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Often considered a period of political and economic decline, the crises during the Qājār dynasty (early eighteenth to early twentieth century) seem to have fuelled theological discussions with a particular focus on political and spiritual authority. The Qājārs’ lack of religious legitimacy led to attempts at producing a political theology that would either strengthen or weaken the monarch’s position *vis-à-vis* the *ʿulamāʾ*, some of whom increasingly showed power ambitions of their own. It is commonly held that the Uṣūlīs eventually triumphed over their Akhbārī and Ṣūfī rivals. While these three currents have received some scholarly attention in the past, another significant group has so far remained barely noticed by academics: the Shaykhiyya. The few existing studies focus only on the biographies and doctrine of the two founding figures: Aḥmad b. Zayn ad-Dīn al-Aḥsāʾī (d. 1826) and Kāẓim b. Qāsim al-Rashtī (d. 1843/44).[[1]](#footnote-1)

Students of Shaykhism are faced with several challenges. Shaykhī authors are among the most prolific and their writings comprise tens of thousands of pages. Shaykhī doctrine also developed over time and into conflicting branches and, thus, each author’s work serves only as representative of his own thought, not necessarily of the whole branch, let alone “the Shaykhī school” proper. Add to this the Shaykhī leaders’ frequent engagement in dissimulation (*taqiyya*), as well as possible changes of mind prone to occur to any author writing over a period of decades.

Denis Hermann, in *Le Shaykhisme à la Période Qajare*, has taken it upon himself to write “the first European language social and doctrinal history of Shaykhism” (p. 31). Fully aware that any attempt at summarising Shaykhī doctrine is currently at best preliminary, Hermann limits the scope of his study to the social history of one of the major sub-sects of Shaykhism, the Kirmānī branch, and its formation in the second half of the nineteenth century (p. 38). This still leaves him with a monumental task. While there is an abundance of doctrinal sources yet awaiting systematic study, there is very little in terms of biography and history (p. 36). Significant information can certainly be gained from doctrinal and polemical writings but, since the works of the Kirmānī branch’s founder Muḥammad Karīm Khān Kirmānī (d. 1873) alone, in a recent edition,[[2]](#footnote-2) comprise 47 volumes, not to speak of his successors’ large *œuvre*, no scholar can be blamed for not having studied it all (cf. p. 62).

The title of Hermann’s work might suggest otherwise, but to expect a history in the sense either of a detailed chronological overview of a series of events, or of biographies and works of the founders and leaders of Shaykhism and its various factions, or a systematic introduction to their main teachings and how they developed over the past two centuries, would be unrealistic. Rather, Hermann has looked at some aspects of the social and, only to a minor extent, doctrinal history of the Kirmānī branch between 1844 and 1906 (p. 39). The year 1844 saw the beginning of permanent schism within the Shaykhiyya and 1906 both the death of the second Kirmānī leader and the Constitutional Revolution, often seen as a turning-point for Iranian society and politics (p.9 and 40). The book is probably better appreciated as a collection of studies on various individual aspects of the Kirmānī Shaykhiyya’s history than a general introduction to Shaykhī doctrine and history (cf. p. 41).

Part One deals with the “birth of Shaykhism” or, more accurately, the Kirmāniyya or Rukniyya. The first two chapters summarise, very briefly, some of the extant biographical scholarship on the school’s name giver, Aḥmad al-Aḥsāʾī, and his student and successor, Kāẓim ar-Rashtī (pp. 45–49). They are generally recognised as the two founders of the Shaykhiyya, although Hermann’s study does not devote much further attention to them or to their teachings. Only the four best-known titles of Aḥsāʾī’s many written works are given and none of Rashtī’s. The bibliography mentions neither the numerous editions published since the 1990s in Beirut, Damascus and Kuwait, nor the Kirmānī Shaykhīs’ online library.[[3]](#footnote-3) The most recent publications from their voluminous body of work in Basra[[4]](#footnote-4) may not have been available to Hermann when writing. These resources will certainly facilitate systematic Shaykhī studies in the future and help refine and correct earlier assessments which were based on a more limited access to sources.

As Hermann correctly states, Aḥsāʾī’s teachings are often unduly reduced to his allegedly controversial views on corporeal resurrection and the Ascension of the Prophet Muḥammad (p. 109). Much of polemic and apologetic literature centres on this topic while leaving most of the wide range of themes and topics touched upon in Aḥsāʾī’s and Rashtī’s dense writings largely unexplored. Although they also fall outside the scope of Hermann’s study, the uninitiated reader would have benefitted from at least some basic information on the main philosophical, theological, epistemological and cosmological teachings, as well particularly on the founding figures’ doctrines on prophetology and imamology to better appreciate the later conflicts and controversies. While it might be legitimate to neglect doctrine when writing a social history of a religious group, the two often cannot be wholly separated from each other.

The third and fourth chapters discuss the Shaykhī schism after Rashtī’s death in 1844. Two main branches, the Kirmānīs and the Tabrīzīs, as well as the sub-branch of the Bāqirīs are very briefly introduced. Again, some more biographical information, particularly on the Kirmānī leaders, as well as some light shed on the actual events or debate(s) that led to the split would have been useful. A mere page is dedicated to Muḥammad Karīm Khān Kirmānī’s life and works and only a passing reference his son Muḥammad, the second Kirmānī leader. Hermann simply says that the branches were “founded” or “formed” (pp. 61, 63, cf. 67) and only briefly alludes to the events and controversies that led to permanent schism and ensuing hostility. From Hermann’s further explanations, one gathers that the controversies must have been over conflicting interpretations of Aḥsāʾī’s and Rashtī’s teachings, mainly on the question of leadership. He briefly sums up the competing Shaykhī leaders’ views on the “Fourth Pillar” (*al-rukn al-rābiʿ*) (pp. 82–95, cf. 171–74), with special focus on the early Kirmānī view. Of particular interest is the fresh, albeit brief, information on Shaykhī rituals (pp. 69ff.) and particularly on the lesser known branches’ geographical spread and their organisation up until present time (pp. 63–68).

Part Two looks at factors that contributed to the spread of Shaykhism in Iran. While Aḥsāʾī had spent most of his life travelling, Rashtī was based in Karbalāʾ, a factor that significantly contributed to the establishment and consolidation of Shaykhism as a “school”. The subsequent leaders resided in Iran’s Kirmān and Tabrīz. The scarcity of or lack of accessibility to historical sources, particularly relating to the Kirmānī branch, again poses a serious challenge. Hermann, thus, decided to study three *waqf* documents which provide a good amount of useful information (pp. 113f.). The Kirmānī *awqāf* were an important element in the institutionalisation and consolidation of a distinct Shaykhī identity. The pious foundations investigated by Hermann supported observance of religious rites, oversaw the publication of Shaykhī books and fostered the development of the Ibrāhīmiyya theological school in Kirmān, thus advancing social cohesion amongst the Shaykhīs as well as promoting their doctrine. They also served as a protection against recurring persecution. It was only in 1980 that the Kirmānīs lost their *awqāf* and their printing house was closed by the Islamic Republic’s government (p. 35, 152).

The conflict between Shaykhīs and other Shīʿīs is explored in Part Three. The discrimination and hostility to which the different branches of the Shaykhīs were subject are another significant factor in the making of the Kirmāniyya. To allegations of apostasy and ritual impurity (pp. 156f.), Kirmānī leaders responded in kind by putting particular emphasis on the concepts of “unbelief” in their doctrinal works and closing themselves further off from most Shīʿīs (pp. 163–74), while other Shaykhī branches looked to bridging or downplaying doctrinal controversies (p. 177). Hermann describes two events—one 1898 in Tabrīz and one in 1905 in Kirmān—when polemics eventually escalated into armed conflict to illustrate how the interplay between various actors competing for power was responsible for hostility towards and, at times, violent persecution of Shaykhīs. The mechanisms are described well and in detail by Hermann and are a template for pogroms against other minorities as well, like the Ṣūfīs (pp. 177f.), Jews (p. 186), Bābīs and Bahāʾīs. Usually, attacks were instigated by a low-to-middle ranking cleric (pp. 157, 164f., 185f., 195), with the local governors at times either complicit or incapable of resistance (cf. pp. 181f., 187ff.). Local thugs (pp. 161f., 187f.), supported by an incited mob of inhabitants, would then act as the executors of the cleric’s verdict. The Kirmānīs, unlike other minorities, were relatively well connected by family with the Qājār dynasty and, thus, not only enjoyed some protection but even dared to take up arms and fight back (pp. 195–200). The main motive identified by Hermann for anti-Shaykhī campaigns was the creation of an enemy, an external or internal “other” in order to close ranks and define an identity (p. 158). Beyond those on the persecution of Shaykhīs, Hermann’s findings help to further clarify the general reasons behind the frequent outbursts of religious persecution in the late Qājār period which were rarely borne out of pure religious zeal.

Part Four amply demonstrates how the Kirmānī masters, as leaders of a marginalised group, in turn employed the same tactics of seeking an internal other, the Bābīs, as well as an external enemy, the “West”. In Chapters 1 and 2, Hermann deals with the Kirmānī reaction to the emergence of Bābism in 1844. There are several issues with Hermann’s treatment of the Bābī-Shaykhī relationship, but I shall here confine myself to a few general observations and refrain from a discussion of historical and doctrinal details. According to Hermann, Bābī and Bahāʾī writers, as well as several academics, have portrayed Bābism as being rooted in Shaykhism, a claim he considers illegitimate, and as ultimately responsible for the anti-Shaykhī hostility of some Uṣūlī *ʿulamāʾ* (pp. 39, 133, 205f.). He also portrays most previous academic work as “partisan” and “militant” (p. 218 and 219) and particularly singles out the theses of Denis MacEoin and Vahid Rafati, both completed in 1979 (pp. 216ff., 227ff.). Hermann seems unfamiliar with the content of my 2004 work, even though he mentions it in a footnote.[[5]](#footnote-6) Many of the issues he raises about alleged Shaykhī messianism, the Bāb’s status as a “student” of Rashtī and whether early Bābism should be considered a Shaykhī offshoot have already been addressed and discussed there. In any case, the status assigned to Aḥsāʾī and Rashtī in Bābī and Bahāʾī historiography is not as important as Hermann assumes and it is certainly a misconception to read anti-Bahāʾī-polemics as primarily refutations of Shaykhism (cf. pp. 214ff.). Hermann’s misunderstanding might be rooted in his isolated reading, from a secondary source, of a short comment by Shoghi Effendi, head of the Bahāʾī community between 1921 and 1957 (p. 206). The mere fact that this is the only mention of Shaykhism, occurring in the foreword of a quasi-official history of the faith of 400 pages, certainly calls into question the notion that the Bahāʾī faith, whether rightfully or not, claims descent from Shaykhism.[[6]](#footnote-7)

That the Bāb made unwarranted claims as to Aḥsāʾī’s and Rashtī’s legacy is indeed mainly declared in Shaykhī polemics. A different, much more widespread accusation runs contrary to it that Bābīs and Bahāʾīs in fact hide or deny their Shaykhī and, more generally, Shīʿī and Islamic roots. When Hermann thus portrays the closeness of the Bāb’s relationship with Rashtī as unduly exaggerated (pp. 205ff.), ironically he repeats what many critics denounce as Bahāʾī apologetics, namely attempts to downplay the Bāb’s intellectual debt to Rashtī and to vindicate his claim to divine revelation. The debate, thus, has a complex history and the arguments of either side should not be dismissed so lightly. In fact, the analyses offered by Hermann are based solely on selected secondary and later Kirmānī works and, therefore, suffer from lack of reference to Bābī as well as early Shaykhī primary sources, a fact only mentioned here because Hermann himself repeatedly and in strong words holds earlier authors accountable for failing to produce textual evidence (p. 206, 221, 225, 227, 230). To give but one example, Rashtī’s nightly sermons and teaching sessions, held during the late 1830s and early 1840s and now available in print, as well as his 1841 major work *Sharḥ al-Qaṣīda*, prove that there was indeed a strong messianic element in his preaching, contrary to Hermann’s assessment (p. 225), The nature of this messianic element and whether it was exaggerated in early Bābī accounts or downplayed by later Kirmānī ones requires further study.

Hermann correctly points out that Bābism was a new religion with distinct teachings and not a Shaykhī sub-sect (p. 221). Yet, it is absurd to deny the close relationship between early Bābism and early Shaykhism and describe it as “fictitious and constructed” (cf. pp. 205f.). The large number Shaykhīs who became Bābī converts, the Shaykhī concepts and terminology in the early writings of the Bāb and his followers, the epistles he wrote to various Shaykhī leaders (cf. p. 235) and, not least, the harsh responses of the latter, Kirmānī being the first to write rebuttals of the new faith from as early as 1845 onwards (cf. p. 234), provide ample evidence that the emergence of the new faith cannot be separated from a Shaykhī environment, just as it cannot be reduced to it. So too does the fact that three Shaykhī *ʿulamāʾ*, notably not including Uṣūlīs (cf. p. 245), sentenced the Bāb to death at a trial in 1848 (cf. pp. 233, 247). Hermann incorrectly sees investigating these threads as a sign of “ideology”, “apologetics” and “partisanship”, rather than a necessity. Hermann implies that, with the sole exception of Henri Corbin, all previous studies of the emergence of Bābism and its Shaykhī background are partisan and academically worthless because they neglect later Kirmānī views (pp. 206, 223ff., 228f., 230). Here, Hermann seems to imply that the Kirmānī tradition was true orthodoxy and preserved a pristine Shaykhism, as if that even existed, while the Bābīs and others deviated from it. It is also problematic to identify Muḥammad Karīm Khān Kirmānī as one of the “three founding figures” of Shaykhism (cf. p. 296). The view that Kirmānī’s expositions are identical to Rashtī’s and Aḥsāʾī’s is, after all, exclusively held by the Kirmāniyya themselves. In fact, several interpretations of his heritage were put forth after Rashtī’s death. These can be described, compared, and analysed, but is it the purpose of an academic work to identify the “correct” side in such debates? While strongly criticising what he perceives as a common, entirely wrong and partisan interpretation of Shaykhism adopted even by major academics in the field, Hermann seems to attempt a counter-narrative and, to this end, rely uncritically on the Kirmānī view. He even erroneously ascribes several quotations and tenets to Bābism based merely on Shaykhī polemics instead of reliable sources (pp. 210, 244, 250, 253ff.). His frequent allusion to the Bāb’s alleged call to *jihād* and the “violent” nature of his mission (pp. 14, 208f., 240) is also somewhat outdated. More recent studies on the nature of the “Bābī upheavals”, the Bāb’s *de facto* abnegation of *jihād*, as well as his numerous accommodating letters to Muḥammad Shāh and the Prime Minister Ḥājjī Mīrzā Āqāsī published in recent years, have created a much more nuanced picture.[[7]](#footnote-8)

The last point to address here is whether the emergence of Bābism exacerbated anti-Shaykhī hostilities (cf. pp. 211ff.). In the absence of systematic studies of Aḥsāʾī’s and Rashtī’s entire *œuvre*, it is still difficult to pierce through layers of myth and polemics to determine the true reason for the controversy which their views caused, mainly with Uṣūlī *ʿulamāʾ*. Before the Bāb began his mission in 1844, Rashtī (d. 1843) had already defended Aḥsāʾī’s legacy for two decades and much of his *œuvre* is comprised of apologetics. To attribute Uṣūlī hostility merely to Shaykhism’s connection with Bābism is, thus, anachronistic and, of course, part of the Kirmānī’s attempt to move closer to “orthodoxy” by attacking what he portrayed as the Bābīs’ “real heterodoxy”. A careful reading of Kirmānī’s anti-Bābī treatises, on which Hermann bases most of his explications, is quite revealing in this regard. In his earliest work, *Izhāq al-Bāṭil* (1845), Kirmānī strongly criticised the government because its tyranny had fostered heretics.[[8]](#footnote-9) He later changed his tone after he had been called to the Court and put under surveillance. In his 1867 *Risālih* dedicated to the monarch, from which Hermann quotes extensively, Kirmānī goes to considerable lengths to portray himself as a true supporter of the just government and the violent Bābīs as an imminent threat that only the government’s employment of armed force, supported ideologically by the Shaykhī *ʿulamāʾ*, could stop (cf. pp. 236f., 295). In truth, the Bābī movement had already been effectively crushed by this time and the remaining Bābīs, under the leadership of the exiled Bahāʾullāh, had long abandoned armed resistance. An alternative reading thus suggests that Kirmānī’s insistence on *jihād* being the prerogative of the Imām and on the Shāh being the sole legitimate wielder of the sword could be read as an attack on the Uṣūlīs and promotion of Shaykhīs as supporters of the state under the guise of anti-Bābī polemics. In any case, these polemics were mainly ways to propagate Shaykhī teachings (cf. pp. 242ff., 249, 289). A more critical analysis along these lines of the true intentions and the strategy employed in Kirmānī’s polemics is briefly hinted at in the final paragraph of the book (p. 299) and deserved more extensive treatment. Despite methodological issues and the at times inexplicably hostile and often misplaced tone in judging previous scholarship, these two chapters do provide a good summary of the major themes in Kirmānī anti-Bābī polemics and are therefore valuable, mainly for readers already familiar with Bābism and Shaykhism.

The final chapters of Part Three deal with the Kirmānī leaders’ reaction to modernity, reform and the “West”. Responding to the “shock of the Occident” (p. 259), they supported the war against British colonialists as “necessary”. This created a tension between their insistence on *jihād* being the sole prerogative of the Hidden Imām on the one hand and the responsibility for warfare being the Shāh’s. Hermann discusses this theme against the background of earlier conflicts between state and *ʿulamāʾ*, not least with regard to the role of the latter during the Perso-Russian Wars. Most Kirmānī leaders also displayed a strong aversion towards women’s rights, modern schools, the teaching of secular sciences and, particularly “freedom” and “liberty”, all of which they deemed root causes of moral decay and destruction. While such views were shared by contemporary conservative clerics, such as Faḍl’ullāh Nūrī (d. 1911), what singles out the Kirmānī authors’ protest is their declaration of *ijtihād* as the root cause of all these problems.

This is the topic of Hermann’s *Kirmānī Shaykhism and the* Ijtihād. Containing a table of contents and 42 pages of text but no index nor bibliography, it is more of an article than a book. Part III (*Ijtihād*, pp. 19–24) conforms, at times verbatim, to the French text in *Le shaykhisme* (pp. 74–82). Hermann then presents a more detailed study of the fourth Kirmānī leader Abū’l-Qāsim Khān’s (1897–1969) treatise on a particularly crucial topic. Abū’l-Qāsim wrote less than his predecessors but played an important role in further consolidating the Kirmānī school through his teaching and apologetical works. (*Ijtihād*, pp. 15f.) His *Ijtihād* *wa* *taqlid* is, thus, not only important for understanding later Kirmānī doctrine but is also considered “one of the most important intellectual refutations of Uṣūlism written in the post-Safavid era” (p. 49).

The present state of scholarship does not allow for any definitive statements on the relationship of Shaykhism—or rather, individual Shaykhī leaders—with Akhbārism and Uṣūlism. There are several similarities with Akhbārism, such as the refusal to categorise *ḥadīth*, belief in *taḥrīf* and condemnation of Sufism. However, as Hermann points out, these are not particular enough to deem Shaykhism an heir to the declining Akhbārī current, which was not uniform in any case (pp. 19f.). While Kirmānī authors from early on wrote strong rebuttals of Uṣūlism and *ijtihād*, they did not level similarly harsh criticisms against Akhbārīs (pp. 22–24, 36). Notably, there are several of Rashtī’s works which await systematic study and may provide further nuances to Hermann’s assessment.[[9]](#footnote-10) Muḥammad Karīm Khān Kirmānī’s condemnations of *ijtihād* stand in sharp contrast to the views of his mentor, Rashtī, who took a much more conciliatory approach and even seems to have sided with the *mujtahid*s. This might hint at a major shift between earliest Shaykhism and the later Kirmānī tradition, but more study is needed that also takes into account, for example, the possibility that Rashtī practised *taqiyya*.

Abū’l-Qāsim refutes the concept of *ijtihād* and *taqlīd* as providing innately fallible human beings with too much authority and keeping the masses uneducated in matters of faith (pp. 27f.). He denounces *ijtihād* as a Sunni invention (*bidʿa*) introduced by the likes of Abū Bakr and Muʿāwiya and only adopted by ignorant or power-hungry Shīʿīs who lost patience waiting for the Mahdī. *Ijtihād*, to him, is the door to Westernisation, loss of faith and unity, and moral decay (pp. 31ff.). His treatise thus strongly refutes, among others, Khomeini’s arguments in his “Ḥukūmat-i Īslāmī/Wilāyat-i Faqīh” lectures. This might explain why Kirmānīs have been persecuted since 1979. Their stance on the impossibility of ruling in accordance with God’s Law during the Occultation (p. 44) stood in stark contrast to the new regime’s core ideology.

As becomes clear from Hermann’s explanations, taking the strong Kirmānī rejection of *taqlīd* as a sign of abolishing religious hierarchies is a mistake. On the contrary, they propagated a belief in an alternate “occult and non-occult hierarchy”—the “Fourth Pillar” (*rukn-i rābiʿ*)—headed by the “sole speaker” (*nāṭiq-i wāḥid*) and represented through “trustworthy men” (*thiqa, shakhṣ-i thiqih*). These are supposed to be sought out by the believers as they will initiate them into the higher, occult hierarchies. But following them, Abū’l-Qāsim Khān claims, is not to be confused with *taqlīd*. Based on Hermann’s summary of his arguments (pp. 44ff.), it seems that Abū’l-Qāsim had a master-disciple relationship in mind, possibly along the lines of Ṣūfī shaykhs. Still, considering such strong emphasis on an only semi-occult hierarchy, Abū’l-Qāsim’s argument against *taqlīd* does not seem entirely consistent. In either case, Hermann identifies the “Fourth Pillar” doctrine as the most original contribution of Kirmānī Shaykhism and one which clearly distinguishes it from Akhbārism. The hierarchy, in its non-occult form, also helped create a communitarian structure which Akhbārism lacked “to ensure its survival in the early nineteenth century” (p. 49). The doctrine of the “Fourth Pillar”, apparently absent from Aḥsāʾī’s and only vaguely alluded to in Rashtī’s writings, has been a matter of contention that led to early and permanent schism among Shaykhīs. Hermann concisely presents and analyses this particular aspect of Kirmānī teaching.

Both publications deserved more careful editing and proofreading, as there is hardly a page without mistakes. Even common terms are repeatedly misspelled, such as *thiqa* (rendered as *thaqa*), *jizya* (*jaziyya*), *bayḍa-yi Islām* (*bayḍāh-yi*), *ajillāʾ* (*ijlāʾ*), *waʿy* (*waʿī*) and *nājīyih* (*naǧātī*) (p. 87); so too are *marjaʿ-i* (*marjaʿ-yi*), *al-jāmiʿa* (*al-ǧamaʿat*), *mutasharriʿ* (*mutasharraʿ*) and *pādishāh-i* (*padishāh-yi*). There are also some words that I was not able to decipher, such as *nafasīḥ* (*nafīsa*?) (*Le Shaykhisme*, p. 72) and *Ḥaydarī-kāna* (p. 159).

Hermann’s work is a valuable contribution to the study of modern Shīʿism in general and Shaykhism in particular. Like any pioneering work on such a broad topic, it suffers from unavoidable shortcomings. Yet, it draws attention to a vast, still unexplored, but quite rewarding field of study, adds important new facets to our knowledge about the development of modern Shīʿism and to contemporary debates on religious authority. It is obviously premature to attempt a definitive social and doctrinal history of Shaykhism before foundational work, such as a chronological assessment of the writings and biographies of the movement’s central figures and a systematic assessment of their teachings and how they evolved over time. There is certainly enough material for many future monographs and Hermann is to be commended for having made a courageous first step. It is to be hoped that he and others will shed further light on this as yet little understood area of the modern history of Islam.
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