



MOḤAMMAD-KARIM KHAN KERMĀNI

MOḤAMMAD-KARIM KHAN KERMĀNI, ḤĀJJ (b. Kerman, 1225/1810; d. Tahrud, 1288/1871; [Figure 1](#)), the founder of the Kermāni branch of Shaikhism (q.v.) and one of the main Shi'ite ulema of the modern period.

On the one hand, the Kermāni Shaikhi (Šayḳi) school, founded after the death of Sayyed [Kāẓem Rašti](#) (q.v.; d. 1259/1844, claims to return to the foundations of Shi'ite Islam, that is, to the teaching of the Prophet and the Imams contained in the Hadith (Amir-Moezzi, 1997, pp. 33-39); on the other hand, it highlights the fact that the learning of Shaikh [Aḥmad Aḥsā'i](#) (q.v.; d. 1241/1826) and his principal disciple and successor, Sayyed Kāẓem Rašti, was inspired by the Prophet and the Imams, and especially the Imam of Time (Aḥsā'i, *Resāla-ye šarḥ-e aḥwāl*, pp. 10-15, Kāẓem Rašti, p. 20, Moḥammad-Karim Khan, *Hedāyat al-tālebin*, pp. 62-67, 71-73, 116). The attitude of the school towards philosophy and speculative mysticism is very complex. Thus, Shaikh Aḥmad Aḥsā'i formulated his refutation of certain philosophers and theologians with the aid of theosophical and esoteric arguments (Cole, 1987, pp. 196-97). His thinking about the sources, restricted to the Qur'an and the Hadith of the Imams, is much more hermeneutic than dialectic. Shaikh Aḥmad Aḥsā'i referred to this as the "unveiling" (*kašf*) as a source of knowledge (Aḥsā'i, *Rasā'el al-ḥekma*, pp. 27-28). The successive Kermāni masters have themselves also claimed to be guided by Imams. Here is what Moḥammad-Karim Khan said about it:



Henceforth [after a vision of the 9th Imam] I was careful to scrutinize the hidden things; I had the mental perception, the inner vision of the holy Imams, and felt myself guided by them; for my knowledge, I now resorted directly to them, and to no one else. I do not profess anything that is not based on them. I do not give my acquiescence (*taqlid*) to anyone else. All my knowledge comes from my inner vision, the doctrine of the Imams guiding my spiritual research. Nothing else [tr. after citation in Corbin, 1972, p. 238].

Although Moḥammad-Karim Khan dedicated a few lines to the life and work of his two predecessors, Shaikh Aḥmad Aḥsā'i and Sayyed Kāzem Rašti, very little has been written about him, and the accessible biographical information on him is limited (Moḥammad-Karim Khan, *Hedāyat al-ṭālebin*). The Shaikhi master Abu'l-Qāsem Khan Ebrāhimi (d. 1389/1969), however, devoted a few pages to him in his long introduction to the catalog of the works of the Kermāni Shaikhi masters, which constitutes the first history of Shaikhism composed by a master of the school (Ebrāhimi, pp. 71-75).

Moḥammad-Karim Khan was born in Kerman in 1810 and died in 1871 in Tahrud, a town southeast of Kerman. After his death, his body was transferred to the mausoleum of Imām Ḥosayn in Karbala, where he was buried. Moḥammad-Karim Khan was a member of the Qajar royal family. He was the eldest son of Ebrāhim Khan Ṣāḥir-al-Dawla (q.v.; d. 1824), a cousin and son-in-law of the ruler Faṭḥ-'Ali Shah (q.v.; r. 1797-1834), and a disciple of Sayyed Kāzem Rašti, with whom he had established a deep relationship during a stay in Karbalā (Moḥammad-Karim Khan, *Taḍkerat al-awliā'*, pp. 55-58). Ṣāḥir-al-Dawla admired the theosophical exposition of Shaikh Aḥmad Aḥsā'i but was not able to meet him. After commanding the Qajar armies in Khorasan and Gilan, Ṣāḥir-al-Dawla was appointed governor of Kerman Province and Baluchestan, a position he held for a period of 22 years (1218-40/1803-24; Bāmdād, I, p. 21). During his governorship, he invited many ulema from Khorasan, Fars, and Arabia to settle in Kerman (MacEoin, 2009, p. 147). Many of his descendants became major landowners in the Kerman area. Some also assumed administrative responsibilities in the regions of Jiroft and Rafsanjān (de Groot, 1977, p. 142). At the turn of the 19th century, many prominent people of the region had joined the Ne'mat-Allāhiya Imamite Sufi order.

Moḥammad-Karim Khan studied during his childhood and adolescence at the Ebrāhimiya School, built at the orders of his father in the center of the Kerman bazaar and devoted to the study of Shaikhism. He left for Karbala at the age of



16 or 17 (Corbin, 1972, pp. 236-38). He remained only a few years in the *'atabāt* (q.v.) and returned to Kerman as a representative of Sayyed Kāẓem Raštī. It was during this period, in 1250/1834, that he established a rich library at the Ebrāhimiya School, which was run after his death by his son and successor as the head of the Kermāni Shaikhis, Ḥājj Moḥammad Khan Kermāni (q.v.). It was also in the Ebrāhimiya School that Moḥammad-Karim Khan taught. Having received a deeply elitist education, he only went out in the company of disciples and students and led a particularly ascetic life (Manoukian, pp. 164-66), notably performing many spiritual retreats in the mosque of Langar, a village close to Kerman.

Works. Moḥammad Karim Khan's corpus of work is immense; 278 works are attributed to him. They are divided into the following fifteen categories: theosophy (*ḥekmat-e elāhiya*); Shi'ite dogmatics and controversies; preaching and sermons; commentaries on the Qur'an; hadiths of the imams; Islamic legal theories (*oṣul-e feqh*); jurisprudence; treatises on prayer, devotion; medicine; treatises on light, optics, the science of perspective and mirrors; treatises on colors, music; astronomy, mathematics, the science of the astrolabe; alchemy, the interpretation of dreams, geomancy; calligraphy, poetry, and grammar; and answers to diverse questions (Ebrāhimi, pp. 440-577). Moḥammad-Karim Khan's work is particularly famous for its hermeneutics of the Shi'ite doctrine of *rejāl al-ḡayb* (men of the occultation) or *ahl al-ḥaqq* (people of truth). He especially theorized about faith in the occult elite, the companions of the Imam of Time (Emām-e Zamān), through an exposition of the doctrine of *rokn-e rābe'* (the fourth pillar). This is certainly the major contribution of the Kermāni Shaikhi school to Shi'a thought. This faith in a hierarchy of Shi'ites dominated by a *nāteq-e wāḥed* (the unique speaker) and designated representatives, *noqabā* (chiefs or guides; sing. *naqīb*) and *nojabā* (nobles; sing. *najīb*), constitutes for Kermani Shaykhism the fourth principle of religion (*oṣul-e din*), hence the name *rokn-e rābe'* given to this doctrine (Amir-Moezzi, 2001; Hermann, 2007; idem, 2017, pp. 82-95). His most important works on this subject are *Eršād al-'awāmm* and *Rokn-e rābe'*. Moḥammad-Karim Khan was also the author of some important Hadith compilations, entitled *al-Ketāb al-mobin* and *Faṣl al-ketāb*, which reveal the central importance given to the teaching of the Imams in Šayḳi thought. He also commented on a number of *suras* and Hadith. One can only regret the lack of studies on this corpus, which is one of the most impressive for the modern period—for one thing, because of its very high originality and coherence, and, for another, because of its deeply encyclopedic dimension, touching almost all the religious but also non-



religious sciences. On the other hand, Moḥammad-Karim Khan was less interested than his two predecessors in criticism of works of the Isfahan school of philosophy (Cole, 2001a; idem, 2001b; idem, 2001c; Lawson, 2005; idem, 2010). He did not devote any specific work to Sufism, but criticized it on several occasions, notably in his opus magnum *Eršād al-ʿawāmm* (IV, pp. 316-24). In particular, he criticized the relationship between Sufi disciples and their masters as slavish (Moḥammad-Karim Khan, “Resāla dar jawāb-e irādāt,” pp. 127, 136; idem, “Resāla dar raf-e baʿzi šabahāt-e mošabehhin,” pp. 106-08).

The call to political quietism was a constant point in the works of Moḥammad-Karim Khan, who interpreted the teaching of Imams in this sense, a principle that must be respected more scrupulously by the ulema than by others. Even the duty of “ordering good and forbidding evil” (*al-amr be’l-ma’ruf wa’l-nahy ‘an al-monkar*; see [AMR BE MA’RUF](#)) seems strongly restricted during the Occultation:

How can we [Kermāni Sheikhis] be accused of seeking power in this world, of loving power, or of pushing people to revolt [...]? All these claims come from the love of power (*ḥobb-e riāsat*) and this world. This does not correspond to the way of life of the ulema. What is most important today for the ulema is to stay away from this world and practice asceticism in it. According to the doctrine of our masters, the *mojtahed* cannot apply the legal penalties (*ḥodud*), such as killing, stoning, or flogging. Even ordering the good and forbidding the evil are forbidden in most cases until the parousia of the Imam of Time. This is our religion and our course of action. We know that some of the *mojtaheds* who enforce legal penalties, such as killing, stoning, or flogging, commit an error. [...] At this time, the distinctive sign of the pious and ascetic scholar is loneliness and retreat, transmitting the light of Imams through learning and otherwise avoiding people (Moḥammad-Karim Khan, *Si faṣl dar jawāb-e irādāt ...*, pp. 37-39)

This call to quietism also implied a duty of obedience to the sovereign. Moḥammad-Karim Khan returned to this concept mostly in his *Resāla-ye nāṣeriya dar jehād*. This last treaty was composed in Rajab 1273/February 1857 in order to support Nāṣer-al-Din Shah (r. 1848-96) against the British forces that had been occupying the port of [Bušehr](#) (q.v.) since Rabi II 1273/December 1856 in order to force the Qajars to withdraw from Herat, which they had conquered in Šafar 1273/October 1856. Bušehr was highly strategic economically and militarily. *Resāla-ye nāṣeriya dar jehād* was a call to the



Iranian people to defend the nation against the British army and, more broadly, a criticism of the growing influence of the West in Iran. The conclusion of the treatise, more specifically devoted to this last question, was also republished separately under the title of *Kātema-ye nāṣeriya*. Moḥammad-Karim Khan referred more specifically to the danger of rampant Westernization seven years later, in a short book entitled *Jawāb-e marḥum ‘Abd-al-‘Ali Kān dar etḡbāt-e maḥall-e budan-e kalā’*. It is essentially a response to the activity at *Dār al-Fonun* (q.v.), the polytechnic school founded in Tehran by Mirza Taqi Khan *Amir Kabir* (q.v.; d. 1268/1852) and inaugurated in Rabi‘ I 1268/December 1851 (Gurney and Nabavi, p. 662). Moḥammad-Karim Khan indirectly attacked its current director, the Qajar prince ‘*Aliqoli Mirzā E‘teżād-al-Salṭana* (q.v.; d. 1298/1880).

In this general context, one may also refer to his *Noṣrat-al-Din*, a book written in the style of a new genre of literature, “the refutation of priests” (*radd-e pādiri*) that emerged during the 19th century. It was a doctrinal answer directed at an English Christian missionary who was sent to Iran during the reign of *Moḥammad Shah* (q.v.; r. 1834-48) and had written a book in 1252/1836-37 inviting Muslims to Christianity.

Moḥammad-Karim Khan and the consolidation of Shaikhism. After the death of Sayyed Kāẓem Rašti, most of the Shaikhis of Iran and Iraq recognized the authority of Moḥammad-Karim Khan and his successors (Cole, 1988, pp. 185-89). Moḥammad-Karim Khan did not have any relations with Tabrizi Shaikhi masters, and they accused him and his followers of being innovators. The Tabrizi branch was founded by two Tabriz clerics, namely Mollā Moḥammad Māmaqāni (d. 1269/1852) and Ḥājj Mirzā Šafi‘ Teqat-al-Eslām Tabrizi (q.v.; d. 1301/1884), each of whom headed a group of disciples (Hermann, 2017, pp. 63-66; Werner, pp. 81-82, 122-26, 224-28, 252; Bayat, p. 59). The Tabrizi Shaikhis described the Kermānis as *rokniya*, in reference to the doctrine of *rokn-e rābe’* developed by Moḥammad-Karim Khan, or as *ḥājj-karimkāni*, which was then adopted by Kermāni Shaikhis (Ebrāhimi, pp. 92-93).

On the death of Moḥammad-Karim Khan, his sons Moḥammad Khan (q.v.) and Zayn-al-‘Ābedin Khan Kermāni (d. 1360/1941) succeeded him, followed by the latter’s descendants, namely Abu’l-Qāsem Khan Ebrāhimi (d. 1389/1969) and ‘Abd-al-Rezā Khan Ebrāhimi. After ‘Abd-al-Rezā’s assassination in December 1979, Sayyed ‘Ali Musawi (d. 2015), an Iraqi Shaikhi religious scholar (*‘ālem*), became the head of the order, transferring the center of the Kerman School to



Basra.

Moḥammad-Karim Khan played a central role in consolidating Shaikhism in the mid-19th century, notably by introducing many ulema to the Shaikhi doctrine. His students founded other Shaikhi communities and study circles outside the Kerman region. For instance, the Shaikhi community of Fārs was founded by Ḥājj ‘Abd-al-Şāḥeb Davāni, a religious scholar from the Davān district of Kāzerun, who is said to have met the Kermāni master on a pilgrimage to Mecca. He then decided to join the Kermāni Shaikhi school, and subsequently some of the city’s inhabitants followed his choice. Among the students of Moḥammad-Karim Kermāni (not to be confused with Moḥammad Karim Khan Kermāni) trained by him at the Ebrāhimiya School of Kerman, and then sent to animate Shaikhi circles in various regions of Iran or Iraq, one may mention Mirzā Ne‘mat-Allāh Rażawi and Shaikh Ḥosayn Mazidi. Shaikh Ḥosayn moved to Basra and served the Shaikhi community there until he was succeeded by Shaikh Ṭāher Mazidi. Moḥammad-Bāqer Hamadāni (d. 1319/1901, q.v.) led a study circle in Nā’in, which included the elites close to the governor, Mirzā Sayyed Moḥammad Khan Nā’ini (Moḥammad-Karim Kermāni, p. 45). After Moḥammad-Karim Khan’s death, Moḥammad-Bāqer founded a new branch of Shaikhism known as Jandaqi, Eşfahāni, Mirzā Bāqeriya, or Hamadāni (Hermann, 2007; idem, 2017, pp. 28-29). It can also be noted that Moḥammad-Karim Khan was the first Shaikhi master to compose a practical treatise (*Resāla-ye ‘amaliya*) on *feqh* (jurisprudence). This work, *Jāma‘ al-aḥkām al-şarāya‘*, which was widely consulted by the Shaikhis, indicates the prominent role of Moḥammad-Karim Khan in structuring the religious life of the Kermāni Shaikhi community.

Moḥammad-Karim Khan’s influence on the history of the Shaikhi school was also important because of his role in establishing an endowment deed (*waqf*) that was responsible for the consolidation of the school in Kerman city (Hermann and Rezai). A large complex, known as Majmu‘a-ye Ebrāhim Khan or Żahiriya was established in Kerman under the governorship of Żahir-al-Dawla. It consisted of a central bazaar, an annex bazaar, a water reserve (*āb-anbār*), a public bath (*ḥammam*), and the Ebrāhimiya School. On the advice of Shaikh Ne‘mat-Allāh Baḥrāni, one of Kerman’s influential scholars at that time, Żahir-al-Dawla decided to set up this complex through a *waqf*. Twenty-three years later, in 1255/1839, a conflict occurred between two Kermani clerics concerning the management of this *waqf*. One of them, Ḥājj Sayyed Āqā Jawād Şirāzi (d. 1287/1870), was the *emām-e jom‘a* (q.v.) of the city and the son-in-law



of Zahir-al-Dawla. He was also one of the main opponents of Moḥammad-Karim Khan. His rival, Āḳond Mollā ‘Ali Tuni A‘mā, was a *mojtahed* popular with the people of Kerman. Unable to settle their differences, they turned to Moḥammad-Karim Khan, who was then 30 years old and teaching at the Ebrāhimiya School. After reviewing the *waqf* document, Moḥammad-Karim Khan declared it invalid for two reasons. On the one hand, neither one of the litigants had respected all of the obligations of the *waqf* as they had not been fully providing lessons in all the disciplines supposed to be taught at the school. On the other hand, the management was inefficient, and there were many unpaid debts (Moḥammad-Karim Khan, *Hedāyat al-ṭālebin*, p. 158). However, Moḥammad-Karim Khan referred the document to one of the most influential jurists of the period, Sayyed Moḥammad-Bāqer Šafti (d. 1260/1844), who confirmed the opinion of the Shaikhi master. We do not know precisely the outcome of the conflict, but it seems that, in the absence of Moḥammad-Karim Khan, Āqā Jawād Širāzi and Mollā ‘Ali Tuni A‘mā monopolized for a time the management of the *waqf* and the premises of the Ebrāhimiya School, mostly due to their influence on the non-Shaikhi students (*ṭollāb*) of the city, but Shaikhi students cunningly introduced themselves into the school at night and managed to take control of it again (Modaressi Čahārdahi, 1955, pp. 261-62)

During the month of Ramažān 1262/August 1846, members of the Ebrāhimi family established the Ebrāhim Khan complex and three arable lands. The first donor (*wāqef*) was Moḥammad-Karim Khan himself. He owned only 1/65th of all of this property. It was only after his initiative that sixteen of his brothers and sisters also joined their shares. The properties gathered together were numerous and consequential. It can therefore be assumed that the revenues raised from this *waqf* were quite substantial. A few years later, efforts were made to bring together all the components of the Ebrāhim Khan complex and the land. In 1284/1867, and then in 1287/1870, the *waqf* was supplemented by contributions from other members of Moḥammad-Karim Khan’s family. Some 6 to 7/10ths of the revenues was to be allocated solely for the functioning of the Ebrāhimiya School and partly redistributed in the form of allowances and stipends for study. It seems that it was mostly this *waqf* that made it possible to finance the organization of studies in religious sciences for the Kermāni Shaikhi community. It is also possible that Moḥammad-Karim Khan supplemented these revenues in order to finance the running of the Ebrāhimiya School, as well as that of other circles scattered in Iran and elsewhere, also using in addition some of the *koms* that he received. This *waqf*



also financed the religious ceremonies of the community, notably of ‘Āšurā’ (q.v.), and the dissemination of the works of the masters of the order (for more information about this important *waqf*, see Hermann and Rezai, pp. 95-100).

Moḥammad-Karim Khan indicated in his *waqf-nāma* that the manager (*motawalli*) of the *waqf* had to be the director of the Ebrāhimiya School, at that time Moḥammad-Ḥosayn Khan Yazdi (d. 1288/1871). Upon the death of Moḥammad-Karim Khan, other more modest *waqfs* were formed by members of the school to finance the needs of the community.

Refutation of Babism. Moḥammad-Karim Khan also remains famous for his polemics against Babism. He wrote five or six treatises on this subject. It seems that only four of them are known: *Ezhāq al-bāṭel dar radd-e Bāb-e mortāb* (written in 1261/1845), *Resāla-ye tir-e šahāb dar rāndan-e Bāb-e kosrān-ma’āb* (written 1262/1846), *al-Šahāb al-tāqeb* (written in 1265/1849), *Resāla dar radd-e Bāb-e mortāb* (written in 1283/1867; Ar. tr. as *Resāla fi’l-radd ‘alā al-Bāb al-mortāb*), and *Rojum al-šayāṭen*, which seems to be lost. Moḥammad Karim Khan is certainly the Shi’i ulema contemporary with the Bāb who wrote the greatest number of treaties against Babism. He was particularly pleased to note that the region of Kerman has known very few conversions to Babism: “Thank God, I saw no Bābi, and they have not debated with me. Thank God, there is not a single Bābi in my region” (Moḥammad-Karim Khan, *Resāla dar radd-e Bāb-e mortāb*, p. 58). According to him, the influence of Kermāni Shaikhis on the city of Yazd had also allowed that region to experience relatively few conversions to Babism (Moḥammad-Karim Khan, *Resāla dar radd-e Bāb-e mortāb*, pp. 27-28; idem, *Si faṣl dar jawāb-e irādāt ...*, p. 34). Moḥammad-Karim Khan mocked the various claims and arguments of the Bāb that he considered ridiculous and contradictory, noting in particular that the latter claimed successively to be the representative of the Imām of Time, then the messiah himself, and finally the prophet bringing a new scripture, the *Bāyān*. He also noted the inadequacy of his Arabic (Moḥammad-Karim Khan, *Resāla dar radd-e Bāb ...*, pp. 17-20; idem, “Resāla-ye tir-e šahāb ...,” p. 199; Hermann, 2017, pp. 249-57).

According to Moḥammad-Karim Khan, support for the ruler Nāṣer-al-Din Shah in his struggle against Babism was a religious obligation (*wājeb*) incumbent on Muslim subjects. However, he presented two types of disciples of the Bāb who should not be killed under any circumstances. He first refers to those who, without understanding the apostasy of the Bāb, gave him their support because of their natural and traditional trust in the sayyeds (Moḥammad-



Karim Khan, *Resāla dar radd-e Bāb-e mortāb*, p. 24). The second category concerns rogues or brigands (*luṭi*) and opportunists looking only for power. Moḥammad-Karim Khan considers that the latter only saw the claims of the Bāb, and especially the call to *jehād*, as a means to create disturbances and perhaps to acquire loot. They are, therefore, not designated as heretics. Moḥammad-Karim Khan believed that those who must be fought were first and foremost those who attested to their belief in the message of Babism after clearly hearing the claims of the Bāb and in particular his rejection of the *šari'a*. Moḥammad-Karim Khan also wrote a *fatwā* (authoritative ruling) for the purpose of condemning to death two Babi missionaries who went to Kerman (Mirzā Ḥosayn Hamadāni, tr. Browne, p. 200). For Moḥammad-Karim Khan, it was above all thanks to the ruler Nāṣer-al-Din Shah that Iran had avoided the victory of Babism over Islam. He dedicated his book, *Resāla dar radd-e Bāb-e mortāb*, to Nāṣer-al-Din Shah, who had commissioned it. He says that the king's action has limited the expansion of the movement in Iran and put an end to the Bābi revolts, and he particularly criticized the attitude of the Ottoman authorities, who had guaranteed the security of some Babi/Bahai leaders in their territory, and called on all the ulema to mobilize (Moḥammad-Karim Khan, *Resāla dar radd-e Bāb ...*, pp. 22-24).

It is interesting to note that, despite the accusations of some clerics that the claims of the Bāb were in conformity with the doctrine of *rokn-e rābe'*, Moḥammad-Karim Khan regularly reiterated this doctrine in his first refutations of Babism. Not only did Moḥammad-Karim Khan recall the importance of *rokn-e rābe'* within Shi'ite doctrine, he also argued against the Bāb on behalf of the same fourth pillar (Moḥammad-Karim Khan, *Resāla dar radd-e Bāb ...*, pp. 210-32).

The numerous historiographical problems in evaluating the relationship between Shaikhism and Babism have been pointed out elsewhere (Hermann, 2017, pp. 216-31). This question is all the more important in dealing with the life and work of Moḥammad-Karim Khan because the latter occupies a central place in this debate. Indeed, as the successor of Sayyed Kāzem Rašti and the senior Shi'i ulema who wrote anti-Babi treatises during the life of the Bāb and after his death, the few mentions of the biography of Moḥammad-Karim Khan found in critical studies in European languages most often concern his opposition in the face of Babism and more generally the societal evolutions of the Qajar era. Most of these works were done by authors whose lack of scientific objectivity is evident. Louis Nicolas, for example, who considered



that Babism came from Shaikhism, criticized Moḥammad-Karim Khan and the Kermāni branch in particularly harsh terms (Nicholas, I, pp. xvii-xviii, III, p. 16).

Thus, Moḥammad-Karim Khan was often presented as a conformist religious scholar breaking with the supposed “heterodoxy” of Shaykh Aḥmad Aḥsā’i and Sayyed Kāẓem Raṣṭi and seen as a kind of “traitor” to them. For example, Denis MacEoin presented Babism as the inheritance of an esoteric Shaikhism, associating Moḥammad-Karim Khan’s theology with a Shi’a “orthodoxy” that excommunicated Shaikh Aḥmad Aḥsā’i (MacEoin, 2009, p. 139). For Mangol Bayat, Moḥammad-Karim Khan and the Kermāni Šayḳi branch, for their part, are seen as a deviation that breaks with the “socio-political revolutionary” education or the “progressive reform movement” of the first two teachers of the school and which would find their full measure in Bahaism. Moḥammad-Karim Khan is also blacklisted for refusing to commit to political and social changes under the rule of Nāṣer-al-Din Shah. Bayat also notes the lack of interest of the Kermāni Shaikhiis in politics, which she equates with intellectual stagnation as opposed to Babi vitality (Bayat, pp. 84, 86, 178, 181). However, no analytical study of the work of Moḥammad-Karim Khan and his successors, which seems little known to these researchers, tends to support those interpretations.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Works by Moḥammad-Karim Khan (in alphabetical order; for a more complete list, see Ebrāhimi).

Asrār al-ḥajj, Tehran, 1319/1901.

Čahār faṣl, Kerman, n.p., 1945.

Eršād al-‘awāmm, 4 vols., Kerman, 1974-75.

Ezhāq al-bāṭel dar radd-e Bāb-e mortāb, Kerman, 1972.

Faṣl al-keṭāb, 2nd ed., Kerman, 1972.

Hedāyat al-ṭālebin, Kerman, 1961.



Hosām-al-Din, n. p., 1893.

Izāh al-eštebāh, Tabriz, 1917.

Jāma'

al-a

h

kām al-šarāya', tr. from Arabic into Persian by Zayn-al-Ābedin Ebrāhimi, ed. Ḥasan Vakilzāda Ebrāhimi, Qom, 1373/1995.

Jawāb-e so'ālāt wa irādāt-e Moḥammad-Bāqer Eṣfahāni, n.p., n.d.

Ketāb al-jāma' al-aḥkām al-šarāye', Kerman, 1367/1948.

Kayfiyat-e eṣlāh-e nafs, Tehran, 1298/1881.

Majma' al-rasā'el-e adabi:

Šarf wa naḥw-e fārsi; Tanbih al-odabā'; Ta'lim al-kottāb; Taqwim al-lesān, ed. Aḥmad Bahmanyār, Kerman, 1365/1946.

Nabard-e Āšurā yā jang bayn-e kodā-parasti wa māddigari, Mashhad, 1331, 1912.

Noṣrat-al-Din, Kerman, 1956.

“Resāla dar jawāb-e irādāt-e Mollā Ḥosayn-‘Ali Tuyserkāni bar selsela-ye ‘eliya,” in idem, *Majma' al-rasā'el-e fārsi* XV, Kerman, 1380/1960-61, pp. 110-88.

“Resāla-ye nāšeriya dar jehād,” in idem, *Majma' al-rasā'el-e fārsi* I, Kerman, 1386/1966-67, pp. 295-398.

Resāla dar radd-e Bāb-e mortāb, Kerman, 1384/1964.

“Resāla dar raf-e ba'zi šobahāt-e mošabbihin,” in idem, *Majma' al-rasā'el* XV, Kerman, 1380/1960-61, pp. 189-217.

“Resāla-ye tir-e šahāb dar rāndan-e Bāb-e kosrān-ma'āb,” in idem, *Majma' al-rasā'el-e fārsi* I, Kerman, 1386/1966-67, pp. 161-242.

Rokn-e rābe', Kerman, 1368/1949.



Rojum al-šayātin, Tabriz, n. d.

Si faṣl dar jawāb-e irādāt-e ba'zi mawredin bar selsela-ye jalila-ye Šaykiya, Kerman, 1368/1949.

Soltāniya, Kerman, 1382/1962-63.

Tadkerat al-awliā', Kerman, 1387/1967-68.

Tafsir-e sura-ye Hajarāt, Kerman, 1952.

Taqwim al-'awj fi taqwim al-a'raj, Bامbay, 1304/1886-87.

Tawḥid, nobuwwa, emāmā, šī'a, litho. ed., Tabriz, 1310/1892-93.

Sources.

Shaikh Aḥmad Aḥsā'i, *Rasā'el al-ḥekma*, Beirut, 1993, pp. 27-28.

Idem, *Resāla-ye šarḥ-e aḥwāl*, tr. Moḥammad-Karim Khan, Kerman, 1387/1967.

Idem, *Šarḥ ketāb al-ḥekma al-'aršiya*, litho. ed., Tabriz, 1278/1861-62.

Idem, *Šarḥ ketāb al-mašā'er*, litho. ed., Tabriz, 1278/1861-62.

Idem, *Šarḥ al-ziāra al-jāme'a*, litho. ed., Tabriz, 1276/1859-60.

Abbas Amanat, *Resurrection and Renewal: The Making of the Babi Movement in Iran, 1844-1850*, Ithaca, 1989.

Mohammad Ali Amir-Moezzi, "Remarques sur les critères d'authenticité du hadīth et l'autorité du juriste dans le shī'isme imāmīte," *Studia Islamica* 85, 1997, pp. 5-39.

Idem, "Une absence remplie de présences. Herméneutiques de l'occultation chez les Shaykhiyya (Aspects de l'imamologie duodécimaine VII)," *BSOAS* 64/1, 2001, pp. 1-18; Eng. version, as "An Absence filled with Presences: Shaykhiyya Hermeneutics of the Occultation (Aspects of Twelver Imamology VII)," in Rainer Brunner and Werner Ende, eds., *The Twelver Shia in Modern Times: Religious Culture and Political History*, Leiden, 2001, pp. 36-57.

Idem, "Shī'ite Doctrine," in *Encyclopaedia Iranica Online*, http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2330-4804_EIRO_COM_1365.



Mohammad Ali Amir-Moezzi and Sabine Schmidtke, “Twelver-Shī‘ite Resources in Europe: The Shī‘ite Collection at the Oriental Department of the University of Cologne, the *Fonds* Henry Corbin and the *Fonds* Shaykhī at the École Pratique des Hautes Études, Paris. With a catalogue of the *Fonds* Shaykhī,” *JA* 285, 1997, pp. 73-122.

Mehdi Bāmdād, *Šarḥ-e hāl-e rejāl-e Irān dar qorun-e 12, 13, 14 hejri*, 6 vols., Tehran, 1968-75.

Moḥammad-Ebrāhīm Bāstāni Pārizi, *Hamāsa-ye kavir*, Tehran, 1356/1977.

Mangol Bayat, *Mysticism and Dissent: Socio-Religious Thought in Qajar Iran*, Syracuse, N.Y., 1982.

Juan R. I. Cole, “‘Indian Money’ and the Shī‘i Shrine Cities of Iraq 1786-1850,” *Middle Eastern Studies* 22/4, 1986, pp. 461-80.

Idem, “Rival Empires of Trade and Imami Shi‘ism in Eastern Arabia, 1300-1800,” *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 19, 1987, pp. 177-204.

Idem, *Roots of North Indian Shi‘ism in Iran and Iraq: Religion and State in Awadh, 1722-1859*, Berkeley, 1988.

Idem, “The World as Text: Cosmologies of Shaykh Ahmad al-Ahsa‘i,” *Studia Islamica* 80, 1994, pp. 145-63.

Idem, “Casting away the Self: The Mysticism of Shaykh Ahmad al-Ahsa‘i,” in Rainer Brunner and Werner Ende, eds., *The Twelver Shia in Modern Times: Religious Culture and Political History*, Leiden, 2001a, pp. 25-37.

Idem, “Individualism and the Spiritual Path in Shaykh Ahmad al-Ahsa‘i,” in Lynda Clarke, ed., *Shī‘ite Heritage: Essays in Classical and Modern Traditions*, Binghamton, N.Y., 2001b, pp. 345-58.

Idem, “Shaykh Ahmad al-Ahsa‘i on the Sources of Religious Authority,” in Linda S. Walbridge, ed., *The Most Learned of the Shi‘a: The Institution of the Marja‘ Taqlid*, New York, 2001c, pp. 82-93.

Juan R. I. Cole and Moojan Momen, “Mafia, Mob and Shi‘ism in Iraq: The Rebellion of Ottoman Karbala, 1824-1843,” *Past and Present* 112, 1986, pp. 112-43.



Henry Corbin, *Terre céleste et corps de résurrection de l'Iran mazdéen à l'Iran shī'ite*, Paris, 1960.

Idem, "L'École shaykhie en théologie shiite," in *Annuaire de l'École Pratique des Hautes Études: Section des Sciences Religieuses 1960-61*, Paris, 1961, pp. 3-59.

Idem, *En Islam iranien, aspects spirituels et philosophiques IV*, Paris, 1972.

Abu'l-Qāsem Khan Ebrāhimi, *Fehrest-e kotob-e mašāyek-e 'ezām*, 3rd ed., Kerman, n.d.

Joanna de Groot, "Kerman in the Late Nineteenth Century: A Regional Study of Society and Social Change," Ph.D. diss., University of Oxford, 1977.

John Gurney and Negin Nabavi, "Dār al-Fonūn," in *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, VI, pp. 662-68.

Mirzā Ḥosayn Hamadāni, *Tāriḳ-e jadid, or New History of Mirzā 'Ali-Moḥammad the Bāb*, ed. and tr. Edward G. Browne, Cambridge, 1893.

Idris Samawi Hamid, "The Metaphysics and Cosmology of Process According to Shaykh Aḥmad al-Aḥsā'ī: Critical Edition, Translation, and Analysis of 'Observations in Wisdom'," Ph.D. diss., State University of New York at Buffalo, 1998.

Denis Hermann, "Quelques remarques à propos de l'interprétation du sens *rokn-e rābe'* chez Moḥammad Bāqer Hamadānī, le fondateur de l'école shaykhī hamadānī," *JA* 295/2, 2007, pp. 461-91.

Idem, "Shaikhism," *Encyclopaedia Iranica Online* (forthcoming).

Idem, *Le shaykhisme à la période qajare: l'histoire sociale et doctrinale d'une école théologico-mystique chiite*, Turnhout, 2017.

Denis Hermann and Omid Rezai, "Le rôle du *vaqf* dans la formation de la communauté *shaykhī kermānī* à l'époque qājār (1259-1324/1843-1906)," *Studia Iranica* 36/1, 2007, pp. 87-131.

Todd Lawson, "Orthodoxy and Heterodoxy in Twelver Shi'ism: Aḥmad al-Aḥsā'ī on Fayḍ Kāshānī (the *Risālat al-'Ilmiyya*)," in Robert Gleave, ed., *Religion and Society in Qajar Iran*, London and New York, 2005, pp. 127-54.



Idem, “Shaykh Aḥmad al-Aḥsā’ī and the World of Image,” in Denis Hermann and Sabrina Mervin, eds., *Shi’i Trends and Dynamics in Modern Times (XVIIIth-XXth Centuries): Courants et dynamiques chiïtes à l’époque moderne (XVIII^e-XX^e siècles)*, Beirut, 2010, pp. 19-31.

Denis M. MacEoin, “From Shaykhism to Babism: A Study in Charismatic Renewal in Shi’i Islam,” Ph.D. diss, Cambridge University, 1979.

Idem, “Orthodoxy and Heterodoxy in Nineteenth-Century Shi’ism: The Cases of Shaykhism and Bābism,” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 110/2, 1990, pp. 323-29.

Idem, “The Trial of the Bab: Shi’ite Orthodoxy Confronts its Mirror Image,” in Juan R. I. Cole and Susan Maneck, eds., *Occasional Papers in Shaykhi, Babi and Baha’i Studies* 1, 1997 (<http://www.h-net.org/~bahai/bhpapers.htm>).

Idem, “From Shaykhism to Babism: A Study in Charismatic Renewal in Shi’i Islam,” in idem, *The Messiah of Shiraz: Studies in Early and Middle Babism*, Leiden, 2009, pp. 3-249.

Setrag Manoukian, “Fatvas as Asymmetrical Dialogues: Muhammad Karim Khan Kirmani and His Questioners,” in Muhammad Khalid Masud, Brinkley Messick, and David Stephen Powers, eds., *Islamic Legal Interpretation: Muftis and Their Fatwas*, Cambridge, 1996, pp. 162-72.

Moḥammad-Karim Kermāni, *Tāriq-e ‘ebrat al-imān-e e’tebar dar waqāyi’-e 1315 hejri dar Hamadān*, n. p., n. d. (author not to be confused with Moḥammad-Karim Khan Kermāni).

Mortazā Modarresī Čahārdahī, *Šayk Aḥmad Aḥsā*

, Tehran, 1955.

Idem, *Šaykigari wa bābigari az naẓar-e falsafa, tāriq, wa ejtemā’*, Tehran, 1966.

Moojan Momen, *The Works of Shaykh Aḥmad al-Aḥsā’ī: A Bibliography Based upon Fihrist Kutub Mashyikh ‘Iẓam of Abū al-Qāsim Ibrāhīmī Kirmānī*, Newcastle, 1991.

Negin Nabavi, “Dar al-Funun: The First Modern College in Iran,” M. Phil. thesis, University of Oxford, 1990.



Louis Alphonse Daniel Nicolas, *Essai sur le chéikhisme*, 4 vols., Paris, 1910-14.

Vahid Rafati, “The Development of Shaykhī Thought in Shī‘ī Islam,” Ph.D. diss., UCLA, 1979.

Sayyed Kāẓem Rašti, *Dalil al-moteḥayyerin*, tr. Zayn-al-‘Ābedin Ebrāhimi, Kermān, n.d.

William Ronald Royce, “Mir Ma‘sum ‘Ali Shah and the Ni‘mat Allahi Revival 1776-77 to 1796-97: A Study of Sufism and Its Opponents in Late Eighteenth Century Iran,” Ph.D. Diss., Princeton University, 1979.

Āqā Mobin Sarḥaddi, *Tadkera-ye šayḵ al-awḥad Šayḵ Aḥmad al-Aḥsā‘i ḥaqā‘iq ki rušani men*, Faisalabad, n.d.

Christoph Werner, *An Iranian Town in Transition: A Social and Economic History of the Elites of Tabriz, 1747-1848*, Wiesbaden, 2000.