghifārī) to amplify the *faḍā'il* of ʿAlī.[91]

While the text clearly advocates for a partisan position on the issue of succession, as did nearly all *Faḍā'il al-ṣaḥāba* compilations, the rubric and tone chosen by al-Dāraquṭnī for his *Faḍā'il* emphasizes the polemical rather than the edifying or laudatory tradition. In an era of consolidating Sunnism, put into sharp relief in Būyid Baghdād, intra-Shii tensions from an earlier era were thus enfolded into the *faḍā'il* corpus writ large. Put differently, al-Dāraquṭnī's text demonstrates how the parameters of *faḍā'il* expanded beyond enumeration of expressions of Muḥammad's favour for positive virtues to accommodate the negative emotions of later figures, including their suspicion, incredulity, anger, or frustration.

In addition to the reasons for inclusivity with regard to non-legal traditions or traditions with weak *isnād*s discussed above, a final rationale for accepting such *ḥadīth* or *āthār* was that it allowed for the collection of "more colorful and affective reports" that had "pedagogical utility".[92] The nature of what counted as pedagogically efficacious, however, is generally left unexplained. Studies centred on *faḍā'il* have (aptly, due to the generally positive nature of the early *faḍā'il* tradition) tended to emphasize their hagiographical nature, highlighting the genre's representation of positive character traits deemed worthy of reverence or emulation. The premier example of such a work is Asma Afsaruddin's *Excellence and Precedence*, a comprehensive study on *sābiqa*/precedence and *faḍā'il* with respect to leadership and succession that analyses

88 Al-Dāraquṭnī, *Faḍā'il*, 14 (Editor's introduction.)
89 Abū Saʿīd Ismāʿīl ibn ʿAlī ibn Ḥasan al-Sammān, *Kitāb al-Muwāfaqa bayna ahl al-bayt wa-l-ṣaḥāba,* ed. Farīd b. Farīd al-Khāja (Bahrain: Jāmiʿat al-Āl wa-l-'Aṣḥāb, 2016).
90 Abū Ḥamīd al-Maqdisī, *Al-Radd ʿalā al-rāfiḍa, Ma ruwiya ʿan ʿAlī wa Ahl al-Bayt fī faḍl Abū Bakr* (Alexandria: Dār al-Baṣīra, 2001) 4, 114–28.
91 E. Kohlberg, "The attitude of the Imāmī Shīʿīs to the Companion of the Prophet" (PhD thesis, University of Oxford, 1971), 293–313. For a later iteration of this phenomenon, see Matthew Pierce, "Ibn Shahrashūb and Shīʿa rhetorical strategies in the 6th/12th century", *Journal of Shīʿa Islamic Studies* 5/4, 2012, 441–54.
92 J. Brown, "Did the Prophet say it or not? The literal, historical, and effective truth of Ḥadīths in early Sunnism", *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 129/2, 2009, 8.

competitive tropes such as generosity, abstemiousness, valour, and service to Islam.[93] Afsaruddin has probed the complex theological and political dimensions of how Abū Bakr and ʿAlī were construed in terms of their religious excellence and precedence as criteria for leadership, in order to argue against the early emergence of an emphasis on biological kinship with Muḥammad as a factor in Shii claims to legitimate authority.[94] Later, more elaborate, *faḍāʾil* works on the "Ten Promised Paradise" are even more explicitly pietistic, though they also served an anti-Shii polemical purpose.[95] In short, *faḍāʾil* literature is often treated as implicitly hagiographical,[96] and in spite of the *Faḍāʾil al-ṣaḥāba* genre's decidedly political origins, constructions of pious partisanship are seen as the purview of *faḍāʾil* traditions and texts that valorized positive emotions. Al-Dāraquṭnī's contribution to the genre does not fit neatly into such conceptions.

Negative affective representations in pious tradition-based literature have not, however, gone entirely unnoticed. Taking a broader view of the positive and negative emotive potential in *adab* and *ḥadīth* (two fields of knowledge which were interconnected), studies on the renunciant tradition emphasize a wide range of emotions in *zuhd* literature, as do works on Sufism.[97] In fact, according to Christopher Melchert, to the category of *ḥadīth*-based tradition:

93 Afsaruddin, *Excellence and Precedence* and also "In praise of caliphs".
94 Other studies emphasize the representational aspects of particular figures and the use of those constructions in the service of theological or political claims, including the work on ʿĀʾisha by Denise Spellberg; the study of Salmān al-Fārisī by Sarah Bowen Savant; and the recent book by David Powers on the Companion Zayd. D. Spellberg, *Politics, Gender and the Islamic Past* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1996); S. Savant, *The New Muslims of Post-Conquest Iran: Tradition, Memory and Conversion* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013); D. Powers, *Zayd* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2014). See also Sue Campbell, "Telling memories: the Zubayrids in Islamic historical memory" (PhD dissertation, UCLA, 2003) and D. Soufi, "The image of Fāṭima in classical Muslim thought" (PhD dissertation, Princeton University, 1997). For a comparative approach, see M. Thurlkill, *Chosen among Women: Mary and Fāṭima in Medieval Christianity and Shīʿite Islam* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2007).
95 Yazigi, "*Ḥadīth al-ʿashara*".
96 The same is generally true for studies on the lives of saints and Sufi mystics. In-depth analyses of writings focused on or attributed to particular people occasionally explore the images of early or founding figures other than Companions or family members of the Prophet (e.g. Sufyān al-Thawrī, Aḥmad Ibn Ḥanbal, or al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī) as they were constructed in later periods. See S. Judd, "Competitive hagiography in biographies of Al-Awzāʿī and Sufyān al-Thawrī", *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 122, 2002, 25–37; M. Cooperson, *Classical Arabic Biography: The Heirs of the Prophet in the Age of al-Maʾmūn* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000); Suleiman Mourad, *Early Islam between Myth And History: Al-Ḥasan Al-Baṣrī and the Formation on His Legacy in Classical Islamic Scholarship* (Leiden: Brill, 2005). It's worth noting that in this type of scholarship, the figures under consideration are almost always surveyed through biographies and chronicles, not *faḍāʾil*, with the main exceptions of H. Keaney, *Medieval Islamic Historiography: Remembering Rebellion* (London: Routledge, 2013), and Thurlkill, *Chosen among Women*.
97 On *adab* and *ḥadīth*, see A. Ragab, *Piety and Patienthood in Medieval Islam* (London: Routledge, 2018), 245. On *zuhd*, Christopher Melchert, "Exaggerated fear in the early Islamic renunciant tradition", *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 3, no. 21, 2011, 283–300.

... belong our most voluminous sources for early piety, mainly Abu Nuʿaym (d. 430AH/1038CE), *Ḥilyat al-awliyāʾ*, Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal (d. 241AH/855CE), *al-Zuhd*, Ibn al-Mubārak (d. 181AH/797CE), *al-Zuhd*, the zuhd and other sections of Ibn Abī Shaybah (d. 235AH/849CE), *al-Muṣannaf*, and Hannād ibn al-Sarī (d. 243AH/857CE), *al-Zuhd*. All of these provide more sayings than any source in the traditions of *adab* and Sufism. These also include most of our earliest sources.[98]

Zuhd literature, *targhīb wa-tarhīb*, and *faḍāʾil* are related in terms of their content (all are aimed at edification or pious instruction or exhortation) and in their consistent reliance on non-legal, generally "weaker" or more dubious *ḥadīth* and *āthār*. Each of these genres of edifying or exhortatory literature contains its own range of affective possibilities, which display the various emotional moods with which piety could be construed.

To conclude this analysis of al-Dāraquṭnī's *Faḍāʾil*, I would like to suggest that we appreciate the work as a *faḍāʾil* text precisely because of its representation of negative affects. Appreciating the range of emotive possibilities (positive and negative) in *faḍāʾil* literature is especially relevant considering the genre's relationship to the cultivation of sectarian partisanship in different ways over time. Attention to affective variety in the *faḍāʾil* texts will shed light on how emotion was central to the formation of sectarianism, since the shared stakes and communal aspects of sectarianism itself hinged on the formation of what Barbara Rosenwein has called "emotional communities":

> An emotional community is a group in which people have common stakes, values, and goals. Thus it is often a social community. But it is also possibly a "textual community", created and reinforced by ideologies, teachings, and common propositions. With their very vocabulary, texts offer exemplars of emotions belittled *and* valorized.[99]

The history of emotion is a developed field of study for the medieval west, and has been applied to select sources on medieval Islam, especially (but not only) the Quran.[100] In addition to Christopher Melchert's study of fear in the renunciant tradition, which addresses the emotive qualities of ascetic literature, Zouhair Ghazal has highlighted tropes of *ghaḍab/*anger displayed by the Prophet in the *Ṣaḥīḥayn* and in the *Musnad* of Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal.[101] Most recently, a monograph on childhood, emotion, and visual culture in Islamic societies by Jamal Elias devotes an entire chapter to reviewing affect theory and the history of emotions

---

98   Melchert, "Exaggerated fear", 285–6.
99   B. Rosenwein, *Emotional Communities in the Early Middle Ages* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2006), 24–5, emphasis added.
100 Karen Bauer, "Emotion in the Qurʾān: an overview", *Journal of Qurʾānic Studies*, 19/2, 2017, 1–30.
101 Melchert, "Exaggerated fear". Z. Ghazal, "From anger on behalf of God to 'forbearance' in Islamic medieval literature", in Barbara H. Rosenwein (ed.), *Anger's Past: The Social Uses of an Emotion in the Middle Ages* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1998), 202–30. See also Anna Gade's general essay "Islam", in *The Oxford Handbook of Religion and Emotion* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 35–50.

and their relevance to Islamic culture.[102] These works represent a new theoretical infusion into the study of different types of Islamic sources, with enormous potential for historians of religion as well, since, as Julia Bray has suggested:

> A history of emotions is still lacking in the spectrum of Islamic histories, but I believe it is an essential, whether we see it as a type of history or, as William M. Reddy has put it, "a way of doing political, social, and cultural history, not something to be added to [them]". Since people act on what they believe and feel, a history of emotions seeks to explain both why people act and what their actions mean to them. Historians of emotion hold a range of positions but agree that thinking and feeling are connected; that neither is a natural, ahistorical given; and – a view that sits well with ʿAbbāsid textual sources – that emotions are specific not only to cultures but, within them, to "emotional communities", of which, Barbara H. Rosenwein argues, there will be several in any society. Identifying and exploring emotional communities is something for which we have a large body of early and medieval Arabic sources, including poetry and many types of narrative. Where to begin?[103]

When it comes to *faḍāʾil*, it has been noted that their focus shifted, after the fourth/tenth century, from particular groups to the "Qurʾānically guided vision of a righteous polity led by its most morally excellent members".[104] The contents and tenor of al-Dāraquṭnī's *Faḍāʾil* suggest that in assessing how that morality was construed, we ought to pay attention to negative affective aspects of this literature in addition to the valorized positive traits embodied by revered figures or pious exemplars. The suspiciousness of Sālim ibn Jaʿd, the insolence of Sālim ibn Abī Ḥafṣa, the exasperation and frustration of al-Bāqir and al-Ṣādiq: these too were among the affective dimensions of the *faḍāʾil* tradition, and contributed to the formation of an increasingly sectarian *faḍāʾil* discourse peopled by figures who were neither the Prophet nor even his Companions, whose imagined loyalties pushed the boundaries of the genre beyond an exclusively laudatory purview.

The extant chapter of al-Dāraquṭnī's contribution to *Faḍāʾil al-ṣaḥāba* is just one brief text, and it is a somewhat idiosyncratic text at that, but it emerged from a specific intra-Shii context. Containing contentious interactions rather than idealized pietistic themes, a compilation like al-Dāraquṭnī's *Faḍāʾil* reveals the workings of an evolving competitive discourse in which the representation of negative affects was considered an instructive and persuasive narrative device. What al-Dāraquṭnī's compilation teaches us, as brief and fragmentary as it may be, is that the cultivation of pious partisanship through the collection and dissemination of *faḍāʾil* was not necessarily a straightforwardly hagiographical endeavour.

102 J. Elias, *Alef is for Allah: Childhood, Emotion, and Visual Culture in Islamic Societies* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2018), 28–60.
103 J. Bray, "Toward an Abbasid history of emotions: the case of slavery", *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 49/1, 2017, 143–7, here 143.
104 S. Enderwitz, "Faḍāʾil", *Encyclopaedia of Islam* 3, citing A. Afsaruddin, "In praise of the word of God: reflections of early religious and social concerns in the *Faḍāʾil al-Qurʾān* genre", *Journal of Qurʾanic Studies* 4, 2002, 27–48, here 38.