FROM SHAYKHISM TO BABISM:
A STUDY IN CHARISMATIC RENEWAL IN SHĪᶜĪ ISLAM

DENIS MARTIN MACEOIN

ORIGINAL DEDICATION

This study is dedicated to my parents, David and Isobel, for their help and encouragement over so many years and their patience with what must have seemed at many times an incomprehensible field of study; and to my mother-in-law, Nancy, and my late father-in-law, Sydney, for their unfailing kindness and help.

DEDICATION OF PUBLISHED EDITION

To my darling wife of thirty-one years (and counting), Beth—the Dido Twite of her generation!

Foreword

FROM SHAYKHISM TO BABISM:
A STUDY IN CHARASMATIC RENEWAL IN SHĪᶜĪ ISLAM

Ph.D. Dissertation by Denis Martin MacEoin, King's College, Cambridge

The present study seeks to explore a neglected but important development in the history of Iranian Shiᶜism in the period immediately preceding the beginning of full-scale Western economic and political penetration. Shiᶜism has, in general, not witnessed the emergence of significant reformers in the modern period, comparable to those of the Sunnī world. Earlier, much attention was focused on Babism and Baha'ism, but these movements are less reformist than heterodox in nature and, in the end, seek to move beyond an Islamic frame of reference altogether. This, however, is paradoxical, in that early Babism and the Shaykhī school from which it emerged both laid considerable stress on orthodoxy and on rigid Islamic practice. It is the purpose of this thesis to demonstrate the place of this paradox within the wider context of Twelver Shiᶜism as a whole and to explore the role of authority claims and the interplay of charismatic and legal authority as basic factors in the emergence of the Shaykhi and Bābī movements.

The introduction discusses the relevance of the present study to contemporary events in Iran, notably the religiously-inspired revolution led by Ayatollah Khomeini. The first chapter considers the nature of authority and charisma in Shiᶜism following the 'disappearance' of the twelfth Imām, analyzing the role of the religious establishment as a whole and the *mujtahids* and *marāji*ᶜ *al-taqlīd* in particular, as well as the place of works of *fiqh* and *ḥadīth* as sources of traditional authority; this chapter also concerns itself with a detailed discussion of developments in Shiᶜism in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, particularly in respect of the emergence of individual ulama as foci for routinized charisma.

It is followed by chapters on Shaykh Aḥmad al-Aḥsāʾī (the founder of the Shaykhi school) and his successor Sayyid Kāẓim Rashtī. Chapter Four deals with the main schismatic developments in Shaykhism following the death of the latter and discusses the circumstances in which Sayyid ᶜAlī Muḥammad Shīrāzī (the Bāb) established his position as the principal claimant to leadership of the school. Chapter Five approaches the question of early Babi doctrine, first by describing and analyzing the earliest writings of the Bab then by a detailed consideration of his various claims in the early period. In the final chapter, the course of the Babi propaganda among the Shaykhis in Iraq is discussed, with emphasis on controversies centered on the figure of Qurrat al-ᶜAyn, a woman who became the leading *ᶜālim* of the religion; the Shaykhi reaction to Babism, divisions within the early Babi community, first steps taken by Qurrat al-ᶜAyn

and her followers towards the abrogation of the Islamic *sharīᶜa*, and the Babi rejection of Shaykhism are all discussed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE TO 1979 THESIS

Sources

In writing the present dissertation, I have drawn on a wide variety of manuscript and printed sources in Persian, Arabic, English, French and, to a lesser extent, other European languages. As regards Shīᶜī Islam, general Qajar history, and other background topics, I have relied exclusively on printed materials. For Babism, I have drawn widely on manuscripts located in Cambridge University Library (mostly in the E. G. Browne Collection), the British Library, the Iranian National Bahaʾi Archives in Tehran, the International Bahaʾi Archives in Haifa and a few private collections. I have discussed at length the relevant materials in "A Revised Survey of the Sources for Early Babi Doctrine and History" (see bibliography) and more briefly in this dissertation. [The "Revised Survey" has since been published as *Sources for Early Babi Doctrine and History*—see bibliography.] I have also made use of British consular and diplomatic materials kept in the Public Record Office, London; extensive research on these for the purpose of locating references to Shaykhism and Babism has been carried out over a period of several years by my friend and colleague, Dr. Moojan Momen, to whom I am most grateful for his permission to refer to his Xerox copies and notes. Since large amounts of the main Shaykhi sources have been printed, I have made only limited use of manuscripts for this aspect of my research.

The printed materials for Babism include large numbers of books, many of them secondary, published by the Azalī Bābīs and the Bahaʾis in Iran. Since these books cannot be obtained through the normal channels they are not generally available anywhere but in private hands; thanks to the kindness of my friends over several years, I have been able to build up an almost complete library of these works. Particular mention should be made here of the Azalī editions of several important works of the Bab and to Mīrzā Asad Allāh Fāḍil-i Māzandarānī's *Tārīkh-i ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq* (volume 3), which contains copious partial and complete quotations from early Babi literature. Even less readily obtainable are copies of facsimile reproductions of manuscripts in the Tehran Bahaʾi archives [Iran National Bahaʾi Archives], distributed to a very limited group of subscribers some years ago. The European printed materials by Edward Granville Browne, Arthur Comte de Gobineau, A.-L.-M. (Louise Alphonse Daniel) Nicolas and others are generally well known and available in most serious libraries; I have used them widely, but with great caution, since they are often inaccurate and certainly much outdated.

Later Bahaʾi-produced materials in Persian or English are generally of little value for Babi history or doctrine, but I have made careful use of Shoghi

Effendi's edited translation of Nabīl-i Zarandī's *Tārīkh-i Nabīl*[1] (the original text of which has not yet been published in any form) and several recent historical works by Muḥammad-ᶜAlī Malik Khusravī (Nūrī), Muḥammad ᶜAlī Fayḍī, and Ḥasan Muvaqqar Balyuzi. The main printed materials for Shaykhism may be found adequately catalogued in *Fihrist-i kutub-i Shaykh-i ajall-i awḥad marḥūm Shaykh Aḥmad Aḥsā'ī* by Abū 'l-Qāsim ibn Zayn al-ᶜĀbidīn Khān Kirmānī; this work also contains a detailed list of Shaykhi manuscripts kept in Kirman. The only European sources dealing with early Shaykhism are works by Nicolas and Corbin, but none of these is at all adequate for the purposes of serious research.

Transliteration and dates

The system of transliteration is, with few modifications, that used by most scholarly publications in this field, and is largely based on that of *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Islam in the Modern World*. Inconsistencies necessarily occur where I am quoting or referring to materials in European languages using different systems. As ever, it is a problem combining both Arabic and Persian words and phrases in one document. For the sake of consistency, I have preferred an Arabic-based system, since it is more sensitive to the letters in both languages, but fully accept that this does not do justice to the pronunciation of Persian words, even where they are straight adaptations of Arabic originals. Those familiar with the eccentric Bahaᵓi system of transliteration may find themselves nonplussed by this essentially academic system. I can only point out that the forms in common use by Baha'is today are inconsistent and problematic, and that my system will prove much more accurate for the retranscription of words back to Arabic or Persian. In the case of many names I have used full transliteration only on their first occurrence. Common place-names (Basra, Tehran) are written as they normally appear in atlases.

In the text, reference is made to Western and lunar Muslim dates, while in the bibliography, use is also made of the solar Muslim, Babi/Bahaᵓi (*badīᶜ*), and Iranian Shāhanshāhī calendars.

Preface to the published edition

This must be the strangest of the many books I have published over the years. It is a lightly edited version of my 1979 PhD thesis, written at King's College, Cambridge and completed when I was twenty-nine years old. I'm now closer to sixty, yet re-reading and editing the text for this publication, everything seems as fresh to me now as it did then. In an ideal world, one without other commitments, it deserved a complete re-writing. When I wrote it, not much had been written in European languages about Shi^{c}ism, Shaykhism, or Babism; today, Shi^{c}ism has become a popular academic topic and the subject of whole conferences (let alone daily news reports from Iran and Iraq), but almost no-one but my coeval Abbas Amanat, Todd Lawson and myself has written substantially about the Babis, and no-one has taken Shaykhi studies an inch further. Heavy-handedness on the part of the governing bodies of the Baha'i religion towards academic and intellectual work has made it next to impossible for a younger generation of Baha'i scholars to emerge from that milieu, and interest in the subject from outsiders (besides myself and the Danish scholar Margit Warburg) has never been kindled.

To be honest, I think it unlikely that Babism will ever be more than a peripheral topic for academics in Islam, Shi^{c}ism, or Iranian studies. The only people to remain interested in this almost-forgotten byway of 19th-century Shi^{c}ism are members of the Baha'i faith, and they will seldom find an honest appraisal of Babism particularly attractive.

A full re-write would have been attractive for all sorts of reasons; but my growing commitments in the years following completion of this work proved too great a drain on my energy and time even to contemplate something on that scale. I did, of course, write books, articles and encyclopedia entries on Shaykhism and Babism, all of which add up to a substantial appendix to the present book, as can be seen from the bibliography. Many of these have been made available online to provide readers with access to studies of Babi militancy, ritual, texts and more, up through the important phase of Middle Babism (roughly 1850 to the 1860s) and beyond. But, as the years passed and I read more, I simply could not find time to write the longer study that this should have been. That's a shame, but I still hope the present text has enough to offer readers a further insight into the way Babism developed out of orthodox Shi^{c}ism.

Since a majority of those who will read this book will be Baha'is, perhaps it is in order to say a little about where a work of this kind stands in relation to their beliefs and attitudes.

For my own part, I have traveled a long way since writing the thesis. I began it as a committed Baha'i and not long after its completion parted from the religion. That has been unfortunate in that some Baha'is have concluded that

academic study in a secular environment and with rationalist methods is inimical to faith. As a secular humanist, I would agree that it is, but many Christians and Jews and a tiny number of Muslims would disagree. For all that, the experience of other Baha'i academics since then has reinforced that earlier conclusion in the minds of many.

This is a pity, since academic pursuits ought to be encouraged in a religious context, particularly in a religion that advocates the independent search after truth and the harmony of science and faith. The debate is no longer mine to a large degree. Within the Baha'i religion itself, controversy over these and related issues rages and takes a high toll. There can be no reason at all why sound academic study of a religion should lead to the loss of faith. Many Baha'i academics successfully combine serious scholarship with belief, just like their counterparts in several other religions. What will be lost is a naïve belief in hagiography, in literal interpretations of texts, in excessive deference to religious authorities. Those are, surely, healthy things to lose, and, indeed, Baha'is themselves regularly counsel followers of other faiths to lose them. There should be no conflict here.

My task in all this has simply been to show how an academic, scientific, secular study of religion is possible. I have taken my cue from earlier work on religious history by Jewish and Christian scholars, as well as secular-minded academics like myself. Historical truth should not prove destructive of faith. Destruction comes when attempts are made to deny simple facts, to wrap events in a caul of mystery, to challenge what was through an appeal to what should have been. There is nothing in these pages that should disturb a faithful but intelligent Baha'i, but there is much that should challenge them.

As a simple example of how mythologizing can harm both the truth and people's ability to hold to a higher truth, I will mention something that is not in these pages. Elsewhere, I have shown calculations, based on original histories, that demonstrate beyond a shadow of doubt that the number of Babis killed between 1844 and the early 1850s amounted to scarcely more than 3,000 persons, perhaps 4,000 if we inflate the figures. Even recently, the Baha'i authorities have re-affirmed the accuracy of their claim that an iconic figure—20,000—died. This is to fly in the face of all the evidence, including that of their own sources. No historian of any quality or dignity would venture beyond the figures I have given, and some might reduce them. My figures are based on a count of names and rough figures given for the four main incidents in which Babis died, together with extra figures with much smaller death counts. For there to have been a further 17,000 deaths that are unaccounted for in government, diplomatic, Babi, or Baha'i sources beggars belief. It is simply not likely that as many as 20,000 Babis even existed in Iran between 1844 and 1852, the period of the main incidents. To give some idea of how vast the discrepancy is, we need only note that 20,000 equals the number of British dead during the Battle of the Somme.

No intelligent historiography can continue where such irrational denials of the obvious occur. There is absolutely nothing to stop Baha'is recognizing those 3,000 martyrs, valuing them, or writing about them in a hagiographic fashion. They have a right to do that. What they do not have is a right to falsify or deny explicit evidence. If they ever come up with solid proof that 20,000 died, I will be the first to welcome the new figure. That is what this is all about: respect for evidence, respect for honest conclusions based on rational considerations, respect for the adventure that scientific and academic research and writing represent.

As far as the present thesis is concerned, a few words are in order, just to make clear a few points that some readers might misunderstand. The personalities, books, doctrines and events discussed in this book have been, over the years, the subject of veneration, hagiography, and propaganda within an intense religious context ranging from vicious polemic to uncritical acceptance. Even names like "The Bāb", "Ṭāhira", or "Baha$^{\circ}$ Allāh" can trigger off reactions that have their origin in religious belief, making it difficult to engage in rational discourse about the environment in which they lived, the books they wrote, or the things they did and said. But this is an academic work, a book that started life as a PhD dissertation and has only been lightly revised. The methodology it uses, the standards by which it must be judged, and the weighting it gives to documents and persons all belong to the realms of academe and science and do not attempt or wish to be part of any religious debate.

In order to distance this work from the thought processes of true believers, I have deliberately written in a style designed to force a dislocation from the sort of pious veneration that closes the mind and leads to knee-jerk responses. Baha'i readers, if they believe in the harmony of faith and science must respect my approach or dismiss rational processes outright. Whether they do so or not is not my business. As an academic and a non-believer I have no investment in any of the people around whom my narrative is based. The Bab is just another human being: a genius, a madman, or something in between, it is hard to tell. Shaykh Ahmad al-Ahsa$^{\circ}$i and Sayyid Kazim Rashti are simply two Shi$^{\circ}$i clerics, one of outstanding philosophical stature, the other a learned defender of his master's name.

Modern Baha'is are not accustomed to see these figures of their founding myth handled without the kid gloves of piety. Unfortunately, the prophetic aura has no place in unbiased historiography. Throughout this book, I have tried to wean pious readers (if there are any) off their diet of romance and mysticism. They are welcome to go back to that diet once they have read, digested, and dealt rationally with my presentation of the facts. But they are not welcome to attack my findings or my presentation on the basis of what their hagiographies tell them. Hagiographies occupy a different mental plane to academic histories, and religious conviction is no substitute for hard fact in a rational context.

To further this process, I have tried to reduce the belief factor as far as possible. For example, I do not use the Baha'i system of transliteration, first because it is a very bad system, and secondly because it predisposes readers to recollect pious versions of persons and events. I call the Babi heroine Ṭāhira mainly by her earlier honorific, Qurrat al-ᶜAyn, because the former name is too closely associated with myth and legend to allow readers to see her freshly, to understand her, not as the "first suffragette martyr" that she never was, but as a learned and original woman who was, if I am not mistaken, the real driving force behind the Babi movement and its break with Islam. I want readers to see these things as clearly as possible, and not just revert to the cardboard cut-outs on which they have been raised.

In the text, notes and bibliography, I regularly refer to the Bab as "Shīrāzī" because I want to place him firmly alongside all the Hamadānīs, Iṣfahānīs, Tehranis, and others with whom he lived and to whom he preached his message. I hope that, in doing so, I divest him of his magical powers and let readers come to him much as history shows us, and not as a figure outside history. It is not for me to say whether he was in reality a mere man or a manifestation of the divine. What I do not have the right to do in a book of this kind is to treat him as anything but a man, for that is all our historical material presents him as. It is the eye of faith that will render him divine if it must: the eye of reason is restricted to this mundane existence.

There are many faults in this book, and I'm sure some reviewers will take the opportunity to take me to task for them. I do ask them to be kind to the faults of youth that are still exposed raw and unhealed in these pages. As a professional writer of many years, who spends some of his days working with undergraduates and postgraduates on the structure, grammar, and style of essays and dissertations, let me apologize for the dire writing found here. The long sentences, the use of jargon, the frequent density of the style are all faults I would seek to correct in my own students, and I see no reason not to plead guilty to the failings of my student self from all those years ago. I have walked softly through these pages, however, making corrections where necessary, and improving matters of style only occasionally. Bear all this in mind as you read, and take pity on the failings of youth that seemed such shining examples of erudition at the time.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In the years during which research for the present study was in progress, I became deeply indebted to numerous organizations and individuals for their help, advice, and information. Needless to say, there have been too many for me to list them all here, but it would be unthinkable not to mention here as many as possible and to ask the rest to accept my grateful thanks for their kindness and assistance. To my wife Beth, above all others, must go my abiding thanks for her unfailing support, advice, and encouragement at all stages of this work; in a very real sense, this dissertation would not have been written but for her. Not only has she kept my spirits up even when I have most despaired of finishing, but her help at all stages of the work in reading proofs, suggesting improvements, and polishing my style has been invaluable, and her patience in the midst of recurring chaos and disorder quite unflagging.

I must also express my very deep thanks to my supervisor, Professor Laurence Elwell-Sutton, for so kindly undertaking the supervision of my work at a remove of several hundred miles and for his patient understanding of my aims and methods; to the Northern Ireland Department of Education for their financial support during the first three years of my research; to the trustees of the E. G. Browne Memorial Fund and the Spalding Trusts for research grants relative to my visit to Iran in 1977; to the Universal House of Justice for permitting me to examine materials in the International Bahaʾi Archives in Haifa in 1976; to the National Spiritual Assembly of the Bahaʾis of Iran for permission to use manuscripts in their archives in Tehran; to Mr. Fuʿād Sānaʾī for his assistance there; to the late Mr. Ḥasan Balyuzi for his advice, encouragement, and generous loan of materials; to Ḥājī ʿAbd al-Riḍā Khān Ibrāhīmī (d. 1979) for his exceptional generosity in providing me with the publications of the Shaykhi community of Kirman and for granting me several interviews; to Mrs. Fakhr-Tāj Dawlatābādī, Mr. Nūrī Naẓarī, and other Azalī Babis in Tehran for supplying me with books and information; to Ḥājī Shaykh ʿAbbūd al-Ṣāliḥī for his information on the Baraghānī family of Qazvīn; to Dr. Moojan Momen for all our discussions over the years and for letting me make use of the fruits of his indefatigable researches in the Public Record Office and elsewhere; to Mr. [now Dr.] Peter Smith for providing ideas and suggestions over many years and for his help with my sociology (the many errors in which remain very much my own); to Mr. [now Professor] Abbas Amanat for invaluable help during the early stages of my work; to Allen Purvis, my wife, and all the other staff of the manuscript reading room of Cambridge University Library for their kindness and assistance in coping with my many requests; to Mr. Wilfred Lockwood of the Oriental Department of Cambridge University Library for his many recommendations and untiring help in locating elusive

materials; to King's College, for providing funds to assist in the preparation of the dissertation; to the Ashraf-Saysānī family of Tehran for their very great kindness and hospitality during my last stay there, and above all, to the memory of ʿAlī Ashraf Saysānī, whose death so soon after my return was a blow to us all.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Sources

INBA	Iran National Bahaʾi Archives
CUL	Cambridge University Library

Dates

	Unless otherwise indicated all dates are
B.	*Badīʿ:* the Babi and Bahaʾi calendar
Sh.	*Shamsī*: the Islamic solar calendar used in Iran.
Shsh.	*Shāhanshāhī*: the imperial calendar used in Pahlavī Iran (pre-1979)

b.	Born
d.	Died
r.	Ruled

GLOSSARY

ᶜAbbāsid dynasty
The second great caliphal dynasty in Islam. The ᶜAbbāsids ruled an empire from Baghdad, from 750 until the death of the last caliph at the hands of the Mongols under Hulagu, following the capture of the capital in 1258.

al-abwāb al-arbaᶜa
The "four gates": the four agents who acted on behalf of the "hidden" twelfth imam during his "lesser occultation" (*al-ghayba al-ṣughrā*), 878-941

ᶜadl
Justice

aḥādīth
Plural of *ḥadīth* (Ḥadīth)

akhbār
Traditions, sayings attributed to Muḥammad and the Imams. The Shi'ite equivalent of the Sunni *aḥādīth*.

Akhbārī
A mainly 18th-century school of thought in Iraq and Iran. The Akhbārīs emphasized the role of the Traditions (see *akhbār*) over independent reasoning (*ijtihād*). Opposed to the Uṣūlīs (see below). There are still remnants of Akhbārīs in Iraq, Bahrain, and the Gulf. For details visit www.akhbari.org/homepage.htm

ākhund
Term for a low-ranking member of the *ᶜulamā'*

ᶜālam
World, universe

ᶜālim
Religious scholar

ᶜālim ᶜādil
A just scholar.

ᶜallāma
Very learned member of the ulama; learned in every branch of the Islamic sciences

amr
A matter, affair, or command

amr Allāh
The command, affair, or cause of God

Āqā
Honorific title, meaning "Sir", 'Mister'

ᶜaql
Reason. The term is used very differently in classical and modern Islam and modern Baha'ism from its Western equivalent. *ᶜAql* can never be used to call in question the "truths" of revealed religion.

aqṭāb
Pl of *quṭb*

arkān
Pl. of *rukn*

ᶜĀshūrāᵓ
10 Muḥarram, commemorated by the Shiᶜa as the anniversary of the martyrdom of Imam Husayn.

ᶜatabāt
Collective term for the Shīᶜī shrine cities in Iraq (includes Karbala, Najaf, al-Kāẓimiyya, and Samarra)

ᶜawālim
Pl. of *ᶜālam*

awṣiyāᵓ
Pl. of *waṣī*

al-ᶜawāmm
The common people, the masses (often used in contrast to *al-ᶜulamaᵓ*, the learned)

ayatollah (āyat allāh)
A senior member of the ulama class; a title of 19th-century origin

Azalīs, or Azalī Bābīs
Followers of Mīrzā Yaḥyā Nūrī, Ṣubḥ-i Azal, appointed by the Bāb as his successor.

adhān
The Muslim call to prayer

bāb (pl. *abwāb*)
Gate; one of four intermediaries of the Twelfth Imam; title used by Sayyid ᶜAlī Muḥammad Shīrāzī. A chapter in a book

Bābī
Follower of the Bāb (2)

Babism
Religion based on the teachings of the Bāb, Qurrat al-ᶜAyn, and others

bābiyya
Status of *bāb;* Babism

Badīᶜ
"New". Term applied to the Bābī and Bahā'ī calendar

Bahāᵓiyya
Baha'ism. Religion based on the teachings of Mīrzā Ḥusayn ᶜAlī Nūrī, Bahāᵓ Allāh

Bahāᵓī
Follower of Bahāᵓ Allāh

Baqiyyat Allāh
Remnant of God. A title of the Hidden Imam

baraka
Divine grace/charisma bestowed on an individual. Used in Shiᶜism and Sufism.

barzakh
An interworld, boundary between the mundane and celestial realms

bāṭin
Hidden, inward, symbolic: applied to inner meanings or realities; opp. to *ẓāhir*

Bektāshiyya
An Ottoman Turkish Sufi order

bidᶜa
Innovation, a belief or practice without any precedent in the time of Muhammad or the Imams, usually prohibited because it may represent unbelief (*al-bidᶜa kufr*, "innovation is unbelief")

Buwayhids (Būyids)
The first Shiᶜite dynasty (945-1055)

caliph
Ar. *khalīfa*. Religio-political successor of Muḥammad. The first four "righteous" caliphs (Abū Bakr, ᶜUmar, ᶜUthmān, and ᶜAlī) were followed by two major dynasties (Umayyads in Damascus, then ᶜAbbasids in Baghdad); later claimants to the caliphate are found in Egypt and Ottoman Turkey

Dajjāl
An apocalyptic figure in Islamic eschatology, probably based on the Christian Antichrist

Daylamites
Inhabitants of the region of Daylam in northern Iran

daᶜwa
"Call". The summons to Islam that precedes or replaces holy war; Islamic missionary endeavour, proselytization

dīvān
(Ar. *dīwān*) An anthology of poems in Persian, or other oriental languages; specifically a series of poems by one author, with rhymes usually running through the alphabet

fanāᵓ
"Extinction". A Sufi term used to denote the passing away of the self in God (*al-fanāᵓ fi 'llāh*)

faqīh (pl. *fuqahāᵓ*)
An expert in religious jurisprudence (*fiqh*)

farmān/firmān
Order, decree issued by a ruler

fatwā
A ruling on a point of religious law, issued by a senior cleric (in Sunnism, a mufti, in Shiᶜism a mujtahid)

fiqh
Islamic jurisprudence, study of Muslim law (cf. *faqīh*)

furūᶜ
In theology and religious jurisprudence — subsidiary principles

Ghadīr Khumm
"The Pool of Khumm". A legendary location at which the Prophet is said to have made his son-in-law ᶜAlī his successor.

ghālīn
A Shīᶜī term for theological extremists who go beyond what is considered reasonable in what they claim about the Prophet and Imams. The Shaykhīs and Bābīs fall into this category.

ghayba
Occultation (applied to the physical and spiritual absence of the Twelfth Imam).

al-ghayba al-kubrā
The Greater Occultation. The period between the twelfth imam's physical disappearance in 940 and the present.

al-ghayba al-ṣughrā
The Lesser Occultation. The period between the imam's reputed disappearance in 874 and his move into a supernatural realm in 940. During the lesser occultation, it is said that the imam communicated with his followers through four gates (*abwāb*).

ghulāt
"Exaggerators". Extreme gnostic groups in Shiᶜism

ḥadīth
A narrative about the Prophet, relating his words and/or deeds. The body of traditions is used as a basis for Islamic law and customary practice. There are six main Sunni collections of this material.

ḥājj (Ar.); *ḥājī* (Pers.)
Title given to a man who has made the pilgrimage to Mecca

ḥajj
The pilgrimage to Mecca

hijra
Flight. Westernized as Hegira. Muḥammad's flight from Mecca to Medina in 622, used as the starting date of the Islamic calendar

hujja
"Proof".

ḥukamāʾ
sg. *ḥakīm.* Philosophers, used in particular for Shiᶜi philosophers of the Safavid period

Hurqalyā
A mystical realm where the hidden Imam is believed to reside during his greater occultation

ḥurūf al-ḥayy
"Letters of the Living", a term applied to the Bāb's first eighteen followers

Ijāza, pl. *ijāzāt*
A certificate in use among the ulama, permitting a pupil to transmit his master's teaching or testifying to his ability to exercise *ijtihād*

ijmāᶜ
Consensus. A term used in both Sunnism and Shi'ism to signify the agreement of the religious establishment in matters of doctrine and law

ijtihād
The process of arriving at judgements on points of religious law using reason and the principles of jurisprudence. In theory, *ijtihād* has fallen into desuetude among the Sunnis, but is still exercised by Shiᶜi ulama of the rank of *mujtahid.*

Ijtihādī
Term sometimes used for the Uṣūlī school in Shiᶜism.

ᶜilm
"Knowledge", "science" (pl. *ᶜulūm*).

īmān
"Faith".

imām
An honorific title applied to eminent doctors of Islam, such as the founders of the orthodox Sunni schools; any of a succession of religious leaders of the Sevener (Ismāᶜīlī) or Twelver (Ithnāᵓ ᶜAsharī) Shiᶜites, regarded by their followers as divinely inspired; a leader of congregational prayer in a mosque.

Imām Jumᶜa
The Friday Imam. The leading government appointed religious leader in each city; leader of the prayer in the Friday Mosque (Masjid-i Jāmiᶜ).

Imāma
The imamate. The status of being an imam.

Imāmzāda
Shrine of a descendant of one of the first eleven of the Twelver Shīᶜī Imams.

Ishrāqīyūn
"Illuminationists". Platonists. A term applied to a school of Shiᶜi mystical philosophers during the reign of the Safavids and, to a lesser extent, the present day.

Ismāᶜīliyya
The Ismāᶜīlī sect. A Shiᶜi sect of great intellectual significance whose adherents believe that Ismāᶜīl, son of the sixth Imam, was the rightful seventh Imam, and who diverge from the more numerous Twelver Shīᶜa. Their imamate continues to the present day, running in the line of the Aqa Khans.

isnād
The chain of transmitters whose names, being attached to a *ḥadīth*, are thought to assure its authenticity

Ithnāᵓ-ᶜAsharī
"Twelvers". The term applied to the main body of Shiᶜism.

Jābulsā (Jābarsā) and Jābulqā (Jābalqā)
Imaginary cities in the realm of Hurqalyā, where the Hidden Imam is believed to reside

jabr
A decree of fate, predestination

Jaᶜfarī *madhhab*
The Jaᶜfarī school of law, i.e. the school of religious law belonging to the Twelver Shīᶜa. Named after the sixth imam, Jaᶜfar al-Ṣādiq

jihād
Holy war aimed at the conquest of the world for Islam and the conversion or submission of mankind; in Sufism and elsewhere, a "greater" jihad describes the spiritual struggle with the self

Kaaba (Kaᶜba)
A cube-shaped structure in Mecca dating from the pre-Islamic era, later adopted by Muḥammad as the centre of his cult, the point (*qibla*) to which believers turn in prayer, and the focus of certain rituals forming part of the *ḥajj* pilgrimage

kāfir
"Ungrateful". An unbeliever. Pl. *kuffār*.

kalām
Speculative theology.

Kharijites (Khawārij)
An early Islamic century sect noted for its puritanical and extremists views, which led to the killing of any Muslims deemed to be sinful

khuṭba
The Friday sermon.

kufr
"Ingratitude". Unbelief (see also *kāfir* and *takfīr*)

maᶜād
Resurrection.

madhhab
A school of religious law or thought; a sect.

madrasa
"Place of stuffy". A seminary.

Mahdī
A term applied to the Muslim Messiah in both Sunnism and Shiᶜism; in the latter, it is applied specifically to the twelfth imam, the Imam al-Mahdi.

Mamlūk
"Slave". A Turkish dynasty made up of slave conscripts who ruled Egypt from about 1250 to 1517. The two main branches were the Burjī and Baḥrī Mamlūks.

marjaᶜ al-taqlīd (pl. *marājiᶜ al-taqlīd)*
"Reference points of imitation". The highest rank within the Shiᶜi clerical hierarchy, limited to a tiny handful of *mujtahids*, sometimes to only a single individual.

maẓhar
"Place of appearance". Applied to the imams as manifestations of the divine (*maẓāhir ilāhiyya*). In Babism applied to the Bāb and those of his followers who had received the divine afflatus. Pl. *maẓāhir*.

miᶜrāj
The supposed "ascent" of Muhammad to heaven, following a night journey (*isrāᶜ*) from Mecca to Jerusalem or, in earlier interpretations, from Mecca directly to the highest heaven, where he spoke with God.

muʾassis
Founder of a theological school, sect, etc.

mubāhala
Mutual execration by calling down God's curse on one's opponents.

mufassir
A Qurʾān interpreter. See also *tafsīr*.

muftī
A jurisprudent qualified to make judgements (see *fatwā*) on matters of sharīᶜa law.

muḥaddith
A transmitter of religious traditions (*ḥadīth*).

muḥaqqiq
Researcher. An occasional honorary title givcn to some ulama.

mujaddid
"Renewer". A figure, always an *ᶜālim*, who appears at the beginning of each Islamic century to revive the faith. Applicable in both Sunni and Shiᶜi contexts.

mujtahid,
One who exercises *ijtihād* or reasoning in religious and legal matters. Limited to early legists in Sunnism, the term is used much more widely in Shiᶜism, where it applies to a category of ulama who exercise authority in the absence of the hidden Imam or his earthly agents.

Mujtahidī
A term sometimes used to designate the Uṣūlī branch of Twelver Shiᶜism. (Cf. Ijtihādī.)

muqallid
"Imitator", follower. A term applied to the mass of Twelver Shiᶜis, who are required to obey the rulings of one or another *marjaᶜ al-taqlīd* (see above). (Cf. *taqlīd*.)

murawwij
"Propagator" (of the faith). An honorific title given to the leading cleric of each century (cf. *mujaddid*).

murshid
Guide. The head of a Sufi order, equivalent to *shaykh* or *pīr*.

mutakallim
Theologian.

naṣṣ
The verbal direct appointment of each imam by his predecessor

nāᵓib
"Deputy". A representative of the twelfth Imam. Pl. *nuwwāb*.

al-Nāᵓib al-ᶜĀmm
A leading *ᶜālim* who acts as a "general" representative of the Imam without specific appointment by the Imam in person.

al-Nāᵓib al-Khāṣṣ
A representative of the Hidden Imam appointed by the Imam himself (such as the four *abwāb*).

Niᶜmatu'llāhī
An Iranian Shiᶜi Sufi order founded by Shāh Niᶜmat Allāh Valī 1330-1431

Nizārīs
A branch of the Ismāᵓīlī Shīᶜa founded in Iran in the 12th century and better known as the Assassins (from Ḥashshāshīn, hashish users). The Nizārī line of imams represents the main branch currently led by the Āqā Khāns.

nujabāᵓ
"Nobles". A species of Shiᶜi saint. Sg. *najīb*.

nuqabāᵓ
"Aristocrats". Another species of Shiᶜi saint. sg. *naqīb*.

Pasha/Bāshā
Formerly a provincial governor or other high official of the Ottoman Empire, placed after the name when used as a title.

Qāᵓim/ al-Qāᵓim bi 'l-Sayf
"He who will rise up"/ "he who will rise up with the sword": a title of the Hidden Imam in his persona as the Mahdi and world-conquerer.

Qājār
Turkomen tribe which gained the Iranian throne in 1795 and reigned until it was replaced by the Pahlavi dynasty in 1925.

qiyāma
"Rising up". The resurrection.

quṭb
pl. *aqṭāb*. Axis. A figure in Sufism who is understood to be the perfect human being, around whom all others turn. In Shiᶜism, applied to the Imam.

rājᶜa
The "return" (of the dead).

rāwī
A narrator of traditions.

risāla
Tract, treatise, letter. Pl. *rasāᵓil.*

al-rukn al-rābiᶜ
The Fourth Support: a figure in Shaykhī theology.

ṣābiqūn
Precursors. The earliest followers of the Bāb (see *ḥurūf al-ḥayy*).

Safavid (Safavī)
Iranian ruling dynasty, 1501-1736.

safīr
See *sufarāᵓ*

Ṣāḥib al-Zamān
The Lord of the Age, a title of the hidden Imam as Qā'im.

Sayyid
Ar. Sir, Mister, lord. A descendant of the Prophet. Often as Sīdī, a title given to Sufi saints in North Africa.

Shāh
"King". Comes at the end of the personal name. Also used at the beginning of the names of some Sufis and *qawwālī* singers.

sharīᶜa
The body of religiously-ordained and -sanctioned legislation set down in the books of the four Sunni law schools and the Jaᶜfarī school of the Shīᶜa

Shaykhī
A follower of Shaykh Ahmad al-Ahsā'ī, then Sayyid Kāẓim Rashtī, then the Kerman-based shaykhs of the Ibrāhīmī family, and today the Iraq-based leadership.

Shaykh al-Islām
A high-ranking state position awarded to senior clergy under the Ottoman, Safavid, and Qajar dynasties.

silsila
"Chain". The chain of transmission for sacred traditions.

sufarāᵓ
"Ambassadors"; a term for the agents of the hidden Imam. Sg. *safīr.*

Sufism
The varied system of Islamic mysticism characterized by personal devotion and numerous orders or brotherhoods, by liturgical traditions and hierarchies distinct from those of orthodoxy, but by the 19th century embraced by a majority of Muslims in many countries such as Morocco, Egypt, and Turkey.

Sunna
The body of traditional Islamic law accepted by most orthodox Muslims as based on the words and acts of Muhammad. The term is also used to describe actions not strictly Islamic such as female genital mutilation.

Sunnism
Ar. *Ahl al-sunna*, People of the Sunna, descriptive of the majority branch of Islam defined by the Ḥanbalī, Ḥanafī, Shāfiᶜī, and Mālikī law schools, devotion to the Caliphal principle, and rejection of the premises of Shiᶜism.

sūra
A "chapter" of the Qurᵓān, following an arbitrary division during the early period, when scattered passages were supposedly collected into a single volume.

tafsīr
Exegesis of whole or part of the Qurᵓān.

taḥrīf
The doctrine that the Torah and Gospels have been corrupted by Jewish and Christian religious leaders

takfīr
Rendering someone/something part of unbelief; a formal declaration that someone is or has become an unbeliever or apostate.

taqiyya
Dissimulation of one's religious beliefs. A practice designed in principle in order to protect a believer's self, family, or property from harm. Also used in time of *jihād* to mislead the enemy. It is often described as a specifically Shīᶜī practice, but *taqiyya* is allowed in Sunnism too.

ṭarīqa (Pers. *ṭarīqat*)
"Path". A Sufi order established by a particular saint, having its own body of mystical teaching, conventual rules, liturgy, and hierarchy.

taᶜziyya
"Condolence". A form of passion play depicting the various stages of the Karbala debacle and the death of the Imam Husayn

ṭālib
Lit. *ṭālib al-ᶜilm*, "a seeker after knowledge". A religious student at a *madrasa.* Pl. *ṭullāb;* Pers. pl. *ṭālibān*.

Twelver Shiism
See Ithnāʾ ᶜAshariyya. The chief form of Shiᶜi Islam.

umma
The international community of all Muslims, starting with the original body of believers established by Muhammad at Medina. Sometimes translated as the "nation" of Islam. In fact, the concept of the nation state is wholly alien to the religion.

uṣūl
Principles, bases. (Sg. *aṣl*.)

uṣūl al-fiqh
Principles of jurisprudence used for arriving at a judgment in religious law.

Uṣūlī
The dominant school of thought in Shiᶜa Islam since the 19th century.

Wahhābism
A puritanical and radical school of Islam that came to power twice in Saudi Arabia, where it is still the dominant form of the faith. Through Saudi patronage, Wahhabism has extended its influence throughout the Islamic world and sustained modern fundamentalist tendencies and movements. The Wahhābīs are vehemently opposed to both Sufism and Shiᶜism.

wakīl
"Appointed representative", "agent". In pl., a network of Shiᶜi activists. Pl. *wukalāʾ*.

walī
"Custodian, guardian, defender". The term has a broad legal use, and in Shiᶜism is used with reference to the imams. In Sufism, it refers to saints. Pl. *awliyāʾ*.

walī al-amr
The "guardian of the cause [of God]", a Shiʿi expression used for the twelfth Imam.

waḥy
Direct revelation from God vouchsafed to a Prophet or, in Shiʾism, the imams as epiphanies of the divine (*maẓāhir ilāhiyya*) — see *maẓhar.*

waqf
Islamic territory won by conquest. Property or other goods established or given for religious and related purposes (such as schools, hospitals, madrasas, etc.) and deemed inalienable.

wilāya
The status of guardianship in legal and spiritual terms (see *walī*).

ẓāhir
"Outward", literal. Opp. to *bāṭin.*

ziyāra
"Visitation". A pilgrimage made to the shrines of the Imams, imāmzādas, and Sufi saints.

ziyāratnāma
A prayer to be recited during a *ziyāra.*

ẓūhūr
Appearance, manifestation. The appearance of the divinity in human form.

EPIGRAPH

An intellectual hatred is the worst.

W. B. Yeats
A Prayer for My Daughter

INTRODUCTION

Recent events have vividly demonstrated the continuing power of religion as a force to be reckoned with in the life of the Iranian people. Economic frustrations, social disadvantage, and political oppression may, as always, have been major spurs goading the masses to revolution, but it was in devotion to Shi^{c}i Islam and enthusiasm for the religious leadership (the learned or ^{c}*ulamā*^{ɔ}) who led them that they found a rallying-point and an effective means of channeling their demands for change. More than that, religious feelings of outrage at modernization, moral decline, and loss of religio-national identity, coupled with the fervor produced in the Shi^{c}i mind by the themes of martyrdom and suffering, proved perhaps the most important elements in driving men and women onto the streets. It is the fundamentally religious character of the Iranian Revolution which has excited the most comment and caused the most mystification abroad.

The role of religion as a catalyst in revolutionary movements is well known,[2] not least in Iran, yet it is surprising how many otherwise perceptive commentators failed, even at the eleventh hour, to appreciate fully how critical a factor traditional Shi^{c}ism might become among the forces of opposition to the Pahlavī regime.[3] Now that the revolution has taken place—however long it may survive in a world its leaders seem little fit to cope with—the eyes of scholars and journalists alike are turned towards Qum and the newly-powerful ranks of the Shi^{c}i ulama; but it may be much to hope that sharp vision will replace short-sightedness overnight and that those unfamiliar with the dynamics of Shi^{c}i piety and political messianism will readily grasp the principles and forces involved in this most medieval of all modern revolutions. Doubtless the secular forces present throughout this period of upheaval—those most amenable to study by Western political scientists and commentators—shall be subjected to searching and competent dissection and analysis, but one may, I think, expect that many will find it more difficult readily to come to terms with the purely religious features of the revolution (insofar as these may be genuinely abstracted from the secular factors).

Guenter Lewy and others[4] have argued cogently against a narrow Marxist or quasi-Marxist interpretation of sectarian and millenarian revolt as "phenomena of an ongoing class struggle in societies within which the class conflict has not yet become conscious,"[5] maintaining that "medieval heresy in all its diversity should be treated as genuine religious dissent rather than purely as a manifestation of the class struggle"[6] and that "in the case of millenarian sentiments and movements, the Marxist thesis is similarly unsupported."[7] Christopher Hill, although himself a Marxist, has similarly stressed the autonomy of religious and intellectual factors in the English revolution. It is doubtless this failure to recognize that religious and ideological factors may be more than a mere superstructure erected on an economically-determined basis

that has led Fred Halliday and others to leave them out of their calculations in evaluating the modern history of Iran, whatever the value of a Marxist historical approach in other instances. This is all the more tragic in that Shiᶜi Islam presents the historian and the sociologist with one of the more compelling examples of a religio-political symbiosis in which religious elements figure with a degree of autonomy and self-directedness rarely found elsewhere.

This is not to suggest that the role of religion has been ignored in studies of contemporary and pre-contemporary Iran. The work of Algar, Keddie, Lambton, and others shows a perfect grasp of the importance of the religious phenomenon and a keen appreciation of the part it has played since Safavid times in molding the political and social destiny of the Persian people. As a basis for comprehending the forces behind recent and, doubtless, future, events the studies of the above writers are likely to be unsurpassed for some time to come. In analyzing the nature of relations between church and state on the one hand and the impact of modernization on the religious classes an their response to it on the other, they have identified many of the strands of thought and belief out of which Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini and his zealots wove their web of rebellion and revolutionary change.

Yet certain areas remain dim or even dark, whatever the light shed by recent happenings, not least of which is the question of the relationship in Shiᶜism between charisma and authority and, in particular, the manner in which charismatic renewal takes place within the context of Shiᶜism as an orthodox system. Closely linked to this question are others such as the role of the ulama during the period of the Imām's occultation, the continuance of the messianic impulse among the Shiᶜi masses, and the means whereby orthodoxy and heterodoxy are distinguished and counterpoised. A careful reading of Khomeini's *Vilāyat-i faqīh* will reveal just how significant these and related factors are for an understanding of the roots of Shiᶜi Islam in the modern world.

Recent developments in Iranian Shiᶜism, theoretical and actual alike compel us to re-evaluate many earlier developments, both for the clarity they may give to subsequent events and for the opportunity to assess past ideas and movements anew from the perspective of the present. "It has become necessary," writes John Obert Voll, "to reexamine the significance of many movements in the light of recent events. This has become an activity of special import. Geoffrey Barraclough has suggested a reason for this: "Today it is evident that much we have been taught to regard as central is really peripheral and much that is usually brushed aside as peripheral had in it the seeds of the future."[8] An excellent case in point is that of Babism and its antecedents. Almost from its inception the object of curiosity in Europe, the Babi movement drew the interest of contemporary observers as a potential force for religious and social change in Iran and, perhaps, elsewhere in the Islamic world. It was, as it were, the Iranian Revolution of its day. But even by the time of the Comte de Gobineau (whose *Religions et philosophies dans l'Asie centrale*, first published

in 1865, popularized the movement throughout Europe), Babism was, in the political sense at least, a spent force. In 1910, Edward Granville Browne, who had devoted a considerable part of his career to the study of Babism, and who, as late as 1893, had expressed the belief that it might "still not improbably prove an important factor in the history of Western Asia,"[9] now conceded that "the center of interest in Persia has shifted from religion to politics."[10] Babism as a revolutionary alternative was no longer even a remote possibility and, whatever relative success it may have had abroad in the form of the Bahaʾi movement, it has continued to remain far removed from the political and social life of Iran.

As Browne's fascination for Babism faded, so too did that of other scholars: before long**,** the Babi episode had been relegated to a minor place as a passing convulsion of no long-term importance for the historian. This attitude is expressed succinctly by Algar, who writes that "Babism was ultimately no more than a side issue in the Qajar history."[11] This is certainly true in the obvious sense that the Babi movement was defeated militarily, suppressed, driven underground, and transformed into a quietist religion seeking converts in the West. But recent events suggest that, in many ways, Browne's early enthusiasm for the Babis was not entirely misplaced. In its later development as a heterodox sect, its metamorphosis into the Bahaʾi religion claiming a new faith independent of Islam, its rejection by the majority of Shiʿi Muslims, and its lasting incapacity to become a powerful force in the land of its birth, Babism clearly appears as an aberration unrepresentative of contemporary Shiʿism in Iran. But this obscures the fact that, in its earliest days, Babism was a highly conservative, orthodox, and even reactionary religious movement (albeit extreme in certain respects) which emerged from a milieu of Shiʿi pietism developed in the Shaykhi school. Far from being uncharacteristic of the mainstream of Shiʿism, the Babi sect—in its early stages at least—displays for us in exceptionally sharp relief many of the principal features of Shiʿi doctrine and practice which lie at the very roots of contemporary religious life and thought in Iran. It is vital to bear in mind that neither Babism nor Shaykhism was a movement of dissent which sought to be consciously heretical over against a "corrupt" established church; both Shaykhis and early Babis saw themselves (as the Shaykhis still do) as pious, devoted, and wholly orthodox Shiʿi Muslims. They did not reject but were rejected.

Babism is really the last of the great medieval Islamic movements. It is of unusual importance for us in that it passed through all the major phases of its development in the period before Western pressures on Iran became too great to be ignored. Neither Shaykhism nor Babism itself displays the least sign of having been in any sense a reaction against Western encroachment or the growing secularization of Iranian society. A fresh look at both movements, then, may be expected to reveal much that cannot be learnt even from the Tobacco Rebellion or the 1979 revolution, much that was significant in the Persian religious mind on the eve of Western involvement.

Whatever the external economic and political forces which molded it, Babism may be said to represent the last example of an unselfconscious expression of Shiᶜi pietism and messianic revolt untainted, as it were, by the context of modernism. As a movement which almost succeeded in overthrowing theQajar dynasty and establishing a new, theocratic state in its place, and as the only sizeable Shiᶜi millenarian movement of the modern period, Babism has for too long been suffered to linger as something peripheral in the history of post-Safavid Iran. It is time for it to be returned to its rightful place as one of the most thought-provoking and controversial movements to arise in the Islamic world in recent centuries. Perhaps the present study will help re-awaken an awareness among those concerned with the study of Shiᶜism and Iran of the importance of Babism as an element to be considered in their research.

CHAPTER ONE

THE RELIGIOUS BACKGROUND

The pronouncement of a heresy charge (*takfīr*) against Shaykh Aḥmad al-Ahsaʾi from about 1822, and the subsequent rejection of the Shaykhi school—despite vigorous declarations by its various leaders as to its absolute orthodoxy—by the mainstream of Twelver Shiʿism, have tended to obscure the originally close links of Shaykh Aḥmad with the representatives of Shiʿi orthodoxy and the early development of his school as a major element in the resurgent Shiʿism of the early Qajar period. Although the French scholar Henry Corbin went to considerable pains to demonstrate the position of Shaykhism as the latest and, for him, profoundest development of the metaphysical tradition within Iranian Islam,[12] his emphasis on the theosophical elements of the school and its association with what has always been at best a suspect yet tolerated strand in Shiʿi thought has again clouded both the real reasons for al-Ahsaʾi's "excommunication" and the place of his thought within the orthodox development of Shiʿism in the first years of the Qajar restoration. More seriously, perhaps, Corbin's attempt to portray the Shaykhi school as a consistent and homogeneous movement from the time of al-Ahsaʾi to that of Shaykh ʿAbd al-Riḍāʾ Khān Ibrāhīmī [died 1979, ed.], the last Kirmānī head of the school, has concealed several important shifts in doctrine and avoided the problem of changing relationships between the Shaykhi community and the main body of Shiʿism, as well as the influence of these fluctuations on the expression of doctrine in the literature of the school.

Not only Shaykh Aḥmad and his successor Sayyid Kāẓim Rashti, but also Sayyid ʿAlī-Muḥammad Shīrāzī, the Bāb (1819-1850), in many of his early works, specifically and categorically condemned as unbelievers Ṣūfīs, philosophers (*ḥukamāʾ*), "Platonists" (*ishrāqiyūn*), and others,[13] while all three laid much emphasis on the 'orthodox' nature of their doctrines. As we shall see, the Babis at the inception of the sect were almost as notable for their rigorous orthodoxy and orthopraxy as they were later to become known for their extreme heterodoxy. Later writers, concentrating on the "heretical" elements in Shaykhi and Babi teaching, have lost sight of the powerful bond that existed in both cases with traditional Twelver Shiʿi teaching, and have failed to explore the relationship between the Shaykhi and Babi movements on the one hand and orthodox Shiʿism on the other. The tendency of later writers to ignore or play down the significance of Shaykhism and Babism has likewise helped draw attention away from the fact that both movements were an integral feature of the development of Shiʿism in Iran during the Qajar period, and that the shaping and exposition of Shaykhi and Babi doctrine owed as much to the general conditions of the period as did the molding of what was considered as orthodox thinking.

Before attempting to consider Shaykhism and Babism as separate phenomena, therefore, it will be essential first to survey briefly the religious background against which they developed.

Although the main area of investigation for our present purposes will be the developments in Shiᶜi thought in Arab Iraq and Iran in the second half of the eighteenth and the first half of the nineteenth century, it seems to me both practical and theoretically sound to begin with a discussion of certain earlier, more general developments in Shiᶜism. To be specific, I propose to reconsider briefly the religious history of Shiᶜism in the period following the "occultation" of the twelfth Imām in 260/ 872 in terms of charismatic and legal authority and the routinization of charisma. I intend to make such a reappraisal, not in the hope of contributing anything original to the discussion of Weberian or post-Weberian theory (for which I am far from qualified), but to provide a focus for certain key ideas which, as will be seen, occupy quite prominently the stage of Shiᶜi thought during the period of my main study. The issues of authority, charisma as invested in specific individuals, the "polar motif", the role of *ijtihād* and the development of *fiqh*, millenarian expectation, and the relationships between the Imām, the ulama, and the body of the Shīᶜa, are all central to any discussion of the emergence of Shaykhism and Babism.

Charismatic and Legal Authority in Imāmī Shiᶜism

The few writers who have discussed Shiᶜism as a charismatic movement have concentrated on the question of the legitimization of the authority of the Imāms (varying in number according to the sect in question),[14] generally contrasting the charismatic nature of that authority with the legal authority of Sunnism or the charismatic nature of the Sunni community. Early Shiᶜism is a clear and useful example of extended hereditary charismatic leadership, and there is certainly much value in discussing the Imāms as almost classic "bearers" of Weberian charisma of this type. To restrict ourselves to the period of the Imāms, however, is to avoid dealing with the much more complex set of issues which centre around the vital question of how Shiᶜism came to terms with the abrupt loss of a living bearer of absolute charismatic authority on the supposed disappearance of the twelfth Imām, Muḥammad ibn Ḥasan (b. 868). The initial and fairly typical response was the attempted "routinization" of the charisma of the Imām in the persons of four successive individuals: Abū ᶜAmr ᶜUthmān ibn Saᶜīd al-ᶜUmarī, his son Abū Jaᶜfar Muḥammad al-ᶜUmarī (d. 305/ 917), Abū 'l-Qāsim al-Ḥusayn ibn Rūḥ Nawbakhtī (d. 326/ 937), and Abu 'l-Ḥusayn ᶜAlī ibn Muḥammad al-Samarrī (d. 329/ 941). These are the four "gates" (*abwāb*), "representatives" (*nuwwāb*), or "ambassadors" (*sufarāᵓ*) who communicated between the Imām and his followers.

It seems, however, that this attempt may have been less original or systematic than it is represented in retrospect by pious sources: already in the

lifetimes of Jaᶜfar al-Ṣādiq (702? -765) and other Imāms, numerous *wukalāᵓ* had acted on their behalf in various regions.[15] Now, simultaneous with the four *abwāb*, other *nāᵓibs* appeared in Baghdad and elsewhere, some of whom were accorded a degree of recognition, while others were rejected by the community.[16] Muḥammad Javād Mashkūr gives the names of six individuals, including the eminent Ṣūfī martyr al-Ḥusayn ibn Manṣūr al-Ḥallāj (858-922) and Abū Jaᶜfar Muḥammad ibn ᶜAlī al-Shalmaghānī (ibn Abī 'l-ᶜĀzāqir, d. 933), whom he regards as having been false claimants to the position of *nāᵓib*, and who were rejected by the majority of Shi'is.[17] For reasons that are not clear, the innovation of living representatives was abandoned on the death of the fourth *bāb* in 940, and no attempt was made to revive it.[18]

With the abandonment of the system of direct representation, in which letters allegedly dictated by the Imām were actually written in reply to questions, charisma could no longer be "transmitted" to (or "focused" on) a single individual, and it became an urgent concern for the Shīᶜa to discover new ways of legitimizing authority within the community. This legitimization seems to have taken several distinct forms.

1. Since the doctrine of the necessity of the existence of the Imām or proof of God *(ḥujja*) in every age and the impossibility of the earth being without an Imām was intrinsic to the very raison d'être of Shiᶜism, it could not be abandoned without doing irreparable damage to much of its essence;[19] it was, moreover, an established article of faith that "he who dies without an Imām, it is as if he has died in the age of ignorance (*man māta wa laysa lahu imām māta mayatan jāhiliyyatan*)."[20] It was, therefore, propounded (much as it had been in earlier Shiᶜi sects faced with similar problems) that, although the twelfth Imām was hidden from sight, he remained alive in a state of occultation (*ghayba*) as the Imām and Lord of the present age (*ṣāḥib al-zamān*). Living in an interworld or *barzakh*, within but obscured from this world, the Imām could exercise his function as the maintainer of the equilibrium of the universe and the object of the active faith of the Shīᶜa, with whom he remained in contact through dreams, visions, and experiential awareness of the *mundus archetypus* in which he resided.[21]

The possibility of encountering the Imām in a visionary state and of receiving direct guidance from him has played a major part in Shiᶜi piety down to the present day, not only for dreamers and mystics such as those mentioned by Corbin,[22] but for many leading ulama and *fuqahāᵓ* of considerably less imaginative bent. In 1302/1885, Ḥusayn Taqī al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī (ca. 1838-1902) wrote a work entitled *Jannat al-maᵓwā*, containing fifty-nine accounts of encounters with the Imām related of numerous individuals, including men like Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan Ḥurr al-ᶜĀmilī (1624-1693), al-Ḥasan ibn Yūsuf Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī (ᶜAllāma al-Ḥillī, 1250-1325), Muḥammad ibn Makkī al-Shahīd al-Awwal (1333-1380), and, in the modern period, Sayyid Muḥammad

Mahdī ibn Murtaḍā Baḥr al-ᶜUlūm (1742-1797) and Muḥammad Ḥasan ibn Bāqir al-Najāfī (1788-1850).[23]

These meetings would take place in men's homes as far afield as Bahrain or Mecca, but most commonly in the Masjid al-Kūfa, the cellar in Sāmarrā' (where the Imām was supposed to have disappeared), the Shrine of Imām ᶜAlī in Najaf, or the Masjid al-Sahla on the outskirts of Kūfa.[24] Side by side, then, with patently other-worldly meetings in the *Jazīrat al-Khadrāᵓ* or the cities of *Jābarsā* and *Jābalqā*, we find records of the Imām appearing in locations known and accessible to anyone, some associated with his earthly life, some elsewhere. It was, for example, widely reputed that "whoever shall go to the Masjid al-Sahla on forty Wednesdays shall behold the Mahdī."[25] The *ghayba al-kubrā* is, in fact, seen as a natural and uncomplicated extension of the earthly existence of the Imām and his period in the *ghayba al-ṣughrā*, as is indicated by the fact that Nūrī Ṭabarsī's *Jannat al-maᵓwā* has several times been published as an appendix to the volume of the *Biḥār al-anwār* dealing with the life and lesser occultation of the twelfth Imām.[26]

Remarkably little of the theoretical authority of the Imām can be said to have dissipated: he was and is alive, not only in the heart of the believer (as, for example, in certain forms of evangelical Christianity)—not merely in a supernatural realm accessible to the saint or mystic, but, potentially at least, in real places, where he has been seen by real persons. At the same time, he *is* in occultation, and it is this fact which strengthens his symbolic function. Charisma, like *baraka* with which it is closely associated (though not identical), would seem to be not so much something possessed by the charismatic individual as conferred on him by others: "people in fact become possessors of *baraka* by being treated as possessors of it."[27]

It is significant that, in his state of occultation, the Imām appears to function less as a figure of charismatic authority (which, in real terms, he could not be) than as a possessor of *baraka*, for in such a state the subjective focusing of the faithful becomes dominant in the charismatic relationship. Disappearance of the charismatic figure may lead to the routinization of his charisma either in hereditary charisma or charisma of office (giving "charismatic latency"), whereby "the conception of personal qualities is… undergoing transformation into a conception of a transmissible, though immaterial power which could light on the most ordinary personality and give it authority"[28]—which certainly took place in the case of the Imāms after the death of the Prophet. The further disappearance of the bearer of hereditary charisma would normally be expected to lead either to the evaporation of the group or to a further routinization of the charismatic authority in a more "church-like" organization.[29] While, as we shall see, something like this did occur, the concept of the living presence of the Imām and the belief in his return combined to postpone the process of ecclesiastical routinization.

2. Such a condition could not, however, be considered as indefinite. There would appear to be a tendency to avoid premature routinization of charisma (such avoidance is, for example, a marked feature of Babi and Baha'i history[30]) and one of the most effective means of doing this is to introduce eschatological and chiliastic themes into the charismatic perspective. That the Imām was alive presupposed his return as the messianic liberator of his *shīᶜa*, as in the earlier case of Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥanafiyya (630-700) and others. A body of traditions now grew up, attributing to Muḥammad and the first eleven Imāms statements to the effect that there would be a total of twelve Imāms and that the twelfth would be the Qā'im and Mahdī.[31] Existing traditions relating to the imminent appearance of the Mahdī seem to have been fused to some extent with later forgeries rationalizing the fact that the Imāms must now be limited to twelve. In this way, the cessation of an earthly Imāmate with the twelfth Imām was justified and linked to what was now his personal eschatological role. In the same way the Ismailis found elaborate ways in which to rationalize the limitation of the Imāms to seven, so the Twelvers found equally elaborate means of demonstrating that the existence of twelve Imāms was, in some sense, part of the natural order of things, a symbol in the microcosm of a macrocosmic reality.[32]

Drawing on existing messianic prophecy relating to the figure of the Mahdī and on later *aḥādīth* attributed in Twelver compilations to the Prophet and first eleven Imāms, Shiᶜi scholars elaborated a corpus of traditions, some vague, some highly explicit and many extremely contradictory, relating to the future return (*rajᶜa*) of the twelfth Imām before the universal resurrection (*qiyāma*) as the restorer of the faith and the *mujāhidīn* who would lead the final assault against infidelity.[33] Whereas in Sunnism the Mahdī does not appear in most of the *ḥadīth* literature, and is essentially a figure of popular piety, he is for Shiᶜism an integral element of orthodox faith whose return is anticipated in the works of theologians as much as in popular eschatology.

More importantly, where the Mahdī of the Sunnis is merely an unidentified man descended from the Prophet, the Messiah of the Twelver Shīᶜa is explicitly identified with the twelfth Imām, now in occultation. It is in this that the *baraka* and authority of the Hidden Imām are extended indefinitely through time up to the moment of his reappearance and final victory. Since the Imām in his role as Qā'im is as much a figure of charismatic focus as in his earthly or occult states, the postponement of his return acts in some measure as a brake on the routinization of charismatic authority. Inasmuch as the Imām—as one who is preserved (*maᶜṣūm)* from sin (*maᶜṣiyya*), neglectfulness (*ṣaḥw*), and even forgetfulness (*nisyān*),[34]—is the sole source of infallible guidance and legislative renewal for the Shīᶜa, the promise of his advent rules out the assumption of his authority to carry out these functions by the *ulama* or the community acting through consensus (*ijmāᶜ*).[35] The importance of this "messianic motif" for an understanding of the dynamics of Babism has been stressed by Peter L. Berger,[36]

and will again be referred to by us in our discussion of the chiliastic current in the Shaykhi community on the death of Rashti.

3. Meeting with the Imām in sleep or in a visionary state was theoretically possible for anyone, but, in practice, very few could claim such an experience. Pilgrimage (*ziyāra*) could, naturally, still be performed to the shrines of the Imāms and of Imāmzādas, or to places associated with them, and *baraka* thus acquired; but this was clearly no substitute for direct contact with the Imām or his living representative. Similarly, the Imām might, in theory, return tomorrow, but the tendency was to argue that his coming would be delayed until the world had developed and was ready for his parousia.[37] In the meantime, if the community of believers was not to be dispersed and a sense of purpose and guidance preserved, other, more immediate bearers of the Imām's charisma had to be found. In the corpus of Imamite *akhbār* which grew up rapidly in the period following the *ghayba*, we find several traditions which speak of the appearance of outstanding scholars and saints who will protect the Shiᶜi faith from corruption and act as guides to the truth. In a tradition attributed to Muḥammad, for example, it is said that "in every generation (*khalaf*) of my people, there shall be an upright man (*ᶜadl*) who shall cast out from religion the corruption (*taḥrīf*) of the extremists (*al-ghālīn*) the arrogation of the false and the interpretation of the ignorant."[38] Imām ᶜAlī is recorded as stating in a *khuṭba* that

> I know that... You will not leave Your earth without a proof (*ḥujja*) for You to Your creatures, whether outward but unobeyed, or fearful and concealed, lest Your proof be made vain or Your holy ones be led astray after You have guided them.[39]

In a similar tradition, ᶜAlī prays to God not to leave the earth without "one who shall arise on behalf of God (*qāʾim li 'llāh*) with proof."[40] In several traditions attributed to the Imām Jaᶜfar, it is stated that:

> God shall not leave the earth without a scholar (*ᶜālim*) who will know what has been increased and what has been decreased in the world; should the believers add anything, he shall turn them back from it and, should they neglect anything, he shall increase it for them.[41]

On the basis of traditions such as these and the more creative role now played by them, numbers of individual scholars were able to achieve considerable renown and to exercise a large amount of charismatic authority as the de facto leaders and defenders of the faith. As "inheritors" of the mantle of the Imāms, these individual ulama represent a significant continuation of the "polar motif" (as derived from the concept of a *quṭb* or a series of *aqṭāb* as

centers of charismatic or latent charismatic authority in Islam) so characteristic of Shiᶜism and so vital a feature of Babi and Bahaᵓi doctrine in all its stages.[42]

Some individuals, born at appropriate times, acquired the name of Renewer (*mujaddid*) or Promulgator (*murawwij*) of the faith for their century, and it is significant to note that, whereas the *mujaddids* of the first and second centuries were the Imāms Jaᶜfar al-Ṣādiq and ᶜAlī al-Riḍāᵓ ibn Mūsā respectively, it was not deemed inappropriate to regard an *ᶜālim*, Muḥammad ibn Yaᶜqūb al-Kulaynī (d. 941?), as the *mujaddid* of the third century and, after him, other leading ulama.[43] The subsequent history of Twelver Shiᶜism is particularly marked by the emergence of a series of outstanding scholars, for the most part associated with one or more books on *fiqh*, *uṣūl*, *ḥadīth*, or *kalām*.[44] Whereas the history of Sunnism is closely linked to the fortunes of dynasties and empires, or that of Catholicism much occupied with papal reigns, councils, and the founding of religious orders, Shiᶜi history, largely divorced from the mainstream of events in the Islamic world, is an almost unchanging realm peopled by learned men and their books.

As we shall see, however, it was not until the thirteenth/nineteenth century that the role of the individual scholar began to take on in practice something of the charismatic significance with which it had, in theory, been endowed from the time of the lesser occultation. We shall observe how the status of *mujtahid* develops into that of the widely-recognized *marjaᶜ al-taqlīd* and ayatollah, while in Shaykhism the *rukn al-rābiᶜ* concept comes to offer an original solution to the problem of charismatic authority within terms of the polar motif.

4. The doctrinal theories which have, in the past two centuries, permitted certain individual ulama of exceptional merit or personality to hold almost universal sway over the Shiᶜi world were slow in developing. In the meantime, traditions such as those quoted above were generally treated together with others which imbued the body of the ulama as a whole with the authority to transmit the grace of the Imām. In a tradition attributed to the fifth Imām, Muḥammad al-Bāqir ibn ᶜAlī Zayn al-ᶜĀbidīn (d. 731), it is stated that

> God created a remnant of the people of knowledge who summon [men] from error to guidance, and who endure afflictions with them; they respond to the one who calls to God [i.e., the Imām] and themselves summon [others] unto God with understanding; preserve them, then... for they possess an exalted station. Their sufferings in this world are as a trust: they bring the dead to life through the book of God, and they see amidst blindness by the light of God. How many slain by the devil have they resurrected, and how many an erring wanderer have they guided.[45]

The role of the ulama during the occultation of the Imām is clearly indicated in a tradition attributed to the eleventh Imām, Ḥasan al-ᶜAskarī:

> Were it not for those of the ulama who shall remain after the occultation of your Imām calling [men] unto him, producing evidences on his behalf, and striving for his faith with the proofs of God, delivering the weak among the servants of God from the snares and demons of Satan and from the traps of the wicked, there would be no-one who would not abandon the faith of God.[46]

In a variant of one of the traditions quoted in the previous section, the Prophet is recorded as stating that "righteous men (*ᶜudūl*) shall bear this religion in every century, who shall cast out from it the interpretation of the false, the corruption of the extremists, and the arrogation of the ignorant, just as bellows remove the dross from the iron."[47]

Shiᶜi ulama had already begun to emerge during the period of the Imāms, many of them being their pupils and companions. We may note a number of Shiᶜi Qurᵓān commentators (*mufassirūn*), transmitters of Ḥadīth (*muḥaddithūn*), jurisprudents (*fuqahāᵓ*), and, at a slightly later date, theologians (*mutakallimūn*) who worked in this period.[48] These include Faḍl ibn Shādhān al-Nayshābūrī,[49] ᶜAlī al-Maythamī (ᶜAlī ibn Ismāᶜīl ibn al-Maytham al-Tammār),[50] and Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam (d. ca. 815).[51] It is clear, however, that individuals such as these remained very much in the shadow of the Imāms, who were the infallible sources of guidance in all matters. ᶜAbbās Iqbāl writes that "the Imāmiyya differed from other Islamic sects in that they always had recourse to the infallible Imām in matters of *tafsīr*, interpretation of Quranic verses, and the Sunna of the Prophet."[52]

At a period when the role of the Sunni ulama was paramount in the development of *fiqh*, *ḥadīth*, and *kalām*, the Shīᶜa continued to depend primarily on charismatic guidance for the solution to often complex questions of a rational nature. The presence of a charismatic figure who is prepared to answer queries on any issue invariably inhibits the development of independent scholarship. This may be seen, for example, in the contrast between Catholic and Protestant theology in the twentieth century, or the absence of serious scholarship in Bahaᵓi circles during the eras of ᶜAbbās Afandī ᶜAbd al-Bahāᵓ (1844?-1921), his successor Shoghi Effendi Rabbani (d. 1957) and even now under the "infallible" rule of the Universal House of Justice (*Bayt al-ᶜAdl-i Aᶜẓam*).

During the era of the Imāms we do not see the emergence of a distinct body of Shiᶜi ulama, free from the restraints of a living higher authority. *Kalām* in particular was much opposed, but the demands of polemic and apologetics rendered it increasingly necessary; thus, from the time of Jaᶜfar al-Ṣādiq, Shiᶜi *mutakallimūn* began to make a gradual appearance, borrowing initially from the Muᶜtazila, but later diverging strongly from them.[53] It is worth noting that many

of the early Shiᶜi *mutakallimūn* were "corrected" in their theories by the Imāms or their close companions[54]—clearly, the removal of the Imām or his direct representative was bound to lead to significant developments, but it was not until Naṣīr al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad al-Ṭūsī (1201-1274) that Shiᶜi *kalām* reached its maturity.

Later Shiᶜi ulama were often divided as to how they should regard these early theologians particularly in cases like those of Abū ᶜĪsā Muḥammad ibn Hārūn Warrāq (d. 247/ 861)[55] and Aḥmad ibn Yahyā Rāwandī (d. 245/ 859),[56] whose true relationship with orthodox Shiᶜism remains unclear; by and large, the works of these early writers are not those on which later Shiᶜi scholarship came to be founded. Even in cases where retrospective opinion is favorable to earlier writers, it is clear that the supposed sense of continuity may be much less than is thought: "Later Shiᶜite writers," says William Montgomery Watt, "commonly refer to men like Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam and his contemporaries as Imāmites, but it is not certain whether they used this name of themselves."[57]

Although Shiᶜi scholars had taken advantage of periods of relative tolerance towards the sect, notably under the caliph Maᶜmūn (786-833),[58] such intervals were few and their influence limited. The lesser occultation, however, coincided with the beginning of a period of comparative freedom for the Shīᶜa in many places, under dynasties such as the Samanids, the Hamdanids, and the Shiᶜi Buwayhids, who took Baghdad in 334/945, only five years after the death of the last of the *abwāb al-arbaᶜa*. The coincidence of freedom from charismatic restraint and political oppression gave a necessary impetus to the development of Shiᶜi scholarship.

However, in the absence of any fully-fledged, centralized, and stable Twelver state, the religious authority of the ulama remained scattered in the various centers of Shiᶜi activity, principally in Qum (which became a major center for religious studies from the time of the Buwayhids),[59] Al-Kūfa, Baṣra, Bahrain, Aleppo, Jabal ᶜĀmil, and elsewhere.[60] This meant that scholars preserved a high degree of independence from the demands of functioning within a wholly Shiᶜi context within a single state system, and were free of the hierarchical demands of a church-like structure which would be imposed by a centralized body of ulama.

This position was altered radically by the rapid emergence and consolidation of the Ṣafawī state in the early sixteenth century. "It is," writes Hamid Algar, "from the Safavid period onward that one may meaningfully talk about the existence of a body of Shiᶜi ulama."[61] This had at least two major consequences: on the one hand, it led to the routinization of the inherited charismatic authority of the ulama in something resembling an ecclesiastical system in the context of a church-state symbiosis: on the other hand, and as the dynasty declined, the very large body of ulama who did not accept positions as state-appointed ecclesiastical functionaries, and who refused to recognize the

legitimacy of the Safavid or any other state became highly popular with and influential over the Shiᶜi masses, particularly in rural areas.

Contrary to Algar's statement that "no authority in the strict sense of the term resided in the ulama,"[62] it was precisely their ability to claim an inherited charismatic authority on behalf of the Imām and, importantly, over against the secular, illegitimate state, which gave and still gives the ulama so much of their power over the people. Ironically, therefore, the very existence of the Safavid, Qajar, and Pahlavi states did much to enhance the charismatic authority of the ulama, providing them with a political role which was clear throughout the nineteenth century and which is, perhaps, best exemplified in the part played by the *ākhūnds* in the overthrow of the Pahlavi regime and their dominant role within the Islamic Republic.

It has, indeed, been fundamental to the thinking of Ayatollah Khomeini that the *fuqahāʾ* be seen as the only legitimate sources of political authority in a Shiᶜi state, inasmuch as they and they alone are the successors (*jā-nishīnān*; *awṣīyā*) of the Prophet and the Imāms.[63] As such, they possess the same authority to rule as the latter:

> This notion that the governing powers of the Prophet were greater than those of the Amīr [ᶜAlī] or that the governing powers of the Amīr were greater than those of the *faqīh*, is false and mistaken. Undoubtedly, the endowments of the Prophet are greater than those of all the world, and, after him, those of the Amir are greater than all; but abundance of spiritual endowments does not increase powers of government. God has granted the same powers and guardianship (*wilāyat*) which were possessed by the Prophet and the rest of the Imāms... to the present government [i.e., that of the ulama], except that no one individual is specified; there is simply the term: "a just scholar (*ᶜālim ᶜādil*)."[64]

This *wilāya* of the *faqīh* is established by a firm appointment (*naṣṣ*) from the Prophet,[65] and in this way, the need for a "guardian of the cause" (*walī-yi amr*) at all times is taken care of.[66]

5. The function of the ulama, like that of individual *ᶜālims*, as bearers of the charismatic authority of the Imām, lay relatively dormant until the late eighteenth century. In the intervening period, however, they came to inherit in a particular sense the charismatic "aura" of the Shiᶜi community as a whole. Watt's somewhat untypical distinction between the 'charismatic community' of the Sunnis and the "charismatic leader" of the Shīᶜa only really holds true for the very earliest period.[67] From a relatively early date, the view developed that not only the Imāms but their true followers also were specially blessed, guided, and assured of salvation.[68] The charisma of the Shīᶜa and its polar motif were particularly focused on the existence within the community of individuals

known as *nuqabāʾ* and *nujabāʾ*.[69] A tradition ascribed to the eleventh Imām al-Ḥasan ibn ʿAlī al-ʿAskarī (845-872) states that "we shall send unto them the best of our *shīʿa*, such as Salmān, al-Miqdād, Abū Dharr, ʿAmmār, and their like in the age following them, in every age until the day of 'resurrection'."[70] This concept came to play an important role in the later version of the Shaykhi doctrine of the *rukn al-rābiʿ*, along with that of the ulama as agents of the grace of the Imām: "the existence of succor (*ghawth*) shall not suffice in this day without the pillars (*al-arkān*), and the pillars cannot exist without the *nuqabāʾ* nor the *nuqabāʾ* without the *nujabāʾ* nor the *nujabāʾ* without the ulama."[71]

According to this view, the presence of the Hidden Imām is not sufficient for the needs of men, who require someone visible and tangible to aid them.[72] The ulama act as mediators for knowledge from the Imām to the masses (*al-ʿawāmm*), while the *nujabāʾ* mediate for the ulama and the *nuqabāʾ* for the *nujabāʾ*, setting up a hierarchical chain leading from men to God.[73] Definition of the role and nature of the *nuqabāʾ* and *nujabāʾ* was to form an important part of Muḥammad Karīm Khān Kirmānī's (1810-1872) refutation of the Bab.[74]

6. All of the above are ways in which Twelver Shiʿism to some extent routinized the charisma of the Imāms from the third century. This routinization is, perhaps, most apparent in the creation of a body of ulama from the Safavid period onward and in the related development of a corpus of authoritative Shiʿi literature, showing an increasing measure of formalization and organization. During the lifetime of the Imāms, some four hundred compilations of *akhbār*, entitled ʿ*Aṣl*, are said to have been drawn up by Shiʿi ulama,[75] but it is clear that the actual presence of an Imām divested these of any real authority.

With the Imām in occultation however, the need to possess authoritative *akhbār* became pressing and the "four books"—al-Kulaynī's *al-Kāfī*; Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī Ibn Bābawayh's (918-991) *Man lā yaḥḍuruhu al-faqīh*, and Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan al-Ṭūsī's (995-1067) *Al-Istibṣār fi-mā ʾkhtalafa min al-akhbār* and *Tahdhīb al-aḥkām*—soon came into existence to supply this need. The production of these collections and others such as the *Nahj al-balāgha* of Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥusayn Sharīf al-Radī (969-1016) and Ibn Bābawayh's *Madīnat al-□ilm*, as well as the inclusion in them of numerous *aḥādīth* manufactured to justify in transcendentalized terms the mundane reality of what had become Twelver Shiʿism, was both a powerful means of continuing in theory Imām-centered charismatic authority and of routinizing, systematizing, and foreclosing the doctrinal and legal options of the Imāmī school.

Other compilations of *akhbār* continued to appear, but it is significant that the fullest, most systematic, and, eventually, the most popular of these—Majlisī's *Biḥār al-anwār*—came into being as an expression of the routinization of religious authority among the ulama during the Safavid period. It is also relevant for our present thesis to note that two of the later heads of the Shaykhi school, Muḥammad Karīm Khān Kirmānī and his son Muḥammad Khān Kirmānī (1846-1906), produced what are, in fact, two of the lengthiest, best-

organized, and most comprehensive collections of *akhbār*—the *Faṣl al-khitāb* and *Al-kitāb al-mubīn* respectively.

7. The development, reassessment, and systematization of Shiᶜi *fiqh* continued much longer than in Sunnism, by reason of the doctrine of continuing *ijtihād*, and is, in theory at least, an unending process. The relationship of *fiqh* to the problem of retaining the authority of the Imām is made clear by Muḥammad Ḥusayn Muẓaffarī: "After them [the four gates] access to him [the Imām] and personal acquisition of guidance from him (*al-akhdh ᶜanhu raᵓsan*) was terminated; the derivation of laws (*al-aḥkām*) was limited to *ijtihād*."[76] This close relationship between *imāma* and *ijtihād* did not develop immediately, however—whatever retrospective Shiᶜi theorizing may suggest. One of the earliest works of Shiᶜi *fiqh* is supposed to have been a book written by the second *nāᵓib* Abū Jaᶜfar Muḥammad al-ᶜAmrī, at the dictation of the Hidden Imām[77]—a clear indication of how difficult it was to break away from the influence of the original source of charismatic authority even in the development of a new source of legal authority.

The classic Sunni distinction between ᶜ*ilm*, knowledge of Quranic and *ḥadīth*-based legislation, on the one hand, and *fiqh*, independent rational development of points of law, on the other, existed in a particularly marked form in the case of Shiᶜism. The Imāms, in particular Jaᶜfar al-Ṣādiq, had functioned as the sole authorities according to whom Shiᶜi law was developed, and for some time Shiᶜi *fiqh* consisted largely of compiling the *akhbār* collections referred to above. Al-Kulaynī, Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad Mufīd (d. 1022), Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan al-Ṭūsī (Shaykh al-Tā'ifa, 995-1067), and others studied and wrote extensively, but the first major works on *fiqh* were those produced by Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī, still regarded as the leading authority on *uṣūl*.

Al-Ḥillī was also the first Shiᶜi *faqīh* to lay emphasis on the role of *ijtihād* as a continuing force for legislative renewal in Shiᶜism, although he was not strictly the earliest to mention it.[78] His works have the distinction of being based firmly on independent research and rational discussion, a point which Muḥammad Bāqir Khwānsārī makes in contrasting them with those of the later Muḥammad Bāqir ibn Muḥammad Taqī Majlisī (1627-1699).[79] Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī and his successors laid, as we shall see, a basis which made it possible for Āqā Muḥammad Bāqir ibn Muḥammad Akmal Bihbahānī (1118-1207/ 1706-1792), in the middle of the eighteenth century, to establish Uṣūlī *fiqh*, based on a strongly-developed sense of the role of *ijtihād*, as the central bearer of legal authority within Shiᶜism.

Karīm Khān Kirmānī notes that "in these days... the knowledge of *fiqh* and the outward form of the *sharīᶜa*… has reached a state of perfection" and that "the beginning of the appearance and spread of the *fiqh* and *akhbār* of the Shīᶜa was at the end of the eleventh century, that is, one thousand one hundred; now (1268/1851) it is less than two hundred years that these manifest Shiᶜi sciences

have been spread in the world. The truth of the matter is that the outward stages of the holy law reached perfection in the twelfth century, that is, in one thousand two hundred."[80]

We shall observe in a later chapter the relevance of this theory to Shaykhi concepts of the ages of *ẓāhir* and *bāṭin*, "manifest" and "hidden". Two of Bihbahānī's most outstanding successors in the first half of the nineteenth century—Shaykh Muḥammad Ḥasan al-Najāfi (1788-1850) and Shaykh Jaᶜfar al-Najafī)—produced two of the most important and original works on Shiᶜi *fiqh* for some time. The former's *Jawāhir al-kalām* has been compared to the work of Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī in respect of its independent and innovative nature.[81] Similarly, Mullā Muḥammad ibn Sulaymān Tanakābunī (1819-1892) writes of the latter's *Kashf al-ghiṭāᵓ* that "no such book detailing the *furūᶜ* of the faith in this way had been written until then."[82]

This conjunction of legal authority, as seen in the development of *fiqh* by the nineteenth century, and charismatic latency, as observed in the efflorescence of the role of the *mujtahid* as *marjaᶜ al-taqlīd* by the same period, is an important feature of the age we are studying and tells us much of the character of Shiᶜism at the time of the development of Shaykhism and Babism.

To summarize, then, we may note that several strands appear to come together in the first half of the nineteenth century. The ulama, first properly developed under the Safavids, found themselves regrouped protected, and increasingly powerful; the position of *mujtahid* had been defined and stressed and, as we shall see, the way was open for the appearance of outstanding figures with unprecedented personal charismatic authority. Legal authority, in the form of *fiqh*, had reached the peak of its development, but its expression was still closely linked to charismatic figures such as Muḥammad Ḥasan ibn Bāqir al-Najāfi; messianic expectation was on the increase with the proximity of the hijri year1260, one thousand years after the disappearance of the Imām.

By this time, however, it is obvious that there was growing tension between these elements. The authority implicit in the exercise of independent *ijtihād* did not march happily with that contained in the definitive volumes of *fiqh,* nor did the charismatic role of *marājiᶜ al-taqlīd* points of imitation and final authorities in religious matters harmonize readily with chiliastic hope in the return of the Imām. However, this tension did clearly represent a major development of the third and fifth themes discussed above: the existence of outstanding ulama in every age, and the continued presence of *nuqabāᵓ* and *nujabāᵓ* in the community. The extreme veneration accorded the most outstanding ulama conflicted to some extent with the charismatic role of the religious scholars as a single body, and also with the more diffuse concept of *nuqabāᵓ* and *nujabāᵓ* within the charismatic Shiᶜi ecclesia.

This last tension is particularly marked, as we shall note, in the contradiction between the visible role of the leaders of Shaykhism, on the one hand and the doctrine of the "fourth support" as referring to the ulama or to the

nuqabāʾ and *nujabāʾ*, on the other. It is also apparent in the variety of claims to charismatic polar authority within Babism, put forward not only by the Bab, but by large numbers of his followers, particularly in the period after 1850, creating what Berger calls a "charismatic field."[83] The early nineteenth century can, then, be described as a period for Shiʿism in which several related issues came to a head at once, and in which potential charismatic tensions which had remained unresolved from the time of the lesser occultation came to the surface and shrilly demanded attention.

The Eighteenth Century Reformation

Of particular importance for this development was the Shiʿi "reformation" which took place at the shrines in Iraq at about the time Shaykh Aḥmad al-Ahsaʾi arrived there from Bahrain in the 1790s. What amounted to a revolution in Shiʿi thinking was being fostered there by several outstanding ulama with many of whom al-Ahsaʾi came to be associated. This revolution, or reformation, coinciding with the restoration of a central Shiʿi government in Iran under the Qajar dynasty, was to set the tone for all subsequent developments in Twelver Shiʿism, not only at the ʿ*atabāt* (the Shiʿi shrines at Karbala, Najaf, Kāẓimiyya, and Samarra), but even more in Iran itself. The questions raised in the course of this reappraisal and reconstitution of Shiʿi theology were all, as we shall see, of considerable relevance to the claims put forward by the Bab and his early disciples and explain in large measure the general rejection of Babism by the main body of Shiʿi Islam. The picture painted of Shiʿism in this period in many Babi and Bahaʾi histories, as decadent, imitative, and static,[84] while not lacking altogether in validity, is only partial, and fails to take into account the major developments we have mentioned. Both Shaykh Aḥmad al-Ahsaʾi and Sayyid Kāẓim Rashti are portrayed in these accounts as far removed from the mainstream of events in the period, and the question of their relations with other ulama is either ignored or treated negatively.

The collapse of the Safavid dynasty in 1722 precipitated a major crisis in Twelver Shiʿism. For some two hundred years, Shiʿi ulama had been consolidating the position of their branch of Islam as the national religion of Iran, had been educating the population as a whole in the fundamentals of Shiʿi belief, and had been attempting to come to terms with the problems of co-existence between a religious hierarchy in theory obedient only to the Hidden Imām on the one hand, and a state ruled by a monarch claiming descent from the seventh Imām and a large measure of divine right to rule on the other.[85] But from 1722 until many years after the Qajar restoration at the end of the eighteenth century, the political confusion of Iran was to render doubtful the continued existence of a Shiʿi state in that country. During the interregnum,

however, significant developments occurred in Iraq which determined the nature of relations between the future Qajar state and the ulama.[86]

After the overthrow of the Safavids, many of the ulama, fearing for their lives or their religious freedom under the Sunni Afghans and later under Nādir Shāh (1688-1747),[87] had fled to India and Arab Iraq. The region around Baghdad where the *ʿatabāt* were situated was in many respects, ideal as a refuge for such individuals. A sizeable Persian Shiʿi population had long existed there especially in Karbala, while the shrines in general attracted Shiʿi pilgrims from many regions. Najaf in particular became a focus on which scholars from Iran and elsewhere converged, its more Arab character being considerably changed and its importance as a center of learning becoming greatly increased as a result.[88] Not only was Arab Iraq situated beyond the vicissitudes convulsing Iran at this period, but, with the appointment of Ḥasan Pāshā (ruled 1704-1723) as governor of Baghdad in 1704, an epoch of virtual independence for the region, under a succession of "Mamlūk" rulers, had begun.[89]

It has been common to speak of the period between the fall of the Safavids and the restoration under Āqā Muḥammad Shāh, the first Qajar ruler (r. 1796-1797), as virtually devoid of religious scholars of any real ability. Sayyid Muḥammad Hāshimī Kirmānī remarks that

> From the later years of the Safavid period, scholarship in Iran was extremely limited, as were the circles of theological study; during the period of Nādir Shāh and the Zands, the situation continued to decline. Several factors, the most important of which was the prevailing instability, contributed greatly to this deficit of learning. It would appear that this situation was also prevalent in neighboring countries at this time, as much as in Iran itself. In 1156 [1743], Nādir Shāh brought together in Iraq the *mujtahids* and *muftis* of Iran, the Caucasus, Turkistan, Afghanistan, Iraq, and India. A very large gathering was assembled, but, from the remarks made there, one can see how superficial and banal their scholarship had become. Moreover, their names have all come down to us, and we do not observe a single outstanding scholar among them.[90]

According to Abbas Iqbal, "the most famous of the Imāmī ulama during this interregnum period" were Ismāʿīl ibn Muḥammad Māzandarānī (Khwājūʾī) (d. 1173/1759), Mullā Muḥammad Rafīʿ Gīlānī, Shaykh Yūsuf ibn Aḥmad al-Baḥrānī (1106-86/1694-5 – 1772-3) the author of the *Ḥadāʾiq* and *al-Kashkūl*), and Muḥammad Bīdābādī Iṣfahānī (d. 11971782).[91] This statement is reproduced almost exactly by Algar, who adds that only Shaykh Yūsuf al-Baḥrānī "produced a work that attained any fame—*al-Kashkūl*."[92] In these few words, Iqbal and Algar sum up the religious activities of the period of the interregnum and proceed to a discussion of the achievements of Āqā Bihbahānī.

It seems to me that neither Hāshimī Kirmānī nor Iqbāl offers an adequate explanation nor a satisfactory picture of the period preceding the early Qajar reformation. The period in question is overshadowed at one end by the figure of Muḥammad Bāqir ibn Muḥammad Taqī Majlisī (d. 1111/1699),[93] the author of the voluminous *Biḥār al-anwār*, a prodigious collection of *akhbār*, and the most influential of the late Safavid divines dominating the court of Shah Ḥusayn I (1668-1726); and at the other by that of Muḥammad Bāqir ibn Muḥammad Bihbahānī (d.1206/1791-2), regarded as the Renewer or *mujaddid* of the thirteenth hijri century. Khwānsārī, for example, speaks of "the period of the absence of the ulama (*ẓamān fiṭrat al-ᶜulamāᵓ*)" between Majlisī and Bihbahānī.[94]

It is easy to forget, however, that the influence of Majlisī, of several of his immediate predecessors, and some of the more eminent ulama among his contemporaries persisted well after the fall of the Safavids, and that the achievements of Bihbahānī had their roots in developments over the previous century or more. Among those predecessors we may number men such as Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan Hurr al-ᶜĀmilī (1624-1693),[95] Muḥammad ibn Murtadā Fayd al-Kāshānī (Muḥammad Ḥasan Mūsavī Kāshānī) (1598-1680),[96] Qādī Sa'īd Qummī (1639-1691),[97] and Ḥusayn ibn Muḥammad Khuwānsārī (1607-1686?).[98] Majlisī's contemporaries included Niᶜmat Allāh ibn ᶜAbd Allāh Jazāᵓirī (1640-1701).[99]

Even if the general standard of the ulama was necessarily poor, there are several individuals, apart from those mentioned by Iqbāl, who held positions of some eminence in this period The most outstanding of these was Muḥammad ibn Ḥasan Fādil al-Hindī (1651-1724), the author of the *Kashf al-lithām*.[100] Others included Sayyid Ṣadr al-Dīn ibn Muḥammad Bāqir Raḍāwī Qummī (d. 1803);[101] a son of Niᶜmat Allāh ibn ᶜAbd Allāh al-Jazāᵓirī (1640-1701), Nūr al-Dīn ibn Niᶜmat Allāh al-Jazāᵓirī (1677-1745), who had studied under al-Ḥasan Ḥurr al-ᶜĀmilī;[102] a son of Nūr al-Dīn al-Jazāᵓirī, Sayyid ᶜAbd Allāh Shūstarī (1702-1759);[103] Sayyid Murtaḍā ibn Muḥammad Ṭabāṭabā'ī (d. 1793), the father of Muḥammad Mahdī ibn Murtaḍā Baḥr al-ᶜUlūm (1742-1797);[104] Muḥammad Bāqir ibn Muḥammad Bihbahānī, the father and teacher of Āqā Bihbahānī;[105] Shaykh Abū Ṣālih Muḥammad Mahdī Fatūnī al-ᶜĀmilī,[106] and Shaykh Muḥammad Taqī Darūqī al-Najāfi,[107] both teachers of Baḥr al-ᶜUlūm, Shaykh Jaᶜfar al-Najāfi and many others; and Shaykh Muḥammad Bāqir Hizārjarībī Najāfi (d. 1790), a teacher of Baḥr al-ᶜUlūm, Shaykh Jaᶜfar al-Najāfī and Abū 'l-Qāsim Qummī.[108] Men such as these, some in Iran and others at the *'atabāt*,[109] if not themselves ulama of the first grade, nevertheless set the stage for the entrance of figures such as Āqā Bihbahānī, Baḥr al-ᶜUlūm, Shaykh Jaᶜfar al-Najāfī, Sayyid ᶜAlī ibn Muḥammad Ṭabāṭabāᵓī ᶜAlī Iṣfahānī (1748-1815), Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad Ibrāhīm Kalbāsī (1831-1897) and Shaykh Aḥmad al-Ahsaᵓi . The strength of the continuing tradition of Shiᶜi scholarship over the interregnum is clearly demonstrated in the fact that most of the ulama from

whom Shaykh Aḥmad received licences to teach (*ijāzāt*) had studied under Yūsuf ibn Aḥmad al-Baḥrānī[110] – a fact which also shows the degree of al-Ahsaʾi's indebtedness to that tradition.

Three major factors contributed to the development of Shiᶜi thought in the interregnum, the problems raised being resolved finally by Āqā Bihbahānī and his contemporaries. These factors were: the challenge presented by the religious policies of Nādir Shāh, the reinterpretation of the role of the ulama in the absence of a Shiᶜi state (and during the continued occultation of the Imām), and the struggle for supremacy between the Akhbārī and Uṣūlī schools of thought.

The most serious threat posed to the continuation of Shiᶜism in Iran by Nādir Shāh—apart from his direct physical and economic attacks on the ulama class[111]—was his aim to unite the Shiᶜi sect to Sunnism through the ingenious expedient of so modifying Shiᶜism as to have it regarded as a fifth "Jaᶜfarī" *madhhab* within the Sunni structure. As we shall see when we come to consider the question in more detail later, the most disturbing aspect of this proposal as far as the Shiᶜi ulama were concerned was the implication that, by placing Shiᶜism side by side with the four existing Sunni law schools, it would have to share with them a much more limited role for *ijtihād*,[112] with the Imām Jaᶜfar al-Ṣādiq the Shiᶜi equivalent of the founders of the fourth Sunni schools of law. Not only would this have denied to the Imāms after Jaᶜfar their traditional role as sources of continued divine guidance, thereby removing the central feature of Twelver Shiᶜism, but it would have all but dispensed with the role of the Shiᶜi *mujtahid* as a source of legislative renewal (in theory, at least) during the occultation of the Imām.[113] As we shall see, this latter possibility was a particularly disturbing threat at this point.

The question of the relationship between church and state in Shiᶜi theory and practice has attracted much attention and been discussed at length elsewhere;[114] there is no need to do more here than summarize the situation insofar as it affected the ulama following the collapse of the Safavid dynasty. For centuries before the establishment of the Safavid state, *Ithnāʾ-ᶜasharī* Shiᶜism had persisted as a minority sect for which all secular authority – Umayyad, Abbasid, or otherwise—was illegitimate. This very sense of illegitimacy lay at the root of Shiᶜi belief, and led it inevitably to a sense of the illegitimacy of any state whatever.[115] "In contrast with the Sunni ulama," writes Keddie, "who had to work out their doctrine under the rule of a government that claimed political sovereignty, the Shiᶜis lacked political protectors, which for centuries weakened their real power, but also enabled them in theory to deny the sovereign claims of any state."[116]

The peculiar manner in which the Safavid regime was created had meant that, when a religious hierarchy finally developed, it had to come to terms with an existing secular state which had brought it into being, which sought to foster it (albeit it in an inferior role to the secular hierarchy), and which claimed a

legitimacy based in part on religious considerations. The early Safavid ulama seem to have been content to accept the role forced on them by a state which held in its hands effective power over both secular and religious affairs. Initially, it would seem, the fact that a Shiᶜi monarch sat on the throne precluded any question of illegitimacy in the rule of the state. The doctrinal theory which denied legitimacy to secular rulers had been developed originally against the Sunni 'usurpers' of the caliphate, and it was some time before the ulama began openly to infer from that theory that the rule of a Shiᶜi monarch must equally involve the usurpation of the function of the Imām as the divinely-appointed head of the Islamic *umma*.[117] As the power of the Safavid state declined, however, that of the ulama increased, and, towards the end of the seventeenth century, it was being claimed openly that not only was the rule of the shah illegal, but that, in the absence of the Imām, true authority lay with the *mujtahids* as his representatives.[118]

Although the collapse of Safavid rule and the ensuing anarchy caused much harm to the ulama, this was little more than a physical and economic setback. Sequestered in the comparative safety of the *ᶜatabāt,* or in various enclaves in an Iran conspicuously deprived of effective centralized government, the ulama could well regard themselves as the remaining representatives of the vanished Shiᶜi state, and could now give free rein to speculation on the role of the *mujtahid* class, whether in the perpetual absence of a Twelver Shiᶜi state, or in whatever new order came to fill the vacuum left by the disappearance of the Safavids.

The Akhbari-Usuli Split

The resulting debate took the form of a final clash between the Akhbari and Usuli (or Mujtahidī) schools of thought, and culminated in the victory of the latter party on the eve of the Qajar restoration. Since this debate and its consequences have a considerable bearing on the interpretation of Shaykh Aḥmad al-Ahsaᵓi's role among the early Qajar ulama, it will be worthwhile to touch on the major aspects of the controversy.

The origins of the debate are somewhat obscure. Later Shiᶜi writers normally regard the Akhbaris as innovators first appearing in the 17th century with the emergence of Muḥammad Amīn ibn Muḥammad Sharif Astarābādī (d.1623). It is more probable, however, that the appearance of an Akhbari school at this date is more a reflection of the growing power of the *mujtahids* and the early development of what came to be identified as the Usuli position. The doctrine of the role of the *mujtahid* as the interpreter of the will of the Imām "is apparently a late one that has no basis in early Twelver theory,"[119] and it seems likely that the Akhbari party was less innovatory than conservative, the true

respective positions of the two schools becoming distorted after the victory of the Usulis.

That the Akhbaris represented a purer and more primitive line of thought within Shiᶜism clearly seems to have been the belief of Mullā Muḥammad Amīn Astarābādī, regarded as "the first to open the door of reviling against the *mujtahids*"[120] and as "the leader of the sect of Akhbaris."[121] A Persian work of his, the *Dānish-nāma-yi shāhī*,[122] seeks to demonstrate that the Ijtihādī (Usuli) school was an innovation which had not existed before the time of Muḥammad ibn Yaᶜqūb al-Kulaynī.[123] "Up to the latter period of the lesser occultation, people followed the Akhbari school."[124] Muḥammad Amīn saw his own role as that of restoring the Akhbari teachings to their former position of dominance within Shiᶜism.

He himself had studied initially under two of the leading Shiᶜi scholars of his day, Muḥammad ibn ᶜAlī al-ᶜĀmilī (1539-1600)[125] the author of an important work entitled the *Madārik al-aḥkām*,[126] and Shaykh Jamāl al-Dīn Abū Manṣūr Ḥasan al-ᶜĀmilī) (1551-1602),[127] the author of the *Maᶜālim al-dīn wa-malādh al-mujtahidīn* [128] and a son of Shaykh Zayn al-Dīn ibn ᶜAlī al-Shahīd al-Thānī (1506-1558). He later lived in Mecca and Medina, and studied during this period under Mullā Muḥammad ibn ᶜAlī Astarābādī (d. 1028/1619).[129] It was this man who encouraged Muḥammad Amīn to 'revive' the Akhbari school. The latter writes in his *Danish-nāma*: "After he [Muḥammad ibn ᶜAlī] had instructed me in all the traditions, he indicated that I should revive the school of the Akhbaris and should remove the doubts that were opposed to that school. 'I have intended to do this,' he said, 'but God has decreed that your pen take up this subject.'"[130] Muḥammad Amīn undertook the composition of his most important work, *al-Fawāʾīd al-madaniyya fī raddi man qāla bi 'l-ijtihād*,[131] as a direct attack on the theory of independent reasoning then current in Shiᶜi thought. He himself states that the work was well received,[132] a fact confirmed by Muḥammad Taqī ibn Maqṣūd ᶜAlī Majlisī (1594-1659), the father of Muḥammad Bāqir in his *Lavāmiᶜ-i ṣāḥib-qirānī*,[133] when he writes:

> About thirty years ago, the erudite scholar Mullā Muḥammad Amīn Astarābādī busied himself with comparing and studying the traditions of the blessed Imāms, turned his attention to the condemnation of decisions reached by speculation and analogy (*ārāʾ wa maqāyis*), and understood the path of the companions of the Imāms. He wrote the *Fawāʾiḍ-i madaniyya* [sic] and sent it to this country. Most of the people of Najaf and the *ᶜatabāt* approved of his thinking (*ṭarīqat*) and began to refer to the traditions (*akhbār*) as their sources. In truth, most of what Mullā Muḥammad Amīn has said is true.[134]

In the *Fawāʾīḍ al-madaniyya*, Astarābādī argues that the first individuals to abandon the path followed by the companions of the Imāms and to rely on the

art of theological discussion (*kalām*) and the juridical principles (*uṣūl al-fiqh*) based on rational arguments as common among Sunnis (*al-ᶜāmma*) were, as far as I know, Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad al-Junayd, who acted on the basis of analogy (*qiyās*) and Ḥasan ibn ᶜAlī ibn Abī ᶜAqīl al-ᶜUmanī the *mutakallim*.[135]

He goes on to say that, when al-Shaykh al-Mufīd (d. 413/ 1022)[136] expressed his views on the worth of these two men to his own pupils, these ideas continued to spread over a long period until the time of the foremost Shiᶜi authority on *uṣūl*, al-ᶜAllāma al-Ḥillī,[137] who emphasized them in his writings. Astarābādī brings the development of Usuli thought down to his own time through Muḥammad ibn Makkī al-ᶜĀmilī al-Shahīd al-Awwal (731-86/ 1333-84),[138] Shaykh ᶜAlī (presumably ᶜAlī ibn ᶜAbd al-ᶜAlī al-ᶜĀmilī, al-Muḥaqqiq al-Thānī (c.870-940/ 1465-1533),[139] Zayn al-Dīn ibn ᶜAlī al-ᶜĀmilī al-Shahīd al-Thānī (d. 966/ 1558),[140] his son, and the teacher of Astarābādī, Shaykh Jamāl al-Dīn Abū Manṣūr al-ᶜĀmilī and, finally, his own contemporary Bahāᵓ al-Dīn Muḥammad al-ᶜĀmilī (d. 1030/ 1620), better known Shaykh Bahāᵓī.[141]

The fundamentalist nature of Astarābādī's thought is evident from the foregoing. Not only was he opposed to the practice of *ijtihād* as current in his day, but he retrospectively criticized several of the leading figures in Shiᶜi theology in the period following the occultation of the Imām.[142] Surprisingly enough, however, Astarābādī's views, as we have seen, were at first well received, and in succeeding years several important scholars adopted, in varying degrees, the ideas he had put forward. Among these were Shaykh Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan al-Ḥurr al-ᶜĀmilī, one of the "three Muḥammads of the modern period and the author of several important works, including the influential *Waṣāᵓil al shīᶜa ilā taḥsīl masāᵓil al-sharīᶜa* and the *Amal al-āmil*;[143] Mullā Muḥsin Fayḍ Kāshānī (1598-1680), another of the "three Muḥammads" of later Shiᶜism, a student and son-in-law of Mullā Ṣadrā (d. 1641), and one of the most eminent of the Safavid philosophers; [144] Qāḍī Saᶜīd Qummī (d. 1103/ 1691) a philosopher of some note who also achieved recognition as a *faqīh*;[145] Sayyid Nīᶜmat Allāh al-Jazāᵓirī (1640-1701), the leading contemporary of Muḥammad Bāqir Majlisī;[146] and Mīrzā Muḥammad ibn ᶜAbd al-Nabī Nīshāpūrī Akhbārī (b. 1178/1765), the last and, perhaps, the most intransigent of the Akhbari controversialists, best known for his involvement with the incident of the "Inspector's head" during the reign of Fatḥ ᶜAlī Shāh (r.1797-1834).[147] A number of other important ulama, if not totally committed Akhbaris, tried to walk a medial path between the Usuli and Akhbari positions. These included Shaykh Yūsuf al-Baḥrānī[148] and Shaykh ᶜAbd Allāh ibn Nūr al-Dīn al-Jazāᵓirī (1701-59).[149]

For a considerable time, the Akhbari teachings enjoyed a respectability and influence later obscured by the victory of the Usulis. There is no space here to enter in into a detailed discussion of what these teachings were: in his *Minyat al-mumārisīn*, Shaykh ᶜAbd Allāh ibn Ṣālih al-Samāhijī al-Baḥrānī (d. 1135/1722-3), an Akhbari *ᶜālim* of some distinction,[150] 1ists forty points of

disagreement between the Akhbari and Usuli schools,[151] a clear indication of how, towards the end of the Safavid era, Astarābādī's comparatively simple objections to the use of *ijtihād* had become elaborated to the point where, instead of two slightly diverging schools of thought co-existing peacefully within the body of Twelver Shiᶜism, the Akhbari and Usuli positions had become mutually antagonistic on a large number of issues, many of them very unimportant, even factitious—a pattern which was to be repeated in the Shaykhi-Bālāsārī dispute.

For our present purposes, it will suffice to note a few more important elements in the Akhbari-Usuli debate which have a bearing on the developments with which we are primarily concerned. The *Minyat al-mumārisīn* mentions the following areas of disagreement of interest to us:

1. the Usulis accept *ijtihād*, but the Akhbaris accept only what is related by the Imāms; 2. the Usulis have four sources of authority, namely the Qurᵓan, Sunna, *ijmāᶜ*, and *ᶜaql* whereas the Akhbaris accept only the first two of these, some even rejecting all but the first; 3. the Usulis divide mankind into two groups, *muqallid* (an imitator) and *mujtahid* (one empowered to use independent reasoning), while the Akhbaris hold that all are *muqallid* to the Imām; 4. the Usulis say that *ijtihād* is obligatory in the period of occultation and that direct derivation is possible only in the Imam's presence, but the Akhbaris make it obligatory to go to him even if through an intermediary; 5. the Usulis only permit *fatwās* through *ijtihād*, but the Akhbaris permit them if there is a (relevant) tradition from an Imām; 6. the Usulis say that a perfect *mujtahid* (*mujtahid muṭlaq*) is learned in all religious ordinances through the strength of his intellect, whereas the Akhbaris maintain that only the Imām is informed of all religious ordinances; 7. the Usulis forbid *taqlīd* to a deceased *marjaᶜ*, while the Akhbaris permit it; 8. the Usulis say that the mujtahid must be obeyed as much as the Imām, whereas the Akhbaris reject this.[152]

It is worth noting at this stage that several of the Akhbari doctrines listed here, particularly those relating to the overriding position of the Imāms, bear a significant resemblance to many of the views of Shaykh Aḥmad al-Ahsaᵓi which formed the basis for the doctrine of the Shaykhi school.

The collapse of Safavid power appears initially to have meant an increase in influence for the Akhbari party, despite the advances made by the Usulis in the late seventeenth century. The reason for this development is probably very simple: the Usuli/*mujtahidī* party had been elaborating its position in the context of a Shiᶜi state in which the role of *ijtihād* vis-à-vis the secular powers was progressing satisfactorily, particularly in the reign of Ḥusayn I (1668-1726). The removal of a Shiᶜi government created a need to revise the role of *ijtihād*. The Akhbari position, however, needed little or no reappraisal. The existence or absence of a Shiᶜi state had small bearing on a system which depended solely on the Qurᵓan, *aḥādīth,* or the Imāms for guidance in all affairs, and which accorded to no contemporary authority the right to apply *ijtihād* in either the

private or the public sphere. For some time after the Safavid collapse, indeed the Akhbaris clearly offered a more viable system in the absence of a centralized government and a state-fostered religious hierarchy. Until the *mujtahids* found a way to reinterpret and reassert their position, the *ulama* at the ᶜ*atabāt* were dominated by the Akhbari school.[153]

The Usuli revival which led to the final reversal in the position of the two schools was the result of a process which, as we have indicated, went on throughout the interregnum. However, the Usulis owed their eventual victory to one man above all others: Muḥammad Bāqir ibn Muḥammad Akmal, Vaḥīd-i Bihbahānī, (1118-1207/ 1706-1792).[154]

Bihbahānī was born in Isfahan, spent his childhood in Bihbahān, and later went to Karbala. He studied at first under his father, Shaykh Muḥammad Akmal,[155] and later with other teachers, including Mullā Ṣadru'd-Dīn Tūnī,[156] whose daughter he married; Shaykh Yūsuf al-Baḥrānī;[157] and Sayyid Muḥammad Burujirdī.[158] Through his *ijāzas* from his father and Mullā Ṣadr al-Dīn Tūnī, Bihbahānī possessed a chain of *riwāya* going back to Muḥammad Bāqir ibn Muḥammad Taqī Majlisī and, like many other ulama of this period, was himself descended from the Majlisī family[159]—both indications of the continuity which existed between the later Safavid divines and those of the post-Safavid era.

Vaḥīd-i Bihbahānī was, in many ways, the outstanding link between the late Safavid and early Qajar periods. Referring to his pupils, Muḥammad ᶜAlī Muᶜallim Ḥabībābādī states that "if we did not possess the link of their transmission (*riwāya*) from him; and, if his chain (*silsila*) of transmission and one or two other chains apart from his did not go back to ᶜAllāma Majlisī and certain others in the twelfth [Isalamic] century, there might have been a break in the chain of transmission of the Shiᶜi ulama during that troubled interval (*fiṭrat*)."[160] Bihbahānī's central position in the transmission of authority is abundantly clear from the *ijāzāt* of many modern ulama such as the late Muḥammad Muhsin Āghā Buzurg al-Ṭihrānī (1875-1970), whose *isnād* is as follows: from ᶜAllāma Mīrzā Ḥusayn Nūrī (1254-1320/1839-1902), from Murtaḍā ibn Muḥammad Amīn Anṣārī (Shaykh Murtaḍā Ansārī (1214-1281/1800-1865), from Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad Mahdī Nirāqī (1771-1828), from Sayyid Mahdī Baḥr al-ᶜUlūm (1155-1022/1742-1797), from Bihbahānī , from his father Shaykh Muḥammad Akmal, from ᶜAllāma Majlisī.[161]

Going in the opposite direction, we note that many of the eminent ulama of the early thirteenth century hijri were numbered among Bihbahānī's pupils. Muḥammad ᶜAlī Muᶜallim Ḥabībābādī lists no fewer than forty ulama of some note who studied under him.[162] Of those mentioned, the following seem to the present writer to be of most importance: Bihbahānī's son-in-law Āqā Sayyid ᶜAlī Ṭabāṭabāᵓī Iṣfahānī;[163] his sons Āqā Muḥammad ᶜAlī Bihbahānī (d. ca. 1207/1792) [164] and Āqā ᶜAbd al-Ḥusayn Bihbahānī ;[165] Āqā Sayyid Muḥammad Mahdī Ṭabāṭabāᵓī Baḥr al-ᶜUlūm;[166] Shaykh Jaᶜfar al-Najāfī;[167] Shaykh Asad

Allah Dizfūlī Kāẓimaynī;[168] Āqā Sayyid Muḥsin al-Aʿrajī al-Kāẓimaynī;[169] Mīrzā Abū 'l-Qāsim Qummī (Mīrzā-yi Qummī);[170] Mīrzā Muḥammad Mahdī Nirāqī;[171] his son, Ḥājj Mullā Aḥmad Nirāqī;[172] Mīrzā Yūsuf Mujtahid Tabrizī;[173] Muḥammad Mahdī Kāẓimī (b. 1901), known as Sayyid Mīrzā Muḥammad Mahdī Iṣfahānī, Shahīd-i Rābiʿ);[174] Hājī Muḥammad Ibrāhīm Kalbāsī;[175] and Sayyid ʿAbd Allāh Shubbar al-Kāẓimī.[176]

Lest a false impression be given, it is necessary to stress that the individuals named here and others of Bihbahānī's students do not form a single group of scholars working under one man. They have in common the fact that they all studied, for varying lengths of time, under the most outstanding figure of the period, some like Mīrzā Muḥammad Mahdī Baḥr al-ʿUlūm and Mullā Abd al-Ṣamad Hamadānī,[177] were associated with Bihbahānī for many years, while others attended his classes for only a short time.

Several of the older students of Bihbahānī (such as Baḥr al-ʿUlūm, Sayyid ʿAlī ibn Muḥammad Ṭabāṭabā'ī ʿAlī Iṣfahānī and Muḥammad Mahdī Nirāqī) had studied under Shaykh Yūsuf al-Baḥrānī, and some (Bahr al-'Ulūm, Sayyid Muḥammad Mahdī Isfahānī, Abū 'l-Qāsim Qummī, and Shaykh Jaʿfar al-Najāfī) under Shaykh Muḥammad Mahdī Fatūnī, and thus themselves had direct links with the late Safavid period.

Younger individuals studied under these men as well as Bihbahānī; thus, for example, Shaykh Asad Allāh Kāẓimaynī was taught by Sayyid ʿAlī ibn Muḥammad Ṭabāṭabāʾī, Shaykh Jaʿfar al-Najāfī, Mīrzā Abū 'l-Qāsim Qummī, Baḥr al-ʿUlūm, and Mīrzā Muḥammad Mahdī Shahristānī,[178] while Ḥājī Muḥammad Ibrāhīm Kalbāsī studied under Baḥr al-ʿUlūm, Shaykh Jaʿfar al-Najāfī, and Sayyid ʿAlī ibn Muḥammad Ṭabāṭabāʾī.

At the same time, it was not uncommon for individuals to teach a particular book or subject to one of their contemporaries or even to individuals older than themselves. Thus, for example, Baḥr al-ʿUlūm included among his pupils Shaykh Jaʿfar al-Najāfī, Sayyid Muḥsin al-Aʿraji, Āqā Sayyid Muḥammad Shubbar, and Shaykh Aḥmad al-Ahsaʾi , while he himself studied *falsafa* under Mīrzā Muḥammad Mahdī Iṣfahānī. Sayyid ʿAlī ibn Muḥammad Ṭabāṭabā'ī was sent to join the classes of pupils much older than himself.[179]

The centralization of Shiʿi scholarship at the *ʿatabāt* resulted in the weaving of a complex web of master-pupil relationships, in which generations and individuals repeatedly overlapped. Where the Safavid and earlier periods had seen a relative scattering of Shiʿi learning through Iran, Arab Iraq, and the Bahrain and Jabal ʿĀmil regions, the second half of the eighteenth century witnessed a high degree of concentration of scholars in a central location to which students headed in growing numbers, and from which some left as well qualified ulama to teach in Iran, India, and elsewhere. Before proceeding to consider the developments which followed him, let us return for a moment to evaluate the impact of Āqā-yi Bihbahānī himself on the Shiʿi world of his period.

The Impact of Āqā-yi Bihbihānī

Bihbahānī's great achievement was twofold. On the one hand, he destroyed the influence of the Akhbaris at the *ᶜatabāt*: "Before him," writes Mullā Muḥammad ibn Sulaymān Tanakābunī, "the Akhbaris were in ascendancy and were extremely numerous, but he uprooted them."[180] His *Risālat al-ijtihād wa 'l-akhbār* remains the most important and influential treatment of the arguments used to invalidate the Akhbari position and to justify that of the Usulis. On the other hand, he redefined the nature of *ijtihād*, established the role of the *mujtahid*, and laid the basis for a system of *fiqh* which has been in use in Twelver Shiᶜism ever since.[181] "He reformed and refashioned the bases of jurisprudence (*uṣūl al-fiqh*), writes Muḥammad ᶜAlī Muᶜallim Ḥabībābādī, "in a fresh and delightful manner and, by reason of his new insights into the areas of debate in the subject, provided a forceful and impressive impetus to its development."[182] As a result of this formidable achievement, Bihbahānī came to be regarded as the *mujaddid* or *murawwij* of the thirteenth century hijri.[183] That this was recognized by his contemporaries is amply testified by Sayyid ᶜAlī ibn Muḥammad Ṭabāṭabāᵓī in his *ijāza* to Shaykh Aḥmad al-Ahsaᵓi , where he refers to Bihbahānī as "the Founder [*muᵓassis*] of the nation of the Prince of mankind at the beginning of the thirteenth century."[184]

The reformation inspired by Bihbahānī was fraught with serious consequences for Twelver Shiᶜism. Before he launched his offensive against the Akhbaris, relations between them and the Usulis had not resulted in serious animosity, much less in outright condemnation of one side by the other for heresy. By pronouncing a sentence of *takfīr* against the Akhbaris, Bihbahānī set a dangerous precedent which was soon to be used against Shaykh Aḥmad al-Ahsaᵓi and his followers. From the time of Bihbahānī, Shiᶜi orthodoxy became more sharply defined than ever before, and the threat of *takfīr* came into use as the ultimate weapon against ideas and individuals likely to challenge the orthodox system or its exponents. It is, above all, a token of the routinization into a church form which was taking place in Shiᶜism at this time.

During the early Safavid period, heterodox and semi-heterodox groups had been to some extent integrated within the rather amorphous form of Shiᶜism promoted by Shah Ismā'īl I (1487-1524).[185] The situation soon changed with regard to the theological extremists (*ghulāt*) and the Ṣūfīs, but, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the existence of philosopher theologians such as Shaykh Bahaᵓi, Mullā Ṣadrā, Mīr Dāmād (Muḥammad Bāqir ibn Muḥammad Dāmād (d. 1040/1631), and Mullā Muḥammad ibn Murtaḍā Muhsin Fayḍ-i Kāshānī (d. 1091/1680) indicated that orthodox Shiᶜism could embrace a wide range of views.[186] The growth in the power of the *mujtahids* in the Safavid epoch culminated in the person of Mullā Muḥammad Bāqir Majlisī, whose

fanaticism was legendary. But even he praised Mullā Muḥammad Amīn Astarābādī in his *Biḥār al-anwār*.[187]

In the period of the interregnum, however, the Usulis grasped an opportunity to develop—given the absence of a central government—the theory of the *mujtahid* as a living source of charismatic authority in the period of *ghayba*. By refusing to recognize this authority, the Akhbaris presented a serious obstacle to the complete domination of the Shiᶜi world and mind by the Usuli school or—more precisely—by its representatives; what had been a relatively polite theological disagreement intensified rapidly into a struggle for mastery over the development of post-Safavid Shiᶜism in its entirety. It was inevitable that the Usulis would win the struggle. The power vacuum created by the Afghan invasion had brought into existence a psychological need among the Shiᶜi population for stability and authority, and this is precisely what the Usuli party offered.

The Usuli victory had many consequences, but one in particular is of considerable importance in helping us understand the reaction of the mass of ulama to Shaykhism and Babism, and, indeed, their very emergence in the first place. This is that *taqlīd* or taking guidance in religious matters, limited by the Akhbaris to the Imāms,[188] was applied by the Usulis to the *mujtahid*. As the *mujtahids* grew in power, so the role of the *marjaᶜ al-taqlīd* increased in importance, not only as a source of charismatic authority, along the lines suggested earlier in this chapter, but increasingly as a source of unity for the Shiᶜi population.

Some modern authorities have adopted a practice of identifying certain leading ulama between al-Kulaynī and the modern period as outstanding *marājiᶜ al-taqlīd*. Thus, for example, ᶜAbd al-Hādī Ḥāᵓirī, citing a monograph by Āqā Muḥammad Vakīlī Qummī, refers to no less than fifty-eight *mujtahids* between al-Kulaynī and Ayatollah Ḥusayn al-Ṭabāṭabāᵓī Burujirdī (1875-1961) as having been "recognized as great *marājiᶜ al-taqlīd*."[189] Ḥusayn Khurāsānī, however, gives the names of only twenty-four *marājiᶜ* from al-Kulaynī to (Ayatollah) Sayyid Āqā Ḥusayn ibn Muḥammad Ṭabāṭabāᵓī Qummī Ḥā'irī (1282-1366/1865-1947).[190] This would, nevertheless, appear to be a highly innovatory practice which obscures the fact that the concept of *marjaᶜiyya* seems only to have been clearly defined from the mid-nineteenth century. There is general agreement, however, that the theory of the role of the *marjaᶜ* as, ideally, a single individual universally recognized, was first embodied in the person of Muḥammad Ḥasan ibn Bāqir Najafī (c. 1202-1266/1788-1850), the author of the celebrated work on *fiqh* known as the *Jawāhir al-kalām*.[191]

Shaykh Muḥammad Ḥasan had studied for the most part under students of Bihbahānī , including men such as Shaykh Jaᶜfar al-Najafī and his son Shaykh Mūsā ibn Jaᶜfar Āl Kāshif al-Ghiṭā (1180–1243/1766-1827), and held an *ijāza* from Shaykh Aḥmad al-Ahsaᵓi . Khwānsārī states that

> none has been seen like him to this day in the elaboration of questions, nor have any beheld his like in the division of unusual elements of the law by means of various proofs; no-one has dealt with the classifications of *fiqh* so fully as he, nor has anyone systematized the rules of *uṣūl* as he has nor has any *mujtahid* before him so consolidated the elements of ratiocination. How might it be otherwise when he has written a book on the *fiqh* of this school from beginning to end, known as the *Jawāhir al-aḥkām* [sic].[192]

He goes on to say that "the leadership of the Shiᶜis, both Arabs and Persians in this age, fell to him."[193] A measure of the influence enjoyed by Shaykh Jaᶜfar al-Najafī is to be found in the fact that, when Sayyid ᶜAlī-Muḥammad Shīrāzī declared himself *bāb* in 1260/ 1844, one of his first acts was to send a letter pressing his claims to the Shaykh,[194] while also dispatching letters to Tehran for Muḥammad Shāh, (r. 1838-1848) and Hājī Mīrzā Āqāsī, the prime minister.[195]

It was, however, a pupil of Shaykh Jaᶜfar, Shaykh Murtaḍā Anṣārī, who carried the role of *mujtahid* to its highest point. Having succeeded al-Najafī at the *ᶜatabāt*,[196] Anṣārī was acknowledged as *marjaᶜ* not only in Iraq and Iran, but in Turkey, Arabia, and India, thus becoming the first to be universally recognized throughout virtually the entire Shiᶜi world.[197] Of particular significance in the present context is the statement of Iᶜtimād al-Salṭana Muḥammad Ḥasan Khān (d. 1896) that Anṣārī was "the first general vicegerent *Nāᵓib al-ᶜĀmm*) of the Imām.[198] The Bab's claim was, in the first instance, held by some to be that of 'special vicegerent' (*Nā'ib al-Khāṣṣ*).[199]

The sense of unity thus achieved was ruptured for a short time by various claims to leadership on the death of Anṣārī, but was continued in the end by Mīrzā Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥasan ibn Maḥmūd Shīrāzī (1230-1312/ 1815-1895), the Mīrzā-yi Shīrāzī who issued a *fatwā* against the Tobacco Regie in 1892.[200] In many respects, the importance of Mīrzā-yi Shīrāzī exceeded that of Anṣārī, to whose position he had succeeded. He is described by his pupil Ḥasan ibn Hādī Ṣadr (1856-1935) in his *Takmilat Amal al-āmil* as "the leader of Islam, the *nāᵓib* of the Imām, the renewer [*mujaddid*] of the divine laws [at the beginning of the fourteenth century hijri]. The leadership of the Jaᶜfari sect through the world was centered in [him] towards the end of his life."[201] Iᶜtimād al-Salṭana, writing in Shīrāzī's lifetime, states that "today he is the most learned of the *mujtahids* in the eyes of the people of discernment."[202]

The lack of any real, hierarchically-organized ecclesiastical system meant that the situation after Shīrāzī became somewhat unclear, with little agreement as to which precise individuals might be regarded as worthy of holding the position of sole *marjaᶜ*. Hairi states that 'if at a given time there existed several equally qualified *mujtahids*, some might be able to gain recognition as the sole *marjaᶜ*,[203] and gives the example of Shaykh Muḥammad Ḥusayn ibn ᶜAbd al-Raḥīm Nāᵓīnī Najafī (1277-1355/1860-1936), Ayatollah ᶜAbd al-Karīm ibn

Muḥammad Jaᶜfar Ḥā'irī-Yazdī (1276-1355/1859-1937), and Abu 'l-Ḥasan Mūsawī al-Isbahānī (known as Sayyid Abu 'l-Ḥasan Iṣfahānī, 1284-1365/1867-1946), in the period before the death of the first two. Nevertheless, a succession of individual scholars did appear who fostered the role of *marjaᶜ* on an absolute or partial basis and kept alive the possibility of a source of charismatic authority in the Shiᶜi world.[204] Ayatollah Burūjirdī, who died in 1961, was particularly successful in establishing his position as sole *marjaᶜ*, although even here there were those who tended to see him as head of the body of ulama in an organizational rather than ideal charismatic sense.[205] During this period, the title *ayatollah* came to be used widely of *mujtahids* who had acquired the standing of *marjaᶜ*, and, in more recent times, there has been a tendency to institutionalize the title, particularly in the form "*Āyat Allāh al-ᶜUẓmā*", used of the most outstanding *mujtahid*. Thus, Burūjirdī was recognized as Āyat Allāh al-ᶜUẓmā in his lifetime,[206] as was Ayatollah Khomeini after the revolution. Even Sunnis have spoken of Khomeini as the *mujaddid* of the fifteenth Islamic century. This is all the more intriguing when we consider that he achieved his present position more by virtue of his political success and charismatic appeal than by any outstanding abilities as an *ᶜālim*—in some ways a reversal of the trend towards ecclesiastical routinization by the irruption of latent charisma.

The implications of this development as a means of extending or projecting the charisma of the Imām into individual figures of supreme or near supreme authority are clear. The *marjaᶜ* or Ayatollah is the living deputy of the Imām in an active and distinct sense. Thus, Mahmoud Shehabi writes that

> The order was received that during the long absence the ignorant are to be guided by the orders and the religious ideas of the leaders—called public deputies (i.e. *nāᵓib-i ᶜamm*), or deputies not specifically appointed (i.e. as opposed to the *nāᵓib-i khāṣṣ*)—who know jurisprudence, can protect their religion, and are thus able to save the people from sins, corruption, and earthly desires. Such public deputies who have a thorough knowledge from the proper sources are, during the long absence, like an Imam and following them is comparable to following an Imam. Since Shī'a depends [sic] upon the one who is the most learned and accepts him as the public deputy, in every epoch the person who is the most learned and pious is regarded as the public deputy and the people follow his ideas and his decisions concerning religious affairs.[207]

This link with the Imām is vividly illustrated by Ḥājī Mīrzā Yaḥyā Dawlatābādī, when he points out that one of the factors inducing Mīrzā yi Shīrāzī to live in Samarra was the existence there of the cellar in which the twelfth Imām was said to have entered occultation, a fact which increased the stature of the *nāᵓib* of the Imām living there.[208] According to Leonard Binder, "Burujirdī's supporters

came close to representing him as the sole spokesman for the Hidden Imām."[209] Some of Khomeini's followers have, in fact, gone as far as to speak of him openly and in print as the *nāʾib* of the Imām[210] while his arrival in Iran in the early days of the revolution had what can only be described as messianic overtones. The significance of the role of the *Rukn-i Rābiᶜ* in Shaykhism, or of the *bāb* in early Babism becomes much clearer in the context of a growing demand for a single source of charismatic authority in Shiᶜism from the time of Bihbahānī onwards. In the case of Babism, however, we shall see that the charisma was original rather than latent.

In this regard, it is important to understand that the emergence of Shaykh Muḥammad Ḥasan Najafi as supreme *marjaᶜ al-taqlīd* was itself the result of a development in which several individuals of importance figured. We have indicated above how many of the leading ulama of the early nineteenth century studied under Bihbahānī and one another, creating a complex network of masters and pupils. Out of this group there emerged a number of ulama who were, in a sense, prototypes of Shaykh Muḥammad Ḥasan Najafi and his successors, on the one hand, and of the wealthy, influential ulama of the later Qajar period (such as Mullā ᶜAlī Kanī, Shaykh Muḥammad Taqī Iṣfahānī Āqā Najafī (d. 1914), and Hājī Āqā Muḥsin ᶜIrāqī) on the other.

Sayyid Muḥammad Mahdī Ṭabāṭabāʾī Baḥr al-ᶜUlūm was widely regarded in Bihbahānī's lifetime as possessing influence at the ᶜ*atabāt* second only to that of the latter, and was certainly the leading *ᶜālim* in the brief period between Bihbahānī's death and his own. This 'Ocean of the Sciences' was born in 1155/1742 in Karbala, where he studied initially under his father, Sayyid Murtaḍā Baḥr al-ᶜUlūm, later receiving instruction from Shaykh Yūsuf al-Baḥrānī (d. 1772?). He then went to Najaf, where, he studied under Shaykh Muḥammad Mahdī Fatūnī, Shaykh Muḥammad Taqī Darūqī al-Najafi, and several other ulama. Following this, he returned to Karbala to study under Bihbahānī . Among his pupils were Shaykh Jaᶜfar al-Najafī, Sayyid Jawād al-Āmilī, Mullā Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad Mahdī Narāqī Kāshānī (d. 1245/ 1829), Hājī Muḥammad Ibrāhīm Kalbāsī, Shaykh ᶜAbd ᶜAlī ibn Muḥammad al-Baḥrānī, and Shaykh Aḥmad al-Ahsaʾi , to whom he gave an *ijāza.* His writings are comparatively few, including the *Hāshiyyat al-wāfiyya* on *uṣūl*, the *Durrat al-manẓūma* on *fiqh*, and the *Fawāʾid al-Uṣūliyya*.[211]

Shaykh Jaᶜfar al-Najafī, whose polemics against Mīrzā Muḥammad Akhbārī in the time of Fatḥ ᶜAlī Shāh put a seal on Bihbahānī's victory over the Akhbari movement, exercised great influence, not only at the ᶜ*atabāt* but in Iran itself, where he commanded the obedience of the Shah. According to Tanakābunī, Shaykh Jaᶜfar al-Najafī,

> permitted Fatḥ ᶜAlī Shāh to ascend the throne (*idhn dar salṭanat dād*), and appointed him as his deputy (*nāʾib*), but on certain conditions: that he appoint a *muʾadhdhin* to each of the regiments

> of the army and an *Imām Jumᶜa* for the army as a whole, who should deliver a sermon once a week and give instructions on [religious] questions.[212]

Despite his well-known love for food and sex, he had a reputation as a sternly religious man, attending rigorously to his devotions, and it was his example which inspired Mullā Muḥammad Taqī Baraghānī Qazvīnī (d. 1847) to apply himself to his prayers during the night, even in winter.[213] Apart from Bihbahānī, Shaykh Jaᶜfar studied under Baḥr al-ᶜUlūm, Shaykh Muḥammad Mahdī Fatūnī, and Shaykh Muḥammad Taqī Darūqī al-Najafī (themselves teachers of Baḥr al-ᶜUlūm, as noted earlier). An Arab, whose Persian was not very fluent, his influence in Iran—where he traveled almost every year—prefigures in many respects that exercised by Shaykh Aḥmad al-Ahsaᵓi, who was, in fact, one of his pupils. In particular, his influence in Isfahan and Qazvīn shows a striking resemblance to that achieved a short time later by al-Ahsaᵓi in those same places, and, with the notable exception of Muḥammad Taqī Baraghānī, exercised over many of the same people. We have referred earlier to the importance of Shaykh Jaᶜfar's work on *fiqh*, the *Kashf al-ghiṭāᵓ*, as an example of the conjunction of charismatic and legal authority in the work of certain individual scholars. He was, in the words of Khwānsārī, "obeyed by both Arabs and Persians,"[214] and became, as he himself writes, "the Shaykh of all the Shaykhs of the Muslims."[215] Āghā Buzurg al-Ṭihrānī describes him as "the favored leader of the Shiᶜis, and their greatest *marjaᶜ* in his day."[216] Some even regarded him as the *nāᵓib* of the Imām,[217] a point of some significance in the present context.

Among the most important contemporaries of al-Najafī, we may note Hājī Mīrzā Abu 'l-Qāsim Qummī (1734?-1816) (Mīrzā-yi Qummī) and Sayyid ᶜAlī ibn Muḥammad Ṭabāṭabāᵓī. Qummī studied under Bihbahānī, Shaftī, Fatūnī, and others, and eventually came to live and teach in Qum, where he did much to raise the standard of religious studies. His important work on *fiqh*, *al-Qawanin al-muhkama*, is one of the most important contributions to the study of *uṣūl*, to the extent that Khwānsārī claims "it has abrogated all the books of *uṣūl*"[218]—yet another example of the way in which Shiᶜi *fiqh* was perceived as developing in this period.

Another Ṭabāṭabāᵓī, Sayyid ᶜAlī ibn Muḥammad (1748-1815)[219] is the author of another famous work on *fiqh*, the *Riyāḍ al-masāᵓil fī bayān al-aḥkām bi 'l-dalā'il*, noted for its contribution to *furūᶜ*. Born in Kāẓimiyya, he was descended from Mullā Muḥammad Taqī Majlisī, the father of Mullā Muḥammad Bāqir, while his own father had married a sister of Āqā Bihbahānī; he himself later married one of Bihbahānī's daughters. His early studies were carried out under the direction of Bihbahānī's eldest son, Āqā Muḥammad ᶜAlī Bihbahānī , but he later studied under the *murawwij* himself. He too taught a number of important ulama, including Shaykh Aḥmad al-Ahsaᵓi , Hājī Muḥammad Ibrāhīm

Kalbāsī, Hājī Sayyid Muḥammad Bāqir Shaftī, Muḥammad Taqī Baraghānī and his brother, Hājī Mullā Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ Baraghānī (d. ca. 1853), (the father of the Babi leader Qurrat al-ᶜAyn (1817-1852), about whom much will be said in succeeding pages.

Sayyid ᶜAlī ibn Muḥammad provides us with an excellent example of an increasingly common phenomenon in the period under review: the *ᶜālim* with close links not only by means of *ijāza* but also through physical descent and marriage with other ulama of significance. From the late Safavid period on, we can observe how religious authority passed not only from teacher to pupil but from father to son as well; descendants of Muḥammad Taqī Majlisī and Muḥammad Bāqir Majlisī, of Nīᶜmat Allāh ibn ᶜAbd Allāh al-Jazāᵓirī, Āqā Bihbahānī, Baḥr al-ᶜUlūm, Shaykh Ja'far al-Najafī, and Sayyid ᶜAlī ibn Muḥammad Ṭabātabāᵓī himself came to occupy positions of importance in the religious hierarchy.

Not only was the power of the individual mujtahids increasing, but the influence of certain clerical families was growing. Intermarriage between the members of these families strengthened this power to a degree that made entry into the highest echelons of the ulama class increasingly difficult for someone outside the circles of this power structure (although, as Bill has noted, the religious classes have provided a path into the middle sector of society for young men of humble birth up to the modern period).[220] By way of contrast, as we shall note, Shaykh Aḥmad al-Ahsaᵓi was neither descended from a clerical family nor related to one by marriage. None of his descendants aspired to rank within the religious hierarchy, although many of his students rose to eminence.

Sayyid Kāẓim Rashti, similarly, came from an important family of *sayyids* who had no connection with the ulama, and, although some of them were scholars, none of his descendants (with the limited exception of his son Sayyid Aḥmad) held a notable position within the Shiᶜi hierarchy. Ḥājī Muḥammad Karīm Khān Kirmānī, Rashti's successor as head of the Shaykhi school, was the only *ᶜālim* in a family closely related to the ruling Qajar house, but it is significant to note that he succeeded in establishing his own small dynasty of scholars in Kirman, as did his rival, Mullā Muḥammad Māmaqānī Ḥujjat al-Islām (d. 1269/1852), in Tabriz. Although Sayyid ᶜAlī-Muḥammad-i-Shīrāzī was related through his father to Mīrzā-yi Shīrāzī and Sayyid Jawād Shīrāzī (an important Imām Jumᶜa of Kirman), his family was primarily composed of wholesale merchants (*tujjār*). Much the same is true of several (but by no means all) of the Bab's disciples, including Mullā Muḥammad Ḥusayn Bushrūᵓī (1814?-1849) and Mullā Muḥammad ᶜAlī Bārfurūshī (d. 1849).

A student of Shaykh Jaᶜfar al-Najafī, Bihbahānī , Baḥr al-ᶜUlūm, Sayyid ᶜAlī ibn Muḥammad Ṭabāṭabā'ī, and Shaykh Aḥmad al-Ahsaᵓi, Ḥājī Muḥammad Ibrāhīm ibn Muḥammad Ḥasan Kalbāsī (1766-1845) seems to have been one of the earliest *mujtahids* to achieve recognition as a *marjaᶜ* beyond a restricted area, being acknowledged as such for the whole of Iran, Arabia, and

India[221]—although his recognition cannot be said to have been universal in those regions. Khwānsārī describes him as "the source of sciences, wisdom, and writings, the center of the circle of noble scholars, the axis around which the *sharīᶜa* revolved in this age, and the support of the Shiᶜa and their distinguished and mighty shaykh."[222] Descendants of Kalbāsī are numbered among the leading ulama of the later period in Isfahan and Iraq. His contemporary and associate in Isfahan, Mullā Muḥammad Bāqir Shaftī (Rashti), Ḥujjāt al-Islām (1761–l844) had studied under Bihbahānī, Sayyid ᶜAlī ibn Muḥammad Ṭabāṭabā'ī Bahr al-'Ulūm, Shaykh Jaᶜfar al-Najafī, Sayyid Muḥsin al-Aᶜraji, and Abu 'l-Qāsim Qummī. He is described by Algar as "the first example of the wealthy, assertive mujtahid, whose power—judicial, economic, and political—exceeds that of the secular government, which functions, indeed, only with his consent and subject to his ultimate control."[223] Shaftī's influence did not end, however, in the financial or political spheres; he acquired a considerable reputation as a scholar, attracting pupils from several countries,[224] and became, in the words of an English observer, "renowned for his sanctity from Kerbelah to the Ganges, and considered the most shining luminary of the Sheeah faith."[225] The importance of his position towards the time of his death is indicated by the fact that Sayyid Kāẓim Rashti singled him out as the one individual whose approval of the Shaykhi position would secure for it considerable protection from the attacks of other ulama, and sought to influence him by sending Mullā Muḥammad Ḥusayn Bushrūᵓī to Isfahan, in order to win his allegiance.[226]

Had it not been for the pronouncement against him of *takfīr* in about 1822, Shaykh Aḥmad al-Ahsaᵓi might well have been the first Shiᶜi *ālim* to achieve universal *marjaᶜīyya*. Despite the *takfīr* and the continuing prejudice against Shaykhism in orthodox circles, later writers have almost universally accorded him the highest praise, and there is no doubt that, in his own lifetime he was one of the most powerful and respected ulama living in Iran. Although strongly favored by Fatḥ ᶜAlī Shāh, and, from 1814, lavishly patronized by Muḥammad ᶜAlī Mīrzā in Kirmanshah, he succeeded in avoiding any imputation of having sold out to the secular powers, and was regarded as both pious and brilliant. No study of the development of charismatic authority in Shiᶜism during this period would be complete without detailed reference to al-Ahsaᵓi, not least because of the manner in which the Shaykhi school after him and, from 1844, the Babi movement interpreted and expressed the nature and function of such authority and of the 'gnostic motif'. Having provided some idea of the intellectual milieu of Twelver Shiᶜism at the time of his arrival in Iraq from Arabia, let us now discuss at greater length the career of al-Ahsaᵓi himself.

Chapter TWO

SHAYKH AḤMAD AL-AHSAʾI

Birth, Childhood, and Youth

Viewed in the light of his later fame as one of the leading Shiᶜi ulama of his day, the circumstances of al-Ahsaʾi's birth were most inauspicious. The individuality of his contribution to Shiᶜi thought in the early years of the nineteenth century may, in some ways, be attributed to his formative years. Unfortunately, our sources reveal comparatively little about this period, and we must depend on circumstantial evidence in attempting to trace the main influences on his thought and outlook, cast as they are in an original and at times eccentric form.

According to his own testimony, al-Ahsaʾi was born in the month of Rajab 1166/May 1753.[227] His birthplace was a small Shiᶜi village called al-Maṭayrafī, situated in the oasis of al-Aḥsāʾ (or al-Ḥasāʾ) near the east coast of the Arabian Peninsula,[228] where his family had lived for several generations. The first of his ancestors to settle there had been Shaykh Dāghir, his great-great-great-grandfather, who had become estranged from his father Ramaḍān and gone to live in the village. The dispute was almost certainly about religion: Dāghir was the first of al-Ahsaʾi's ancestors to embrace Shiᶜism, at about the time local tradition speaks of the conversion of several Arab tribes, about four hundred years ago.[229] Before that, the Shaykh's forebears had been nomadic Sunnis.[230] None of our sources provides details as to the occupation of Shaykh Aḥmad's father or other relatives, but it is reasonable to assume that none of them were ulama. It is possible, however, that his family was of some influence in the area, since they belonged to the dominant Mahāshir clan, of the ruling Banū Khālid.[231]

Despite the religious diversity of al-Aḥsāʾ, which, in the eighteenth century, included Jews and Sabaeans as well as Shiᶜis and Sunnis,[232] the principal religious orientation of the region was Shiᶜi. When the Safavid dynasty in Iran found itself compelled to look abroad for Shiᶜi scholars to instruct the Iranian population in Twelver doctrine, they went to Jabal ᶜĀmil in Lebanon and to Bahrain.[233] Men such as Sayyid Zayn al-Dīn ᶜAlī ibn Sulaymān al-Baḥrānī Umm al-Ḥadīth (d. 1064/ 1653),[234] Hāshim ibn Sulaymān al-Baḥrānī (d. 1109/1695), the author of the *Ghāyat al-marām*,[235] Shaykh Sulaymān ibn ᶜAbd Allāh al-Muḥaqqiq al-Baḥrānī (d. 1120/1708-9),[236] and Shaykh Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad al-Khaṭṭī al-Baḥrānī (d. 1120/ 1708-9)[237] are among the numerous ulama from Bahrain who achieved distinction in orthodox Shiᶜi circles in the Safavid period.

Side by side with the development of Shiᶜi orthodoxy in the region, however, there appears to have been a recurrent tendency to favour more

heterodox systems. One of the most eminent Ishrāqī thinkers, Muḥammad ibn ᶜAlī Ibn Abī Jumhūr al-Ahsaᵓi (d. ca. 1473), was a native of the region. Mullā Muḥammad ibn Sulaymān Tanakābunī has claimed that Shaykh Aḥmad obtained the library of Ibn Abī Jumhūr and that the books in it proved a major influence on his mind as a young man.[238] Whether or not this is true—and it seems highly unlikely—al-Ahsaᵓi certainly acquired considerable familiarity with Ishrāqī literature at some point.

Of possibly greater significance in the Shaykh's development may have been residual Qarmaṭī influence in the area. As is well known, the Qarmaṭī sect founded a state in al-Aḥsāᵓ under Abū Saᶜīd al-Jannābī (d. 300/ 913) in 899. Although the military power of the Qarāmaṭī declined by the eleventh century, the state in al-Ahsaᵓi remained in existence, its internal affairs being run by a representative council of *sādāt* which "seems to have maintained local autonomy down to the xviiith century."[239] There is also evidence of fresh Qarmaṭī influence from Yemen in eighteenth century Aḥsāᵓ.

In the 1760s, one of the most important of the Ismaili (Sulaymani-Mustaᶜli) tribes in Yemen, the Banū Yām, came under the control of the Makramī family, by whom it has been ruled down to the present day.[240] The first Makramī *sheikh*—whose name appears to have been Ḥasan ibn Hibbat Allāh[241]—was made governor of Najrān by the Imām of Saana, but soon achieved independence, extending his influence by 1763 over other Ismaili tribes in Saᶜfān, Ḥarāz, Manākha, and Ṭayba.[242] In 1764, several members of the Banū ᶜAjmān who had been defeated by the Wahhabis at Hadba Qidhla, fled to Najrān and persuaded the tribes there to join in a counter-attack on the Wahhabis. Ḥasan ibn Hibbat Allāh led his forces to Wadī Ḥanīfa and defeated a Wahhabi force under ᶜAbd al-ᶜAzīz (1766-1803).[243] Although Ḥasan eventually left after negotiations, it seems that, at this time, he entered al-Aḥsāᵓ for a period.[244] Louis Massignon (1883-1962) maintains that the Makramīs attempted to revive Qarmatism while in al-Aḥsāᵓ, and that Qarāmaṭī still exist there in the form of what he calls "neo-Ismailis".[245]

The possibility of an Ismaili revival in the region at that time is highly suggestive, and may not impossibly lead to fresh conclusions as to the sources of much of al-Ahsaᵓi's thought. Certain intriguing parallels exist between elements in his later teaching and Qarmaṭī/Ismaili doctrine. The Qarmaṭī view that the Imamate is not a hereditary function but one which may be conferred through a form of divine illumination, making the new Imām the "substituted" son of his predecessor, may well have influenced the Shaykhi theory of succession (up to Muḥammad Khān Kirmānī (d. 1906)) and even played a part in the transition from Shaykhism to Babism.

The concept of the world as a series of phenomena being repeated in cycles, like a drama replaying itself, which is found in Qarmaṭī and Ḥurūfī doctrine, offers a parallel to the Babi view of successive *ẓuhūrāt*, in which the chief actors of the divine drama return to the stage in each epoch, while the use

of *jafr* equivalents for the letters of the alphabet is a recurring feature of Qarmaṭī, mainline Ismaili, Ḥurūfī, and Babi thought. Significant also is the appearance in both Shaykhi and Babi literature of technical terms common to extreme Shiᶜi sects like the Qarmatiyya, and it is not impossible that much of the curious Arabic terminology adopted by Shaykh Aḥmad had such an origin. We shall observe in our final chapters a number of further points of resemblance between Shaykhi/Babi and Ismaili doctrine.

Until further evidence becomes available, however, it would be unwise to fall back too readily on Qarmaṭī/Ismaili influence in the direct sense as an explanation for the development of al-Ahsaᵓi's thought along lines somewhat different to those of the majority of Twelver Shiᶜi ulama at the shrine cities or in Iran during this period. It is, nevertheless, clear that, in respect of orthodox Shiᶜism, al-Aḥsāᵓ in the eighteenth century was not a place where a young man of scholarly bent could readily find instruction beyond the rudimentary level. There were, of course, ulama in the region. Shaykh ᶜAbd Allāh al-Ahsaᵓi speaks of "those learned in externals *(ulamā-yi ẓāhirī)* in al-Aḥsāᵓ"at the time of Shaykh Aḥmad's first departure for Iraq.[246] The same source indicates that many of the ulama in the area were Sunnis, most of whom were also Sufis.[247] Several Shiᶜi ulama of the period are referred to by Shaykh Yūsuf al-Baḥrānī in his *Luᵓluᵓatay al-Baḥrayn*, composed in 1182/1768. Many of Shaykh Aḥmad's own letters are addressed to ulama in al-Aḥsāᵓ and al-Qatif, particularly the latter region. As we shall see later, two of al-Ahsaᵓi's *ijāzāt* were obtained from ulama resident in Bahrain, while Rashti speaks of scholars there and in al-Qatif and al-Aḥsāᵓ who were among the admirers of Shaykh Aḥmad.[248] Much of Rashti's own correspondence, like that of al-Ahsaᵓi, was in reply to questions from clerics in that region, but it was not there that the more capable and influential scholars resided.

With the movement of large numbers of Iranian ulama *to* the ᶜ*atabāt* following the Afghan invasion, and the subsequent revival of Shiᶜi learning at the holy cities in the latter half of the eighteenth century, the better scholars had largely been drawn away from peripheral centres such as Bahrain. Although Wahhabis did not conquer al-Aḥsāᵓ until the 1790s, their progress elsewhere in the Arabian Peninsula and occasional clashes with the Banū Khālid appear to have caused lively distress to the Shiᶜi ulama in the Bahrain region. Sayyid Muḥammad Hāshimī Kirmānī has suggested that Shaykh Aḥmad left al-Aḥsāᵓ in the wake of a general exodus of Arab ulama (presumably Shiᶜi) who went to Iran to escape the Wahhabis.[249] Many of these clerics settled in Fārs and Kirman, and were later among the admirers of al-Ahsaᵓi in those parts. This exodus of Shiᶜi ulama during the period of the Shaykh's early life may have been a factor in his own decision to leave his home for a brief time when he was twenty.

There are indications that Aḥsāᵓ in that period was regarded as little more than a provincial backwater, lacking proper facilities for anything but the most

elementary intellectual pursuits. Baḥr al-ᶜUlūm expressed surprise that someone as learned as Shaykh Aḥmad should be a native of "a region which is empty of knowledge and wisdom, and whose inhabitants are desert-dwellers and country-folk, the furthest extent of whose learning consists in how to perform the daily prayers."[250] Al-Ahsaᵓi himself often remarked that the people of his village were worldly and given to what he regarded as idle pleasures, that they knew nothing of the laws of Islam, and that he could find no-one there to teach him beyond the elementary stages.[251]

Outside the main towns of al-Hufūf and al-Mubarraz education in al-Aḥsāᵓ was, it appears, largely confined to instruction by individual *sheikhs* or *muᶜallims*, few of whom can have been well-educated themselves. Young Aḥmad, having completed the traditional "reading" of the Qurᵓan by the age of five,[252] was not, it seems, intended for tuition beyond this stage. Fortunately, a young cousin was receiving training in grammar and other elementary subjects at a nearby village, and Aḥmad was able to persuade his father to let him join him there.[253] Between this time and the period of his early studies at the *ᶜatabāt* when he was twenty, we possess no further information as to his education.

Somewhat problematic is the statement made in a number of sources, that al-Ahsaᵓi was for a time a *murīd* of Sayyid Quṭb al-Dīn Muḥammad Nayrīzī (d. 1173/1760), the thirty-second *quṭb* of the Dhahabī Sufi order, one of the very few Shiᶜi *ṭarīqas* in existence.[254] Mīrzā Shafīᶜ Thiqat al-Islām Tabrizī, a Shaykhi who had studied under al-Ahsaᵓi, refers to this in his *Mirᵓāt al-kutub*. He quotes the *Qawā'im al-anwār*, a work by Mīrzā Abu 'l-Qāsim Shīrāzī (d. 1286/A.D 1869) the fourth successor to Sayyid Quṭb al-Dīn as head of the Dhahabīs.[255] Here, Mīrzā Abu 'l-Qāsim states that Quṭb al-Dīn lived for a time in Najaf, where he taught Ibn al-ᶜArabī's *al-Futūḥāt al-Makkiyya*. Among those who studied under him, it is claimed, were Sayyid Muḥammad Mahdī Murtaḍā Ṭabāṭabā'ī Baḥr al-ᶜUlūm, Shaykh Jaᶜfar al-Najafī, and Mullā Miḥrāb Jīlānī.[256] He goes on to say that, when Quṭb al-Dīn was in al-Aḥsāᵓ, Shaykh Aḥmad studied under him.

Thiqat al-Islām then quotes from the *Risāla tāmm al-ḥikma* of Abu 'l-Qāsim's son, Sayyid Muḥammad Majd al-Ashrāf.[257] According to this source, Quṭb al-Dīn sent Mullā Mihrāb Gīlānī to Isfahan and Persian Iraq, instructed Baḥr al-ᶜUlūm and Shaykh Jaᶜfar to remain at the *ᶜatabāt,* and sent al-Ahsaᵓi to Iran.[258] Majd al-Ashrāf is quoted to the same effect by Muḥammad Mas'ūm Shīrāzī Maᶜṣūm ᶜAlī Shāh (b. 1853) in his *Ṭarāᵓiq al-ḥaqāᵓiq*; here it is added that Quṭb al-Dīn also sent Āqā Muḥammad Hāshim Shīrāzī (d. 1199/1785) to Fārs.[259] Maᶜṣūm ᶜAlī Shāh also refers to Quṭb al-Dīn as having taught Shaykh Aḥmad while in al-Aḥsāᵓ.[260]

Convincing as all this may appear, it does not sustain critical attention. Sayyid Quṭb al-Dīn was a contemporary of the last Safavid monarch, Ḥusayn I (1668-1726), and had studied under Shaykh ᶜAlī Naqī Istihbanātī.[261] He died in 1173/1759, when al-Ahsaᵓi was only about seven years old.[262] With the

exception of Āqā Muḥammad Hāshim Shīrāzī, there seems to be no independent evidence linking any of the persons mentioned above with Sayyid Quṭb al-Dīn or, indeed, with Sufism at all. The only conclusion to be drawn is that the account of Quṭb al-Dīn's dealings with men such as Baḥr al-ᶜUlūm, al-Najafī, and al-Ahsaᵓi—three of the most influential ulama of their day—was for no other reason than to gain a certain respectability for Sufism at a time when orthodox Shiᶜi attacks on some Ṣūfī orders had become extremely fierce, following a Niᶜmatullāhī revival in the latter half of the eighteenth century.[263]

Shaykhi sources, including two autobiographical *risālas* by al-Ahsaᵓi himself, lay stress on a number of visionary experiences as central to his development during this early period. Showing a marked predilection for seclusion and introspection—a feature also characteristic of the childhoods of Sayyid Kāẓim Rashti and Sayyid ᶜAlī Muḥammad Shīrāzī[264]—al-Ahsaᵓi was given to morbid reflection on the transience of the world.[265] He was really one of Lawrence's Arabs, ascetic and craving the solitary wastes. An impressionable mind joined with favourable circumstances and a lack of facilities for formal intellectual training urged him towards a life of reflection and self-abnegation,[266] culminating, at an unspecified point, in a series of dreams or visions.

These visions were to have a lasting effect on the mind of the young Shaykh, and came to play a central role in his intellectual and spiritual development. Their significance, both in terms of the formation of his thought and the light in which he was regarded by his contemporaries and by later Shaykhis, is very great. They are particularly important in terms of the charismatic relationship between the Shaykh and the Imāms on the one hand, and between him and his own followers on the other. In general, these visions seem to have been experienced by him in sleep and to have taken the form, typical to Shiᶜite piety, of meetings with various Imāms and, on a number of occasions, the Prophet.

The first of these experiences was a dream of a young man, seemingly aged about twenty-five and carrying a book, who came to sit near the Shaykh. He turned to him, read a verse of the Qurᵓan, and proceeded to comment on it.[267] Shaykh Aḥmad was so impressed by the words he heard from this young man that he resolved to abandon the study of grammar and other exoteric subjects. In his account of this incident, he states that he had met many shaykhs yet never heard any speak words such as those in the dream: in itself an indication that he had, by the time of this initial visionary experience, been studying for a while.

A succession of such visions followed, in the course of which the Shaykh believed that he met various Imāms and the Prophet and was taught verses by the Imām Ḥasan ibn ᶜAlī, the purpose of which was to enable him to call on the Imāms whenever he required an answer to any problem—a significant factor in his development as a source of charismatic authority.[268] Such visions, he writes, were experienced by him most days and nights, which may indicate some level of mental imbalance.[269] On two occasions, once with the Imām Ḥasan and once

with Muḥammad, he claimed to have undergone what appears to have been a form of initiatory experience, involving the drinking of saliva from the mouth of the Imām or Prophet.[270] Sayyid Kāẓim Rashti speaks of the initiatory meeting with lmam Ḥasan as the first of the Shaykh's visions,[271] followed by a two-year period during which he did not associate with people and scarcely ate or drank, until he was near death. At this point, the meeting with Muḥammad took place, and the effect of imbibing the saliva of the Prophet was to quiet his excessive religious ardour.[272]

Leaving aside the question of their authenticity, there is no doubt that the subjective impact of these visions on the Shaykh was tremendous. The intensity of his reaction can well be gauged by the behaviour just referred to. He now believed himself to be in direct contact with the Prophet and the Imāms and to have them as his source of guidance on all subjects. In a significant vision, presumably towards the end of this period, he believed himself to have encountered the tenth Imām, ᶜAlī al-Hādī. Having complained to the Imām about the condition of the people among whom he lived, he was instructed to leave them and busy himself with his own affairs. The Imām is then recorded as giving him several sheets of paper, saying 'this is the *ijāza* from us twelve [i.e., the twelve Imāms]'. When al-Ahsaᵓi looked at these papers, he saw that each page contained an *ijāza* from one of the twelve Imāms.[273]

It is this belief that his knowledge was directly granted him by the Prophet and the Imāms (the latter in particular) that distinguishes Shaykh Aḥmad from contemporary religious leaders. Speaking of al-Ahsaᵓi's knowledge of various sciences, Rashti states that 'these sciences came to that distinguished one in true and veracious dreams from the Imāms of guidance."[274] The role of the Imāms as spiritual guides has always been emphasized in Shiᶜism, but al-Ahsaᵓi seems to have taken this concept to an extreme degree. In his *Sharḥ al-fawāᵓid*, written in 1233/1818, some eight years before his death, he writes:

> The ulama derive their knowledge (*taḥqīqāt ᶜulūmihim*) one from the other, but I have never followed in their way. I have derived what I know from the Imāms of guidance, and error cannot find its way into my words, since all that I confirm in my books is from them and they are preserved (*maᶜṣūm*) from sin and ignorance and error. Whosoever derives [his knowledge] from them shall not err, inasmuch as he is following them.[275]

Elsewhere, he writes:

> When anything was hidden from me, I would see its explanation, even if only in summary. And whenever any explanation was given to me in sleep (*al-ṭayf*), after I awoke the question would appear clear to me along with the proofs related to it, in such a way that

> nothing concerning it would be hidden from me. Even if all men were to gather together, they would be unable to achieve anything resembling that; but I would be cognizant of all the proofs of the matter [in question]. And, if a thousand criticisms were levelled against me, the defence against them and the answers would be shown to me without any effort on my part. Moreover, I found that all traditions were in agreement with what I had seen in sleep, for what I saw in my dreams I saw directly, and no error could enter into it… I say nothing unless by virtue of a proof which is derived from them [the Imāms].[276]

In one place, he describes these dreams as *ilhām*, a species of reveleation generally generally eserved for the Imāms themselves, although inferior to the *waḥy* given to prophets.[277] More usually, he speaks of *kashf* or *mukāshifa*, the 'unveilling' of inner meanings by means of these visions.[278] This last concept was given sufficient prominence to give rise to the use of the term *kashfīyya* as a name for the school which grew up around him. Rashti, referring to the use of this term, gives the concept of *kashf* a somewhat general application, but there seems little doubt that the name was appllied to the school by reason of a more technical application of the word.[279] It is worth recalling, in this context, the experience of Faḍl Allāh Astarābādī (740-804/1339-1401) the founder of the Ḥurūfī sect, who, at the age of forty, heard a disembodied voice announcing that "others attain faith by imitation and learning, whereas he attains it by an inner and clear revelation (*kashf wa ʿiyān*)."[280]

It would, however, be misleading to suggest that the Shaykh's reliance on these visions caused him to dispense with formal learning altogether. When Shaykh ʿAbd Allāh al-Ahsaʾi writes that his father abandoned 'exoteric studies',[281] the implication seems to be simply that he gave up the study of grammar, philology, rhetoric, and similar pursuits and devoted himself to the study of the Qurʾan and *aḥādīth*, as well as the 'Divine Philosophy' (*ḥikma ilāhiyya*) of the Isfahan school. This would seem to be confirmed by Rashti, who writes that

> he did not receive these sciences and inner teachings so much in sleep, but rather, when he awoke, he discovered manifest proofs and evidences from the book of God and from the path of the explanations and instructions of the Imāms of guidance.[282]

This statement bears great similarity to that of al-Ahsaʾi, quoted above, in which he says "I found that all traditions were in agreement with what I had seen in sleep."

By 1186/1772,[283] therefore, when he was twenty, al-Ahsaʾi had reached a point in his intellectual and spiritual development where he stood in serious need

of instruction and inspiration which local teachers could not give him. Whether aware of the theological developments taking place there or not, it was in the *ʿatabāt* that the young Shaykh decided to look for such guidance.

The Intermediary Years

Shaykh Aḥmad's first sojourn in Iraq was of insufficient duration to allow him to benefit greatly from the opportunities for study available among the ulama of the shrine cities. Not long after his arrival, plague broke but in Iraq. Beginning in March 1773 at Baghdad, where it had been carried by a caravan from Erzerum, the epidemic spread rapidly as far as Basra. It continued at Baghdad until mid-May and at Basra until September, with heavy fatalities throughout the country.[284] As a result, large numbers of the population dispersed, and Shaykh Aḥmad joined the exodus, returning to al-Aḥsāʾ.[285] Judging from his later attitude to urban life and his obvious reluctance to return to the *ʿatabāt* after the passing of the plague, we may suppose that the Shaykh had found conditions there uncongenial. As a young and comparatively untrained student from the provinces, he may have found it difficult to benefit fully from classes designed for those with a better general grounding in theological studies. He may, in modern idiom, have experienced a form of culture shock. Whatever the cause, the fact is that he chose to remain for a long time in relative seclusion in al-Aḥsāʾ, rather than return to what was then the centre of theological activity in Shiʿism. Had it not been for the Wahhabi advance on Bahrain, it is probable that he would never have sought to leave the region again.

After his return to al-Aḥsāʾ, the Shaykh married his first wife, Maryam bint Khamīs Āl ʿAṣīr, a girl related to him from the village of Qarayn, where he had studied as a child.[286] He was to marry a total of eight wives over the years, from whom he had altogether twenty children.[287] It is never made clear exactly how he provided for his growing family during this period, but there are clear indications that he became well known in the region as a religious authority. Shaykh ʿAbd Allāh al-Ahsaʾi states that, even before his journey to Iraq, people had begun to ask him to pray on their behalf, and we may suppose that a measure of financial return was given for this. During the period after his return, he became famous and was regarded as a *marjaʿ* for the people of the region, but how far his fame actually reached, it is impossible to tell.[288]

One result of his increased association with the people around him was the cessation of his visions.[289] Possibly as a result, he seems to have devoted himself to a wide programme of studies, although here again we have little information as to the books he read or the teachers under whom he worked. Rashti, however, makes it clear that he acquired some competence in a wide variety of subjects, listing some thirty sciences, including astronomy, arithmetic, astrology, alchemy, medicine, *kalām*, and *fiqh*, and several crafts, including weaving and metal-working, in all of which he claims the Shaykh was well-

versed.[290] Although a knowledge of many of these subjects may have been acquired later in life, we must assume that his studies were, for the most part, carried out during the twenty years or so he now spent in Aḥsāʾ and Bahrain.[291] Tanakābunī has noted that, when he came to Iran, the shaykh claimed to be *aʿlam* and learned in every science.[292]

That al-Ahsaʾi was well read and felt himself competent to write on a wide variety of topics (and was asked by others to write on them) is apparent from many of his writings. Apart from the generally learned content of these, and their wealth of quotation from books of tradition, the Qurʾan, and other works, several are specific commentaries on books by other scholars. These include his commentaries on the *Mashāʾir* and the ᶜ*Arshiyya* of Mullā Ṣadrā,[293] on the *Risāla-yi ᶜilmiyya* and other writings of Muḥammad ibn Murtaḍā Fayḍ al-Kāshānī (1598-1680),[294] on the last portion of the *Kashf al-ghiṭāʾ* of Shaykh Jaᶜfar al-Najafī,[295] on the *Tabṣirat al-mutaᶜallimīn fī aḥkām al-dīn* of ᶜAllāma al-Ḥillī,[296] and on the philosophical poetry of Shaykh ᶜAli ibn Abd Allāh ibn Fāris.[297] That a large proportion, if not the bulk, of his reading was done before he finally left al-Aḥsāʾ is indicated by his earliest *ijāza*, given him by Shaykh Aḥmad ibn Ḥasan al-Baḥrānī al-Damastānī[298] on 1 Muḥarram 1205/10 September 1790.[299] This *ijāza* indicates that he had become proficient in the basic religious sciences and had studied several major works of Shiᶜi theology; it permits him to

> Transmit from me all that our ulama have written on the Arabic sciences, on literature, grammar, *uṣūl, fiqh,* and *akhbār*, in particular the Four Books around which we circle in this age… as well as the *Tafṣīl Wasāʾil al shīᶜa* [by al-Ḥurr al-ᶜĀmilī], the *Hidāyat al-umma* [also by al-Ḥurr al-ᶜĀmilī], and the *Biḥār al-anwār* [by Majlisī].[300]

Although the bulk of al-Ahsaʾi's writings date from the later period in Iraq and Iran, he undoubtedly composed several works during his years in al-Aḥsāʾ. Rashti states that, before leaving there, he wrote *risālāt* and books which became well known,[301] although he does not supply the titles or indicate the contents of these. Shaykh ᶜAbd Allāh al-Ahsaʾi refers to his father's first meeting with Baḥr al-ᶜUlūm, stating that the latter asked al-Ahsaʾi for an example of something he had written, whereupon he was shown some pages of a commentary on the *Tabṣira* of Jaᶜfar ibn Ḥasan, Muḥaqqiq al-Ḥillī (1205-1277).[302] As we have noted, there is in existence an incomplete commentary by al-Ahsaʾi entitled *Ṣirāṭ al-yaqīn*, which corresponds to this description, and we may presume it to be the same work as that referred to.[303] The same source also speaks of an early *risāla* on *qadr* composed about the time al-Ahsaʾi met Baḥr al-ʿUlūm.[304] This may well be the *Risāla al-qadriyya,* composed at the request of Shaykh ᶜAbd Allāh ibn Dandan in explanation of statements by Sayyid Sharīf

(al-Jurjānī?).[305] Several other works of the Shaykh's are actually dated to this period or that immediately after.[306]

After some time, according to Shaykh ᶜAbd Allāh, al-Ahsaᵓi brought his family to Bahrain, where they lived for four years. The same source goes on to say that they remained there until Rajab 1212/December 1798, when the Shaykh's mother-in-law died, whereupon he moved to Iraq, later bringing his family from Bahrain.[307] There is, however, a serious difficulty involved in Shaykh ᶜAbd Allāh's dating: Shaykh Aḥmad's *ijāzas* from Āqā Mīrzā Muḥammad Mahdī Shahristānī (resident in Karbala) and Baḥr al-ᶜUlūm (resident in Najaf) are both dated 1209/1794.[308] We should also remember that the final Wahhabi invasion of al-Aḥsāᵓ occurred in 1795, and that it is the appearance of the Wahhabis which is adduced by Rashti as the reason for al-Ahsaᵓi's departure for the *ᶜatabāt*.[309] The date given for the death of Shaykh Aḥmad's mother-in-law may well be correct, but it seems to be misleading in the context of his departure from Bahrain. A possible explanation is that his family did not leave Bahrain until her death.

It is, in fact, possible that al-Ahsaᵓi left Bahrain well before 1795. In 1788, the Wahhabis under Sulaymān ibn ᶜUfaysan had attacked al-Aḥsāᵓ and put the people to the sword. In 1789, the head of the Saᶜūdī family, ᶜAbd al-ᶜAzīz, himself led a second attack on the province, killing three hundred people in Fudhūl, defeating the Banū Khālid Sheikh Duwayhis, and installing Zayd ibn ᶜArᶜar as the new sheikh. ᶜAbd al-ᶜAzīz attacked al-Aḥsāᵓ again in 1792 and defeated Barrak ibn ᶜAbd al-Muḥsin, who had deposed Zayd. Eventually ᶜAbd al-ᶜAzīz was invited by the population of the province to receive their submission; parties were sent out to destroy Shiᶜi tombs and shrines, and steps were taken to instruct the inhabitants in the tenets of Wahhabism. The populace of al-Ḥufūf rebelled but, in 1793, Abd al-ᶜAzīz returned, captured Shuqayq, laid siege to Qarayn and al-Maṭayrafī, and carried out widespread plunder throughout al-Aḥsāᵓ.[310] Shaykh Aḥmad may well have realized the danger by the early 1780s and gone to Iraq by the early 1790s, but not before September 1790, the date of his *ijāza* from Shaykh Aḥmad ibn Ḥasan al-Baḥrānī.

The Years in Iraq

Babi and Bahaᵓi writers have tended to regard al-Ahsaᵓi's departure for Iraq—and, ultimately, Iran—in the early years of the thirteenth century Hegira, as a decision motivated by a sense of divine mission to purify the decadence of Islam and to prepare men for the appearance of the Hidden Imām in the person of the Bab.[311] The final reckoning on the validity or otherwise of such a view must, in the end, rest on criteria which fall outside our present sphere of competence. Nevertheless, it seems to me worth stating that such an approach involves a large degree of retrospective interpretation and that it cannot be supported by known external evidence. None of the Shaykh's own writings, as far as I am

aware, refers to such a mission, nor do Sayyid Kāẓim Rashti or other Shaykhi writers regard his journey to Iraq in this light. Rashti, as have observed, refers specifically to the Wahhabi invasion as the direct cause of al-Ahsaʾi's departure from Arabia. It is not unlikely, however, that the Wahhabi threat acted merely as the final stimulus to a growing urge to visit the *ʻatabāt* once more.

In the last chapter, we saw that what amounted to a revolution in Twelver Shiᶜi thought was taking place among the Iranian and Arab ulama living at the shrines in Iraq. It is probable that al-Ahsaʾi, by now more confident of his own ability to participate in such developments, was no longer satisfied with a second-hand knowledge of the questions being debated. It is unlikely, however that he seriously considered playing a leading role in the discussions: his love for seclusion and his evident distaste for remaining in any one place for very long strongly suggest that he was a man on whom greatness was thrust much against his own wishes.

It would seem that Āqā Bihbahānī was either already dead or in virtual retirement by the time al-Ahsaʾi arrived in Iraq. But, if he did not study under the *murawwij* himself, Shaykh Aḥmad certainly did attend the classes of several of his pupils. As we have mentioned, before his departure from Bahrain, he had obtained an *ijāza* from Shaykh Aḥmad ibn al-Ḥasan al-Baḥrānī al-Damastānī, a pupil of Shaykh Yūsuf Baḥrānī and his brother Shaykh ᶜAbd ᶜAlī.[312] He now began to seek *ijāzāt* from several of the contemporaries and pupils of Bihbahānī. The most outstanding of these was Sayyid Muḥammad Mahdī Ṭabāṭabāʾī Baḥr al-ᶜUlūm, whose influence on and contribution to Shiᶜi studies in this period have been discussed briefly in the last chapter. We have referred above to how al-Ahsaʾi presented Baḥr al-ᶜUlūm with part of his commentary on al-Ḥillī's *Tabṣira* and with his *risāla* on *qadr*. It is claimed by Shaykh ᶜAbd Allāh that, on seeing the former work, Baḥr al-ᶜUlūm said to the Shaykh, "it would be more appropriate for you to give an *ijāza to* me."[313] The same source speaks of the veneration accorded al-Ahsaʾi by Baḥr al-ʻUlūm, and the content and phrasing of the latter's *ijāza* to him seem to corroborate this.[314] At about the same time, the Shaykh obtained *ijāzāt* from two other pupils of Bihbahānī—Shaykh Jaᶜfar ibn Khiḍr al-Najafī Kāshif al-Ghiṭāʾ and Sayyid ᶜAlī ibn Muḥammad Ṭabāṭabā'ī, to both of whom we have referred in the last chapter as being among the most important ulama of their period.[315]

In 1209/1794, the same year that he received his *ijāza* from Baḥr al-ᶜUlūm, al-Ahsaʾi obtained another from Āqā Mīrzā Muḥammad Mahdī ibn Abī ʻl-Qāsim al-Mūsawī al-Shahristānī (d.1215/1800). Born in Shahristān in Khurāsān, Mīrzā Muḥammad Mahdī had moved to Karbala, where he had studied under Shaykh Yūsuf al-Baḥrānī and others; he achieved a certain degree of renown in Anatolia, India, and Iran. A work entitled *Al-maṣābīḥ* on *fiqh* is listed by Iᶜjāz Ḥusayn al-Nīsābūrī Kantūrī as belonging to him, but otherwise he does not seem to have written anything of note.[316]

Some five years later, al-Ahsaʾi obtained his last *ijāza*. This was given him by Shaykh Ḥusayn ibn Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad al-Darāzī al-Baḥrānī (d.1216/1801). This man was a nephew of Shaykh Yūsuf al-Bahrānī, under whom he studied in his youth. Shaykh Yūsuf's *Luʾluʾatay al-Baḥrayn* being originally written for him and his brother, Shaykh ᶜAbd ᶜAlī;[317] he later studied under Yūsuf 's brother ᶜAbd ᶜAlī and is the author of a work entitled *al-Anwār alᶜlawāmiᶜ*.[318] It is of interest to note that al-Ahsaʾi regarded Shaykh Ḥusayn as the *murawwij* of the twelfth century, as he states in his *Risalā wasāʾil al-hammam al-ulyā*, expressly written for him.[319] Shaykh Aḥmad's *ijāza* from him is dated 2 Jumadi I 1214/2 October 1799, a date which raises the question as to how it came into his possession. Shaykh ᶜAbd Allāh does not mention a visit to Bahrain at this point, and the *ijāza* itself states that Shaykh Ḥusayn was blind and in ill health by this date and, therefore, unlikely, to have travelled to Iraq, even to visit the shrines there. Leaving aside the possibility of a faulty transcription of the date by Shaykh ᶜAbd Allāh,[320] it could well be that the *ijāza* was brought from Bahrain to Iraq by a relative or friend of al-Ahsaʾi's.

Abu 'l-Qāsim ibn Zayn al-ᶜĀbidīn ibn Karīm (Khān Kirmānī) mentions an *ijāza* to Shaykh Aḥmad from Ḥājī Muḥammad Ibrāhīm Kalbāsī,[321] but this may be a mistake since Kalbāsī was a pupil of al-Ahsaʾi and had an *ijāza* from him, and not, as far as I know, vice versa. As a further indication of confusion in this area, Āghā Buzurg al-Ṭihrānī remarks that the statement in *Kitāb-i nujūm al-samāʾ* (p. 344) to the effect that one of al-Ahsaʾi's pupils was Sayyid Muḥsin al-Aᶜrajī (d.1231/1816) is incorrect, and suggests that the Shaykh, in fact, received an *ijāza* from the latter.[322] Such an *ijaza*, however, does not seem to be extant.

An important question arises here: Why did someone who believed himself to have received *ijāzāt* from the twelve Imāms, who regarded himself as the recipient of direct inspiration from them and the Prophet, who showed scant regard for rank or prestige, and who did not appear to seek any position within the Shiᶜi hierarchy in its accepted form, approach scholars such as Baḥr al-'Ulūm in order to receive *ijāzāt* from them? The answer may be simpler than it appears. Two major factors have combined to give the false impression that al-Ahsaʾi stood completely outside the mainstream of Twelver Shiᶜism. On the one hand, as we have observed, there are the unusual circumstances of his early life, his possible contact with extreme Shiᶜi views, his reliance on dreams and visions, and the absence of teachers within the tradition of transmitted authority. On the other hand, there is the *takfīr* pronounced against him towards the end of his life by several—but by no means all—of the ulama in Iran and Iraq, virtually excommunicating him from the body of the faithful and certainly creating a new *madhhab* where there had not really been one.

As we shall see, however, in the intervening period al-Ahsaʾi did not seek to dissociate himself from the Usuli tradition, even if his relationship with it was not, perhaps, one of total identification. Apart from his close association with

leading representatives of that tradition in Karbala, Najaf, Yazd, Isfahan, Mashhad, and elsewhere, there are other indications of the Shaykh's general affinity with the orthodox position. His contempt for Sufism and certain forms of mystical philosophy, in particular the thought of Ibn al-ᶜArabī and Murtaḍā Fayḍ Kāshānī, his refusal to collaborate closely with the state, and his rejection of the validity of the *takfīr* which sought to place him and his followers beyond the pale—all these demonstrate al-Ahsaᵓi's close bond with traditional Shiᶜism. It is in this context that we should consider the question of his *ijāzāt*.

The possession of 'spiritual' *ijāzāt* from the Imāms did not, of itself, invalidate physical *ijāzāt* from recognized *mujtahids*. We have already discussed the role of the ulama as bearers of the charismatic authority of the Imām in his absence. There is no reason to believe that al-Ahsaᵓi had any wish to divorce the inward inspiration he thought himself to have been given by the Imāms from the more conventional guidance to be gained from a teacher who provided a living link with a *silsila* of teachers going back to the Imāms themselves and, in a sense, transmitting their *baraka* to men. More particularly, an *ijāza* implied familiarity with the major works of Shiᶜi tradition and law, which we have already identified as one of the main sources of charismatic guidance in the period of *ghayba*. That al-Ahsaᵓi regarded these works as at least complementary to his inner inspiration is amply attested by his *ijāzāt*, which refer specifically to a large number of works which, it is presumed, he had studied in depth.[323]

The relationship between Shaykh Aḥmad's direct visionary experiences of the Prophet and the Imāms on the one hand, and his formal links with the ulama—through reading books, studying and teaching, receiving and granting *ijāzāt*—on the other, is a particularly compelling example of the complex functioning of charisma and authority in Shiᶜism. As we have indicated, the charismatic force of Shiᶜism did not reside only in visions and direct inspiration, but inhered also in the community, in the ulama, and in the system and books of *fiqh* and *akhbār*. Both routinized and direct forms of charisma could co-exist reasonably easily within a single system or, indeed, individual, and al-Ahsaᵓi clearly saw no inherent contradiction between his receiving 'spiritual' *ijāzāt* from the Imāms and seeking their physical counterparts from various ulama. It was only the pronouncement of *takfīr* towards the end of his life which brought to the surface the hidden tensions which such a network of values contained.

During the period of his stay at the *ᶜatabāt* and the next few years spent in Basra and its vicinity, al-Ahsaᵓi wrote a number of works, several of which are dated.[324] Like most of his writings, these generally take the form of *risālāt* written in reply to various individuals, and deal with a variety of topics, from statements of Murtaḍā Fayḍ Kāshānī on the nature of *fanāᵓ*[325] to questions relating to *ijmāᶜ*[326] and aspects of *īmān* and *kufr*.[327]

Having obtained his *ijāzāt*, al-Ahsaᵓi does not seem to have wanted to remain in the *ᶜatabāt*. From now until his death, he continued to move from

place to place in Iraq and Iran, sometimes staying for several years in one place – such as Yazd and Kirmanshah – but never content to settle permanently in any one town, even in old age. This peripatetic existence was to prove a major factor in spreading his fame over a very wide area. During the next few years, spurred on, perhaps, by the growing power of the Wahhabis in the al-Jazīra region, he travelled restlessly from Basra to Dhū Raqq, back to Basra, to Ḥabārāt, once more to Basra, then to Tanwiyya, Nashwa, Safāda, and Shaṭṭ al-Kār. In 1221/1806, he set off again for the *ᶜatabāt*.[328] The Wahhabi threat was by no means ended, but resistance to their incursions in the al-Jazīra had hardened somewhat and the situation appears to have been much safer by the time of the Shaykh's visit.[329]

It was al-Ahsaᵓi intention to follow his pilgrimages in the *ᶜatabāt* with a further *ziyāra*, this time to Mashhad.[330] Whether he was at this time already considering emigration to Iran, it is hard to tell. Despite somewhat increased security in Iraq, al-Ahsaᵓi continued to be worried by the Wahhabi raids, as is indicated by Shaykh ᶜAbd Allāh.[331] Iran, now reasonably secure under the newly-enthroned Fatḥ ᶜAlī Shāh (1771-1834), had its attractions, not least of which was the re-established Shiᶜi state which the Qajar dynasty sought to promote. We shall have to return later to the question of Shaykh Aḥmad's relations with the state in Iran; for the moment, we need only suggest that he may have regarded the protection of the Qajars as an attractive alternative to the unsettled conditions of Iraq or Bahrain. After visits to Najaf, Karbala, and Kazimiyya, he set out with several companions for Mashhad.[332]

Iran 1221-38/1806-22

Shaykh Aḥmad's first major stop in Iran was Yazd, a town with a continuing reputation for sanctity, where a large number of ulama resided.[333] The religious zeal, at times turning to fanaticism, of the Yazdis—in part a result of the existence of a sizeable Zoroastrian community in and around the town—is well known and, in its more positive aspects, must have created an atmosphere which al-Ahsaᵓi would have found congenial. On his arrival there, he was warmly welcomed by the inhabitants, in particular the ulama, some of whom he may have known personally. Kashmīrī states that, when the shaykh arrived in Yazd, all the ulama honoured him, with the sole exception of Āqā Sayyid Aḥmad Ardakānī Yazdī.[334] According to Shaykh ᶜAbd Allāh, Shaykh Jaᶜfar al-Najafī was then present in Yazd. Apart from this, two of the ulama mentioned by Rashti as being in the town at this time had been students of Baḥr al-ᶜUlūm not many years previously. One of these men, Sayyid Ḥaydar ibn Sayyid Ḥusayn Mūsawī Yazdī (d. ca. 1260/1844),[335] had been given his *ijāza* by Baḥr al-ᶜUlūm in 1209/1794, the same year al-Ahsaᵓi had received his. The other, Mullā Ismāᶜīl ibn ᶜAbd al-Malik ᶜĀqdāᵓī Yazdī (d. between 1230/1815 and 1240/1824),[336] was the leading *mujtahid* in Yazd at this time. His student Āqā

Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ᶜAlī Kirmānshāhī states in his *Mirᵓāt al-aḥwāl* that he studied under ᶜĀqdā'ī in Najaf in 1210/1795,[337] providing evidence that he too was studying with Baḥr al-ᶜUlūm at about the same time as al-Ahsaᵓi. It is not improbable that the latter had at least met these men, a supposition reinforced by their request that he stay in Yazd, which suggests that they were familiar with his abilities. It may well be the case that the shaykh's decision to travel to Yazd in the first place may have been insoired by an invitation from one or both of them.

Agreeing to return to Yazd once his pilgrimage was completed, al-Ahsaᵓi continued to Mashhad. His stay there on this occasion appears to have been brief, and he was soon back in Yazd in accordance with his agreement. It was not his intention to stay there, however, and, after a few days, he attempted to leave, but was prevented from so doing by the populace. It is not difficult to assess the motives of the people of Yazd in wishing the Shaykh to reside there. The presence of powerful ulama in a town provided a form of insurance against oppression from local governors and their agents. Ḥasan ibn Ḥasan Fasāᵓī (b. 1821) gives an example of such protection in Fārs during the governor-generalship of Prince Farīdūn Mīrzā Farmān Farmā (1810-1854). The governor-general had entrusted the administration of the entire province to Mīrzā Aḥmad Khān Tabrizī, who eventually gained a reputation for favouritism towards Azerbaijani refugees in the area and injustice towards local inhabitants leading in the end to the serious riots and political upheavals in Shīrāz which began in 1839. Fasāᵓī points out, however, that "as long as the *mujtahid* Ḥājī Mīrzā Ibrāhīm was alive, Mīrzā Aḥmad Khān did not oppress the populace, out of respect for him."[338]

In the case of al-Ahsaᵓi's residence in Yazd, his own increasing fame and the veneration in which he came to be held by Fatḥ ᶜAlī Shāh made his continued sojourn there a matter of considerable importance for the local population. From al-Ahsaᵓi's point of view, however, the possibility of becoming embroiled in political affairs was extremely distasteful, and we shall see later how it proved a significant factor in his decision not to accept the shah's offer to reside at the capital.

Since the Shaykh only arrived in Iran in 1221/1806, his fame must have spread through the country at a remarkable rate, for the Shah began corresponding with him no later than 1223/1808, and possibly somewhat earlier. This rapid growth in his reputation suggests that manuscripts of some of his *rasāᵓil* must by now have been circulating in Iran. In addition, a number of his works can be assigned to the period of his first stay in Yazd, several of which indicate the beginnings of what was to develop into a wide correspondence with various ulama and others throughout the country. [339]

As we have indicated, the Shaykh's fame soon reached the ears of Fatḥ ᶜAlī Shāh, then in about the tenth year of his reign. It is possible that the specific source of the Shah's information about al-Ahsaᵓi may have been Prince Ibrāhīm

Khān Qājār Quyūnlū, Ẓahīr al-Dawla (d. 1825), a cousin of the monarch and the governor of Kirman and Baluchistan. Ibrāhīm Khān became a fervent admirer of the Shaykh; his own son, Ḥājī Muḥammad Karīm Khān Kirmānī, succeeded Sayyid Kāẓim Rashti as head of the Shaykhi school, while the subsequent leadership of the main school passed to his descendants. Niᶜmat Allāh Raẓavī Sharīf notes that Ibrāhīm Khān corresponded with al-Ahsaᵓi and visited him in Yazd.[340] That it was through the mediation of Ibrāhīm Khān that the name of Shaykh Aḥmad reached the ears of the king is explicitly stated by Sayyid Muḥammad Hāshimī Kirmānī,[341] and it seems likely that this was the case.

Fatḥ ᶜAlī Shāh soon addressed several letters to the Shaykh , expressing a desire to see him in person.[342] The motives underlying this wish on the Shah's part to pay such close attention to an Arab *ᶜālim* newly arrived in a remote corner of Iran are not, I think, hard to discern. First of all, there was Fatḥ ᶜAlī's personal religiosity, which led him to evince a deep-seated veneration for the ulama, even to the point of submitting to their judgement in certain matters. There was also his desire to emphasize the Shiᶜi character of the new regime, as evidenced by the large number of religious endowments made by him in Qum, Shīrāz, Mashhad, and the *ᶜatabāt*, and in his patronage of several outstanding ulama, such as Mīrzā-yi Qummī, Shaykh Jaᶜfar al-Najafī, Sayyid Murtaḍā ibn Muḥammad Ṭabāṭabā'ī, and Mullā Aḥmad Narāqī.[343]

The reverence, almost subservience, which Fatḥ ᶜAlī Shāh bore towards the ulama is evident from the wording of one of his letters to al-Ahsaᵓi, as quoted by Āqā Sayyid Ḥusayn Yazdī in *al-Kashkūl*. In this letter, the Shah, after addressing the Shaykh with the customary hyperboles, writes: "We desire to meet you as the one fasting desires the new moon, as the thirsty longs for pure waters, as the husband is eager for his wife, and the destitute for wealth…" He then invites him to set out immediately for Tehran so that he may benefit from his presence and obtain illumination from him.[344] Despite the courteous tone of this letter – the Arabic original of which would not, of course have been penned by the shah himself – the "invitation" to come to the capital is, in reality, nothing but a veiled command. At this stage, however, pressure to go to Tehran was not sufficiently great to compel compliance, and al-Ahsaᵓi made various excuses for his inability to leave Yazd.[345]

At that same time, he did reply to certain questions put to him by the Shah; his answers are contained in the *Risāla al-khāqāniyya*, dated early Ramadan 1223/late October 1808.[346] It is of interest to compare the somewhat superficial questions put by the Shah at this time with the two he put to al-Ahsaᵓi some ten years later, after the latter's return to Kirmanshah in 1234/1818, and which the Shaykh answered in his *Risāla al-sulṭāniyya*.[347] These two questions, which deal with the distinction between the Imām and the stations of *nubuwwa* and *wilāya*, indicate a growing knowledge of religious matters on the

shah's part, and suggest that his interest in theology, if not profound, was at least serious.

The receipt of the *Risāla al-khāqāniyya* seems to have whetted the Shah's appetite and made him even more eager to have al-Ahsaʾi come to Tehran; a letter was soon sent expressing this wish in particularly strong terms. This letter was brought to Yazd by one of the members of the court, Mīrzā Muḥammad Nadīm,[348] and, according to Rashti, the Shah's instructions were communicated to al-Ahsaʾi through the governor of Yazd.[349] Shaykh ʿAbd Allāh gives a synopsis of this letter, in which the shah declares that it is his own duty to visit the Shaykh but that, for various reasons, it is not in his power to do so, and that he asks pardon for this. He goes on to say that, if he should have to make a personal visit to Yazd, he should have to bring with him at least ten thousand soldiers; since Yazd is a valley without much cultivation, the arrival of so many troops would result in famine for the inhabitants. The shah ends by expressing his humility towards Shaykh Aḥmad, and politely asks him to visit him as soon as he receives this letter – "otherwise I shall have no choice but to come to Yazd (*dār al-ʿibāda*)."[350] The thinly-veiled threat is obvious: the effects of *ṣādirāt*—irregular and arbitrary levies imposed on towns or provinces on such occasions as a royal visit—were too well known to require elaboration.[351] The letter was, in effect, an ultimatum.

Faced with the choice of either becoming involved with the court or bringing famine to Yazd, al-Ahsaʾi determined to quit Iran altogether. He decided to leave for Shīrāz, planning to take that route back to Basra, but, when the people of Yazd heard of this, they prevented his departure. The threat of a royal visit was serious enough, but, on the other hand, if the Shah thought they had encouraged him to go in fear of that threat, there was the more serious risk of their incurring royal displeasure and being punished. It was, in any case, the winter season and travel would be difficult.[352]

The problem remained as to how to reply to the Shah. A meeting of the leading citizens was held, but they could think of no solution. Al-Ahsaʾi pointed, out that, if he were to excuse himself from going, the shah would come and cause great distress in the region, but, if, on the other hand, he were to promise to go, he would be prevented by the cold from actually travelling to the capital. By this point, the Yazdis seem to have been seriously alarmed about the possible consequences of a continual refusal on the part of the Shaykh to go to Tehran, and sufficient pressure was at last applied to make him relent and agree to go. It was arranged that Mīrzā ʿAlī Riḍā,[353] a *mujtahid*, would accompany him to the capital and ensure that he suffered no discomfort on the way.[354] It is probable that Mīrzā ʿAlī Riḍā's real function was to make sure that the Shaykh did not attempt to take another route back to Iraq.

Shaykh Aḥmad and his companion proceeded directly to Tehran, arriving around November 1808.[355] He had frequent meetings with the Shah while there and wrote several *rasāʾil* in reply to various questions put by him.[356] Rashti

notes that the Shaykh was visited by all the ulama and *ṭullāb* then living in the capital;[357] they were probably as much attracted by his standing in the eyes of the king, however, as by his reputation as an *ᶜālim*. As a result of their association, the shah's admiration for the Shaykh increased; the latter, however, felt he had fulfilled his obligation to the king, quickly wearied of Tehran, and decided to leave. Continuing Wahhabi attacks in the neighbourhood of Basra were a constant cause of concern to him since most of his wives and children were still resident there. The shah, however, tried to prevent his departure and eventually succeeding in persuading him to stay in Iran, arguing that he could not openly make his knowledge known in Iraq (presumably because it was a Sunni-governed country).[358] Having succeeded in this, Fatḥ ᶜAlī Shāh began to apply pressure on the Shaykh to live in the capital, offering to put a house at his disposal there.[359] This offer was tactfully but forcefully refused.

Fatḥ ᶜAlī had probably intended from the beginning to ask al-Ahsaᵓi to stay in Tehran. The invitation accorded with his general policy of encouraging ulama to live in the new capital.[360] Men such as Ḥājī Mullā Muḥammad Jaᶜfar Astarābādī,[361]—later the author of a polemic against al-Ahsaᵓi—Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥasan Qazvīnī Shīrāzī,[362] Mullā Muḥammad ᶜAlī Māzandarānī Jangalī,[363] and others were invited to come to Tehran in an attempt to raise the prestige of the city and of the dynasty which had made it its capital, as well as to encourage the development of a centre of religious authority close to and allied with the seat of government—distinct from the *ᶜatabāt*, which were outside the borders of Iran. Fatḥ ᶜAlī's policy was destined to failure. The *ᶜatabāt* retained their influence, increasing in importance through the nineteenth century and, in Iran itself, Isfahan, Mashhad, and, in particular, Qum remained the centres of religious studies. Although the number of ulama resident in the capital greatly increased in the reign of Nāṣir al-Dīn Shāh (1831-1896),[364] not even men such as Mullā ᶜAlī Kanī, Shaykh Faḍl Allāh Nūrī (d. 1909), Sayyid ᶜAbd Allah Bihbahānī, and Āqā Sayyid Muḥammad Ṭabāṭabā'ī were able to make Tehran a religious capital such as Isfahan had been under the Safavids.

Shaykh Aḥmad's reason for not staying in Tehran, as explained to Fatḥ ᶜAlī, is of great interest in helping us understand how the ulama in this period regarded the secular authority of the Qajars. We may assume that the version of this reply given by Shaykh Abd Allah is tolerably accurate, in view of the fact that it agrees in substance with that given in the *Tārīkh-i ᶜAẓudī*. The Shaykh argued that, were he to remain at the capital, it would mean the end of the Shah's power (*salṭanat*). When asked why this would be the case, al-Ahsaᵓi inquired of the Shah whether he (al-Ahsaᵓi) should live in honour or disgrace. When Fatḥ ᶜAlī replied that he should live in the greatest honour, the Shaykh said

> In my opinion, kings and governors execute their orders and their laws through tyranny. Since the masses regard me as someone

> whose word is to be obeyed, they would turn to me in all matters and would seek refuge with me. Now, it is incumbent on me to defend the people of Islam and to fulfil their needs. Were I to seek intercession for them from the king, one of two things would occur: either he would accept [my intercession], thereby suspending the operation of his authority, or he would refuse it, thus causing me to be humiliated and disgraced.[365]

This argument did not fail to impress the shah, who could not have been unaware of the counter-threat it contained. We have already noted how it lay in the power of certain ulama to force the hand of the Shah in cases of injustice and oppression. Perhaps more than any particular incident of the period, al-Ahsaʾi's warning to Fatḥ ʿAlī Shāh prefigures the later expression of clerical opposition to the throne during the Tobacco Regie, in the Constitutional movement, and even in the 1979 revolution.[366] Fatḥ ʿAlī immediately offered al-Ahsaʾi freedom of choice in his place of residence, but the latter chose, curiously enough, to return to Yazd.

It is, I think, worth noting the role played by this visit in the later hagiographic Bahaʾi version of the incident, as originated by Zarandī.[367] For this writer and others after him, such as William Sears and H. M. Balyuzi, the visit is fraught with overtones of messianic expectation. Al-Ahsaʾi, far from being reluctant to travel there, sets out for the capital because he perceives "the first glimmerings that heralded the dawn of the promised Dispensation from the direction of Nūr, to the north of Tehran."[368] He leaves the city with the greatest reluctance, wishing to spend the rest of his life there.[369] In order to give full force to this interpretation of the event, Zarandī makes the visit coincide with the birth of Bahāʾ Allāh (Mīrzā Ḥusayn ʿAlī Nūrī, 1817-1892), which occurred in Tehran on 2 Muharram 1223/12 November 1817, a date which is simply impossible. Other contradictions occur, such as Zarandī's statement that al-Ahsaʾi was accompanied on the journey by Sayyid Kāẓim Rashti and that he left Tehran directly for Kirmanshah. The whole effect is one of tendentiousness of the most extreme kind, making this version of the incident—which has acquired an important place in Bahaʾi historical myth—of considerable interest as an example of how a controversial religious figure may be adopted and transmogrified into a character of messianic import by a later movement with which he may have only the most tenuous connection.

Although al–Aḥsāʾī did not go to Kirmanshah at this point, he did become acquainted with Muḥammad ʿAlī Mīrzā Dawlatshāh (1788-1822), who was later to be his patron there for several years. Since the prince was at that time already governor-general of Arabistan, Ḥawīza, and their dependencies,[370] he offered to send one of his agents from Arabistan to Basra in order to bring the Shaykh's family to Yazd. The prince wrote a *farmān* to the governor of Basra, Ibrāhīm Āqā, asking him to give his agent the necessary authority to carry this out on his arrival—an interesting example of the influence of this young prince within the

borders of Iraq.[371] Al-Ahsaʾi himself returned to Yazd not later than 19 Ṣafar 1224/5 April 1809, as is clear from a letter written there and bearing this date.[372]

Al-Ahsaʾi spent the next five years in Yazd,[373] with the exception of at least two pilgrimages to Mashhad in 1226/1811[374] and 1229/1814.[375] It is stated by a number of sources that he produced the bulk of his writings during this period,[376] most of these being, it seems, replies to the numerous letters which now began to arrive from ulama in many places. However, on the evidence of those letters which are dated, it would seem that fewer were written in this period than during the Shaykh's later stay in Kirmanshah—although it would be unwise at this stage to regard this as a wholly reliable means of assessing the distribution of his writings from different periods.

It is, in any case, clear that the dissemination of the Shaykh's writings during his stay in Yazd gained him an increasingly large following there and in Fārs, Khurāsān, and Isfahan.[377] His visits to Mashhad brought him into contact with numerous ulama, and the high estimation in which he was held by the scholars resident there must, in its turn, have spread by means of the pilgrims with whom they spoke.[378] Al-Ahsaʾi's ideas seem to have made their way to a very wide audience, as is suggested by Rashti, when he speaks, significantly, of how some of the topics dealt with by the Shaykh—topics which were not at first clear to anyone outside his circle, (*ghayr-i ahlish*)—became current among the masses, 'and day by day people became eager and enthusiastic about those topics and remained awestruck when they heard them mentioned."[379]

This situation appears to have led to some misunderstanding, for the Shaykh himself at one point gave instructions for someone to preach from the pulpit on the orthodoxy of his views on the relationship between outward and inward beliefs (*ẓāhir wa bāṭin*).[380] Although the details of this incident are unclear, it is likely that we have here the beginnings of what was to develop into serious opposition to the views of al-Ahsaʾi, leading in the end to the *takfīr* pronounced against him in his final years.

A few days after his return from a pilgrimage to Mashhad in 1229/1814, despite an earlier intention to stay in Yazd,[381] Shaykh Aḥmad determined to visit the *ʿatabāt*, travelling via Shūstar. Rashti states that the reason for his departure from Yazd was a dream of the Imām ʿAlī inviting him to perform a pilgrimage to al-Kufa.[382] Karīm Khān Kirmānī, however, gives a more cogent reason in stating that the Shaykh was distressed by the behaviour of some notables in Yazd, who did not appreciate his importance and were lax in showing respect.[383] A more important reason—and very possibly the cause of al-Ahsaʾi's displeasure with the above notables—may well have been an invitation from Muḥammad ʿAlī Mīrzā to go to Kirmanshah.

Shaykh ʿAbd Allāh describes his father's arrival in Kirmanshah as unpremeditated and unexpected, and states that the prince's invitation to stay was spontaneous—but this does not seem to be consistent with the reality of the situation. Al-Ahsaʾi cannot have been unaware of the implications of his going

to Kirmanshah, the seat of the most powerful and ambitious prince in the kingdom. Muḥammad ᶜAlī Mīrzā, for his part, is unlikely to have relied on chance to bring such an important religious figure—and one, as we have seen, already indebted to him—to his capital. The willingness of the Shaykh to stay in Kirmanshah and the subsequent length of his sojourn there also suggest a previous decision to accept a formal invitation from the prince. Further evidence that this was the case is provided by Muḥammad ᶜAlī Kashmīrī, who states that the prince gave Shaykh Aḥmad the sum of one thousand *tomans* for his travelling expenses to the city.[384]

Fatḥ ᶜAlī Shāh's policy of inviting important religious personages to live in Tehran was emulated by many of the royal princes in the hope of raising the prestige of their provincial capitals.[385] Muḥammad ᶜAlī Mīrzā made a particular point of increasing the importance of Kirmanshah. Sir Robert Kerr Porter remarks of the city that

> The population amounts to about 15,000 families, some few of which are Christians and Jews; the views of its governor inclining him to draw into his city, and to disperse through the whole range of his government, those sorts of persons most likely to increase his revenues, and to spread, his general influence.[386]

The invitation to Shaykh Aḥmad fitted in well with the prince's general aims, but it is less easy to understand the motives of the former in accepting. Al-Ahsaᵓi, whatever his stated reservations about close identification with secular authority, was not actually averse to associating with representatives of the state, as is attested by his cordial relations, not only with Fatḥ ᶜAlī Shāh and Muḥammad ᶜAlī Mīrzā, but also with Prince Maḥmud Mīrzā, Muᶜizz al-Mulk (1799-1853), with whom he corresponded,[387] Prince Mīrzā ᶜAbd Allāh Khān, Amīn al-Dawla, with whom he stayed in Isfahan,[388] Prince Ibrāhīm Khān, Ẓahīr al-Dawla (d. 1825), and possibly even ᶜAbbās Mīrzā (1789-1833), who is described as one of his admirers.[389] At the same time, the close attachment of Ibrāhīm Khān cannot have been without its attendant problems in the form of sycophants on the one hand and political rivals on the other. The later difficulties in Kirman which followed on the death of Ibrāhīm Khān, and the more serious religio-political disturbances on the death of Karīm Khān Zand (d. 1750) indicate how problematic such relations could become.[390]

Despite an attempt to prevent his departure by the governor of Yazd, Shaykh Aḥmad succeeded in leaving for Kirmanshah, travelling by way of Isfahan, where he stayed for forty days.[391] During this period, he associated with the leading ulama of the city and their pupils, and was requested to stay there permanently.[392] Citing the dream which had spurred him to travel to the *ᶜatabāt*, al-Ahsaᵓi made his excuses and prepared to leave; at this point, a deputation from Muḥammad ᶜAlī Mīrzā arrived to bring him to Kirmanshah, and, in

compliance with the prince's request, he set off from Isfahan.[393] The very fact that the prince knew he would be there is itself highly suggestive of a prior arrangement.

News of his impending arrival reached Kirmanshah, and the prince and townspeople went out about two stages to welcome him. Following the *istiqbāl*, tents were pitched at Chāh Kalān outside the city.[394] At this point, whether for the first time—as is claimed, but seems unlikely—or as a reiteration, Muḥammad ᶜAlī Mīrzā invited al-Ahsaᵓi to stay in his capital, adducing as his reasons "the good pleasure of God; the nearness of your excellency; and my distinction among others and exaltation among them."[395] No doubt the true order of motivation was exactly the reverse. The Shaykh argued that he had left Yazd out of a longing to visit the *ᶜatabāt*, but the prince immediately agreed to pay the expenses for an annual pilgrimage to the shrines. Shaykh ᶜAbd Allāh states that he also offered to accompany the Shaykh there every year, but it is highly unlikely, in view of the prince's relations with the government in Baghdad, that this was intended seriously.[396]

Exactly how many of the Shaykh's expenses were, in the end, undertaken by Muḥammad ᶜAlī Mīrzā is very hard to determine. Tanakābunī states that al-Ahsaᵓi had debts and that the prince asked him to sell him a gate of paradise for one thousand *tomans*, and that the Shaykh did so, writing out a bond for the gate.[397] According to Kashmīrī, as mentioned above, the prince gave al-Ahsaᵓi one thousand *tomans* for the journey from Yazd. The same source states that the prince also paid him a stipend of seven hundred *tomans* per month,[398] although Tanakābunī maintains that this was his annual allowance.[399] It is also worth noting that it has been stated—almost certainly without foundation—that Fatḥ ᶜAlī Shāh gave al-Ahsaᵓi the enormous sum of one hundred thousand *tomans* with which to pay off his debts.[400] The figure in question is improbably high, but it is not impossible that the king at one time gave a smaller sum to the Shaykh. That the latter may have incurred heavy debts more than once is suggested by Abu 'l-Qāsim ibn Zayn al-ᶜĀbidīn ibn Karīm, who states that he gave away his entire wealth twice in his life; he was, it seems, about to do so again when he saw Fatima in a dream and was dissuaded from such a course.[401] It is not impossible that al-Ahsaᵓi, his commitments growing, may have found himself in debt in Yazd and gone to Kirmanshah expressly to live under a patron with sufficient resources to support him.

Shaykh Aḥmad entered Kirmanshah on 2 Rajab 1229/20 June 1814. His initial stay there lasted over two years: in 1232/1817, he performed what appears to have been his first pilgrimage to Mecca.[402] Returning by way of Najaf and Karbala, the Shaykh decided to stay for a while at the *ᶜatabāt*; he remained there for a total of eight months, associating with several important ulama, including ᶜAlī ibn Muḥammad Ṭabātabāᵓī and Mīrzā-yi Qummī.[403] It seems that some doubts were expressed at about this time as to the orthodoxy of the Shaykh's beliefs, since some of his *rasaᵓil* were shown to Ṭabāṭabāᵓī with the request that

he comment on their acceptability. He kept the *rasāʾil* in question for two days and, on the third day, expressed the opinion that their contents were perfectly orthodox.[404] In view of later developments, this expression of approval from a champion of the orthodox Usuli position such as Ṭabāṭabāʾī is highly significant. It seems, incidentally, that it was in this period that al-Ahsaʾi taught the *Risāla al-ʿilmiyya* of Murtaḍā Fayḍ al-Kāshānī in the Shrine of Ḥusayn in Karbala.[405]

Shaykh Aḥmad returned to Kirmanshah on 4 Muḥarram 1234/3 November 1818.[406] There he stayed, with the possible exception of some visits to the ʿ*atabāt*, until one year after the death of Muḥammad ʿAlī Mīrzā in1237/1821. During the years he spent in Kirmanshah, he added considerably to his output of treatises and commentaries. Several works are dated as having been written during his first stay of over two years. The most important of these is the monumental and central *Sharḥ al-ziyāra al-jāmiʿa al-kabīra* dated 1230/1815.[407] Comprising 34,000 *bayts* in four volumes, this work is probably the most important single source for the Shaykh's doctrines, particularly with regard to the station of the Imāms.

Soon after the completion of this massive work, al-Ahsaʾi wrote a commentary of over 2,500 bayts on the *Risāla al-ʿilmiyya* of Murtaḍā Fayḍ al-Kāshānī just referred to above.[408] At least one work was written by the Shaykh during his stay in Karbala in 1233/1818; this is a *risāla* written at the request of one of his followers on his own *Sharḥ al-fawāʾid*.[409] On his return to Kirmanshah, he continued this prodigious output. Among the most interesting works produced during this period are: *al-Risāla al-sulṭānīyya*, written in reply to two questions from Fatḥ ʿAlī Shāh, less than one month after his return to the city;[410] the lengthy and important *Sharḥ al-Mashāʾir*, written in 1234/1818 for a certain Mullā Mashhad;[411] the even lengthier and more influential *Sharḥ al-ʿArshiyya*, written in 1236/1821.[412] As well as major works such as these, the Shaykh continued to pen numerous, often lengthy, replies to questions from ulama and laymen in a variety of places.[413]

In 1237/1821, war broke out between the Ottoman Empire and Iran.[414] Although most of the fighting was under the command of ʿAbbās Mīrzā, who achieved several important successes on the Kurdish frontier, Muḥammad ʿAlī Mīrzā also set out with a large force to attack Baghdad. Having come within a short distance of his objective, he died on 26 Ṣafar 1237/22 November 1821.[415] His son, Prince Muḥammad Ḥusayn Mīrzā, Hishmat al-Dawla (d. 1845), was appointed governor of Kirmanshah in his father's place.[416] The removal of Muḥammad ʿAlī Mīrzā was, however, a severe blow to the region, and conditions began to dec1ine seriously, being aggravated by a heavy flood which destroyed a quarter of Kirmanshah about this time.[417] Al-Ahsaʾi remained in the city for a further year,[418] but, in 1238/1822, plague entered Iran from China and India, bringing widespread infection and a high mortality rate.[419] The Shaykh decided to leave Kirmanshah, but not, apparently, to escape the plague (unless

he thought to avoid it by heading where it had been), since he set off towards Mashhad, travelling by way of Qum and Qazvīn.

The Period of *Takfīr* 1238-41/1822-6

Although there is no direct evidence, it would seem that it was at this time that al-Ahsaʾi stayed for a short time in Qazvīn and had the serious disagreement with Mullā Muḥammad Taqī Baraghānī (d. 1847) which led to the pronouncement of *takfīr* against him. Muḥammad Taqī was the oldest of three brothers originally from Baraghān near Tehran. Descended from a family of ulama which dated back to the Buwayhid period, he was born about 1173/1760.[420] He first studied in Qazvīn, then in Qum, where he attended some classes given by Mīrzā-yi Qummī; disliking these, he went to Isfahan, where he studied *ḥikma* and *kalām*, and then to the *ʿatabāt*, where he was taught by Āqā Sayyid ʿAlī Ṭabāṭabāʾī, Shaykh Jaʿfar al-Najafī, and Muḥammad ʿAlī Ṭabāṭabāʾī. When the last-named came to Iran in 1242/1826 to lead the second *jihad* against Russia, he visited Qazvīn, where he gave an *ijāza* to Muḥammad Taqī Baraghānī; both Taqī and his brother Muḥammad Ṣālih Baraghānī (d. ca. 1853) were among the ulama who went on the *jihad*. He later spent some time in Tehran, but, following a disagreement with Fatḥ ʿAlī Shāh, returned to Qazvīn, where he eventually became Imām Jumʿa, achieving particular recognition as one of the best preachers of his day. He composed a number of works, of which the best known are the *Kitāb manhaj al-ijtihād* (in twenty-four volumes) and the *Majālis al-muttaqīn*, attaining some fame as a writer on the sufferings of the Imāms. Iʿtimād al-Salṭana writes that he and his two brothers were "among the great ulama of the Qajar state."[421]

In later years, Muḥammad Taqī won considerable notoriety as the leading opponent of the Shaykhi school in Iran; as a result of this opposition and his subsequent stand against Babism, he was murdered on 15 Dhu 'l-Qaʿda 1263/25 October 1847, apparently by three men, one a Shaykhi, one a Babi, and one a Shaykhi with strong Babi leanings.[422] The circumstances of his assassination earned for him the title of Shahīd-i Thālith, the Third Martyr.[423]

A reasonably detailed account of al-Ahsaʾi's visit to Qazvīn and his dispute with Baraghānī is given by Tanakābunī, a pupil and supporter of the latter. During his stay, Shaykh Aḥmad was a guest of the then Imām Jumʿa, Mullā ʿAbd al-Wahhāb Qazvīnī (d. 1847), apparently because the latter sent ahead an invitation to Hamadān [424] and not improbably because he already had a special interest in the Shaykh's views.[425] Murtaẓā Mudarrisī Chahārdihī has suggested, not, perhaps, without some justice, that Baraghānī, believing himself to be the most learned of the Shiʿi ulama, felt slighted that al-Ahsaʾi had not chosen to be his guest during his visit.[426] That this may have been the case seems confirmed by Baraghānī's own son, Shaykh Jaʿfar Qazvīnī (d. 1888), the only one of his children to become a Shaykhi.[427]

Baraghānī seems to have been an ambitious man,[428] and this apparent slight by someone as important as al-Ahsaʾi was not calculated to further his interests. He was, moreover, a man ever ready to enter into disagreements with other ulama, and had crossed swords on more than one occasion with several important scholars, including Mīrzā-yi Qummī, Āqā Sayyid ʿAlī Ṭabāṭabāʾī, Mullā ʿAbd al-Wahhāb Qazvīnī, Mullā Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad Mahdī Narāqī Kāshānī, and Mullā Muḥammad ʿAlī Jangalī.[429] At one time, as we have noted, he even had a serious disagreement wth the shah himself, as a result of which he left Tehran.[430]

It is important to realize that it was with such a strongly-opinionated man as this that al-Ahsaʾi's *takfīr* originated. Until his disagreement with Baraghānī, there had been little question of the Shaykh's orthodoxy and, even if some individuals had rejected his views and one or two openly disputed them, only the most tentative suggestions had been made that they might be heretical.[431] Had Baraghānī not pronounced the sentence of *takfīr* and made assiduous efforts to circulate it in Iran and at the *ʿatabāt*, it is probable that Shaykhism as a distinct school might never have come into existence and that later interpretations of al-Ahsaʾi's thought would have taken a different direction more in harmony with the mainstream of contemporary Shiʿi thinking. Had that happened, it is highly improbable that the Shaykh's theories would have been able to function as a matrix for the speculations of the Bab and his followers.

Tanakābunī describes in detail the incidents which led to Baraghānī's condemnation of al-Ahsaʾi. At the beginning of his stay in Qazvīn, the Shaykh went to the Masjid-i Jumʿa, where he performed *ṣalāt* along with Mullā ʿAbd al-Wahhāb and the other ulama of the city, except for Baraghānī.[432] One day, he went to visit Muḥammad Taqī, probably in order to placate his feelings after his imagined snub. A heated discussion soon began on the topic of resurrection (*maʿād*), centered on al-Ahsaʾi's view that man has four bodies (two *jasad* and two *jism*) and that, of the two *jasad*, only that composed of the elements of the interworld of *Hurqalyā* would survive physical death as a vehicle for the resurrection of the two *jism*. Baraghānī, in common with the most orthodox ulama, simply maintained that resurrection would take place in an earthly, elemental body.

Confirmation that the topic round which this disagreement revolved was that of resurrection is to be found in a letter from al-Ahsaʾi to Mullā ʿAbd al-Wahhāb Qazvīnī, in which he states that "Shaykh Shaqī [i.e., Taqī][433] had discovered references in one of his books to man's two bodies (*jasadayn*), one of which will return in the resurrection and the other of which will not." "Satan," writes al-Ahsaʾi, "inspired Shaqī and he declared 'this is unbelief (*kufr*) and he [al-Ahsaʾi] is an unbeliever (*kāfir*), and Ākhūnd Mullā ʿAbd al-Wahhāb has prayed behind an unbeliever'."[434] Later that day, when Shaykh Aḥmad went to the Masjid-i Jumʿa, only Abd al-Wahhāb accompanied him. Baraghānī seems to have issued his *fatwā* of *takfīr* almost immediately, and soon had it spread

throughout Qazvīn and even printed in the *Dār al-Ṭabᶜa* there,[435] making of it, quite possibly, the first *fatwā* of its kind printed in Iran.

An attempt was made to save the situation by the governor of Qazvīn, Prince ᶜAlī Naqī Mīrzā, Nawwāb-i Amīn al-Mulk, Rukn al-Dawla (b. 1793), a son of Fatḥ ᶜAlī Shāh.[436] Tanakābunī says he acted to heal the breach because it would give a bad reputation to the town and, significantly, because it would displease the shah. Rukn al-Dawla invited the ulama to dine with him one night and, while they were there, reprimanded Baraghānī for his behaviour, stating that al-Ahsaᵓi was the most important of the ulama of the Arabs and Persians, and should be treated with honour. But Baraghānī refused to retract his accusation.[437] Such interference in a purely theological matter by a local governor is possibly unique in the history of the period and throws an interesting light on the relations of the state and the religious institution in the early Qajar era.

Although Rukn al-Dawla's intercession failed to mollify Baraghānī, it does seem to have been instrumental in easing the situation somewhat with regard to other ulama. According to Shaykh Jaᶜfar Qazvīnī (b. 1806?), who was present at the time, the governor persuaded al-Ahsaᵓi to stay a further ten days in Qazvīn. The Shaykh stayed at Darb Kūshk near the town and continued to lead the prayers either there or in the Masjid-i Jumᶜa. On one occasion, the prince came with five thousand notables, ulama, merchants, tradesmen, and others to attend prayers outside the city.[438]

According to Tanakābunī, the reasons for the declaration of *takfīr* were three: the Shaykh's views on resurrection (*maᶜād*), on the ascension of the Prophet (*miᶜrāj*), and on the nature of the Imāms.[439] As the *takfīr* was taken up by several other ulama, the charges made came to include further points. Rashti mentions some of these in his *Dalīl al-mutaḥayyirīn*: it was claimed that al-Ahsaᵓi had said that all the ulama from al-Shaykh al-Mufid (d. 413/1022) to his own contemporaries were in error and that the Mujtahidī (Uṣūlī) school was false; that he regarded ᶜAlī as the Creator; that he held all Qurᵓanic phrases referring to God as really being references to ᶜAlī; that he spoke of God as uninformed of particulars and maintained that He had two forms of knowledge, one old (*qadīm*) and one new (*ḥadīth*); and that he did not believe the Imām Ḥusayn to have been killed.[440] Rashti refers to these charges (some of which are merely the stock-in-trade of the heresiologists) as 'absurdities' and cites a sermon attributed to the Shaykh in which they are severally refuted. After the death of al-Ahsaᵓi, however, an even greater number of heretical and quasi-heretical views were attributed to him.[441] Muḥammad Ḥusayn Shahristānī's *Taryāq-i fārūq* contains no fewer than forty points of disagreement, many of them extremely factitious.

The validity or otherwise of some or all of these charges is, however, irrelevant. Without the *takfīr* it is likely that al-Ahsaᵓi would have continued to be regarded as no more heterodox than Mullā Ṣadrā or others among the

'philosopher-theologians' of the Safavid period.[442] Tanakābunī maintains that the underlying reason behind the *takfīr* was that al-Ahsaʾi tried to combine *sharᶜ* with *ḥikma* and to harmonize rational (*maᶜqūl*) ideas with those derived from tradition (*manqūl*);[443] but, as Hāshimī Kirmānī has observed, it was really the *takfīr* which prevented his being regarded as a Fayḍ Kāshānī or a Mullā Ṣadrā,[444] whose achievement was precisely that of combining *ḥikma* with orthodox religious views.

Had Baraghānī alone pronounced *takfir*, it is unlikely that it would have had much effect outside Qazvīn and, thanks to the intervention of Rukn Dawla, probably very little even there. Baraghānī's stature as an *ᶜālim* was not sufficiently great for him to expect his *fatwā* to be widely respected without his winning the support of other, more eminent ulama. He, therefore, wrote letters to scholars at the *ᶜatabāt*, informing them that he had pronounced the *takfīr*;[445] a number of them joined him in the attack on al-Ahsaʾi. Several individuals went to Sayyid Muḥammad Mahdī Ṭabāṭabāʾī (d.1249/1833), a son of Āqā Sayyid ᶜAli, and presented him with certain passages from the works of Shaykh Aḥmad which they claimed to be heretical.[446] Although his brother, Āqā Sayyid Muḥammad, the leader of the *jihād* against Russia in 1826, was more eminent, Sayyid Muḥammad Mahdī was highly respected, to the extent that he was able to show open defiance towards Muḥammad Shah (1808-1848) during his last visit to Tehran.[447] Under Sayyid Muḥammad Mahdī's leadership, a meeting was held, at which a large number of ulama attended to draw up a *fatwā* announcing al-Ahsaʾi's *takfīr*. According to Rashti, no sooner had they begun to write the *takfir* than an earthquake occurred and the meeting dispersed.[448]

Tanakābunī gives a list of those ulama who pronounced *takfir* against the Shaykh: Mullā Muḥammad Taqī Baraghānī, Āqā Sayyid Muḥammad Mahdī Ṭabāṭabāʾī, Mullā Muḥammad Jaᶜfar Astarābādī (known as Sharīᶜatmadār) (d.1263/1847),[449] Mullā Āqā Darbandī (d.1286/1869),[450] Mullā Muḥammad Sharīf (Sharīf al-ᶜUlamāʾ Māzandarānī) (d. 1246/1831),[451] Āqā Sayyid Ibrāhīm Qazvīnī Karbalāʾī (d. 1246/1830), [452] Shaykh Muḥammad Ḥusayn Qazvīnī (d. 1254/1838),[453] and Muḥammad Ḥasan ibn Bāqir al-Najafī.[454] Rashti, however, states that the true originators of the *takfīr* were only three individuals, one in Karbala and two in Najaf; Baraghānī he does not mention at all.[455]

According to al-Ahsaʾi, large sums of money were spent to ensure that the *takfir* would obtain as wide a currency and acceptance as possible.[456] His opponents went so far as to send the fourth part of his *Sharḥ al-ziyāra al-jāmiᶜa al-kabīra*, containing passages offensive to Sunni sensibilities, to the governor of Baghdad, who had recently put to death the uncle of Shaykh Mūsā ibn Jaᶜfar al-Najāfi for less serious remarks.[457] That such a foolhardy act could even have been contemplated is a telling measure of the lengths to which the Shaykh's opponents were prepared to go in order to discredit him. Chahārdihī maintains that the ulama of Karbala and Najaf became "more audacious" after the *takfīr* of

al-Ahsaʾi and started to excommunicate anyone who began to gain leadership and of whom they were afraid.[458]

The condemnation of al-Ahsaʾi and the forcible creation of Shaykhism as a separate *madhhab* from the main body of Shiʿism seems to have been necessary in the absence of a target to take the place of the Akhbari school. By attacking the Shaykhis, it was possible for the Usulis to define further their own position, and very soon the Shaykhi /Bālāsarī division came to replace that between Usuli and Akhbari,[459] to be replaced in its turn by the Shiʿi/Babi and Shiʿi/ Bahaʾi divisions of later years – each stage representing a sharper and fuller division than the one before.

At the same time, it must be remembered that, as Corbin has pointed out, the pronouncement of *takfīr* did not represent a declaration of excommunication from the body of an established church, but was, rather, the personal initiative of Baraghānī in the first instance.[460] It is as important to note the names of those leading ulama who did not pronounce *takfīr* as it is to mention those who did. Men such as Mullā Muḥammad Bāqir Shaftī, Mullā ʿAlī ibn Jamshīd Nūrī, Ḥājī Muḥammad Ibrāhīm Kalbāsī, Āqā Sayyid Muḥammad Ṭabāṭabāʾī and others were hesitant to condemn the Shaykh, and either continued to admire him openly or adopted a neutral stance in the matter.[461]

It was some time, however, before the *takfīr* became widely known, and al-Ahsaʾi left Qazvīn with considerable honour, accompanied by an entourage of some seventy people.[462] Travelling by way of Tehran, he visited Shāhrūd, Ṭūs, and Mashhad, where he stayed for twenty-eight days before leaving for Yazd via Turbat-i Haydariyyeh and Ṭabas.[463] Throughout this journey, al-Ahsaʾi was treated with great respect by local governors, and was even given an escort of one hundred horsemen and two hundred infantry to accompany him from Ṭabas to Yazd.[464] After three months there, he set off for Isfahan, where he was welcomed by the ulama and nobles of the city and made the guest of ʿAbd Allāh Khān, Amīn al-Dawla, as mentioned earlier. Although he planned to leave after only a short stay, he was prevailed upon to extend his visit over the coming month of Ramadan, since his performing the fast there would bring *baraka* to the city and its inhabitants. He agreed to stay and sent his "unnecessary baggage and his wives" to Kirmanshah with Shaykh ʿAbd Allāh, who then returned to Isfahan. Large crowds came to visit him there, and, on one occasion, the number of people performing *ṣalāt* behind him reached sixteen thousand.[465] It is likely that on this occasion, as on that of his previous visit to Isfahan, al-Ahsaʾi led the prayers in the Masjid-i Shāh.[466]

Shaykh Aḥmad had numerous admirers in Isfahan, among whom were several of the leading ulama of the day. Most notable among them were Ḥājī Muḥammad Ibrāhīm Kalbāsī and Ḥājī Sayyid Muḥammad Bāqir Shaftī, to both of whom we have referred in the previous chapter. When al-Ahsaʾi was in Isfahan, Kalbāsī suspended his classes, cancelled his Friday prayers, and prayed behind the Shaykh.[467] Although Shaftī was later perturbed by the *takfīr*, he

hesitated to condemn al-Ahsaʾi himself, and it has been claimed that, towards the end of his life, he was convinced of the falsity of the charges levelled against his teachings.[468]

Other admirers in Isfahan included Mullā ʿAlī ibn Jamshīd Nūrī (d.1246/1830),[469] who also suspended his classes when al-Ahsaʾi was in the city, and Shaykh Muḥammad Taqī Isfahānī (d.1248/1832),[470] a pupil of Baḥr al-ʿUlūm and a son-in-law and pupil of Shaykh Jaʿfar ibn Khiḍr al-Najafī.[471] Even if none of these men were "Shaykhis" in what became the strict sense, and may in some cases have held doubts about the Shaykh's beliefs after the *takfīr*, none of them lent his support to the attack launched against him. Kalbāsī, who had an *ijāza* from al-Ahsaʾi, was so unimpressed by the *takfīr* that, on the Shaykh's death, he held a three-day memorial meeting attended by large numbers, including men of rank in the city.[472] That men such as Kalbāsī and Shaftī refused to condemn the Shaykh was a major factor in restricting the effectiveness of the *takfīr*.

On 12 Shawwāl 1238/22 June 1823, al-Ahsaʾi left Isfahan for Kirmanshah, where he stayed for another year; he then went to Karbala having left his wives (and, presumably, the rest of his unnecessary baggage) in Kirmanshah.[473] It was after he had been in Karbala for a short time that serious opposition began, led by Sayyid Muḥammad Mahdī Ṭabāṭabāʾī.[474] According to Rashti, someone compiled a book containing heretical ideas of *mulḥids*, *zindīqs*, Ṣūfīs, Trinitarians, and so on, attributing them to Shaykh Aḥmad, and reading them to a large gathering assembled for the purpose.[475] We have mentioned above the deliberate attempt to incite the governor of Baghdad, Dāʾūd Pāshā, against the Shaykh. The latter seems to have recognized the serious danger he was in and decided to travel to Mecca, leaving Sayyid Rashti behind in Karbala as his leading pupil and, in some sense, his successor.[476] Accompanied by several companions, he went first to Baghdad, from where he set out for Syria.[477] On the way he grew ill and, two or three stages from Medina, at Hadiyya, died on 21 Dhū 'l-Qaʿda 1241/27 June 1826, aged seventy-five.[478] His grave is in Medina.[479]

CHAPTER THREE:
SAYYID KĀẒIM RASHTĪ

We do not, unfortunately, possess any very detailed accounts of the life of Sayyid Kāẓim similar to Shaykh ᶜAbd Allāh al-Aḥsaᵓi's life of his father. Two manuscript biographies written by pupils of the Sayyid—the *Nūr al-anwār*, written for Prince Āṣif Mīrzā by Mīrzā ᶜAlī Naqī Qummī Hindī, and the *Tanbīh al-ghāfilīn*, by Āqā Sayyid Hādī Hindī[480]—are known to be in existence.[481] Unfortunately, despite efforts to trace these for the present author during a visit to Kirman in 1977, the Shaykhi community there has been unable to discover their current location. There is, however, a summary of their contents by Ḥāj Sayyid Jawād Qarashī Hindī, a descendant of Mīrzā ᶜAlī Naqī and a nephew of Āqā Sayyid Hādī; this has been printed by Abu'l-Qāsim ibn Zayn al-ᶜĀbidīn ibn Karīm in his *Fihrist*.[482] Brief accounts of Rashti may also be found in Tanakābūnī's *Qiṣaṣ al-ᶜulamāᵓ*, Khwānsārī's *Kitāb rawḍāt al-jannāt*, Ḥabībābādī's *Makārim al-āthār*, Kirmānī's *Hidāyat al-ṭālibīn*, and elsewhere.

The date of Sayyid Kāẓim's birth is open to dispute. According to different sources, he was born in Rasht in 1198/1784,[483] 1205/1791,[484] 1209/1794,[485] 1212/1797,[486] or 1214/1799,[487] the son of Āqā Sayyid Qāsim ibn Aḥmad. Sayyid Aḥmad was a Ḥusaynī *sayyid*, belonging to an important family in Medina, who had left his native city on the death of his father, Sayyid Ḥabīb, on account of plague, and travelled to Rasht in north-west Iran. Āqā Sayyid Qāsim was born in Rasht and, according to Qarashī, became "one of the great scholars (*fuḍalāᵓ*)" of the city.[488] Whatever his literary or other intellectual attainments, however, Sayyid Qāsim was not primarily an *ᶜālim*, but a silk merchant by trade,[489] and there seems to be no evidence that the family had any close connections with the ulama in Rasht or elsewhere. As with al-Aḥsaᵓi, we may assume that Rashti's impulse to study the religious sciences may have derived from personal initiative rather than upbringing or parental encouragement, in contrast to the majority of leading ulama in his period and since. Like al-Aḥsaᵓi too, the Sayyid seems to have been drawn to a life of retirement and reflection from early childhood, refusing to join in games with other children.[490]

According to a short biography in the E. G. Browne Collection, at the age of twelve Rashti was living at Ardabīl.[491] While there, states Mullā Jaᶜfar Qazvīnī, he engaged in ascetic practices and, like al-Aḥsaᵓi, began to have visions, although with none of the intensity or frequency experienced by the latter.[492] Browne's biography states that, while at Ardabīl, he had a dream of one of the ancestors of Shaykh Ṣafi al-Dīn ᶜAbd al-Fatḥ Isḥāq (1252-1334), progenitor of the Safavid dynasty, who instructed him to travel to Yazd in order to become a disciple of al-Aḥsaᵓi.[493] It seems improbable that the Sayyid should have gone to Yazd at such an early age, and some other sources, in fact, suggest

that he first met al-Ahsaʾi there in his late teens or early twenties. It is more likely that he returned to Rasht at this point—as is stated by Qazvīnī, who says he did so after a dream of al-Ahsaʾi.[494]

Like the Shaykh, he had an early desire to study, and was sent by his father to a local teacher ran a small *maktab* in the town.[495] When he had completed these "external" studies, he decided to continue to the "higher studies", and expressed a desire to travel for this purpose, probably to the ʿ*atabāt* or one of the centres of learning in Iran. His family were opposed to this, however, and prevented him from leaving.[496] This resembles the disapproval felt by the family of the Bab when he left for the ʿ*atabāt*. In both cases, it seems that the transition from merchant to ʿ*ālim* was considered socially (and probably financially) unacceptable.

According to the standard Shaykhi account, Rashti dreamt one night of Fāṭima, who revealed to him the existence of Shaykh Aḥmad; on the fourth night after this dream, he had another, in which she told him that the Shaykh was then living in Yazd. He set out, accordingly, in that direction, met al-Ahsaʾi, and became one of his pupils.[497]

Our sources, already in disagreement over the date of Rashti's birth, are equally contradictory in respect of his age on meeting al-Ahsaʾi, although they do seem to be agreed that the meeting took place in Yazd—probably between the Shaykh's return from Tehran in 1224/1809 and his departure for Kirmanshah in 1229/1814. Browne, as noted above, suggests that he travelled to Yazd, shortly after the age of twelve – a date which I have rejected as improbable. Corbin thinks he was aged fifteen, thus arriving in Yazd in 1227/1812.[498] According to Qazvīnī, the Sayyid travelled to Yazd via Qazvīn in the company of an old man of his family some time after the arrival of al-Ahsaʾi in Iran; the same source quotes an unnamed mulla from Yazd, who recalls how al-Ahsaʾi went out to meet the Sayyid on his arrival and that the latter was then seventeen or eighteen years old.[499] Zarandī, however, maintains that Rashti, was aged twenty-two on his arrival in Yazd, although he incorrectly states that this was in 1231/1815, at the time al-Ahsaʾi was preparing to leave Yazd for Kirmanshah.[500]

Such a confusing welter of dates and ages makes it extremely difficult for us to estimate the nature and extent of Rashti's development prior to meeting al-Ahsaʾi. There seems little doubt that he showed very considerable precocious talent and began writing at an early age. Zarandī notes that "at the age of eleven, he had committed to memory the whole of the Qurʾan. At the age of fourteen, he had learned by heart a prodigious number of prayers and recognized traditions of Muḥammad."[501] Mullā Jaʿfar Qazvīnī states that on his return to Rasht from Ardabīl, his name reached the ears of Muḥammad Riḍā Mīrzā Iftikhār al-Mulk (1797-1860), who came to visit him, and that, at the age of fifteen, he wrote *rasāʾil* in reply to questions from this prince.[502] How much truth there is in this account, it is hard to determine. Muḥammad Riḍā Mīrzā, the thirteenth son of

Fatḥ ʿAlī Shāh, was, in fact, about the same age as Rashti or, if we accept an earlier date of birth for the latter, much younger than him, being born in 1211/1797. He did not became governor of Gīlān until 1234/1819, and it is possible that he lived in Tehran up until then. On the other hand, a *risāla* on *akl wa maʾkūl* addressed to this prince is recorded as having been written at an unspecified date by Rashti.[503] It is also clear that the prince was deeply interested in religious matters, as witnessed in his devotion to the Niʿmatullāhī Sufi order, in which his personal *murshid* was Ḥājī Muḥammad Jaʿfar Kabūdār Āhangī in Hamadān.[504]

At least three works are known to have been written by Rashti at a relatively early age, these being the *Risāla maṭāliʿ al-anwār*, written at the age of nineteen in reply to Mullā Muḥammad Rashīd in explanation of some phrases in the *Kalimāt-i maknūna* of Fayḍ al-Kāshānī;[505] the *Masāʾil-i Rashīdiyya,* also written at the age of nineteen, in reply to the same individual, on the differences of capacities (*qābiliyyāt*);[506] and a *tafsīr* of part of the "throne verse" (*āyat al-kursī*: Qurʾan 2:255), written during a *ḥajj* journey undertaken at the age of twenty.[507]

Although the controversy surrounding the date of his birth makes it impossible to determine his exact age at the time of writing, there are several dated *rasāʾil* by Rashti which can be ascribed with reasonable certainty to his twenties or early thirties. Among the more important of these, we may note *al-Risāla al-ṣuʿudiyya wa ʻl-nuzūliyya* (1233/1818);[508] *al-Risāla al-ʿĀmiliyya* (1236/1821);[509] the *Sharḥ Duʿā al-samāt* (1238/1823);[510] an Arabic *risāla* on *sulūk* and *uṣūl* (1238/1823);[511] and the *Risāla asrār al-shahāda* (1238/1823).[512]

In general, we may note that, up to the death of al-Ahsaʾi in 1241/1826, Rashti was actively engaged in writing commentaries and replies to questions from a wide variety of individuals.[513] Zarandī states that, within "a few weeks" of his arrival in Yazd, the Sayyid was told to remain in his own house and cease attending his lectures. Those of the Shaykh's disciples who had difficulties in understanding were from then on to be referred to him.[514] While it is highly unlikely that Rashti should so rapidly have been designated al-Ahsaʾi's leading disciple, especially if he was only in his teens on his arrival, there is no doubt that after some time, he succeeded in winning the confidence and respect of the Shaykh and was regarded, well before the latter's death, as his deputy and the semi-official expounder of his views. According to Kirmānī, al-Ahsaʾi's attitude of respect towards Rashti had already become apparent in Yazd: "Sayyid Kāẓim understands, but no-one else does," he is reported to have said there.[515]

Rashti's precise position during the lifetime of the Shaykh is not entirely clear, but he does seem to have been entrusted with the task of answering questions on the latter's behalf, a function which does not appear to have been given to any other of his disciples. An excellent example of his role as the Shaykh's deputy is a lengthy *risāla* written in 1235/1820 in reply to twenty-four

questions originally asked of al-Ahsaʾi, but referred by him to Rashti.[516] He also acted as continuator for al-Ahsaʾi in the case of a *risāla* to a certain Mīrzā Muḥammad ʿAlī.[517]

In this period also, Rashti began to carry out a task which was to preoccupy him greatly in later years—defence of al-Ahsaʾi from attacks made on him by hostile ulama. Thus, for example, in 1240/1825, he wrote a detailed reply to an unnamed individual who had attacked the views of the Shaykh on resurrection (*maʿād*) and the divine knowledge.[518] It may also have been before the death of Shaykh Aḥmad, or shortly after it, that Rashti undertook the translation of some of his works into Persian, namely the *Mukhtaṣar al-Haydariyya*,[519] the *Ḥayāt al-nafs*, [520] and part of the first section of the *Sharḥ al-ziyāra*.[521]

Contrary to the impression given in most of our sources, however, Sayyid Kāẓim does not seem to have remained constantly in al-Aḥsāʾi's company from the time of their meeting in Yazd to the latter's final departure for Arabia. At the age of twenty, possibly some years after his arrival in Yazd, Rashti made the pilgrimage to Mecca – the only occasion on which he was able to do so, according to Niʿmat Allāh Raẓavī Sharīf. [522] In 1229/1814, he accompanied Shaykh Aḥmad to Kirmanshah,[523] but there is evidence that he did not stay constantly with him there: two letters, one from Rashti and the other a reply from al-Ahsaʾi, both apparently written during the latter's stay in Kirmanshah, and possibly during the lifetime of Prince Muḥammad ʿAlī Mīrzā, indicate that the Sayyid spent at least a year, perhaps much longer, in Karbala, with at least one visit to his home town of Rasht.[524]

His absence would appear to have been on the instructions of the Shaykh , seemingly for the purpose of acting as his representative at the *ʿatabāt*: in his reply to Rashti, who had complained of his separation from his teacher and suggested that he had been rejected by him, Shaykh Aḥmad writes "know that I have placed you in a position of rank on my behalf, which is not known to most people, but which I had thought was known to you; I would otherwise have given you what I give everyone else…. I have removed from you the decree of dissimulation (*al-taqiyya*) and have bestowed on you a position on my behalf."[525]

As we have mentioned previously, al-Ahsaʾi left Kirmanshah in 1238/1822, travelling to Tehran, Mashhad, Yazd, and Isfahan, returning to Kirmanshah for a year towards the end of 1238/1822, and finally leaving for Karbala in 1239/1824. Rashti does not seem to have accompanied him on any of these journeys. In Ṣafar 1238/October-November 1822, he was staying in the vicinity of Rasht, as is apparent from a letter written in that month from the village of Shīrvān.[526] This journey to Iran may have been an extended one: his commentary on ʿAlī ibn Mūsā Andalūsī's (1214-1285) *Al-qasīda al-bā'iyya* from the *Shudhūr al-dhahab* was written in the village of Mārān near Hamadān in Shawwāl 1239/June 1824.[527]

It is also clear that, sometime before the death of Shaykh Aḥmad, Rashti studied under and received *ijāzāt* from a number of ulama, all of whom, like the Shaykh, were themselves pupils of Shaykh Jaᶜfar al-Najafī. This is a fact of some importance in assessing the nature of Rashti's relationship with orthodox Shiᶜism. Despite the unusual character of his bond with al-Ahsaᵓi, which was, in some ways, closer to that of a Ṣūfī disciple to his *murshid* than a Shiᶜi *ᶜālim* to the *mujtahid* granting him *ijāza*, it is clear that Rashti did not feel himself excluded from the more traditional mode of transmission of authority and learning. In an *ijāza* written for Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥasan Mūsawī Iṣfahānī (d.1263/1847),[528] and in another written for Āqā Muḥammad Sharīf Kirmānī,[529] Rashti refers to four individuals from whom he possessed *ijāzāt*. Apart from al-Ahsaᵓi, these were ᶜAbd Allāh ibn Muḥammad Riḍā Shubbar (1188-1242/1774-1826), Shaykh Mūsā ibn Jaᶜfar al-Najafī (d. 1241/1826), and Mullā ᶜAlī Rashti.

Sayyid ᶜAbd Allāh Shubbar and his father, Sayyid Muḥammad Riḍā Shubbar, are mentioned by Rashti as among the ulama with whom al-Ahsaᵓi associated while in Kāẓimiyyah.[530] Sayyid ᶜAbd Allāh had himself studied under several important ulama, including Mīrzā Muḥammad Mahdī Shahristānī, Shaykh Jaᶜfar al-Najafī, Āqā Sayyid ᶜAlī Ṭabāṭabāᵓī, Mīrzā-yi Qummī, Shaykh Asad Allāh al-Kāẓimaynī, and Shaykh Aḥmad al-Ahsaᵓi .[531] The author of a number of works, he is perhaps best known for his massive compilation on *fiqh*, the *Jāmiᶜ al-maᶜārif wa 'l-aḥkām*, which Muḥammad ᶜAlī Muᶜallim Ḥabībābādī regards as comparable to Fayḍ-i Kāshānī's *Kitāb al-Wāfī*, al-Ḥurr al-ᶜĀmilī's *Tafṣīl waṣā'il al Shīᶜa*, or Majlisī's *Biḥār al-anwār*.[532] It is of interest to note that Sayyid ᶜAbd Allāh was also one of the teachers of Mullā Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ Baraghānī, the brother of Mullā Muḥammad Taqī.[533] According to Anṣārī, he was known in his day as 'the second Majlisī.[534]

Shaykh Mūsā ibn Jaᶜfar was one of the sons of Shaykh Jaᶜfar, under whom he studied extensively. His father regarded him highly and is said to have considered him as more capable of *fiqh* that any but al-Muḥaqqiq al-Ḥillī and Muḥammad ibn Makkī al-Shahīd al-Awwal,[535] or, according to another source, as one of "the most learned of men in *fiqh"* along with himself and al-Shahīd al-Awwal.[536] It is related that, on the death of Shaykh Jaᶜfar, Mīrzā-yi Qummī declared Shaykh Mūsā to be "the general *marjaᶜ* and the proof of God unto you ... for he is superior to all others in knowledge".[537] Shaykh Mūsā was one of several eminent ulama who defended al-Ahsaᵓi against the attacks of his opponents at the ᶜ*atabāt*.[538]

The identity of Mullā ᶜAlī Rashtī is not clear; he may have been the Mullā ᶜAlī ibn Mīrzā Jān Rashtī for whom Shaykh Aḥmad wrote his lengthy *al-Risāla al-Rashtiyya* in 1226/1811.[539] If this is so, it is conceivable that Sayyid Kāẓim studied under him while still living in Rasht and that it was on his recommendation that he set out for Yazd to study under al-Ahsaᵓi. In the absence of dated texts of the *ijāza* in question, however, our theories as to the periods when Sayyid Kāẓim studied under them must remain conjectural,

although the dates of the deaths of Sayyid ᶜAbd Allāh and Shaykh Mūsā do at least provide us with *termini ad quem* for his study under them.

The death of al-Ahsaᵓi in 1241/1826 was an event fraught with serious consequences for Iranian Shiᶜism. Despite the *takfir* which, for some four years, had been gaining notoriety throughout the main centres of the Shiᶜi world, the Shaykh's position was still essentially that of a respected and influential *mujtahid* and *marjaᶜ al-taqlīd* on whom a sizeable body of *ṭullāb* and ulama pinned their allegiance. It is of the utmost importance that we bear in mind that by no means all of al-Ahsaᵓi pupils became "Shaykhis" in a distinct sense. Many like Mullā ᶜAlī Nūrī and Ḥājī Ibrāhīm Kalbāsī, went on in later years as perfectly respectable ulama with no overt connections with the "Shaykhi school".

At the time of al-Ahsaᵓi's death, there was, indeed, no hint of an attempt to set up a separate school within Shiᶜism, to create a division based either on doctrinal differences or on conflicting claims to authority. Nevertheless, it is clear that the effective resolution of the Akhbari/Usuli struggle had left something of a vacuum which demanded filling. The status and influence of the increasingly powerful *mujtahid* class as representatives of orthodoxy, could best be tested and demonstrated in a conflict with heterodoxy—as defined by the establishment itself. The Niᶜmatullāhī Sufi revival of the late eighteenth century provided a useful focus for such a conflict, but the issues involved were somewhat stale and, despite a number of deaths, matters never really reached very serious dimensions. The division over the affairs of Ahsaᵓi's orthodoxy was, however, potentially much more crucial. Although the conflict with Sufism was essentially centred in irreconcilable claims to authority, on behalf of the Ṣūfī shaykh or *pīr* on the one hand and the Shiᶜi Imam or his representative on the other, the issue did not on the whole, affect or call into question relations within the Shiᶜi hierarchy itself.

Al-Ahsaᵓi's death threatened to render the issue entirely academic. Whatever the ensuing debate as to his personal orthodoxy, the more fundamental—if generally unspoken—issue of authority would now have ceased to be relevant. That it did not was entirely due to the unusual manner in which Rashti was "appointed" the Shaykh's "successor", entailing as it did the creation of an order (*silsila*) or school (*madhhab*) within the Shiᶜi fold. Without such an appointment or its ready acceptance by the vast majority of al-Ahsaᵓi's pupils, it is highly unlikely that "Shaykhism" as a definable entity would have come into being at all or that a matrix would have existed in which Babism might be formed.

When al-Ahsaᵓi left Karbala for Mecca in 1241/1826, Rashti stayed behind, teaching in his place.[540] His assumption of the role of leader of the Shaykh's disciples at the *ʿatabāt*, does not, however, seem to have been based on a merely tacit recognition of his de facto position there on the latter's death.

According to Kirmānī, al-Ahsaʾi had already appointed him as the future leader of this group, both verbally and in writing.

"Some asked the Shaykh 'If we have no means of access to you, from whom are we to obtain this knowledge?' He replied 'From Sayyid Kāẓim, for he has learnt what he knows orally from me and I have learnt [what I know] orally from the Imāms and they have learnt from God without the mediation of anyone.' And it is known that the Shaykh wrote [this] in his own hand."[541]

This appointment was unusual in a number of ways. Although a leading pupil or eldest son might often inherit the sanctity and position of his teacher or father, it was uncommon for a *marjᶜ al-taqlīd* to designate anyone as *marjaᶜ* in his place, particularly at this period. At a later date, something of this kind did occur, significantly in connection with the attempt to restrict *marjaᶜīyyat* to a single individual; thus, Shaykh Murtaḍā al-Anṣārī took over the role of *marjaᶜ* from Muḥammad Ḥasan al-Najafī during the latter's final illness, in the presence of witnesses,[542] while al-Anṣārī's own successor, Mīrzā-yi Shīrāzī, was clearly singled out for that role in his teacher's life-time.[543] The experiment did not succeed, however, as we have observed in the first chapter, possibly because of a reluctance on the part of each *marjaᶜ* to endorse his verbal approval with a written appointment (*naṣṣ*). The unformalized method of acquiring authority by means of growing recognition and popularity seems to fit in more easily with the unstructured system of the Shiᶜi hierarchy. Since the 1979 Revolution, more overtly political factors have come to dominate.

Not only was Rashti's appointment unusual, first in occurring well before any comparable development in the main body of Shiᶜism (unless we include Mīrzā-yi Qummī's declaration in favour of Shaykh Mūsā al-Najafī) and, secondly, in being written; it was also highly unorthodox in its content. Sayyid Kāẓim was not merely a *mujtahid* receiving authority from another to expound and develop the religious law, but was being identified as the direct recipient of a body of knowledge derived, through al-Ahsaʾi, from the Imāms and, through them, from God. He was, as Karīm Khān describes him, "a bearer (*ḥāmil*) ... for that innate knowledge (*ᶜilm-i ladunī*)."[544] The only useful comparisons are those of the appointment of each Imām by his predecessor, beginning with ᶜAli's designation as *waṣī* by Muḥammad; the nomination by the shaykh of a Ṣūfī order of his successor; or the later development of a 'covenant' (*mīthāq*; *ᶜahd*) system in Bahaʾism, whereby ᶜAbd al-Bahāʾ was appointed as interpreter (*shāriḥ*; *mubayyin*) of the sacred writ by his father, and Shoghi Effendi Rabbani as *walī amr Allāh* by his grandfather ᶜAbbās Afandī.

Karīm Khān explicitly makes the comparison between al-Ahsaʾi's appointment of Rashti and the *naṣṣ* of Muḥammad designating ᶜAli or that of each Imām in respect of his successor.[545] Khwānsārī describes Sayyid Kāẓim as al-Ahsaʾi's "representative" (*al-nāʾib fi 'l-umūr manābuhu*) and the "leader [imam] of his disciples",[546] clearly echoing the notion of a formal appointment of this nature. By virtue of this appointment, Rashti became "the interpreter

(*shāriḥ*) of the knowledge of the Shaykh, the clarifier of the difficulties of his books, and the expounder of his stations."[547] In this respect, the Sayyid was endowed with a function very similar to that of the imam as *qayyim bi 'l-Qur'ān* or, more significantly perhaps, the head of the Ishrāqī order as *qayyim bi 'l-kitāb'*.[548]

The self-effacing tone of his writings makes it difficult for us to determine exactly how Rashti himself understood his position after the death of the Shaykh. It is also clear that, even as late as 1258/1842, he persisted in denying the charge that he had established a new *madhhab* within Islam,[549] and that he constantly represented himself as simply the expounder and defender of the views and person of his *shaykh*. The meaning of the term "Shaykhiyya", used to refer to what he calls "this sect" (*īn firqa*), is simply "people who are adherents of (*mansūband bar*) this Shaykh".[550] Rashti's beliefs regarding Shaykh Aḥmad rather than himself are, in fact, probably the best guide to his attitude towards his own role as his successor. Since this is a point to which we shall return in another chapter, I propose to indicate here only very briefly something of Rashti's understanding of the position of al-Ahsa'i within the overall perspective of sacred history.

In an important passage in his *Sharḥ al-qaṣīda al-lāmiyya*[551] Rashti refers to two ages of the dispensation of Muḥammad: an age of outward observances (*ẓawāhir*) and an age of inward realities (*bawāṭin*). The former age came to an end after twelve centuries and the second then commenced. In every century of the first age, there appeared a promulgator (*murawwij*) of the outward laws; at the commencement of the first century of the second age, the first *murawwij* of the inward truth appeared—Shaykh Aḥmad.[552] Similarly, in a letter written to al-Ahsa'i during the latter's stay in Kirmanshah, he describes him as "the one testifying to the *wilāya* of the first *walī* in the first period of the second age."[553] This conception of the role of al-Ahsa'i was, clearly, current among the followers of Rashti, as is apparent from an anonymous *risāla* written sometime after 1261/1845. The author of this document speaks of the beginning of the revelation (of inner truth) in the person of Shaykh Aḥmad at the end of one thousand two hundred years, and refers to the Shaykh as the *murawwij* of the first century of the second age and, indeed, of the twelfth century of the first age of inward truth.[554]

We may, then, tentatively suggest that Rashti regarded himself as empowered by al-Ahsa'i to develop and deepen men's understanding of the "inner realities" revealed by him. It may well be that he conceived of himself as, in some sense, the trustee or teacher of a select group of initiates to this higher gnosis promulgated for the first time by al-Ahsa'i, somewhat after 'the fashion of a Sufi shaykh entrusted with the maintenance of *baraka* and *'irfān* within the *ṭarīqa* of which he is the head. There seems to be no direct evidence that Rashti thought of either Shaykh Aḥmad or himself as vice-regents or gates of the Imām, although it is clear that the attribution of just such a station to them by a

section of the Sayyid's followers was a significant factor in the inception of Babism. At the most, Rashti seems to have looked on Shaykh Aḥmad as privy to knowledge of esoteric truth imparted by the Imāms, and himself as, in turn, a direct recipient of the Shaykh's knowledge. He was, in a sense, the silent interpreter (*ṣāmit*) following the speaking *nāṭiq* of inner truth, in the Ismaili fashion.

Rashti's position appears to have been recognized with little or no hesitation by the vast majority of al-Ahsaʾi's followers, in contrast to the major schisms which occurred on his own death. There can, of course, be little doubt but that al-Ahsaʾi's preferential treatment of the Sayyid and his authorization of him to expound his teachings to his other disciples excited a certain degree of resentment among his more ambitious followers, as Zarandī suggests.[555] There also appears to have been a number of other ulama belonging to al-Ahsaʾi's circle who were regarded or regarded themselves as pre-eminent. Tanakābunī claims that his maternal uncle, Āqā Sayyid Abu 'l-Ḥasan ibn Muḥammad Tanakābunī (d. circa 1265/1849) was the leading (*arshad*) pupil of al-Ahsaʾi, and notes that the latter wrote a commentary on a *risāla* on ʿ*ilm* written by him.[556] In fact, no such commentary by Shaykh Aḥmad is known to me, although there are two *rasā'il* written by him in 1223/1808 and 1224/1809 for a Sayyid Abu '1-Ḥasan Jī1ānī, who may well have been Tanakābunī's uncle.[557] Qazvīnī refers to a former Ishrāqī ʿ*ālim* named Mullā Aḥmad Mullābāshī, who was at one time regarded as next in rank to al-Ahsaʾi but who, on reading Rashti's *Sharḥ al-khutba al-tutunjiyya*, acknowledged the superiority of the latter.[558]

During the period of his leadership of the Shaykhi school, Rashti appears to have remained for the most part in Karbala, with occasional visits to the other shrine towns of Iraq. Muḥammad Taqī al-Harawī, an important Shaykhi ʿ*ālim* who later became a Babi for a short period, writes in *al-Durar al-manthūra*—a commentary on the Sayyid's *al-Lawāmiʿ al-Ḥusayniyya*[559]—that he received explanations of the text from Rashti himself in Karbala, Kazimiyya, Samarra, and Najaf.[560] It is possible that the Sayyid performed an annual *ziyāra* to Najaf on the occasion of the festival of *Ghadīr Khumm*, as he himself suggests in the *Dalīl al-mutaḥayyirīn,*[561] while he is recorded as having travelled to Kazimiyya each year in the month of Dhu 'l-Qaʿda.[562] According to Chahārdihī, however, he never once visited Iran during the entire period of his leadership.[563] In thus adopting a sedentary mode of existence, in sharp contrast to the peripatetic restlessness of al-Ahsaʾi, Rashti gave to the amorphous body of the Shaykh 's admirers and disciples "a local habitation and a name". By thus providing the formless "school" of Shaykh Aḥmad with a centre and a focus, Sayyid Kāẓim—perhaps quite inadvertently—did much to hasten its crystallization into a body increasingly far removed from the mainstream of orthodox Shiʿism.

Despite his constant efforts to do so, Rashti failed to reintegrate the Shaykhī school with mainline Shiʿism, and he and his writings remained the

target of continued opposition on the part of the ulama up to the time of his death. However, as we shall see, this stood in direct contrast to the political influence he wielded in the *ʿatabāt* region.

The Sayyid's earliest and most determined opponent was Sayyid Muḥammad Mahdī Ṭabāṭabāʾī, a son of Sayyid ʿAlī Ṭabāṭabāʾī and brother of Āqā Sayyid Muḥammad Ṭabāṭabāʾī, (see the last chapter). Although less illustrious than his father or brother and disinclined either to write or to hold classes,[564] Sayyid Muḥammad Mahdī possessed some degree of prestige in Karbala by association with them, and, as, we have seen, was probably the first individual there to declare *takfīr* against al-Ahsaʾi. On the Shaykh's death, he and his supporters at first abandoned their campaign for about two years.[565] They revived it, however, as it gradually became apparent that Rashti, as the Shaykh's successor, had been able to maintain a sense of identity among his pupils and was continuing to defend and disseminate his views. That the takfir campaign thus ceased for a period indicates how much it was directed against al-Ahsaʾi as an individual, rather than against a sect or school deemed to have been established by him. Its resumption, in turn, shows that Ṭabāṭabāʾī and others now recognized that, under Sayyid Kāẓim, just such a school was being created. One of their specific attacks on Rashti was, in fact, that he was attempting to form a *madhhab* separate from and independent of orthodox Shiʿism.[566]

On Friday 1 Rajab 1243/18 January 1828,[567] Rashti was summoned to a meeting organized by his opponents and held in the house of Mīrzā Muḥammad ʿAlī Shahristānī, a son of Mīrzā Muḥammad Mahdī Shahristānī (one of al-Ahsaʾi's teachers).[568] The purpose of the meeting—which was attended by "several thousand" people, was to secure Rashti's admission that, according to the popular meanings attached to the terminology used in them, certain statements of al-Ahsaʾi constituted heresy (*kufr*). The concept that "the body which is composed of elements shall not be resurrected (*al-jasad al-unṣurī lā yaʿūdu*)"[569] was particularly criticized, and the Sayyid was urged to write a declaration to the effect that it was heretical. This he did, but his "admission" of heresy was heavily qualified with statements maintaining that only the outward and popular meaning was objectionable and that, properly understood, none of the words of al-Ahsaʾi could be deemed contradictory to the Qurʾan, the Traditions, or, indeed, the writings of the great Shiʿi ulama.[570]

Although this meeting soon dispersed, its objective had scarcely been attained. Rashti's testimony was too much qualified to be of use and could even backfire on his opponents if brought into play by them. Shortly after this first gathering, therefore, a second meeting was held in the courtyard (*ṣaḥn*) of the shrine of ʿAbbās, at which it was determined to expel Rashti from Karbala.[571] According to Kirmānī, Sayyid Muḥammad Mahdī ascended a *minbar* and urged those present to take immediate action to put this decree into effect; a large crowd made for the house of Sayyid Kāẓim but, once there, dispersed for no apparent reason.[572] It is quite possible that the civil authorities, fearing the

possible consequences of such an expulsion, prevented the mob from carrying out their intention.

Some time after this, Ṭabāṭabāʾī returned to Najaf, where he normally resided.[573] There, he seems to have encountered some degree of opposition from other ulama, who regarded his behaviour towards Rashti as indefensible and advised him that his criticisms lacked any solid foundation.[574] This defence of Rashti by ulama not actually belonging to the circle of al-Ahsaʾi's followers is of considerable importance in showing to what extent the debate on the latter's *takfīr* was essentially a controversy within the context of Shiʿi orthodoxy, rather than the orthodox (Bālāsarī) versus heterodox (Shaykhī) conflict it later became. Whereas, at the later stage of the debate, opposition to Shaykhism implied simple identification with Usuli orthodoxy, at this point its implications were less cut and dried.

The efforts of Ṭabāṭabāʾī and others to make of al-Ahsaʾi's *takfīr* a cause célèbre may initially have owed much to existing rivalries in the religious institution, themselves possibly fostered by feelings of uncertainty as to the nature of authority—charismatic or otherwise—among the ulama in what was very much a period of transition. Feelings of confusion with respect to authority may have been exacerbated in individual cases by a lack of personal prestige coupled with strong ambition—as in the cases of Baraghānī or Sayyid Muḥammad Mahdī. The role of Sayyid Kāẓim as al-Ahsaʾi's *waṣī* clearly raised the question of authority in a particularly sharp form, even though opposition to him did not centre openly on this issue. As we shall see, a similar problem faced the Shaykhī ulama some twenty years later, when confronted with the rise of Babism as a charismatic movement which threatened to jeopardize even further the Shaykhī position vis-à-vis the religious establishment.

It seems to have been in Dhu 'l-Ḥijja 1243/July 1828,[575] while Rashti was performing his annual *ziyāra* to Najaf for the *Ghadīr* festival, that a messenger arrived from Shaykh ʿAlī al-Najafi (d.1254/1838), requesting a meeting.[576] Shaykh ʿAlī was a son of Shaykh Jaʿfar al-Najafī and a brother of Sayyid Kāẓim's supporter Shaykh Mūsā. He was also, like Sayyid Muḥammad Mahdī, a man overshadowed by his father and brother. He seems to have originally been a firm supporter of Rashti,[577] but had at some point clashed with him over a question of property rights, and soon joined the opposition party.[578] Shaykh ʿAlī was in a particularly good position to help further the campaign against Rashti since, although normally resident in Najaf, he spent three months of every year in Karbala.[579]

Rashti refused to meet with Shaykh ʿAlī unless an independent arbitrator could be found, whose decision as to the validity of any arguments advanced by either party would be considered binding.[580] When Shaykh ʿAlī refused accept this condition and made it known among the pilgrims in Najaf for the festival that Rashti had failed to respond to no fewer than nineteen invitations to meet with him, the Sayyid reacted by having a *minbar* erected in the courtyard of the

shrine of Ali, from which he preached during the afternoon to a large crowd.

The summary of this sermon, which he himself gives in *Dalīl al-mutaḥayyirīn*, is valuable evidence as to the four main points of doctrine then at issue, as well as to the Sayyid's use of *taqiyya*, which becomes a marked feature of Shaykhi writing from this time on.[581] In his sermon, Rashti stresses the exalted station of the Imāms and Fāṭima, while refuting any claims that they are divine or "partners of God" or that God has transferred (*tafwīḍ kard*) his command to them.[582] In referring to the *miᶜrāj* of Muḥammad, he maintains that the Prophet "ascended to heaven with his body (*jism*), his clothes, and his sandals" and goes on to say that "on the day of resurrection, all created things shall be raised up in their visible, tangible, earthly bodies and corporealities (*badanhā wa jasadhā*)".[583] As far as the knowledge of God is concerned, Rashti holds that "God knows all things collectively before their creation, after their creation, and at the time of their creation."[584] Such a clear refutation of four of the specific charges of heresy levelled against him and Shaykh Aḥmad cannot have failed to make an impression on Rashti's audience. As a result, in the evening of the same day, a deputation comprising two merchants and one of Shaykh ᶜAlī's *ṭullāb* came to repeat the invitation to meet with the Shaykh.[585] Rashti himself deputed one of his leading followers, Mullā Muḥammad Ḥasan Gawhar, to present Shaykh ᶜAlī with what amounted to a challenge to *mubāhala* or mutual cursing before God.[586] Although Shaykh ᶜAlī accepted an alternative proposition to write down his objections against specific passages in the works of Sayyid Kāẓim, to have the latter write down a reply to these and to send all of this to an acceptable *ᶜālim* for arbitration, he failed, in the end to comply.[587]

In Rabīᶜ I 1244/January 1829, Sayyid Muḥammad Mahdī began to express objections to a phrase in a *risāla* of Rashti's on morals, which, loosely interpreted, suggested that the Sayyid was recommending the abandonment of all traditional doctrines and authorities and attempting to establish a new *madhhab*.[588] Although Rashti replied to this accusation in a separate treatise,[589] his opponent refused to retract his allegations and continued to pursue a policy of denunciation for the next two years.[590] Sayyid Muḥammad Mahdī carried his campaign beyond the ᶜ*atabāt*, writing letters in condemnation of Rashti to India and, probably, elsewhere.[591] It seems that, with the support of Shaykh ᶜAlī al-Najafī, Ṭabāṭabāᵓī was gradually able to bring most of the ulama of Najaf to his side, and that the opposition to Shaykhism gained much ground there.[592]

Rashti nevertheless continued to make his annual pilgrimage to the town. In Dhu 'l-Hijja 1246/May-June 1831, a total of three gatherings were held in Najaf by Ṭabāṭabāᵓī and his followers for the purpose of again confronting Sayyid Kāẓim. The first two meetings were held in the house of Sayyid Muḥammad Mahdī's brother, Sayyid Maḥmūd, and the third in the house of Sayyid Muḥammad ᶜAlī, the Keeper of the Keys to the shrine of Ḥusayn. Among those present were Shaykh Khalaf (ibn ᶜAskar), Mullā Sharīf, and Ḥājī Mullā Jaᶜfar Astarābādī.[593] Mullā Muḥammad Ḥamza Sharīᶜatmadār

Māzandarānī, a Shaykhi *ʿālim* who was present at these meetings and is the only writer to refer to them, does not, unfortunately, make clear what result, if any, they had; but, in view of Rashti's isolation on each occasion, it is unlikely that anything of value was achieved. Sayyid Muḥammad Mahdī died at the Shrine of Shāh ʿAbd al ʿAzīm near Tehran in 1249/1833, leaving the opposition to Rashti in Najaf in the hands of Shaykh ʿAlī.

In Karbala, Sayyid Ibrahīm ibn Muḥammad Bāqir Qazvīnī (d. 1846) emerged as the Sayyid's chief rival in both religious and political affairs. Possibly as a result of his involvement in the politics of Karbala, Rashti was made the target for several attempts on his life,[594] as well as petty threats and insults.[595] On one occasion, he was even fired on with a rifle in the courtyard of the Shrine of Ḥusayn.[596] Despite this, he continued to be active in his public defence of the views of Shaykh Aḥmad, preaching to pilgrims and others on festivals, Thursdays, Fridays, and during the month of Ramaḍān.[597] He also encouraged his followers to emulate him in adopting a defensive stance against the orthodox condemnation of Shaykhism, a policy which inevitably widened the range of arguments employed in the doctrinal debate.

On one occasion, for example, he made a general request to the Shaykhi ulama to write polemics in defence of al-Ahsaʾi;[598] among those who responded was the niece of Mullā Muḥammad Taqī Baraghānī, Fāṭima Khānum, whom Sayyid Kāẓim subsequently named Qurrat al-ʿAyn.[599] More specifically, Rashti requested one of his leading followers in Karbala, Mullā Muḥammad Ḥasan Gawhar Qarāchadāghī, to take sections from his (Gawhar's) commentary on the *Ḥayāt al-arwāḥ* of Mullā Muḥammad Jaʿfar Astarābādī, dealing with specific attacks on al-Ahsaʾi, and to compile these into a separate *risāla*.[600] Another of Rashti's leading supporters in Karbala, Muḥammad Ḥusayn ibn ʿAlī Akbar Muḥīṭ Kirmānī, wrote a reply to points raised by Mullā ʿAbd al-ʿAlī Ṭabasī at Rashti's request.[601]

In thus encouraging the Shaykhi *ulama* to defend and expound the "doctrine" of the school at a time when the precise nature of that doctrine was still unclear to many, Sayyid Kāẓim undoubtedly prepared the way for the serious disputes which ensued between his leading followers (including Qurrat al-ʿAyn, Mullā Ḥasan Gawhar and Mīrzā Muḥīṭ in particular) on his death. Although real and potential doctrinal divisions were generally subordinated to the authority of Rashti during his lifetime, the rapidity with which the Shaykhi school disintegrated into warring factions following his removal from the scene indicates how precarious was the situation in the years immediately prior to his death.

Apart from his influence over the immediate circle of his followers from his base in Karbala, the Sayyid carried on a widely flung correspondence with ulama in most of the centers of Shiʿi Islam, including Baghdad,[602] Damascus,[603] Bahrain,[604] Jabal ʿĀmil,[605] al-Aḥsāʾ,[606] Isfahan,[607] Khurasan,[608] and India.[609] His reputation in these places, especially in more distant regions where the *takfīr* of

al-Ahsaʾi had had little impact, seems to have been high, but it was, if anything, even more so in Iraq itself. Despite the *takfīr* and the continuing campaign against him, Rashti succeeded in establishing for himself a position as one of the leading *mujtahids* of Karbala and, indeed, the entire *ʿatabāt*. Outside of the immediate circle of the Shaykhi school, he and his writings were highly respected by many of the leading ulama of the period, several of whom had already supported al-Ahsaʾi. These included Shaykh Mūsā al-Najāfi,[610] Sayyid ʿAbd Allāh Shubbar,[611] Sayyid ʿAlī Ṭabāṭabāʾī,[612] Ḥājj Muḥammad Ibrāhīm Kalbāsī,[613] and Sayyid Muḥammad Bāqir Shaftī,[614] as well as numbers of their relatives and pupils.[615] Rashti's influence was not, however, confined to the Shiʿi ulama, but extended to individuals such as Shihāb al-Dīn Maḥmūd Abu 'l-Thanāʾ al-Ālūsī, the famous Sunni *mufti* of Baghdad,[616] for whom he wrote at least two *risalas*;[617] and ʿAlī Riḍā Pasha, on whose directions he wrote the *Sharḥ al-qasīda*.[618]

Of even greater significance was his relationship with Sulaymān Khān Afshār Qāsimlū (d. 1309/1891), one of the leading officials of the Qajar state. Not only was Sulayman Khān an ardent follower of the Sayyid, who wrote at least one *risāla* in reply to intelligent questions from him,[619] but his son, Riḍāʾ Qulī Khān (who later became a Babi) was married to Rashti's daughter.[620] In view of Sulaymān's close connection with the court—he was married to Qayṣar Khānum, the thirty-fourth daughter of Fatḥ ʿAlī Shāh [621]—the marriage of his son (albeit by another wife) to the daughter of Sayyid Kāẓim was both a token of his own feelings of respect towards the Sayyid and a means of enhancing the latter's prestige in government circles in Iran. Sulaymān Khān later became a follower of Karīm Khān Kirmānī (himself a relative of Fatḥ ʿAlī Shāh), with whom he corresponded;[622] he later built two mosques in Tabriz for the Karīm Khānī Shaykhis of the town[623] and left *waqf* monies to pay for the publication of Shaykhi books there. He appears to have met Sayyid ʿAlī Muḥammad Shīrāzī in Mecca towards the end of 1260/1844,[624] but refused an appeal for assistance written to him by the latter while near Qazvīn en route to prison in Azerbaijan.[625] He is, perhaps best known to historians of Babism as the man appointed by Mīrzā Taqī Khān Amīr-i Kabīr to quell the disturbance at Shaykh Tabarsī in Mazandaran in 1849.[626]

The Sayyid's political influence, both at the ʿ*atabāt* and, less directly, in Iran, appears to have been considerable. According to Chahārdihī, he associated closely with various Qajar princes exiled to the ʿ*atabāt* by Muḥammad Shah; as a result, a great many members of the Qajar family became Shaykhis.[627] The princes at the '*atabāt* are not identified, but they may well have included the three sons of Prince Muḥammad Ḥusayn ʿAlī Mīrzā Farmān-Farmā (1789-1835), who left Shīrāz on their father's defeat following his abortive attempt to take the throne on the death of Fatḥ ʿAlī Shāh, namely: Riḍāʾ Qulī Mīrzā (1806-1862), Timur Mīrzā (ca. 1812-1874), and Najaf Qulī Mīrzā (ca. 1808-before

1862).[628] There is evidence that Rashti provided funds to Prince ʿAlī Shāh Ẓill al-Sulṭān (1796-1854), a former claimant to the throne of Iran, during his exile in Karbala,[629] and that he associated closely with Hulāgu Mīrzā (d. 1854), the exiled son of Ḥasan ʿAlī Mīrzā Shujāʿ al-Salṭana (1789-1853).[630] He also seems to have been on close terms with a certain Hāshim Khān Niẓām al-Dawla, another Iranian official resident in Karbala,[631] and with Prince Sulaymān Mīrzā, Hishmat al-Mulk (1810-1859?).[632]

In Iran, a core of individuals favorable to him was created at the court, with the notable exceptions of ʿAlī-Qulī Mīrzā Iʿtiḍād al-Salṭana (d. 1880) and Farhād Mīrzā, Muʿtamad al-Dawla (1818-1889).[633] Of the forty-eight children of ʿAbbās Mīrzā (1789-1833), all but a few are said to have been Shaykhis.[634] In Karbala, Rashti came to be reckoned as one of the two most influential *mujtahids*, the other being his rival Sayyid Ibrāhīm Qazvīnī.[635] According to Chahārdihī, Sayyid Kāẓim was, for a period of one or two years, in charge of "the money from India" (*pūl-i Hindī*), which may be a reference to either the Oudh bequest funds (divided at that time between the two *mujtahids*, one in Najaf and one in Karbala) or the *sahm-i imām* sent from the Shiʿa of India—it is not clear which.[636]

Active though he was in the political life of Karbala, Rashti seems to have been a somewhat reluctant participant in such matters, as is evidenced by a letter written by him to Karīm Khān Kirmānī:

> As regards the matter of the administration of justice (*ḥukm*) and the issue of legal judgements (*qaḍāʾ*), beware, beware! Flee from legal judgements as you would from a lion. Dear friend, as far as is in you, shut fast this door, for these are but wretched people and association with them and involvement with their affairs shall prove a cause of loss to you in this world and the next, unless it be at times in order [to prevent] the eating of unclean meat (*mayta*) or for the preservation of the faith. In such matters, you have no choice—as is the case with this powerless one. I ask the help and assistance and succour of God! Had I regarded it as permissible for me to tell another "Go to Zayd in order to pass judgement," by God, I should not have sat a single day in the court of justice. Indeed, I that must endure the bitterness and trials of justice." Indeed, I that must endure the bitterness and trials of it know what happens. Dear friend, dear companion, dear brother, as far as you are able, abandon this business, whether in religious or worldly matters, save out of necessity, at such times as you yourself think best.[637]

Rivalry between Rashti and Qazvīnī was for some time an important element in the local politics of Karbala. Since about 1822, the city had been "a

self-governing semi-alien republic", effectively independent of the Ottoman authorities in Baghdad.[638] Some three-quarters of the inhabitants were Iranian, and actual control of Karbala was in the hands of a band of from two to three thousand *girāmī* – criminals and fugitives from Iran and Arab Iraq who made a living preying on the local population and pilgrims to the shrines.[639] The *girāmī* were themselves split into at least two factions,[640] the most powerful of which was led by a certain Sayyid Ibrāhīm Zaʿfarānī.[641] Both Rashti and Qazvīnī had the support of a body of *girāmī*, the former having the allegiance of Zaʿfarānī (who may have been a Shaykhi), the latter relying on a force under a chief named Mīrzā Ṣāliḥ, who was regarded as the most powerful leader next to Zaʿfarānī.[642] Zaʿfarānī's (and, thus, Rashti's) position was strengthened by the support of Sayyid Wahhāb, the titular governor of the city,[643] and, by 1842, he was in absolute control.[644]

In Shaban 1258/September 1842, a new pasha, Muḥammad Najīb, arrived in Baghdad to replace ʿAlī Riḍāʾ.[645] Unlike his predecessors, Najīb Pāshā was not willing to tolerate the continued independence of Karbala. By the end of Ramadan/October, the failure of the population to send supplies to Baghdad in recognition of the authority of the central government, and their refusal to allow his entry to their city, even as a pilgrim, with more than four or five attendants, determined Najīb to insist on the reception of a military garrison there.[646] When Zaʿfarānī declared that, should the pasha come to Karbala with troops, he would refuse him entry, the latter decided to make his entrance to the city by force if necessary.[647] He proceeded towards Karbala with an army in Dhū 'l-Qaʿda/December and pitched camp at nearby Musayyab.[648] Negotiations now began with representatives of the population of Karbala, in which Rashti played a leading role.

While Najīb Pāshā was encamped at Musayyab, he was visited for four days by a deputation from the city, composed of the nominal governor, Sayyid Wahhāb, ʿAlī Shāh Ẓill al-Sulṭān, Sayyid Kāẓim, Sayyid Ḥusaynī, and Sayyid Naṣr Allāh.[649] Before this party returned to Karbala in the hope of persuading the inhabitants to cede to some of the demands of the pasha, the latter requested Rashti and Ẓill al-Sulṭān to try to persuade the Iranian section of the population to dissociate themselves from the *girāmī* factions; ideally, they were to quit the town or, if this were impossible, to retire to one quarter of it or take refuge in the shrines of Ḥusayn and ʿAbbās.[650] It is likely that, on this same occasion, Najīb assured both Rashti and Ẓill al-Sulṭān that anyone seeking refuge in their houses would be spared in the event of an attack.[651] The Iranian consul in Baghdad also seems to have written on two occassions to Rashti, requesting his assistance in persuading the Persian population to evecuate the town, although the Sayyid later maintained that he never received his letters to this effect.[652]

Najīb Pāshā now received reinforcements and, on 19 December, Saʿd Allāh Pāshā, the military commander, arrived before Karbala.[653] During the month that now passed before the assault on the town, Rashti and Ẓill al-Sulṭān

visited Saᶜd Allāh in an effort to effect some compromise, but they remained unable to persuade the townspeople to accede to the pasha's demands.[654] In the town, the Shiᶜi ulama were urging the people to fight a *jihad* against the Sunni forces of the pasha,[655] while the *girāmī* took steps to prepare the town to repel the coming attack.[656] In contrast, Rashti—who, in the absence of Qazvīnī in Baghdad, was the leading *mujtahid* in the city – made strenuous efforts to effect a reconcilliation and to dissuade the Karbala'is from undertaking what he must have recognized would be a hopeless defence. According to Colonel Francis Farrant (1803-1868)

> The Chief Priest Hajee Seid Kausem did all in his power to prevent hostilities, he preached against their proceedings, he was abused and threatened, they would not listen to him—this I have heard from many people at Kerballa—at this time all were unaimous in defending the place… to the very last he entreated them to listen to the Pacha but without avail, he showed great courage on the occasion, as he had all the chief Geramees and the Mollahs against him.[657]

On 13 January 1843, the forces of Najīb Pāshā stormed Karbala[658] and, as is well known, put to the sword large numbers of the inhabitants and caused widespread destruction.[659] Estimates of the numbers killed vary tremendously,[660] but at least four thousand people are thought to have perished. In the course of the sack, the only places accorded immunity were the shrine of Ḥusayn,[661] the house of Ẓill al-Sulṭān, and the house of Sayyid Kazim Rashti.[662] It is hard to estimate how many took refuge in Rashti's house and in the adjoining houses which he appropriated for the occasion,[663] but that the number of refugees was large may be surmised from the fact that between sixty and and two hundred people were crushed to death in the melée.[664]

On the day following his capture of Karbala, Najīb Pāshā entered the city and was greeted in the Shrine of Ḥusayn by a party of its surviving notables, including Ḥājj Mahdī Kamūna, the deputy *kalīd-dār* (keeper of the keys) of the shrine, Sayyid Kazim, Mullā ᶜAlī al-Khaṣṣī, Shaykh Wādī al-Shaflaḥ, and others.[665] Despite his unpopularity prior to the fighting, Rashti's offices in securing the safety of so many citizens, and the obvious accuracy of his earlier evaluation of the state of affairs, as well as his reputation as one of the few individuals in the city who had tried to persuade the townspeople not to resist the Baghdad troops, meant that his prestige was now higher than ever. Although he himself died almost exactly one year after the attack, his son Sayyid Aḥmad continued to exercise influence in the city. According to Chahārdihī, he possessed authority in the appointment and dismissal of the Keeper of the Keys of the shrine of Ḥusayn,[666] and was regarded as one of a small number of individuals closely attached to the Ottoman court.[667] The Rashti family has remained prominent in Karbala since then.[668]

Apart from his personal position, Rashti's preaching, wide correspondence, and increasing popular classes were instrumental in heightening the prestige and expanding the numbers of the Shaykhi school in both Iraq and Iran. Aleksandr Kazem-Bek (1802-1870) states that "during the life of Sayyid Kāẓim, the doctrine of the Shaykhis spread throughout Persia, so much so that, in the province of Iraq alone, there were more than one hundred thousand *murīds*."[669] Exaggerated as this figure probably is—even if, as seems likely, it is intended to include Arab Iraq—there is no doubt that the number of those who gave some form of allegiance to Shaykhism was considerable. Aside from sizeable groups in larger towns such as Kirmanshah, Tabriz, and (possibly) Kirman, many small towns and villages in Iran, such as Mīlān in Azerbaijan, were, it seems, predominantly Shaykhi.[670]

Had Rashti not died at a relatively early age or had Sayyid Aḥmad been able to preserve the unity of the school and maintain Karbala as its center, it is more than likely that, with time, Shaykhism would have come to exercise increasing influence on political circles in both Iraq and Iran. Its potential as a religious movement attractive to statesmen such as Muḥammad ʿAlī Mīrzā Dawlatshāh, Ibrāhīm Khān Ẓāhir al-Dawla, and Sulaymān Khān Afshār has already been demonstrated in the case of both al-Ahsaʾi and Rashti. In later years, however, no Shaykhi leader commanded the respect or influence of the two *shaykhs*. Nevertheless, it should be noted that, when the Kirmani Shaykhi leader Ḥājī Abu 'l-Qāsim Khān Ibrāhīmī (1896-1969) died on a pilgrimage to Mashhad in 1969, Mohammad Reza Shah himself defied ant-Shaykhi sentiment in signifying that he be buried with ceremony in the precincts of the shrine and that a large memorial meeting be held in the capital.

For the most part, the school remained an important private religious alternative for many princes and government officials.[671] The most significant example of this is the "conversion" to Shaykhism of Muẓaffar al-Dīn Shāh (1853-1907), who was encouraged to adopt it as his personal faith by his mother, Shawkat al-Dawla (1838-1892), a niece of Karīm Khān Kirmānī.[672] Although the later influence of Shaykhism was largely confined to individuals on a personal basis, in certain areas, such as Tabriz and Kirman, it proved a continuing factor in local politics. Bāstānī Pārīzī has drawn attention to the fact that, since the governors of Kirman during the later Qajar period were generally princes of the royal house, related to the family of Karīm Khān, they tended to favor the Shaykhi sect in the city, a policy which provoked the resentment of most of the population.[673] In 1905, serious trouble broke out between the Shaykhi and non-Shaykhi sections of the populace, in the course of which deep-rooted political and economic divisions in the city came to the surface.[674] In general, however, Shaykhism never regained the prestige it had acquired under Rashti's leadership; as we shall see, the emergence of Babism as a radical religio-political movement forced the remaining branches of what was now a

divided school to adopt a quietist and non-interventionist position in politics, coupled with the use of *taqiyya* in religious matters.

Following the sack of Karbala, the Shiᶜi population of the city was obliged to observe *taqiyya* during the initial period of occupation by the Sunni troops of Najīb Pāshā.[675] According to Kirmānī, the strain of the siege and attack, and the stresses imposed on him during the occupation of Karbala had a crippling effect on Sayyid Kāẓim; his hair grew white and he became physically debilitated.[676] In early Dhū 'l-Qaᶜda 1259/late November 1843, according to his custom, Rashti left Karbala, accompanied by a number of followers, to perform a pilgrimage to Kazimiyya.[677] Returning to Karbala in the early days of Dhū 'l-Ḥijja/ late December,[678] in time for the festival of al-ᶜArafa on the 9th/31st, he died in the early hours of the evening of 11 Dhū 'l-Hijja/1 January 1844.[679] This date, which is given in Shaykhi sources, seems confirmed by a statement in a letter written by the Bab from prison to his uncle, Hājī Mīrzā Sayyid ᶜAlī Shīrāzī (d. 1850), in which he says that Rashti died "nineteen days before the revelation of the mystery," and that the beginning of this "revelation" was the start of the year 1260.[680] We can, I think, dismiss as fictitious accounts which claim that Rashti was poisoned in Baghdad by Najīb Pāshā.[681]

CHAPTER FOUR: FROM SHAYKHISM TO BABISM

The Succession to Sayyid Kāẓim Rashti

The death of Rashti precipitated the first major internal crisis in the Shaykhi school, of which he had been the acknowledged head for some seventeen years. To be more precise, it created a situation in which concealed tensions, disagreements, rivalries and ambitions within the Shaykhi community were brought to the surface. Rashti did not, for reasons that are unclear, emulate al-Ahsaᵓi in appointing a successor, nor did he leave clear instructions as to the direction of the school after his death. Since he was relatively young when he died, it may simply be that he had not thought it yet necessary to take steps to provide for this eventuality. Without a clear appointment of a successor to the Sayyid, the school rapidly fragmented into several factions, of which the two largest were those grouped around Sayyid ᶜAlī Muḥammad Shīrāzī, the Bab (1235-66/1819-50) and Ḥājī Mullā Muḥammad Karīm Khān Kirmānī (1225-88/1810-71).

These two factions in particular expressed diametrically opposed tendencies inherent in Shaykhism, the first moving away from the outward

practice of Islam towards a concentration on the revelation of its inner (*bāṭinī*) features and, ultimately, a new revelation (*ẓuhūr*) following the appearance of the hidden Imam; the second emphasizing the continuing role of the Prophet and the Imams and seeking accommodation with the Shiᶜi majority which had formerly excommunicated the founder of the school and his successor. It was inevitable that, once these incompatible interpretations of Shaykhi thought came to be openly expressed, an unrelenting hostility would grow up between the two parties, fiercer if anything than that which previously existed Shaykhis and Bālāsarīs.

Karīm Khān Kirmānī himself acknowledges that Rashti had not indicated a successor in direct terms and that, on his death, a number of leaders gained a following, while many of his disciples scattered to different places.[682] That considerable confusion existed in the mind's of Rashti's followers is apparent from a number of statements in an Arabic *risāla* written in reply to Karīm Khān's *Izhāq al-bāṭil* by an early Babi of Karbala named al-Qatīl ibn al-Karbalā'ī, who had himself been in the circle of the Sayyid's companions. "Those among the *ṭullāb* who were possessed of discernment," he writes, "were confused as to where they should go and to whom they should cling."[683] He himself, he states at the beginning of the treatise, did not know where to turn during the first four months following Rashti's death."[684] This confusion appears to have been compounded by the dissemination of various rumors and reports, some of them vaguely messianic in character, others relating to the question of the direction of the school in the period immediately after the death of the Sayyid.

Among these reports were a number in which Rashti was said to have alluded obliquely to an "affair" or "cause" (*amr*) which would occur or appear after him. According to Kirmānī, his reply to those who asked him about his successor (*al-khalīfa baᶜdahu*) had been to say, "God has an affair which he shall bring to maturity (*li 'llāhi amrun huwa bālighuhu*)."[685] Rashti's use of the phrase was certainly not accidental, and must have been calculated to evoke specific associations in the minds of his hearers; it was, in fact, the very phrase traditionally ascribed to the fourth *nā'ib* of the hidden Imam, Abu 'l-Ḥusayn ᶜAlī al-Sammarī, when asked on his death-bed concerning the matter of succession.[686]

That Rashti made use of this phrase in this connection more than once is apparent from a reference in al-Qatīl ibn al-Karbalā'ī's *Risāla*, where it is recorded that the Sayyid was asked about his successor by Mullā Muḥammad Taqī Harawī,[687] to whom he made this reply, adding, however, the qualification "our cause is not like that of the *abwāb*."[688] The significance of this last statement is not entirely clear: as we shall observe, a section of the Shaykhi community at this period certainly seems to have regarded both al-Ahsaᵓi and Rashti as "gates" of the Imām, a belief which was instrumental in facilitating the

transition to Babism. It is possible that Rashti was thought to have been implying that, whereas the Imam had gone into major occultation on the death of the fourth *bāb*, he might now be preparing to return. That the "affair" or "cause" to which the Sayyid referred was in some way linked to the advent of the Imam or to have been synonymous with that event or the preparations for it, seems clear from his statement: "Are you not content that I should die and the cause of your Imam (*amr imāmikum*) be made manifest?"[689]

Zarandī ascribes a similar remark to the Sayyid, though endowing it with more obviously messianic overtones: "Would you not wish me to die, that the promised One be revealed?"[690] Mullā Jaʿfar Qazvīnī similarly states that he was present when Rashti said "are you not content that I should go and the truth (*ḥaqq*) be made manifest?"[691] The messianic quality of Rashti's utterances on this topic is apparent in the following statement attributed to Qurrat al-ʿAyn: "O people! My passing is near, yet you have not understood what I have been saying to you, nor have you comprehended my purpose. After me, there shall appear a great cause and a severe test and you shall fall into disagreements with one another. We have been but as a herald (*mubashshir*) for the great cause."[692] As we shall see in more detail later, this chiliastic strain played an important role in the development of Babism as an expression of the more extreme charismatic and gnostic tendencies within the school. And it is, of course, more than likely that the messianic themes developed in Babism may have coloured most of the reports we have just quoted.

According to at least two accounts, Rashti had instructed certain of his followers to stay after his death with Mullā Muḥammad Ḥasan Qarāchadāghī (Mullā Ḥasan Gawhar) for "a little time" (*bi-zamānin qalīl*) until "our affair would appear".[693] Mullā Jaʿfar Qazvīnī writes that someone asked Rashti to whom his followers should turn after him; he replied that it was permissible to turn to anyone but that "for some days, you should stay about Mullā Ḥasan Gawhar." He later explained that Mullā Ḥasan would be there for forty-five days and then the truth would be manifested.[694] Although Mullā Ḥasan's position remained at first ambiguous, there is no doubt that many of Rashti's followers thought it natural to be referred to him.

A former pupil of al-Ahsaʾi, Mullā Ḥasan was one of the oldest and most highly regarded disciples of the Sayyid, from whom he held an *ijāza*.[695] Several works by him are still extant,[696] and it seems that some of these had received the direct approval of Rashti.[697] It would not have been surprising if a section of the Shaykhi community in Karbala should have looked on Mullā Ḥasan as a potential successor to Rashti and, as we shall note, it was not long before he put forward a claim to succession on his own behalf. Initially, however, the question of succession remained in abeyance while news of Rashti's death made its way to Shaykhi communities outside the *ʿatabāt*.

Al-Qatīl ibn al-Karbalā'ī states that, following Rashti's funeral, some of the *ṭullāb* approached Mullā Ḥasan and his close associate, Mīrzā Muḥammad

Ḥusayn Muḥīṭ Kirmānī, and asked if they heard anything from the Sayyid concerning the succession. Mullā Ḥasan replied that he had heard nothing, while Mīrzā Muḥīṭ implied that he had, in fact, been told something but that he could not at that time reveal what it was; they should not disperse, he said, but remain in Karbala.[698]

As if in corroboration of Mīrzā Muhīt's advice to await developments, a rumor became current to the effect that Rashti has said "the affair shall be made manifest one year after me."[699] Currency also seems to have been given to a prophecy, allegedly related by Rashti himself, which had been made in a dream to one of the members of his household, and in which it was stated that the "affair" would be manifested in another thirty weeks.[700] These thirty weeks, according to al-Qatīl ibn al-Karbalā'ī, would be completed at the beginning of Jumādī I 1260/late May 1844,[701] and it was probably under the influence of this second rumor that numbers of *ṭullāb* waited out the four months of Muḥarram, Ṣafar, Rabīᶜ I and Rabīᶜ II, thinking that Mīrzā Muḥīṭ might be right in what he said.[702]

It seems, however, that Mīrzā Muḥīṭ said or did something unspecified which caused many to reject him, whereupon they dispersed from Karbala,[703] some even before the four-month period had ended. That a substantial number of Shaykhis left Karbala in different directions at about this time is indicated in several sources. We have already referred to Kirmānī's statement to the effect in *Izhāq al-Bāṭil*. This version of events is substantially corroborated by Mīrzā Ḥusayn Khān Dakhīlī, the son of Mullā Ḥusayn Dakhīl, a Shaykhi who had lived in Karbala with Mullā Muḥammad Ḥusayn Bushrūᵓī (the first of Shīrāzī's disciples) and who also later became a Babi. Mīrzā Ḥusayn Khān writes: "after the death of the late Sayyid, his companions scattered, and from whomsoever they heard a call, they would go in search of the lord of the affair (*ṣāḥib-i amr*)."[704] Zarandī indicates, however, that, when Mullā Ḥusayn Bushrūᵓī returned to Karbala on 1 Muḥarram 1260/ January 1844, he met with Mullā Ḥasan Gawhar, Mīrzā Muḥīṭ, "and other well-known figures among the disciples of Sayyid Kāẓim," and that these individuals advanced pretexts for not leaving Karbala.[705]

With the dispersal of many of the *ṭullāb* within about two months of Mullā Ḥusayn's arrival, the main area of events moved, for a time, from Arab Iraq to Iran.

In Iran, the bid for leadership of the Shaykhi community came to be centered in three places: Tabriz, Kirman, and Shīrāz. In Tabriz, two men made simultaneous claims, each of them achieving considerable success in establishing his position as a leader of the Shaykhis in Azerbaijan, but neither succeeded in winning very much of a following outside this region. The first of these was Ḥājj Mīrzā Shafīᶜ Thiqat al-Islām (c. 1218-1301/1803-1884) a *mujtahid* who, in 1242/1826, had gone to the ᶜ*atabāt* to complete his studies under Shaykh Ḥasan al-Najafi, Shaykh ᶜAlī al-Najafi, and Sayyid Kāẓim Rashti.

Having become a Shaykhi, he returned to Tabriz, where he encouraged students to travel to Karbala in order to study under Rashti, whom he regarded as the most learned (*aʿlam*) of the Shiʿi ulama. On Rashti's death, he claimed that succession was restricted to himself but, apart from styling himself "shaykh" of the school, he does not appear to have advanced any major claims on his own behalf, nor to have introduced any radical changes in doctrine.[706] There seems to be no justification for the statement of Iʿtimād al-Salṭana that he claimed *rukniyyat* (the status of being the *rukn* or support, on which see later) for a short time.[707] Mīrzā Shafīʿ appears to have left Tabriz and gone to live in Mecca shortly before the revolt in Tabriz of the Kurdish leader Shaykh ʿUbayd Allāh Naqshbandī, which occurred in 1298/1881.[708] On his death in Mecca in 1301, at the age of eighty-three, he was succeeded in Tabriz by his son, Shaykh Mūsā Thiqat al-Islām (d. 1319/1910).[709]

The second claimant to succession in Tabriz was Mullā Muḥammad Māmaqānī (or Mamaqānī) Ḥujjat al-Islām. It would seem that, for Māmaqānī, succession meant little more than taking Rashti's place as a *marjaʿ al-taqlīd* for all those who regarded themselves as *muqallid* to him. He played down the charismatic and gnostic aspects of Shaykhism to such a degree that he became a highly respectable figure within the orthodox community in the region, being widely regarded as a *marjaʿ* for government officials, nobles, *ṭujjār*, and bazaar merchants; these followers built for him the Masjid-i Ḥujjat al-Islām beside the Masjid-i-Jāmiʿ of Tabriz.[710] On his death in 1268/1851 or 1269/1852, he was succeeded by his son, Mīrzā Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ḥujjat al-Islām (d. 1303/1885), also a former student of Rashti.[711]

Apart from Thiqat al-Islām and Māmaqānī, there were several other notable Shaykhis in Tabriz, the most outstanding of whom were Ḥājī Mullā Mahmūd Niẓām al-ʿUlamāʾ (d. circa 1272/1856), the tutor of the Crown Prince, Nāṣir al-Dīn Mīrzā; Mīrzā ʿAlī Aṣghar Shaykh al-Islām (d. 1264/1848), his son Mīrzā Abu 'l-Qāsim Shaykh al-Islām, and Mullā ʿAlī Muʿīn al-Islām. Although incidents between Shaykhis and Bālāsarīs took place intermittently in Tabriz, notably riots in 1267/1850[712] and 1285/1868,[713] it is clear that the Shaykhi notables and ulama of the city were particularly eager to identify themselves with the main body of Shiʿism and to avoid, as far as possible, all imputations of heterodoxy.

This trend towards orthodoxy was given added impetus by the emergence of Babism as an identifiable and vulnerable target for the concerted attacks of conventual Shiʿis and Shaykhis alike. The fact that, as we shall see, the Bab himself and all but a few of his principal followers had been students of Rashti, coupled with the continuing veneration shown by the Babis to him and to al-Ahsaʾi as, in some sense "precursors"' of their movement or as "the two preceding *bābs*", placed the remaining Shaykhis in serious danger of being closely linked with Babism in the minds of the public and the ulama.

At first, this simply meant the continuation of some form of ostracism of Shaykhism by many of the orthodox community but, before long, it began to carry the risk of physical attacks from government and people. In order to offset the unwelcome implications of their mutual origin, certain Shaykhi ulama, particularly in Tabriz, proved eager to take a leading role in the theological, judicial, and even physical assault on the Bab and his followers.

The trial of the Bab, held in Tabriz in August 1848, was attended by Nāsir al-Din Mīrzā, leading government officials, religious dignitaries and eminent members of the Shaykhi community, including Mullā Muḥammad Māmaqānī and Mīrzā ᶜAlī Aṣghar Shaykh al-Islam; it was directed by Hājī Mullā Mahmūd Niẓam al-'Ulama.[714] Following the trial, in which the Shaykhi participants took a prominent part, the Bab was bastinadoed at the home of Mīrzā ᶜAlī Aṣghar by the Shaykh al-Islam himself.[715] In 1266/1850, when the Bab was brought to Tabriz for execution, Māmaqānī was among the small number of ulama who signed a *fatwā* for his death.[716] Apart from a book by Mīrzā Muḥammad Taqī Māmaqānī,[717] however, the Shaykhi ulama of Tabriz—unlike their counterparts in Kirman—do not appear to have engaged in much polemical conflict with the Babis. There can be little doubt, nevertheless, that their direct involvement in the condemnation of the Bab proved a significant factor in helping them ingratiate themselves with the orthodox community, become integrated into it, and, in the end, become wholly re-identified with it.

It was Kirman rather than Tabriz which finally came to be recognized as the new center of Shaykhism, displacing Karbala for the majority of Iranian Shaykhis and for smaller numbers in Iraq and elsewhere. In numerical and historical terms, Babism had by far the greater impact, but it was in its Kirmānī form that Shaykhism was to be preserved—albeit much modified—as a distinct school within Twelver Shiᶜism. If, on the one hand, the Shaykhis of Azerbaijan were to stress and deepen the conservative elements in Shaykhi belief and practice, rendering it practically indistinguishable from orthodox Shiᶜism, and the Babis, on the other hand, were to exploit the more extreme tendencies of the school, breaking entirely from Islam before the lapse of many years, the development initiated by Karīm Khān Kirmānī was to travel something of a middle road, identifying and reinterpreting certain key themes in the works of al-Ahsaᵓi and Rashti in an unusual and unorthodox fashion while retaining a strong sense of identity with and loyalty to Twelver Shiᶜism as the true expression of Islamic faith and practice.

Ḥājī Mullā Muḥammad Karīm Khān Kirmānī was born in Kirman on 18 Muḥarram 1225/23 February 1810.[718] His father, Ibrāhīm Khān Ẓāhir al-Dawla, was a cousin and son-in-law of Fatḥ-ᶜAlī Shāh,[719] and, at the beginning of the latter's reign, was appointed governor of Khurāsān, later being transferred to the governorship of Kirman and Baluchistan,[720] a position which he held from 1803 until his death in 1824.[721] Ibrāhīm Khān's relationship with the ruling dynasty was strengthened by his marriage to Humāyūn Sulṭān Khānum-i Khānumān,[722]

the eldest daughter of Fatḥ-ᶜAli and a sister of Ḥusayn ᶜAlī Mīrzā Farmān-Farmā and Ḥasan ᶜAlī Mīrzā Shujāᶜ al-Salṭana (1789-1853), and, by the marriage of two of his sons to two other daughters of the monarch.[723] In addition, as we shall note, Karīm Khān was later married to a daughter of Muḥammad Qulī Mīrzā Mulk Ārā (1789-1844), the third son of Fatḥ-ᶜAli.

In the course of his term as governor of Kirman, Ibrāhīm Khān did much to restore the physical property of the city.[724] A deeply religious man, he showed concern at the absence of *fuqahāʾ* in the region following the sack of Kirman by Agha Muḥammad Shah in 1794, and invited ulama from Arabia, Khurāsān, and Fārs to come and live there. He showed particular favor to Shaykh Aḥmad al-Ahsaʾi , whom he met several times during the latter's residence in Yazd and, as we have noted, it has been suggested that it was through his influence that Fatḥ-ᶜAlī Shāh invited the Shaykh to Tehran in 1808.

It appears to have been his father's wish that Karīm Khān be raised a scholar (unlike his other sons, all of whom were given administrative posts throughout Kirman province)[725]—possibly with the intention that he eventually become the *ᶜālim* in charge of the Madrasa-yi Ibrāhīmiyya which he had built in 1232/1817.[726] Karīm was, therefore, provided with tutors as a child and, in adolescence, continued his studies under the general supervision of Mullā Muḥammad ᶜAlī Nūrī Mullā-bāshī, whose daughter he married.[727] On the death of Ibrāhīm Khān in Tehran in 1240/1825, the inevitable wrangling broke out among his sons, but Karīm is said to have avoided becoming involved in these disagreements and to have continued with his studies and devotions.[728] Shaykhi sources relate that he concentrated on purely religious issues, endeavoring to find the 'Perfect Man' (*insān-i kāmil*). In search of this individual, he associated with a variety of sects and schools of thought but was, in the end directed by a certain Hājī Muḥammad Ismāᶜīl Kūhbanānī—a former pupil of al-Ahsaʾi[729]—to visit Rashti in Karbala.[730] Despite the efforts of the new governor, Ḥasan ᶜAlī Mīrzā, to prevent any of the sons of Ibrāhīm Khān leaving Kirman,[731] Karīm succeeded in making his way to the ᶜ*atabāt*, where he met and began to study under Sayyid Kāẓim.

This first visit to Karbala took place in about 1828, when Karīm Khān was eighteen, and was extended into a stay of one year. Returning to Kirman, he continued his studies and gave classes to others for a time, before leaving once more for Karbala, this time accompanied by his wife. He now became a close disciple of Rashti, receiving considerable praise from his teacher and making marked progress under his instruction. It was probably during this period that Rashti wrote his *ijāza* for him, possibly the only one he ever received.[732] After some time, however, Rashti instructed him to return to Kirman in order to teach the people there.[733] It is possible that the Sayyid considered Karīm Khān, quite apart from his undoubted intellectual capabilities, as a singularly valuable supporter, in view of his close association with the Qajar family, his wealth, and potential influence in the somewhat remote Kirman region. In sending him thus

to a part of Iran which seems to have had few Shaykhis, Rashti may have hoped to establish a base of religious and political influence with which to offset the damaging effects of the continuing campaign against the school.

Leaving his wife in Kazimiyya, Kirmānī headed for his home via Hamadān. There he undertook what may, in the context of a possible drive towards acquiring political influence, be considered a most significant action — namely, the arrangement of a marriage with his half-cousin, one of the twenty-three daughters of Muḥammad Qulī Mīrzā Mulk Ārā (1789-1844).[734] Since the girl in question was then in Tehran, he headed there for the marriage, afterwards spending some time in the capital, where he improved his standing by associating with Muḥammad Shah, whom he had previously met in Kirman.

It was not long, however, before he set off on the final stage of his journey home, accompanied by his new wife.[735] In Kirman, he continued to correspond with Rashti, whose regard for him is apparent from numerous letters. Among these is a brief letter in which he writes, speaking of Kirmānī, that "his decree is to be obeyed and whatever he prefers is to be done; to reject him is to reject God, the Prophet, and the blessed Imāms."[736] In another letter, Rashti speaks of his "spiritual communion" and "mysterious relationships" with Karīm Khān and assures him that he has a place "in the very core" of his heart and shall not be forgotten by him.[737] In yet another instance—and it is a particularly significant one in view of subsequent events—he writes how, in speaking with a certain Ḥājī Muḥammad ᶜAlī in Samarra, he referred to Kirmānī (*jināb-i Ḥājī*) as "a tongue uttering the truth, a speaking book," and urged his companion to "ask your questions of him and enquire of him concerning reality, for he shall inform you of matters particular and general, brief and comprehensive, manifest and hidden, save those things which are hidden in the hearts of men."[738] In view of these and similar statements made in his respect by Rashti, it is scarcely surprising that, on the latter's death, Karīm Khān should have regarded himself as the person most fit to assume the leadership of the school.

Kirmānī must have returned from Karbala in about 1255/1839.[739] It seems to have been shortly after his arrival that he became involved in a dispute concerning the control of his father's *waqf* properties, in particular the Madrasa-yi Ibrāhīmiyya. The origins of this dispute are obscure, but its main outlines can be reasonably well defined. In order to provide for the upkeep of the *madrasa*, Ibrāhīm Khān had made over portions of his estates in Māzandarān and other private lands as *waqf* properties.[740] On his death, these properties, including the *madrasa* itself, were probably placed in the hands of a *mutawallī*, but, when Ḥasan Mullā ᶜAlī became governor of Kirman in 1243/1828, he placed all the financial affairs of Ẓāhir al-Dawla's children under his personal supervision and, although he did not directly interfere with the *awqāf*, probably exercised considerable control over them.[741]

By the time of Karīm Khān's return to Kirman following his first visit to Karbala, around 1245/1828, Ḥasan ᶜAlī Mīrzā's position in the city seems to

have weakened somewhat, and Karīm was able to exercise some degree of freedom in financial matters, giving the supervision of his personal properties to a certain Āqā Sayyid Muḥammad ᶜAlī and that of the *madrasa* and the *waqf* properties belonging to it to Mullā ᶜAlī, a local *mujtahid*.[742] Already, during his first stay in Karbala, he had offered to make over to Rashti all the property he had inherited from his father; when this offer was refused, he promised Rashti the payment of *khums* on his possessions, which proved acceptable.[743]

During his second absence in Iraq, however, matters seem to have fallen very much out of his control or that of his appointees. Fīrūz Mīrzā Nuṣrat al-Dawla (1819-1886) became governor of Kirman in 1253/1837, replacing Ḥasan ᶜAlī Maḥallātī (1800-1881), the first of the Āghā Khān Ismaili leaders.[744] He seems to have attempted to exercise control over the ulama of the city by means of a policy of divide and rule: a year after his arrival, he expelled from Kirman Ākhūnd Mullā ᶜAlī Akbar, a rigorously puritanical divine who insisted upon close observance of the religious law.[745] At the same time, he showed considerable favor towards two *mujtahids*, Mullā ᶜAlī Tūnī (known as Aᶜmā) and Ḥājī Sayyid Jawād Shīrāzī.

Under the patronage of Fīrūz Mīrzā, Sayyid Jawād succeeded in replacing Ākhūnd Mullā ᶜAlī Akbar as Kirman's *Imām-Jumᶜa*, a position which he held until his death in 1287/1870.[746] Sayyid Jawād also improved his prestige in the city by marrying one of the daughters of Ibrāhīm Khān.[747] He and Mullā ᶜAlī Tūnī became increasingly involved in the affairs of the *madrasa* and the *waqf* of Ẓāhir al-Dawla about the time of Karīm Khān's return to Kirman, and managed to exercise such influence over the *ṭullāb* that the latter was unable to regain control of the *waqf*.[748]

Kirmānī, in retaliation, declared the *waqf* invalid, meaning to inherit it personally as *irth* property, and applied for confirmation of his *fatwā* from Mullā Muḥammad Bāqir Shaftī in Isfahan.[749] Shaftī's concurrence notwithstanding, the *ṭullāb* refused to hand over the *madrasa* until one of Kirmānī's followers succeeded in taking control one night by means of a ruse; on the following day, Shaykhi *ṭullāb* were installed in the *madrasa*, which has remained in their hands since then.[750] It seems that Kirmānī's position was further strengthened by his success in persuading the other children of Ibrāhīm Khān each to make his share of the inheritance into *waqf*.[751] Although he did not manage the *waqf* personally, leaving it instead in the hands of trustees,[752] there is no doubt that much of Karīm Khān's power in Kirman—as, indeed that of his descendants—derived from his ultimate control over much of his father's vast wealth. It is said that he received an annual income from his relatives of from two to three thousand *tomans*, in the form of *khums* and *zakāt*.[753]

On Rashti's death, Karīm Khān, then aged thirty-four, began to claim for himself the leadership of the Shaykhi community through out Iran and Iraq and, within a short time, was able to draw to himself the majority of Iranian and a number of Arab Shaykhis who had not become Babis. In general, those

Shaykhis who became followers of the Bab only to abandon him at a later stage in the development of his doctrines, tended to turn to Kirmānī as an alternative. By the end of his life, he had so consolidated his position as head of the sect that the succession, after a brief dispute, passed to his second son, Ḥājj Muḥammad Khān Kirmānī (1263-1324/1846-1906), passing from him to his brother Ḥājj Zayn al-ᶜĀbidīn Khān Kirmānī (1276-1360/1859-1941), from him to his son Ḥājj Abu'l-Qasīm Khān Ibrāhīmī (1314-89/1896-1969), and from him to the last Kirmani head of the school, Ḥājj ᶜAbd al-Riḍāᵓ Khān Ibrāhīmī (d. 1979).[754]

Our sources do not make entirely clear the details of how Kirmānī established his position as head of the Shaykhi community at Kirman and, before long, in Iran as a whole, but the general outlines of this development can be reconstructed from a careful examination of the materials currently available. It seems that Sayyid ᶜAlī Kirmānī, who acted as amanuensis to Rashti in Karbala,[755] initiated a belief that he referred, albeit in somewhat cryptic fashion, to Karīm Khān as being the aware of the identity of his successor. In a letter which he is said to have forged in the Sayyid's name, and which may have been written in Rashti's lifetime, Sayyid ᶜAlī quoted the tradition frequently attributed to the Imām Alī, which ends with the words "I am the point beneath the *bāᵓ*"; he then went on to write, apparently in reference to Karīm Khān, that "you are aware of him, and have met with the point of knowledge and have reached the goal."[756] This letter was read to some of the *ṭullāb* and caused a certain amount of tumult; it was, according to al-Karbalā'ī, a factor in encouraging certain *ṭullāb* to leave for Kirman after Rashti's death. Although Karīm Khān himself does not appear to have been a party to this forgery, al-Karbalā'ī thinks that he may indeed have been informed as to the "bearer" (*ḥamīl*) of knowledge after Sayyid Kāẓim.[757] Sayyid ᶜAlī also seems to have been instrumental in fostering similar ideas concerning Karīm Khān in Kirman as well. In a letter to Kirman, apparently written after Rashti's death, he stated that the Sayyid had said, "a certain person (*fulān*) is informed as to the point of knowledge (*nuqṭat al-ᶜilm*), and that person is spiritual… and more worthy [than others] to be followed; it is permissible to gain knowledge from him."[758] According to al-Karbalā'ī, it was to this that Kirmānī referred in his *Iẓhāq al-bāṭil*, in writing of Rashti that "he indicated what he indicated,"[759] with reference to the matter of succession.

Karīm Khān was not, however, entirely passive in this matter. After Rashti's death, he wrote letters to the Shaykhis of Kazimiyya and to Mīrzā Muḥīṭ Kirmānī, Mullā Ḥasan Gawhar and Prince Sulaymān Mirza,[760] claiming to be "the one arising in the cause after him that is hidden from men (*al-qāᵓim bi 'l-amr baᶜda 'l-ghāᵓib ᶜan al-nās*)."[761] It seems that, at a later stage, following his defection from Babism, Kirmānī employed Mullā Jawād Vilyānī as his "herald" (*munād*) both to carry letters from him and to write on his behalf to others.[762] The exact nature of the claims put forward by Kirmānī in these letters is unclear. Raḍavī maintains that, immediately following the death of Rashti, the

Khān claimed that "one thousand gates of knowledge were opened to me, and within each of those gates another thousand gates lay open."[763] The implication appears to be that, just as Rashti became the bearer of the knowledge which al-Ahsaʾi had derived from the Imāms, so Karīm Khān, in his turn, was the recipient of the same supernaturally acquired knowledge. There is also, almost certainly, a conscious reference to a *ḥadīth* in which it is stated that the Prophet "taught" ʿAlī one thousand gates (of knowledge), from each of which another thousand opened.[764]

In general, Kirmānī succeeded in attracting a following by emerging as the chief representative of certain views and tendencies which appealed to a large section of the Shaykhi school, notably the more cautious and conservative section. His prodigious output of works on numerous topics and the comparative simplicity of most of his Persian writings ensured a rapid spread of his fame and a wide popularity. The emergence of Babism proved to be of particular help to him in consolidating his influence with that section of the school to which he made the strongest appeal, because it gave him the opportunity to make clear his position on the important question of the relationship of Shaykhism to Shiʿism as a whole, and to define his attitude towards more extreme Shaykhi views, particularly those being exploited within the context of Babism. While conserving the identity of the school, Kirmānī and his successors strove to drive a wedge between its present and its past and to integrate it as far as possible with the orthodox community, largely by playing down those elements in the original Shaykhi teachings which clashed most forcibly with traditional or contemporary views, and by emphasizing those aspects which asserted their identity with accepted Shiʿi beliefs.

This emphasis can be seen throughout the works of Karīm Khān, such as his well-known *Irshād al-ʿawwām*, but we may use as a convenient example section seventeen of his *Risāla-yi sī faṣl*, written in 1269/1853.[765] The section was written in reply to the request to "provide an explanation of the beliefs of Shaykhism", and begins with the words: "If you should wish for a brief reply, our beliefs are the beliefs of all Twelver Shiʿis; whatever the Shiʿis agree upon in respect of the principles (*uṣūl*) of religion, we confess the same, and whatever they reject, we also reject. We regard the consensus (*ijmāʿ*) of the Shiʿis on the bases and subsidiaries (*furūʿ*) of faith as evident and proven." The rest of the section is a summary of standard Shiʿi beliefs concerning God, the Prophet, and the Imāms, in a manner resembling the more detailed discussion provided by al-Ahsaʾi in his *Ḥayāt al-nafs* and by Rashti in his *Risāla-yi uṣūl al-ʿaqāʾid.*

We have noted above how the trend towards orthodoxy among many Shaykhis after the death of Rashti was given impetus by the emergence of Babism as a definable target for Bālāsarīs and Shaykhis alike. For Kirmānī, the emergence of such a target proved the key to the establishment of his own role as the defender of Shaykhism against the heretical views of the Babi Shaykhis and as the leader of the rapprochement with authority, such a role making him

an obvious focus for the less radical element in the school. His attacks on the Bab, which he carried out from the pulpit and through the writing and dissemination of four extended refutations, had the virtue of being, on the one hand, negative in its uncompromising rejection of Babism as an innovation (*bidᶜa*) essentially unconnected with Shaykhism and, on the other, positive in its consolidation of the orthodox Shiᶜi position which he was seeking to adopt for the school and its doctrines. It is worth noting that, in all four refutations, in particular the earliest, *Iẕhāq al-bāṭil*, considerably more space is devoted to argument in favor of orthodox doctrine than to condemnation of Babi belief.

Sayyid ᶜAlī Muḥammad Shīrāzī

The main details of the life of the Bab have been dealt with adequately if, at times, sketchily and hagiographically, in several separate works, to which reference may be made.[766] We need only note here a few basic facts of his early life, both in an attempt to clarify and reinterpret the details, and in order to serve as background to the more general events under discussion. Named ᶜAlī Muḥammad,[767] he was born in Muḥarram 1235/20 October 1819[768] to a prominent family of Ḥusaynī *sayyids* in Shīrāz.[769] His father, Sayyid Muḥammad Riḍāᵓ, was a prosperous wholesale merchant (*tājir*), dealing in cloth from premises in Shīrāz and Būshehr, in conjunction with members of his wife's family.[770] Apart from Ḥājī Mīrzā Muḥammad-Ḥasan Shīrāzī (Mīrzāy-i-Shīrāzī) (1815-1895) and Ḥājī Sayyid Jawād Shīrāzī—both paternal cousins of the Bab's father—the family would seem to have had no members among the ulama, although the Bab's maternal uncles and some other relatives appear to have been active adherents of the Shaykhi school.[771] The Bab himself received some six or seven years basic schooling at a local *maktab*,[772] but it is clear that he was destined to join his uncles in running the family business. Although he may have been involved in business pursuits from as early as the age of ten,[773] he did not leave the *maktab* until he was about thirteen and did not take a full part in the family concerns until he reached fifteen.[774] Shortly after this, he moved to Bushehr with his uncle and guardian, Hājī Mīrzā Sayyid ᶜAlī, and, after four years trading in partnership there, became independent at the age of nineteen.[775]

The Bab's own attitude towards commerce, however, was certainly negative, and he seems to have become increasingly preoccupied with religious and intellectual pursuits. In his earliest extant work, a short *risāla* on *sulūk*, he remarks that "a Jewish dog is better than the people of the bazaar, for the latter are they that hesitate on the path"[776]—a telling illustration of his attitude towards the merchant classes at this stage. Perhaps even more significant is a statement in the *Ṣaḥīfa bayna 'l-ḥaramayn*, written in early 1261/1845, to the effect that "the science of *fiqh* is obligatory for all those who wish to engage in commerce; it is not permissible for anyone who believes in God to carry out trading (*al-tijāra*) without a knowledge of *fiqh*."[777]

The frequent citations of *aḥādīth*, allusions to and quotations from works of Shiᶜi scholarship, and detailed discussions of matters relating to points of *fiqh* and *kalām* in works such as the *Tafsīr Sūrat al-baqara*, *Tafsīr Sūrat al-kawthar*, *Risāla furūᶜ al-Adliyya* and *Dalaʾil-i sabᶜa*, suggest that the Bab himself acquired considerable familiarity with theological literature about this period.[778] It seems that, while he was in Bushehr, he began to compose works of a devotional and theological character, including sermons (*khuṭub*) and eulogies of the Imāms.[779] In the *Qayyūm al-asmāʾ*, he himself refers to works written by him for other merchants during his days in Būshehr.[780] According to ᶜAbd al-Ḥusayn Āvāra, some of these works were read by Shaykhis and excited curiosity as to the identity of their author.[781]

Nicolas—who does not, unfortunately, cite his authority for the statement—maintains that the first work penned by the Bab was a treatise entitled *Risāla-yi fiqhiyya*, composed in Bushehr at the age of nineteen.[782] No manuscript of this work is known to exist, but there are a number of copies extant of a short treatise which appears to have been written in the lifetime of Sayyid Kāẓim Rashti. This is the *risāla* on *sulūk* referred to above. It would seem from a passage near the end of this treatise, in which the Bab refers to "my lord, protector, and teacher, Ḥājī Sayyid Kāẓim al-Rashti, may God prolong his life," that it was written between 1255/1839, when the Bab visited Karbala for a year, and the death of Rashti at the beginning of 1844.[783] It seems that the composition and distribution of these early works by the Bab excited some degree of controversy: Ḥājī Sayyid Javād Karbalāʾī, a prominent Shaykhi who had close ties with the Bab's family, is recorded as stating that Hājī Mīrzā Sayyid Muḥammad, one of the Bab's uncles, once approached him with a request to "give some good counsel to my nephew . . . tell him not to write certain things which can only arouse the jealousy of some people: these people cannot bear to see a young merchant of little schooling show such erudition, they feel envious."[784] The Bab himself indicates in the *Qayyūm al-asmāʾ* that his relatives treated his activities with considerable disapproval.[785]

In the end, ascetic practice and religious matters gradually came to occupy the Bab's mind to the exclusion of his business affairs, and, in 1255/1839, he closed up his office in Bushehr and headed for Karbala.[786] He remained at the *ᶜatabāt* for about one year,[787] during which period he attended the classes of Rashti, who received him with much attention on several occasions.[788] According to al-Karbalāʾī, the Bab remained at the *ᶜatabāt* for eleven months, eight in Karbala and three at other shrines; when in Karbala, he would attend the classes of Rashti every two or three days.[789] Aḥmad Rūḥī Kirmānī states that he attended the general classes given by Rashti every day.[790] Balyuzi has argued, in keeping with the Babi/Bahaʾi hagiographical tradition of innate knowledge (*ᶜilm-i ladunī*), that "these occasional visits did not and could not make Him a pupil or disciple of Sayyid Kāẓim."[791] While this certainly correct in the sense that the Bab never completed a full "course" of studies on the basis of which he

might have been granted an *ijāza* by Rashti or another *mujtahid*, it is misleading in terms of his mental attitude towards Sayyid Kāẓim. We have already quoted the *Risāla fi 'l-sulūk*, in which the Bab refers to Rashti as "my lord, support, and teacher (*sayyidī wa muᶜtamadī wa muᶜallimī*)"; in an early prayer, he speaks of himself as having been "one of the companions of Kāẓim, may my spirit be his sacrifice."[792] Similar references may be found in numerous other early letters.[793]

It seems that, while in Karbala, the Bab also studied Arabic literature under Mullā Ṣādiq Khurāsānī (d. 1889), who later became one of his most active converts.[794]

Several sources indicate that, in the course of his stay in Karbala and, particularly, his visits to the classes of Rashti, the Bab became acquainted with and attracted a certain amount of attention from a number of Shaykhis, many of whom later became his followers. These included Shaykh Ḥasan Zunūzī,[795] Mullā Jaᶜfar Qazvīnī,[796] Mullā Ṣādiq Khurāsānī,[797] Mullā Muḥammad Ḥusayn Bushrūᵓī,[798] Mīrzā Muḥammad-ᶜAlī Nahrī and his brother Mīrzā Hādī (d. 1848),[799] Mullā Aḥmad Muᶜallim Ḥisārī,[800] Mīrzā Muḥammad Rawḍa-Khān Yazdī[801] and Hājī Sayyid Javād Karbalāᵓī (d. 1882)[802] Mīrzā Ḥusayn Khān Dakhīlī, a son of Mullā Ḥusayn Dakhīl Marāghaᵓī, states in an unidentified manuscript that his father met the Bab with Sayyid Kāẓim and that a group of mutual friends used to talk about him before Rashti's death. This group included Mīrzā Aḥmad Ibdāl Marāghaᵓī (d. 1849), Āqā Muḥammad Ḥasan, Āqā Muḥammad-Ḥusayn Marāghaᵓī (d. 1850), and Mullā ᶜAlī Ardabīlī.[803] That the Bab met and served Sayyid Kāẓim and was held in respect while in Karbala is also noted by Kirmānī in his first polemic against him, the *Izhāq al-bāṭil*, although he does point out that he himself never met him.[804]

After about one year, in 1256/1840 or, according to another version, in the autumn of 1841,[805] the Bab ceded to requests from his mother and uncles and returned to Shīrāz. Before long, however, he seems to have grown restless again and planned to go back to Iraq. The family, reluctant for him to leave, intervened once more, arranging a marriage for him on 18 Rajab 1258/25 August 1842, to Khadīja Bagum (1820-1882), a daughter of his mother's paternal uncle, Ḥājī Mīrzā Sayyid ᶜAlī.[806] A child named Aḥmad was born in 1295/1843, but died in infancy or, according to one source, was stillborn.[807]

It was several months after this that the Bab had what appears to have been the first of a number of dreams or visions which convinced him that he had been chosen as the bearer of divine knowledge to succeed Rashti, and as the gate to the Hidden Imām. In a passage at the beginning of his *tafsīr* on the *Sūrat al-baqara,* he states that, on the night before he began the book (his first major work), he dreamt that the city of Karbala (*al-arḍ al-muqaddaṣa*) rose piecemeal (*dharratan dharratan*) into the air and came to his house (in Shīrāz) to stand before him, whereupon he was informed of the imminent death of Rashti.[808] The implication is that the Bab had what he regarded as a significant dream not long before the death of the Sayyid in Dhū 'l-Ḥijja 1259/January 1844, possibly in

the month of Dhū 'l-Qaᶜda /November-December 1843, as suggested by Māzandarānī.[809] According to a majority of manuscripts consulted by me, this *tafsīr* was completed up to the first *juzʾ* of the Qurʾan (verse 131 of the sura) in Muḥarram 1260/January-February 1844.[810] The second half of the *tafsīr* was completed in the course of 1260/1844 and was among the works in the Bab's possession when he performed the *ḥajj* in the latter part of that year; it was, however, stolen from him, together with a number of other volumes, between Medina and Jidda.[811]

The extant text of the first half of the *Tafsīr Sūrat al-baqara* reveals very little which might be taken as seriously heterodox, in contrast to the highly unconventional *Qayyūm al-asmā*, begun only a few months afterwards. The abrupt and significant change in style and content between these two works seems to be attributable to a second, more compelling visionary experience which the Bab underwent about one month before the announcement of his claim to Mullā Muḥammad Ḥusayn Bushrūʾī in May 1844. In his *Kitāb al-fihrist*, written in Bushehr on his return from pilgrimage on 15 Jumādī II 1261/21 June 1845,[812] the Bab clearly states that "the first day on which the spirit descended into his heart was the middle [i.e., the 15th] of the month of Rabiᶜ II."[813] Since it is added that fifteen months had passed since that experience, we can give the date as 15 Rabiᶜ II 1260/4 May 1844. It would seem that this "descent of the spirit" was accompanied by a vision similar in many respects to initiatory dreams described by al-Ahsaʾi and Rashti, as we have seen earlier; his own dream is described by the Bab in his *Ṣaḥīfa-yi ᶜAdliyya* as follows:

> Know that the appearance of these verses, prayers, and divine sciences is the result of a dream in which I saw the blessed head of the prince of martyrs [Imām Ḥusayn] severed from his sacred body, alongside the heads of his kindred. I drank seven drops of the blood of that martyred one, out of pure and consummate love. From the grace vouchsafed by the blood of the Imām, my breast was filled with convincing verses and mighty prayers. Praise be unto God for having given me to drink of the blood of him who is His Proof, and made thereof the reality of my heart.[814]

Just as al-Ahsaʾi and Rashti had felt themselves confirmed in their roles as, in some sense, mediators of the knowledge of the Prophet and Imāms following dreams, so the Bab now clearly began to regard himself as the recipient of the divine afflatus, verbally inspired by the grace of the Imām and filled with the Holy Spirit. However, whereas his two predecessors had been members of the *ulama* class and were able to adapt their visionary experiences to their role within the accepted patterns of religious behavior inside the "ecclesiastical" hierarchy (within whose confines the *takfīr* controversy

remained), the Bab was to take the step characteristic of uneducated or partially-educated individuals who believe themselves to be granted supernatural revelations but have no recognized position within the formal religious structure of their society—the creation of a role for himself outside the established ecclesia, corresponding to an approved charismatic or messianic figure revered in popular belief or expectation.

The Bab continued to experience dreams or visions until at least Ramaḍān 1260/September-October 1844,[815]and possibly much later, but their significance dwindled somewhat as he came to believe himself to be in a state of perpetual grace and a recipient of direct verbal inspiration from the twelfth Imām or, in due course, God himself.

It seems possible that, even before the death of Rashti, Shīrāzī (the Bab) had begun to view himself as his future successor and as the "bearer of the cause" he predicted. Kirmānī maintains that, during the lifetime of Rashti, the Bab had been held in some respect, but was even then influenced by certain ideas and events which ultimately led to his later claims.[816] He holds that the Bab had heard of the appearance of a certain Mullā Ṣādiq in Azerbaijan, who had acquired a following of some one thousand two hundred during Rashti's lifetime, and that he was impressed by him.[817] The Mullā Ṣādiq named here would, in fact, appear to have been Mullā Ṣādiq Urdūbādī, who preached the imminent advent of the Qā'im in the Caucasus in the period before 1844,[818] but there is no evidence in the Bab's own writings that he had either heard of or been influenced, however indirectly, by him.

In a letter written in late 1260 or 1261, Shīrāzī indicates that "following the death of the late Sayyid, there must be such a leader (*sayyid*) among his followers in every age," and makes it clear that he was the individual to whom the Shaykhis were meant to turn.[819] It seems that he received at least two letters from Rashti, the contents of which he interpreted as an indication of his future position.[820] Āvāra states that he saw a letter in the Bab's hand, dated 1259, in which he instructs his uncle to "tell the *ṭullāb* that the cause was not yet reached maturity and the time has not yet come,"[821] which strongly suggests that he was attracting attention as a potential leader at this point. The proximity of the year 1260, exactly one thousand lunar years after the entry of the twelfth Imām into the Lesser Occultation (*al-ghayba al-ṣughrā*), cannot have failed to further encourage his belief in the nearness of a new revelation of inner truth, not, perhaps, unrelated to this eventual return of the Imām.

In a letter written from prison in Azerbaijan to his uncle Ḥājī Mīrzā Sayyid ᶜAlī, Shīrāzī indicates his belief that the year 1260 witnessed the beginning of a period of revealed *bāṭin*, following several centuries of *ẓāhir*:

> From the time of the revelation of the Qurᵓan for a period of nineteen times sixty-six years [1254], which is the number of Allāh

> [i.e., sixty-six in *abjad* reckoning], was the outward reality (*ẓāhir*) of the family of Muḥammad, during which every sixty-six years one letter of the words *bism Allāh al-raḥmān al-raḥīm* passed by, while four more years additional to the form of all the letters passed in the time of the perfect Shiᶜi, that is Ḥājj Sayyid Kāẓim… It was for this reason that the letters of *bism Allāh al-raḥmān al-raḥīm*, which contain all the Qurʾan, were gathered together in his presence. Nineteen days before the beginning of the revelation of the mystery, he joined the supreme concourse; the beginning of the year 1260 was the beginning of the revelation of the mystery.[822]

The stage was clearly set for the arrival of Mullā Ḥusayn Bushrūʾī and other Shaykhis from Karbala from about April to June 1844.

The *ḥurūf al-ḥayy* or *sābiqūn*

We have observed in the first part of this chapter that, for a period of some four months after the death of Rashti, the Shaykhi community of Karbala found itself unable to initiate any positive action to determine the mode of succession to its late head. Then, as al-Karbalāʾī states, a break with Mīrzā Muḥīṭ Kirmānī and Mullā Ḥasan Gawhar occurred, and some people began to disperse. This dispersal may well have been initiated—and was certainly led—by a young Iranian Shaykhi *ᶜālim* of about thirty-one, Mullā Muḥammad Ḥusayn Bushrūʾī.[823] Born the son of a local merchant in Bushrūya, Khurāsān, in 1229/1814, Bushrūʾī was sent at an early age to Mashhad, where he studied in the Mīrzā Jaᶜfar *madrasa*.[824] His principal teacher in Mashhad was Sayyid Muḥammad Qaṣīr Raḍawī Mashhadī (d. 1255/1839),[825] a pupil of Āqā Bihbahānī and the teacher of another leading early Babi, Mullā Muḥammad Ṣādiq Khurāsānī.[826] Bushrūʾī appears to have become a Shaykhi in Mashhad[827] and to have studied afterwards in Tehran[828] and Isfahan[829] before traveling to the ᶜ*atabāt* to study under Rashti.[830] In Karbala, where he stayed for nine or eleven years,[831] he gained a reputation as one of the leading pupils of the Sayyid, who entrusted him with the task of answering questions on his behalf.[832] He wrote at least two books during this period, including a *tafsīr* on the *Sūrat al-kawthar*, and seems to have acquired a private following of *ṭullāb* and admirers, among them Mullā Muḥammad Taqī Haravī, Mullā ᶜAbd al-Khāliq Yazdī, and Mīrzā Aḥmad Azghandī.[833] There appears to have grown up a conviction among some that Bushrūʾī would be the successor of Rashti (*al-qā'im bi 'l-amr baᶜdahu*), a belief which was made public on the latter's death but rejected by Bushrūʾī himself.[834]

As noted previously, about four years before the death of Rashti, Bushrūʾī was sent on his behalf to Isfahan and Mashhad to discuss the Shaykhi position with Mullā Muḥammad Bāqir Shaftī and Hājī Mīrzā ᶜAskar (then *Imām-Jumᶜa*

of Mashhad).[835] Following his visit to Mashhad, he seems to have returned to Bushrūya for a time; on his way back to the *ʻatabāt*, he heard of Rashti's death while in Kirmanshah,[836] arriving back in Karbala soon after, on 1 Muḥarram 1260/22 January 1844.[837] On his return, Mullā Ḥusayn, as we have noted above, discussed the situation with Mullā Ḥasan Gawhar, Mīrzā Muḥīṭ Kirmānī, and other leading Shaykhis, but appears to have been dissatisfied with their wait-and-see policy.

On or about 2 Ṣafar/22 February, he retired with his brother, Mīrzā Muḥammad-Ḥasan Bushrūʾī (d. 1849), and nephew, Mīrzā Muḥammad-Bāqir (d. 1849) to the Masjid al-Kūfa, in order to engage in a retreat (*iʿtikāf*) for the conventional forty-day period (*arbaʿīn*).[838] While there, he was joined by Mullā ʿAlī Basṭāmī (d. 1846) and some six or twelve companions, who began an *iʿtikāf* some days behind the first arrivals.[839]

Zarandī limits the number participating in the *iʿtikāf* to those who were later to become the Bab's first disciples, the *ḥurūf al-ḥayy* or precursors (*sābiqūn*),[840] thereby giving the misleading impression that a simple division occurred between those who set out in search of a successor to Rashti—and, by virtue of that act alone, "discovered" the Bab—and those who were prepared to await developments in Karbala. It seems, however, that larger numbers were involved: Mīrzā Ḥusayn Hamadānī (d. 1881), the author of the *Tārikh-i jadīd*, relates that he was present at the *iʿtikāf* in the mosque in Kufa (presumably a fiction of convenience on his part) and that he saw there, apart from several of those who later became *ḥurūf al-ḥayy*, a Mīrzā ʿAbd al-Hādī, a Mullā Bashīr, and "many other learned and devout men who had retired into seclusion."[841] Māzandarānī mentions Ḥājī Sayyid Khalīl al-Madāʾinī, a tribal leader who had studied under Rashti, as also present at the *iʿtikāf*.[842] The *Hasht bihisht* maintains that no fewer than forty individuals were involved.[843]

After the celebration of the birth of the Prophet on 12 Rabiʿ I/1 April, Bushrūʾī left Kufa with his brother and cousin and, possibly, several others, heading for Kirman with the intention of meeting and consulting with Karīm Khān. According to Shaykh Muḥammad Taqī Hashtrūdī's *Abwāb al-hudā*, he was accompanied on his journey by Mullā Yūsuf Ardabīlī (d. 1849), Mullā Jalīl Khūʾī (Urūmī) (d. 1849), Mullā ʿAlī Bushrūʾī, Mīrzā Aḥmad Azghandī, Shaykh Abū Turāb Ashtahārdī, and others.[844] The same source states that Bushrūʾī himself had told the author that, having despaired of Mullā Ḥasan Gawhar, had decided to visit Kirmānī.[845] Aḥmad ibn Abī 'l-Ḥasan Sharīf Shīrāzī records a similar statement by a companion of Bushrūʾī.[846] Aḥmad Rūhī holds that Kirmānī was already "inviting people" to join him, and that Bushrūʾī and his companions sought him out as the possible *bāb* of the Imām.[847] The route taken by Bushrūʾī and his fellow-travelers passed, however, through Bushehr and Shīrāz, where it would seem that they sought out Sayyid ʿAlī Muḥammad. According to one account, Bushrūʾī told Mīrzā ʿAbd al-Wahhāb Khurāsānī that "since the Seyyid ʿAlī Muḥammad had honoured me with his friendship during

a journey which we made together to the Holy Shrines… I at once on reaching Shīrāz sought out his abode."[848] Other sources are agreed that Bushrūʾī had at least seen the Sayyid during the latter's stay in Karbala in 1841, probably shortly before his departure for Isfahan,[849] while Āvāra maintains that he had formed a particular affection for the Bab at that period.[850]

According to Zarandī, Bushrūʾī arrived in Shīrāz on 4 Jumādā I/22 May, was met by the Bab on his arrival, and acquainted that evening with the latter's claims.[851] Almost two months, however, seems unnecessarily long for the journey from Karbala to Shīrāz, and we may presume that Bushrūʾī actually arrived some weeks before this. That such was the case seems to be confirmed by Hamadānī, who describes a process of gradual conversion over several meetings culminating in his reading of the *Qayyūm al-asmāʾ*.[852] Mīrzā Yaḥyā Ṣubḥ-i Azal indicated to E. G. Brown that it was the perusal of the *Qayyūm al-asmāʾ* which had initially convinced Bushrūʾī of the truth of the Bab's claims.[853] During this period, Bushrūʾī also read part at least of the Bab's incomplete *Tafsīr Sūrat al-baqara*[854] and his short commentary on the *Ḥadīth al-jāriyya*.[855] Mullā Jaᶜfar Qazvīnī states, on the authority of Mullā Jalīl Urūmī, himself one of the *ḥurūf*, that the Bab showed various writings to Bushrūʾī while the latter was teaching in the Vakīl mosque; he says that Bushrūʾī would go with his companions every day to visit the Bab and that, after forty days, the latter openly revealed his claims to them.[856] Whatever the details of this preliminary period, the Bab did, in the end, announce to Bushrūʾī that he was the successor to Rashti and, indeed the *bāb al-Imām*; Bushrūʾī accepted his claims, by reason of which he came to be known as "the first to believe" (*awwal man āmana*), the "gate of the gate" (*bāb al-bāb*), and even the "return of Muḥammad".[857] The date of this "declaration" is given by the Bab himself with great precision in the *Bayān-i fārsī* as the evening of 5 Jumādā I/22 May, at two hours and eleven minutes after sunset.[858]

Some three weeks before that, on 15 Rabīᶜ II/4 May, another group of Shaykhis set off from Karbala for Shīrāz, apparently traveling some of the way by sea, presumably following Bushrūʾī's route via Bushehr.[859] This group consisted of seven individuals "to the number of the days of the week", namely Mullā ᶜAlī Basṭāmī, Mullā Jalīl Urūmī, Mīrzā Muḥammad-ᶜAlī Qazvīnī (a brother-in-law of Qurrat al-ᶜAyn), Mullā Ḥasan-i-Bajastānī, Mullā Aḥmad "Ibdāl" Marāghaʾī, Mullā Mahmūd Khūʾī, and Mullā Muḥammad Miyāmī.[860]

Zarandī, however, in writing of what must be the same group, omits the last name and adds another seven, bringing the total to thirteen.[861] Arriving at the latest some forty days after the Bab's "declaration",[862] this group of thirteen met the Bab individually and accepted his claims, most probably with the encouragement of Bushrūʾī and his brother and nephew, who had also joined the rank's of the Bab's disciples.[863] Included in this group were Mullā ᶜAlī Qazvīnī and his brother Mīrzā Hādī; the former was, as we have noted, a brother-in-law

of Fāṭima Khānum Baraghānī, better known as by the titles Qurrat al-ᶜAyn (given her by Rashti) and Jināb-i Tāhira (given her by the Bab).[864]

This remarkable woman—a latter-day Juana Inés de la Cruz[865]—had already won a reputation as an outstanding and radical Shaykhi *ᶜālima*, and was to become a center of much controversy following her acceptance of Babism. Although then in Qazvīn,[866] she was enrolled by the Bab in his group of *ḥurūf al-hayy*, apparently on the recommendation of Mullā Muḥammad ᶜAlī.[867] It would appear that the latter then corresponded with her concerning the Bab and that, on receipt of his information, she, for her part, accepted his claims: "At the beginning of the cause of this mighty one, I was in Qazvīn and, as soon as I heard of his cause, before reading the blessed *tafsīr* [on the *Sura Yūsuf*, i.e., the *Qayyūm al-asmāᵓ*] or the *Ṣaḥīfa makhzūna*, I believed in him."[868] We shall discuss the subsequent activities of Qurrat al-ᶜAyn in a later chapter.

The last member of the group of eighteen individuals known as the *ḥurūf al-ḥayy* was a young Shaykhi *ṭālib* from Mazandaran who had, it seems, also been engaged in *iᶜtikāf* at the mosque in Kufa, but had traveled independently to Shīrāz.[869] Mullā Muḥammad ᶜAlī Bārfurūshī, latter known as *Ḥaḍrat-i Quddūs*, became a close favorite of the Bab, whom he accompanied on the *ḥajj* in the autumn of 1844, and eventually led the Babi uprising in his native province in 1848.[870]

With the arrival of Bārfurūshī in Shīrāz and his acceptance of the Bab's claims, the latter considered the group of his first apostles to be complete.[871] The eighteen *ḥurūf al-ḥayy* (in *abjad* reckoning, *ḥayy* = 18)[872] appear to have constituted with the Bab himself the first "unity" (*wāḥid* = 19) of a series of nineteen unities which would make up a body of three hundred and sixty one individuals—a *kullu shayᵓ* (= 361)—the first believers in the *bāb* of the Imām.[873] The *ḥurūf al-ḥayy* are themselves regarded as identical with the *sābiqūn* referred to in early works of the Bab and his followers,[874] both in the literal sense of their having preceded others in the recognition of the Bab and in the more esoteric sense of their identity with the first group of mankind to respond to God's pre-eternal covenant.[875] This latter group is itself identified in Shiᶜi literature with Muḥammad and the Imāms,[876] and it is clear that the Bab regarded the *ḥurūf al-ḥayy* as the return of the Prophet, the twelve Imāms, the four original *abwāb*, and Fāṭima.[877] As we shall see, both the exclusive position granted the *ḥurūf al-hayy* and their identification with the most sacred figures of Shiᶜism were to be productive of serious controversy in the early Babi community of Karbala.

CHAPTER FIVE: SOME ASPECTS OF EARLY BĀBI DOCTRINE

The Early Writings of the Bab

The *ḥurūf al-ḥayy* were primarily responsible for spreading the claims of the Bab to their fellow-Shaykhis and, to a lesser extent, other Shi^{c}is, and we shall have cause to consider their activities in this connection at a later stage. In thus furthering the Bab's claims, they placed considerable emphasis on the writings which he was now beginning to pen in large numbers.[878]

Of these early writings, by far the most important and influential was the *Qayyūm al-asmā$^{\circ}$* or *Aḥsan al-qaṣaṣ*, a lengthy "commentary" on the *Sura Yūsuf* (and often referred to in early Babi literature simply as "the *tafsīr*").[879] There are, unfortunately, serious problems connected with the dating of this work, which appear at present to be insoluble.

According to Zarandī (1831-1892), the first chapter of the *tafsīr*, entitled "Sūrat al-mulk," was written in the presence of Bushrū$^{\circ}$ī on the evening of the Bab's "declaration", although his account gives a curious impression of an extremely long chapter, which the "Sūrat al-mulk" is not.[880] Mīrzā Ḥusayn Hamadānī, however, implies that Bushrū$^{\circ}$ī was shown a complete copy of the *tafsīr*, possibly on the same occasion.[881]

The Bab himself states in a letter that he completed the writing of the *Qayyūm al-asmā$^{\circ}$* in forty days, although he does not make it clear when he began or ended work on it.[882] It is generally reckoned that, on leaving Shīrāz before the autumn of 1844, both Mullā ^{c}Alī Basṭāmī and Mullā Ḥusayn Bushrū$^{\circ}$ī (d. 1849) carried with them separate copies of this book, which they brought to Iraq and Tehran respectively.[883] That this *tafsīr* was widely distributed in the first year of the Bab's career is further confirmed by him in the *Bayān-i Fārsī*, where, in reference to his *ḥajj* journey in 1844-5, he states that "in that year the blessed commentary on the *Sūra Yūsuf* reached everyone."[884] It is certainly clear that the book must have been begun in 1260/1844, since the Bab states in an early passage that he is now twenty-five years old.[885]

Internal evidence, however, suggests that the *Qayyūm al-asmā$^{\circ}$* was, in fact, completed much later than the forty-day period mentioned. There are, for example, two references to "this month of Ramadan"[886]—most probably Ramadan 1260/August-September 1844. Other references include those to a storm at sea,[887] quite possibly one of those suffered by the Bab on his journey from Bushehr to Jidda between 19 Ramaḍān/2 October and late Dhū 'l-Qa^{c}da/early December;[888] to what appears to be his first public declaration of his claims at the Kaaba in Mecca;[889] to God's having revealed matters to him in the Kaaba;[890] to his call "from this protected land, the station of Abraham," apparently Mecca;[891] to his having been "raised up" in the Masjid al-Ḥarām (in

Mecca);[892] and, finally, to what seems to have been yet another experience in Mecca, in which he says

> when I went to the Kaaba (*al-bayt*), I found the house (*al-sakīna*) raised on square supports before the *bāb*; and, when I sought to perform the circumambulation around the Kaaba, I found that the duty imposed in truth in the Mother of the Book was seven times.[893]

These references, all of which occur in the later section of the book, make it clear that it was completed during the Bab's pilgrimage to Mecca, from which he returned to Bushehr on 8 Jumādī I 1261/15 May 1845.[894] Bushrūʾī, Basṭāmī and others of the *ḥurūf al-ḥayy* must have carried only portions of the *tafsīr* with them when they left Shīrāz. It is also not unlikely that, if this hypothesis as to a later date of completion is correct, the Bab's reference to "forty days" should be taken to mean forty days in all, over a prolonged period, rather than forty consecutive days.

Consisting of one hundred and eleven "suras", corresponding to the number of *āyāt* in the *Sūra Yūsuf*, the *Qayyūm al-asmāʾ*[895] is really much more than a *tafsīr* in the normal sense of the word. Much more space is taken up with doctrinal reflections of the Bab than with actual Qurʾanic commentary, and, when a verse is finally commented on, it is usually in an abstruse and allegorical fashion. The style is consciously modeled on that of the Qurʾan—something true of many of the Bab's earlier writings—this being alluded to in a statement quite early in the book: "We have sent this book down upon our servant by the permission of God, [in a manner] like it [the Qurʾan],"[896] and in later passages.[897]

This apparent similarity to the style of the Qurʾan (which is not, in fact, as consistent as it might at first appear), combined with the form of the book as divided into *suwar* and *āyāt*, and the occurrences of numerous passages closely paralleling the exact wording of the Qurʾan,[898] led to accusations that the Bab had produced a '"falsified" Qurʾan or "forged" his own Qurʾan. Thus, for example, Tanakābunī states that, in the year of his appearance, the Bab sent his false Qurʾan (*Qurʾān-i jaʿlī*) to Iraq, and that this æQurʾanæ was taken from his messenger by the pasha of Baghdad (Najīb Pāshā).[899] Similarly, Major Henry Rawlinson (1810-1895), the British political agent in Baghdad at the time of Mullā ʿAlī Basṭāmī's arrest and trial, wrote to Stratford Canning that Mullā ʿAlī

> Appeared in Kerbela, bearing a copy of the Koran, which he stated to have been delivered to him, by the forerunner of the Imām Mahdī, to be exhibited in token of his approaching advent. The book proved on examination to have been altered and interpolated in many essential passages, the object being, to prepare the Mohammedan world for the immediate manifestation of the Imām,

> and to identify the individual to whom the emendations of the text were declared to have been revealed, as his inspired and true precursor.[900]

Rawlinson elsewhere speaks of Basṭāmī's "perverted copy of the Koran."[901]

The text of the *Qayyūm al-asmāʾ* itself, however, indicates that this was a most superficial response and that the theory behind the *tafsīr* was much more complex than mere imitation of the Qurʾan. At the very beginning of the book, it is made clear that the twelfth Imām had sent it (*akhraja*) to his servant (the Bab, frequently referred to as "the remembrance" – *ah-dhikr*);[902] he has been sent these "explanations" from "the *baqiyyat Allāh*, the exalted one, your Imām."[903] To be more precise, "God has sent down (*anzala*) the verses upon His Proof, the expected one," who has, in his turn, revealed them to his remembrance.[904] In different terminology, the Imām inspires (*awḥā*) the Bab with what God has inspired him.[905]

The role of the Imām here appears to be very similar to that of the angel Gabriel in the Qurʾanic theory of revelation; thus, for example, he has inspired the Bab just as God inspired the prophets of the past.[906] The process is not, however, quite that simple, for the bulk of the work seems to be intended as the words of the Imām speaking in the first person, while there are a great many passages in which either God or the Bab is intended as the speaker, and others in which it is not at all clear who is intended. It is, nevertheless, manifest that the book is represented as a new divine revelation of sorts, comparable to the Qurʾan. Thus the Imām is "made known" through "the new verses from God,"[907] while God speaks "in the tongue of this mighty remembrance [i.e., the Bab]."[908] It is stated that "this is a book from God,"[909] and that "God has sent down (*anzala*) this book,"[910] while the Bab is summoned to "transmit what has been sent down to you from the bounty of the Merciful."[911] In this respect a comparison is drawn with the Qurʾan which goes beyond mere form: God has "made this book the essence (*sirr*) of the Qurʾan, word for word,"[912] and one "will not find a letter in it other than the letters of the Qurʾan";[913] this book "is the *Furqān* of the past,"[914] and is referred to repeatedly as "this Qurʾan,"[915] "this *Furqān*,"[916] or one of "these two *Furqāns*,"[917] while reference is made to "what God has sent down in His book, the *Furqān*, and in this book."[918] As in the case of the Qurʾan, a challenge is made to men to produce a book like it,[919] for it is held to be inimitable.[920] As such, it is in itself the evidence of the Imām to men.[921] It contains the sum of all previous scriptures,[922] abrogates all books of the past, except those revealed by God,[923] and is the only work which God permits the ulama to teach.[924]

The *Qayyūm al-asmāʾ* may be said to combine something of the character of the letters (*ṭawqīʿāt*) "written" by the Hidden Imām through his intermediaries, the four *abwāb*, of the various books reputed to be in the

possession of the Imāms – the *muṣḥaf* of Fatima, *al-Ṣaḥīfa, al-Jāmiᶜa, al-Jabr*, the "complete Qurᵓan", and the previous scriptures[925]—and of the Qurᵓan itself.

The tension between the Bab's specific claims at this period (to be the gate of the Hidden Imām, the remembrance of God and the Imām, and the "seal of the gates" [*khātim al-abwāb*]—a topic with which we shall deal in the next section) and what appears to be a clear impulse in the direction of a claim to prophethood, if not actual divinity (which characterizes the Bab's works from 1848 onwards), forms one of the more interesting features of this book. It is, in any case, one of the lengthiest of works of the Bab and, leaving aside the extremely diffuse *Kitāb al-asmāᵓ*, the most extensive of his Arabic writings. While hardly the easiest of books to understand, being terse, allusive, and at times extremely vague in style, it does provide us with a reasonably detailed picture of the Bab's thought as it must have impressed itself on his earliest disciples and opponents.

Since there is clearly no space here to adequately summarize the contents of a work of some four hundred pages, much of which is given over to the unsystematic treatment of metaphysical themes, reference to certain of the more interesting topics it contained must suffice.

A theme which recurs throughout the book is that it is an expression of the "true Islam" and that, indeed, salvation exists only in acceptance of the claims of the Bab, as the representative of the Imām and of God. Thus, at the very beginning of the book, it is stated that "the pure religion (*al-dīn al-khāliṣ*) is this remembrance, secure; whoever desires submission (*al-islām*), let him submit himself to his cause."[926] Similarly, it is said that "this religion is, before God, the essence (*sirr*) of the religion of Muḥammad,"[927] and that whoever disbelieves in the Bab shall have disbelieved in Muḥammad and his book.[928] The Hidden Imām declares in one passage that "there is no path to me in this day except through this exalted gate,"[929] and it is maintained that "God has completed His proof (*atamma ḥujjatahu*) unto [men] with this book."[930] The gate and representative of the Imām, the Bab was also, in a sense, the Imām himself "in the worlds of command and creation (ᶜ*awālim al-amr wa 'l-khalq*),"[931] and, as such, was entrusted with a mission on behalf of the Imām to all mankind.[932]

He himself constantly addresses the "peoples of the earth,"[933] or of "the East and West,"[934] and calls on his followers to "spread the cause to all lands."[935] Towards the beginning of the *tafsīr*, he summons "the concourse of kings" to take his verses to the Turks and Indians and to lands beyond the East and West.[936] God Himself had assured him of sovereignty over all lands and the peoples in them,[937] had written down for him "the dominion of the earth,"[938] and already ruled the world through him.[939] The Bab, clearly, did not conceive of his message as limited to Iran, or to the Shiᶜi or even the Islamic world, but envisioned a universal role for himself complementary to that of Muḥammad and the Imāms. Since the laws of Muḥammad and the decrees of the Imāms

were to remain binding "until the day of resurrection,"[940] there was no question but that the primary means of bringing men to the true faith was to be *jihād*.[941]

Messianic expectation and exhortation to *jihad* were clearly linked for the Bab in the role of the Imām as the victorious *mujahid* of the last days: "the victory (*naṣr*) of God and His days are, in the Mother of the Book, near at hand."[942] On the one hand, it is clear that aiding God (*naṣr*—a term widely used in the Qurʾan to mean fighting in the path of God) was seen by the Bab as a means of anticipating the Day of Judgment and of helping to hasten its advent. He speaks of "the man who has submitted himself (*aslama wajhahu*) to God, and who aids our cause and anticipates the dominion (*dawla*) of God, the Almighty, as drawing near."[943] Elsewhere, he calls on "the peoples of the East and West" to "issue forth from your lands in order to come to the assistance of God (*li-naṣr Allāh*) through the truth for, truly, God's victory (*fatḥ Allāh*) is, in the Mother of the Book, near at hand."[944] More explicitly, the Bab links the waging of holy war with the necessary preparations for the advent of the Qā'im: "O armies of God!", he writes, "when you wage war with the infidels (*al-mushrikīn*), do not fear their numbers…. Slay those who have joined partners with God, and leave not a single one of the unbelievers (*al-kafirīn*) alive upon the earth, so that the earth and all that are on it may be purified for the Remnant of God (*baqiyyat Allāh*), the expected one [i.e., the twelfth Imām in his persona as the Mahdī]."[945]

On the other hand, the Bab anticipated *jihad* as one of the events prophesied in the traditions relating to the appearance of the Qā'im.[946] In a relatively early passage of the *Qayyūm al-aṣmāʾ*, the Imāms (*ahl al-bayt*) prophesy that they will wage war on behalf of the Bab: "We shall, God willing, descend on the day of remembrance, upon crimson thrones, and shall slay you, by the permission of God, with our swords, in truth—just as you have disbelieved and turned aside from our mighty word [i.e., the Bab]."[947] The *Qayyūm al-asmāʾ* itself was "revealed", it states, "in order that men might believe and assist him [the Bab] on the day of slaughter (*yawm al-qitāl*)."[948] The Bab himself was, it seems, awaiting permission from the Imām to "rise up in the cause" when the time came[949]—a possible allusion to his projected visits to Kufa and Karbala, to which we shall refer later.

Regulations concerning the conduct of *jihad* are set out in some detail in the *Qayyūm al-asmāJ*, principally in *sūras* 96 to 101.[950] For the most part, these consist—like a great many passages of the book (notably those devoted to legislation)—of verbatim or near-verbatim reproductions of existing Qurʾanic passages, or echoes of such passages, with only occasional novel features introduced by the Bab himself. Apart from these regulations for *jihad*, which are of particular interest for the light they shed on early Babi history and on the question of militancy in the movement, the *Qayyūm al-asmāʾ* contains passages detailing the basic Islamic laws concerning *ṣalāt,*[951] *ḥajj*,[952] *ṣawm*,[953] *zakāt*,[954] marriage and divorce,[955] manslaughter,[956] foodstuffs,[957] ablutions,[958]

inheritance,[959] usury and trade,[960] adultery,[961] theft,[962] *nawāfil*,[963] the *lex talionis*,[964] idols, wine, and gambling,[965] and smoking (which is prohibited).[966] There is no room here to enter into a discussion of the relationship of the Bab's legal pronouncements here or elsewhere (as in his *Risāla furūᶜ al-ᶜAdliyya*) and the Islamic law as it appears in standard works of Shiᶜi *fiqh*; the most important point to note is the contrast between this early insistence on the observance of Islamic law with the later abrogation of the *sharīᶜa* and its replacement by the highly idiosyncratic system of legislation embodied in the Arabic and Persian *Bayāns*.

Aside from the *Qayyūm al-asmāᵓ* and the second part of the *Tafsīr Sūrat al-baqara*, the Bab penned several shorter works during the year or so between his first claims and his return to Būshehr from the *ḥajj* in May 1845. There has been some confusion as to the identity of the earliest works of the Bab,[967] but, fortunately, he himself has listed most or all of them in two works, the first entitled *Kitāb al-fihrist*, clearly dated 15 Jumādā II 1261/21 June 1845, and certainly written in Būshehr, and the second probably entitled *Risāla-yi dhahabiyya*, [968] which records fourteen works written "from the beginning of the year 1260 to the middle of the first month of the year 1262"[969] (i.e., from 1 Muharram 1260/22 January 1844 to 15 Muharram 1262/13 January 1846). The first of these works, although earlier in date, in fact contains a larger number of individual titles than the second. It also has the advantage of giving the actual names of the works cited, whereas the *Risāla-yi dhahabiyya* gives oblique references which require elucidation on the basis of information gleaned elsewhere.[970] We shall restrict ourselves here, therefore, to the list of works given in the *Kitāb al-fihrist*.[971]

Apart from the works already mentioned, the *Kitāb al-fihrist* refers to the *Duᶜā-yi ṣaḥīfa, al-Ṣaḥīfa aᶜmāl al-sana, al-Ṣaḥīfa bayna 'l-ḥaramayn, Tafsīr al-basmala, Kitāb al-rūḥ,* thirty-eight letters to individuals, twelve *khuṭub* delivered or written on the *ḥajj* journey, and replies to forty-one questions. In addition to the above, the Bab lists here the titles of several works stolen from him by a Bedouin while on pilgrimage. According to his own statement, in a *khuṭba* written in Jidda, this occurred on 11 Ṣafar 1261/19February 1845, between Medina and Jidda.[972]

It is not certain at what date the *Duᶜā-yi ṣaḥīfa* was written, but its inclusion in the *Kitāb al-fihrist* immediately after the *Qayyūm al-asmāᵓ* suggests that it might have been contemporary with it. This seems to be confirmed by a statement in the latter work that "we have sent down unto you with this book that written *ṣaḥīfa*, that the people may read his prayers (*daᶜwātahu*) by day and by night,"[973] which is almost certainly a reference to this work. Māzandarānī refers to it by the title *Al-ṣaḥīfa al-makhzūna*,[974] and a comparison of texts under these two titles confirms that they are indeed the same work. This important early piece is a collection of fourteen prayers, largely designed for use on specific days or festivals, such as the ᶜĪd al-Fiṭr, ᶜĪd al-Aḍḥā, the night of

ᶜĀshūrā, and even the night of Bab's "declaration" on 5 Jumādā I. Mullā ᶜAlī Basṭāmī carried a copy of this work with him to the ᶜ*atabāt* in the autumn of 1844, and it appears to have been copied and distributed there.[975] Similarly when Bushrūᵓī left Shīrāz shortly after Basṭāmī, but in the direction of Tehran, he also carried a copy of the *Ṣaḥīfa makhzūna*, together with the *Qayyūm al-asmāᵓ* and some other short works.[976] At least seven manuscripts of this work are still in existence.[977]

It seems that at least three major works of the Bab were written in the course of his nine-month *ḥajj* journey. Of these, the most important is undoubtedly the *Ṣaḥīfa bayna 'l-ḥaramayn*. This treatise was written, as the title indicates, between Mecca and Medina, for Mīrzā Muḥīṭ Kirmānī and Sayyid ᶜAlī Kirmānī (who were also on the *ḥajj* that year), [978] on and possibly after 1 Muḥarram 1261/10 January 1845.[979] This work of about one hundred short pages is an unsystematic collection of replies to questions together with prayers. Among the topics dealt with are: the Bab's *mubāhala* challenge to Mīrzā Muhīt;[980] the use of talismans;[981] the seven causes of creation;[982] the courses of the celestial bodies;[983] and right conduct (*sulūk*).[984] There are prayers to be said at sunset,[985] after the noon and dawn *ṣalāts*,[986] on the evening of Friday,[987] and at the beginning of every month,[988] as well as instructions for pilgrims to the Shrine of Ḥusayn.[989]

Of particular interest is a lengthy passage in which the Bab sets out a somewhat strenuous daily routine for the seeker (*sālik*), with directions as to prayer, *nawāfil*, fasting (which includes an additional fast of ten days each month to the age of thirty, of fifteen days from thirty to forty, of three days from forty to fifty, and of Ramadan only from fifty), the taking of gum mastic, water, and milk, study (including that of *fiqh*), sleep and prayers during the night.[990] Several manuscripts of this work are known to exist, the earliest of which are one in the Bahaᵓi archives in Haifa, date 1261/1845, and another in their Tehran archives, dated the same year.

The fate of the *Kitāb al-rūḥ*, composed at sea on the Bab's return journey,[991] was less fortunate. According to Nicolas, this book, which the Bab himself thought highly of, describing it as "the greatest of all books,"[992] and which he wished to have sent to all the ulama,[993] was seized at the time of his arrest and thrown into a well in Shīrāz.[994] Nicolas claims that it was rescued by "pious hands," albeit in a seriously damaged condition.[995] As a result, several partial copies are in existence today, a total of five manuscripts of differing degrees of completeness being known to the present author. This work would also appear to be known as the *Kitāb al-ᶜadl*,[996] and is recorded as having originally consisted of seven hundred suras.

A third work, of some interest for its doctrinal implications, also appears to have been composed during this journey. According to Zarandī, when the Bab returned to Būshehr in 1845, he sent Mullā Muḥammad-ᶜAlī Bārfurūshī (who had accompanied him to Mecca) ahead of him to Shīrāz.[997] Bārfurūshī was

entrusted with a letter to the Bab's uncle, Ḥājī Mīrzā Sayyid ᶜAlī,[998] and a copy of a work entitled the *Khaṣāᵓil-i sabᶜa*: "a treatise in which He had set forth the essential requirements from those who had attained to the knowledge of the new Revelation and had recognized its claims."[999] This work was given to Mullā Ṣādiq Khurāsānī by Bārfurūshī when the latter reached Shīrāz, and it was in accordance with one of the precepts contained in it that Mullā Ṣādiq made use of an altered form of the *adhān* in the Masjid-i Shamshīrgarān in Shīrāz.[1000] A riot ensued, as a result of which Bārfurūshī, Khurāsānī, and a third Babi named Mullā ᶜAlī-Akbar Ardastānī were physically punished and expelled from the city, not long before the Bab's arrival there—the first example of opposition to the Babis in Iran (though hardly the conscious attack on Babism which later partisan sources make it out to be).[1001]

Although I have never been able to trace a copy of this work, there seems to be at least one manuscript in existence, since both Ishrāq Khāvarī, and Muḥammad ᶜAlī Fayḍī refer to its contents. Since they are of considerable interest, I shall list the seven regulations given in this work as cited by these two writers:[1002]

1. To read the *Ziyāra al-jāmiᶜa al-kubrā* on Fridays, festivals, and holy nights, after the performance of ablutions and purification of body and clothes with great care, in a spirit of sanctity.
2. To perform the prostration of the *ṣalāt* on the grave of Imām Ḥusayn, in such a way that the nose of the worshipper touches the grave.
3. To add the formula *ashhadu anna ᶜAlīyan qablu Muḥammad ᶜabdu baqiyyati 'llāh* ("I bear witness that ᶜAlī Muḥammad [i.e. the Bab] is the servant of the Remnant of God") to the *adhān.*[1003]
4. Each believer to hang round his neck, reaching to his chest, a talisman (*haykal*) in the Bab's hand, containing various names of God and other mysterious devices based on the divine names.[1004]
5. Each believer to wear a ring of white agate bearing the words: "there is no god but God; Muḥammad is the Prophet of God; ᶜAlī is the *walī* of God; 273."[1005]
6. To drink tea with the greatest cleanliness and delicacy.
7. To refrain from smoking.

It is, I think, clear that none of these prescriptions constitutes, in strict terms, an abrogation of any part of the Islamic *sharīᶜa*; they appear to be rather in the nature of supererogatory observances designed to mark out the followers of the Bab as especially pious—a point to which we shall return.

An important work which seems to have been written in Bushehr after the Bab's return from the *ḥajj* is the *Ṣaḥīfa* (or *Kitāb*) *aᶜmāl al-sana*. This work contains fourteen chapters, interspersed with unnumbered sections, basically dealing with the observances and prayers for various important dates in the

Muslim calendar, and, in this respect, bearing a close resemblance to the *Ṣaḥīfa makhzūna*. Of even greater importance are two works written most probably shortly after the Bab's return to Shīrāz in the summer of 1845.[1006] These are two related treatises on *fiqh*, the *Ṣaḥīfa-yi 'Adliyya* and the *Risāla furūᶜ al-ᶜAdliyya*, dealing with *uṣūl* and *furūᶜ* respectively.

The *Ṣaḥīfa-yi ᶜAdliyya* consists of five *abwāb* as follows:

1. On the mention of God
2. In explanation of the Balance according to the command of God
3. On the knowledge of God and his saints (*awliyāᵓ*)
4. On the return to God (*maᶜād li 'llāh* [sic])
5. On the prayer of devotion to God (*ikhlāṣ li'llāh* [sic]).

This would appear to be the first Persian work of the Bab's, as he himself explains in the text.[1007] It is of particular value in helping us form a clear picture of the Bab's ideas at this juncture, especially since it seems to represent the first step taken to address himself to a wider audience than the Shaykhi ulama for whom his earlier works had been written. In the course of this work, he states that the *sharīᶜa* legal system "shall not be abrogated";[1008] speaks of his verses as "utter nothingness when compared with a single word of the book of God or the words of the people of the house of purity [i.e., the Imāms]";[1009] praises Shaykh Aḥmad al-Ahsaᵓi , but condemns his followers;[1010] refers to a vision of the head of the Imām Ḥusayn, which he appears to have regarded as instrumental in giving him his earliest inspiration;[1011] condemns the concept of the oneness of existence (*waḥdat al-wujūd*) as *shirk*;[1012] lists the seven bases (*uṣūl*) of mystical knowledge (*maᶜrifa*) as *tawḥīd*, *maᶜānī*, *abwāb, imāma, arkān, nuqabāᵓ,* and *nujabāᵓ*;[1013] states that prayer through the Imām or others is unbelief *(kufr*), and denies that either al-Ahsaᵓi or Rashti prayed through ᶜAlī or thought him the Creator (a point on which, as we have seen, they had been attacked);[1014] regards the station of the Imāms as higher that that of the prophets *(anbiyāᵓ*);[1015] states that "most of the men and women of the *Ithnāᵓ-ᶜasharī* sect, by virtue of their ignorance of this station [i.e., of the *nuqabāᵓ*]", shall go to hell (*dūzakh*);[1016] declares the enemies of al-Ahsaᵓi and Rashti to be unbelievers like the Sunnis;[1017] speaks of the former as the *shīᶜa khāliṣ*;[1018] writes of the necessity of belief in a physical resurrection and *miᶜrāj*, condemns the idea of spiritual resurrection and maintains that al-Ahsaᵓi did not speak of it;[1019] and, finally, speaks of obedience to himself, as the "servantæ of the twelfth Imām, as obligatory.[1020] When compared with statements in earlier works, it is clear that the Bab had opted for the use of *taqiyya*, perhaps because this text was in Persian.

The *Risāla furūᶜ al-Adlīyya* is often found in manuscripts accompanying the foregoing, but is generally less common. It has the distinction of being, as

far as is known, the earliest work of the Bab's to have been translated. While its author was staying at the house of Mīr Sayyid Muḥammad, the *Imām-Jumᶜa* of Isfahan, in the course of his visit to that city from late 1846 to 1847, Mullā Muḥammad-Taqī Haravī (a Shaykhi *ᶜālim* to whom we have referred previously as a close disciple of Rashti) translated the *Risāla* from Arabic into Persian. It consists of seven *abwāb* as follows:

1. *Ziyāra jāmiᶜa (ṣaghīra)*
2. On *ṣalāt*
3. On *aḥkām al-ṣalāt*
4. On *zakāt*
5. On *khums*
6. On *jihād*
7. On *dayn*

All of these topics are dealt with in the traditional Shiᶜi manner, often entering into minute details of observances, purification, and suchlike, and suggesting some familiarity on the part of the Bab with works of *fiqh*.

The most important work which can be assigned to the period of the Bab's residence in Shīrāz from July 1845 to September 1846 is the well-known *Tafsīr Sūrat al-kawthar*, a commentary of over one hundred folios written for Sayyid Yaḥyā Dārābī (known by the *laqab* Waḥīd), during the visit he made to Shīrāz to interview the Bab (according to Babi accounts, on behalf of Muḥammad Shāh).[1021] An account of the writing of this work is given by Zarandī.[1022] It appears to have been widely circulated by the Bab's followers: ᶜAbd al-Ḥusayn Navāᵓī speaks of it being sent to Tehran, Kerman, and Isfahan,[1023] but it undoubtedly went much further afield than that—it was used, for example, by Qurrat al-ᶜAyn when preaching Babism in Kirmanshah,[1024] and we may, I think, assume that Dārābī himself carried a copy on his travels, which carried him to most parts of Iran.

Interesting as it undoubtedly is in places, and highly regarded as it was by the early Babis, this work is, for the most part, almost unreadable, consisting of highly abstract and insubstantial speculation on the verses, words and even letters of the sura on which it is supposed to be a "commentary". Of greater interest are the numerous *aḥādīth* which the Bab quotes in a later section of the work, indicating his familiarity with works of tradition and his concern with the prophecies relating to the advent of the Qā'im. In view of the development of Babi doctrine after 1848, it is of interest to note the Bab's reference here to the fact that, although the *ḥalāl* and *ḥarām* of Muḥammad will endure "until the day of resurrection", yet when the Qā'im appears, "he shall bring a new book, new laws, and a new dominion".[1025]

We have here again, as in the *Qayyūm al-asmāᵓ*, an appeal to the inimitable verses of the book,[1026] but, in distinction to the *Ṣaḥīfa-yi ᶜAdliyya*, it is claimed that only the words of the Imāms can compare with those of the

Bab.[1027] As in the latter work, he praises al-Ahsaʾi and Rashti but condemns their followers,[1028] while here he maintains that "all that Kāẓim and Aḥmad before him have written… does not equal a single word of what I have revealed to you."[1029]

Nevertheless, as we shall note in the next section, the claims which he advances in this work are in apparent contradiction to those which he had made previously.[1030] The Bab's remarks here on the concept of *rukn al-rābiʿ* shall also be dealt with separately. It is of interest to note that, in the course of this *tafsīr*, the Bab specifically identifies the Imāms as the general cause of creation (*ʿilla kulliyya fī ibdāʿ al-mumkināt wa ikhtirāʿ al-mawjūdāt*)[1031]—a doctrine for which al-Ahsaʾi had been attacked.[1032] During this period, the Bab also wrote a large number of *tafsīrs*, including the *Tafsīr āyat al-nūr*, the *Tafsīr Sūrat al-qadr*, the *Tafsīr Sūrat al-tawḥīd*, and those on various *aḥādīth*; he also continued to pen replies to queries from a large number of individuals and to write treatises on topics such as *jabr* and *tawḥīd*, *qadr*, and even grammar and syntax (*naḥw wa ṣarf*).[1033]

It is, I think, clear that ample material exists, albeit scattered and, at times, badly transcribed, which may serve as a basis for the study of the inception and early development of the Bab's thought. One of the most difficult things about following this development through his entire career is its very rapidity, with several large-scale modifications of doctrine taking place in the space of only six years. Most that has been written about the Bab's thought has concentrated on his later ideas, as expressed in the Persian *Bayān* and other works of the late period. This needs to be balanced in future studies by detailed reference to his ideas at this critical early stage. In the works we have mentioned above may be found answers to several important questions, such as what the Bab's earliest claims were, what his attitude was to Islam, the Qurʾan, the *sharīʿa*, the Imāms, and the *abwāb*, what he thought about the advent of the Hidden Imām, what his ideas were with regard to *jihād*, and what he thought of the Shaykhi school.

The Early Claims of the Bab

In our first chapter, we indicated several ways in which the charismatic authority of the Imāms was transferred or routinized in the period following the presumed disappearance of the twelfth Imām, and discussed the development of charisma among the ulama, especially the *mujtahidūn*, *marājiʿ al-taqlīd*; and, in the modern period, ayatollahs. Later, in our discussions of al-Ahsaʾi and Rashti, we showed how their roles as "bearers" of the knowledge of the Imāms represented a particularly dramatic expression of the "polar motif" in Shiʿism, and were closely related to its "gnostic motif". In our last section, we demonstrated how, in his early writings, the Bab emphasized the "gnostic motif" by laying claim to direct knowledge from the Hidden Imām, which was, in turn, *waḥy* from God, and, in our final chapter, we shall return to this motif in relation to the concept

of "inner knowledge" (*bāṭin*) "revealed" by the Bab. At this point, however, it will be useful to discuss—albeit more briefly than is desirable—the polar motif as developed in the early claims of the Bab, both in terms of his own statements and those of his followers concerning him.

It will, perhaps, be as well to take as our starting point the Shaykhi doctrine of the "fourth support" (*rukn al-rābiᶜ*). In *Izhāq al-Bātil*, Kirmānī maintains that the "basic question" involved in the dispute with Babism is the existence of the true bearer (*ḥāmil*) of the *rukn al-rābiᶜ*. When Rashti died, there had to be a bearer after him, and people went in search of his successor in this capacity. At this point, the Bab made his claims and many came to regard him as this *ḥāmil rukn-i rābiᶜ*.[1034] In the same work, Kirmānī states that, during the lifetime of Rashti, the Bab had read what he (Kirmānī) had written on the need for a fourth support and the impossibility of any age being deprived of it.[1035] Inadvertently, as it were, Kirmānī here provides us with an important clue as to the nature of the doctrine of the *rukn al-rābiᶜ* as he originally taught it, and the reason for his modification of the doctrine in subsequent writings.

Let us first give a short description of the doctrine as expounded by Kirmānī in seven works between 1261/1845 and 1282/1865.[1036] Briefly, it is this: traditional Shiᶜi theology speaks of five bases (*uṣūl*) of religion—the divine unity (*tawḥīd*), prophethood (*nubuwwa*), resurrection (*maᶜād*), justice (ᶜ*adl*), and the imamate (*imāma*).

Shaykhi belief, according to Kirmānī, is that knowledge of God, like that of the Prophet or Imāms, implies and involves a knowledge of all of His attributes. Since none of these attributes can be denied by the believer, it makes more sense to speak of "the knowledge of God" as the first base of religion. Similarly, resurrection is a necessary consequence of the justice of God, since "it is a corollary of justice that the obedient be rewarded and unbelievers punished";[1037] from another point of view, belief in the resurrection is necessitated by a belief in the Prophet and the veracity of his words.[1038] "Therefore," he writes, "all five of the bases of religion are clearly affirmed in these three bases [i.e., knowledge of God, *nubuwwa*, and *imāma*]."[1039]

A fourth *aṣl* or *rukn* is added on the grounds that the bases of religion are those matters in which each individual believer must exercise his own initiative (*ijtihād*) and not rely on or imitate others (i.e., use *taqlīd*).[1040] Kirmānī maintains that the decision as to whether one is entitled to exercise *ijtihād* or must base one's actions on *taqlīd* to a scholar of the rank of *mujtahid* is, in itself, another area in which every believer must exercise his own judgment.[1041] The recognition of such a *mujtahid* (or ᶜ*ālim, faqīh*, etc.) ranks, therefore, as a fourth support of religion.[1042]

The nature of this fourth *rukn* is elsewhere expressed by Kirmānī in somewhat different terms. Religious questions, he says, are of two kinds: knowledge of essences (*dhawāt*) and knowledge of the statements (*aqwāl*) of

these essences. The knowledge of the essences involves four groups: knowledge of God, the Prophet, the Imāms, and the generic (*nawᶜī*) knowledge of the friends (*awliyāᵓ*) and enemies (*aᶜdāᵓ*).[1043] With respect to the statements of these four groups, man is required to know the divine decrees (*sharāᵓiᶜ*), which obliges him to know the words of the prophets in which they are expressed, which in turn demands knowledge of the words of the Imāms in which these latter are interpreted; the bearers of the knowledge of the Imāms are the transmitters (*rawāt*) of their words and the scholars (ulama) familiar with their traditions, whose words must also be known.[1044] Knowledge of the words of these four groups constitutes the *uṣūl*.[1045] Thus, the four *uṣūl* or *arkān* are:

1. Knowledge of God
2. Knowledge of the Prophet
3. Knowledge of the Imāms
4. Knowledge of the *awliyāᵓ* of the Imāms.[1046]

In the sense that the term *awliyāᵓ* may be applied to a wide range of people—in its fullest sense to all the Shiᶜa—including *nuqabāᵓ* and *nujabāᵓ*, in practice the *mujtahidūn* and *fuqahāᵓ* are the lowest grade of the *rukn al-rābiᶜ*.[1047]

In his *Risāla-yi sī faṣl* and the *Risāla dar jawāb-i yik nafar-i Iṣfahānī*, Kirmānī devotes considerable space to refuting the charge that he regarded himself in a specific sense as the *rukn al-rābiᶜ*, or that the term could, indeed be applied to a specific person in a given age. "The fourth support of the faith," he writes, "consists of the scholars (ulama) and worthies (*akābir*) of the Shiᶜa, and they are numerous in every period."[1048]

> We regard the *rukn al-rābiᶜ* as love (*walāyat*) for the friends of God (*awliyāᵓ Allāh*) and dissociation *(barāᵓat*) from the enemies of God; after the *arkān*, we regard the *nuqabāᵓ* and *nujabāᵓ* as the greatest of the friends of God…. But, by God, we have not considered it obligatory to know the friends of God in the form of their chiefs (*aᶜyānihim*) or their individual members (*ashkhāṣihim*), and have not laid on men an insupportable duty (*taklīf mā lā yuṭāq*). Rather, we have said that the generic knowledge (*maᶜrifat-i nawᶜ*) of the *awliyāᵓ* is essential, that is, "what sort of person is the *walī* and what are his attributes?"…. We have not said that one should recognize a specific or definite *naqīb*, or that one should recognize one of the *nujabāᵓ* in a specific or definite form.[1049]

The relevance of the foregoing to our earlier discussion of the role of the *arkān, nuqabāᵓ, nujabāᵓ* and ulama as general bearers of the charisma of the Imāms does not, I think, need further elaboration.

Kirmānī also refutes the idea that al-Ahsaʾi or Rashti were the *rukn al-rābiᶜ* in their respective ages. In the general sense, he says, this is true, in that they fulfilled the conditions necessary for a *marājiᶜ al-taqlīd.* "But", he goes on, "God forbid that I should regard them as the specific *rukn al-rābiᶜ* for their ages."[1050] In this general sense also, Kirmānī regards himself as a *marjaᶜ* after al-Ahsaʾi and Rashti,[1051] but refutes any charge of his having claimed personally to be the *nāʾib* or representative of the Imām.[1052] The Babis, however, have, he maintains, held it as obligatory to obey a single individual.[1053]

Originally, the Bab himself would appear to have taught a version of the *rukn al-rābiᶜ* doctrine similar to that developed more fully by Kirmānī. In his earliest extant work, the *Risāla fi 'l-sulūk*, he states that "religion stands on four pillars: *al-tawḥīd, al-nubuwwa, al-wilāya,* and *al-shiᶜa.*"[1054] In the *Tafsīr Sūrat al-baqara*, he repeats that "the *shiᶜa* are the *rukn al-rābiᶜ*" and quotes a popular *ḥadīth* in this connection, in which the Imām Mūsā al-Kāẓim ibn Jaᶜfar (745?-799) states that the "greatest name" (*al-ism al-aᶜẓam*) consists of four letters: "the first is the statement "there is no god but God"; the second "Muḥammad is the Prophet of God"; the third is ourselves [the Imāms]; and the fourth our *shiᶜa*."[1055]

The *Qayyūm al-asmāʾ* and other works written soon after Shirazi's declaration contain no reference to the doctrine, but it is discussed again under the title "the hidden support" (*al-rukn al-makhzūn*) in the *Tafsīr Sūrat al-kawthar*, written for Sayyid Yaḥyā Dārābī, who had not been a Shaykhi.

"Had you been one of the companions of Kazīm," he writes, "you would understand the matter of the hidden support, in the same way that you comprehend the [other] three supports."[1056] He then argues that, "just as you stand in need of an individual sent from God who may transmit unto you what your Lord has willed, so you stand in need of an ambassador (*ṣafīr*) from your Imām."[1057] If it should be objected that the ulama as a whole fulfill this function (a view Kirmānī held by this date, if not before), he would reply that the ulama differ from one another in rank, some being superior to others. They are not even in agreement on all issues, as is evident from the variation of their words, actions, and beliefs. Now, if we accept the principle that certain ulama are superior to others, it becomes necessary for us to abandon one of the inferior rank in order to give our allegiance to his superior – a process which must, in the end, lead us to the recognition of a single person superior to all others.[1058] "It is impossible," he writes, "that the bearer of universal grace from the Imām should be other than a single individual."[1059]

The *rukn al-rābiᶜ* doctrine is developed in relation to the Bab by Qurrat al-ᶜAyn in an undated *risāla.* Describing Muḥammad and the Imāms as the collective "sign" of God's knowledge to His creation,[1060] she indicates that they have appeared in every age in different forms and "clothing" and that men have been and shall be tested by this until the day of resurrection.[1061] In each age, these "signs" appear in the form of "perfected humanity" (*insāniyyat-i kāmil*)

and "all-embracing" (*nurāniyyat-i shāmil*).[1062] Faith (*īmān*) is based on four pillars (*arkān*),[1063] the fourth pillar being the "manifest towns" (*qurā ẓāhira*) referred to in Qurʾan 34:18, that is, the ulama, from whom the mass of believers (*raʿāyā*) must take sustenance (i.e., knowledge fed to them during the period of the *ghayba*).[1064] God has chosen to reveal the station of the *rukn al-rābiʿ* in this age, although it was previously concealed, just as the *rukn* of *wilāya* was kept hidden in the time of Muḥammad.[1065] The meaning of the term *rasūl* in each age is the "bearer of the hidden sign", whom God reveals whenever he deems it suitable.[1066] In this age, he has revealed the *rukn al-rābiʿ* and sent a *rasūl*, *bayyina*, and *dhikr al-imām* (i.e. the Bab),[1067] This individual, she says is the 'manifest town' (in the singular) revealed by God.[1068] That the *rukn al-rābiʿ* has, therefore, been revealed in a single person is made fully clear some pages further on, when she states that God has sent the pure *shīʿa* in a specific form (*shīʿa-yi khāliṣ-rā az maqām-i ikhtiṣāṣ nāzil farmūda*).[1069]

Sayyid Yaḥyā Dārābī (originally a non-Shaykhi, as we have mentioned) also applies the *rukn al-rābiʿ* concept to the Bab in what appears to be a letter belonging to the slightly later period:

> He [God] sent him [Adam] to reveal the mystery of one of these [four] *arkān*, namely that of *tawḥīd* and the sign of the gracious one [i.e., God]; and assistance was given in the spread [of this principle] by the other prophets, both those endowed with constancy (*ulū 'l-ʿaẓm*) and the rest, until the rise of the sun of knowledge from the horizon of certitude, that is, the seal of the prophets and the prince of men and *jinn* [i.e., Muḥammad]. And he commanded him to reveal the mystery of the second *rukn*, namely, that of *nubuwwa*, the source of all truths, until the day of al-Ghadīr [i.e. Ghadīr Khumm], the best of days and the pivot of all ages. Whereupon he brought himself to perfection and entrusted his successors (*waṣiya ilā awliyāʾihi*) the revelation of the third *rukn*, that is, the *rukn* of *wilāya* and the interpretation (*taʾwīl*) of the Qurʾanic verse "when it is said to them 'There is no god but God,' they grow proud" [37:35]. [This continued] until the rising of the sun of eternity in sixty-one preceded by one thousand and two hundred [i.e., 1260], when the Imāms (*āl-Allāh*) and the letters of the word of explanation inspired the heart of their servant, whose breast was expanded for all revelations by the shining of the body of the princess of women [i.e., Faṭima], nay of all created things in the kingdom of command and creation, that he might reveal the mystery of the fourth *rukn* of the universal word, the last of the conditions of faith. At this point, the ages came to their close (*tammat al-adwār*) and the dispensations were completed (*kamulat al-akwār*).[1070]

The Bab himself emphasizes the need for a bearer of the divine knowledge in every age. The earth, he says, is never empty of the proof (*ḥujja*) of God,[1071] and there must always be a "bearer of the cause of God" (*ḥāmil amr Allāh*) between prophets (*ʿalā fiṭratin min al-rusul*).[1072] Thus, he himself, as the *dhikr*, has come during such an interval.[1073] During the shorter *ghayba*, he states, the Hidden Imām was represented on earth by *wukalāʾ* and *nuwwāb*, these being the four *abwāb*.[1074] Thus, the Imām sent the *abwāb* down during the *ghayba* and recently sent Aḥmad al-Ahsaʾi and Kāẓim (Rashti).[1075] A similar view is put forward in a *risāla* written by an anonymous Babi in 1264/1848, where it is stated that, in the shorter *ghayba*, there appeared the "four appointed gates" (*al-abwāb al-arbaʿa al-manṣūṣa*), while in the greater *ghayba*, there were "gates not appointed by name or connection," who appeared in every age until two further specific gates were sent—al-Ahsaʾi and Rashti.[1076]

It does seem that the acceptance of Sayyid ʿAlī Muḥammad as *bāb* was facilitated by prior recognition of al-Ahsaʾi and Rashti as "the Shaykh and Bab" (*al-shaykh al-bāb*) and 'the Sayyid and Bab' (*al-sayyid al-bāb*),[1077] or as "the first Bab" and "the second Bab",[1078] or as "the previous two gates",[1079] or simply as "the two gates".[1080] Even the later *Kitāb-i nuqṭat al-kāf* speaks of them as "those two mighty gates."[1081] The Bab himself refers to them on several occasions as "the two previous gates of God"[1082] and speaks of his "revelation" as being in confirmation of "the two gates."[1083]

The close relationship between the Bab and his two predecessors is clearly outlined by Qurrat al-ʿAyn in what seems to be an early *risāla*. Beginning with the assertion that man has been created to know God, but that the gate of direct *maʿrifa* is closed to him,[1084] she refers to a tradition from the Imām Ṣādiq, who indicated that man might know God "through his name and his attribute,"[1085] This "name and attribute" has a place of revelation (*maẓhar*) and appearance (*ẓuhūr*) in every age and epoch.[1086] God chooses an individual, teaches him what he wishes, and makes him his *ḥujja*, *bāb*, *nabī*, *dhikr*, and *rasūl* to the creation.[1087] There is no difference between the *nabī*, *waṣī*, *rasūl*, and *bāb* in reality.[1088] God sent down the prophets, then Muḥammad, then the Imāms; after this, the Twelfth Imām became hidden.[1089] Since, however, it was still necessary for men to be guided, the *abwāb* were appointed.[1090] Following them, there appeared in every age "an arbiter" (*ʿadūl*) to keep the faith pure.[1091] The Shiʿa were thus guided until there appeared sinful ulama who advanced various claims and rendered it necessary for the Imām to distinguish the good from the wicked.[1092] The Imām singled out a perfect man, taught him his inner knowledge, and made him *maʿṣūm*—this was al-Ahsaʾi.[1093] After him, God appointed Rashti as another sign.[1094] On the Sayyid's death, it was necessary for God to establish a sign according to the exigencies of the time and place, so he revealed the Bab as his gate and proof,[1095] as "the third gate after the two" (*al-*

bāb al-thālith baᶜda 'l-ithnayn),[1096] as the fourth letter of the greatest name of God,[1097] and as the *bāb*, *dhikr*, and *rasūl*.[1098]

In this earliest period, then, the Bab made himself known as a gate to the Imām succeeding al-Ahsaᵓi and Rashti. Mīrzā Muḥammad ᶜAlī Zunūzī thus describes these early claims:

> At the beginning of the cause, he made himself known by the title *bāb* and "servant of the *baqiyyat Allāh*," so that, as people say, he was regarded as having been sent by the Hidden Imām, Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan…. He established his verses below the words of the Imāms, but above those of the Shaykh and the Sayyid… and gave himself out as an interpreter (*mubayyin*) and promulgator (*murawwij*) of the Qurᵓan and Islam… while all his followers… regarded him as the gate of divine knowledge and as superior to the Shaykh and the Sayyid.[1099]

"Most of the Babis in the first years," writes Māzandarānī, "regarded the Bab as the pillar of the knowledge of the Imām."[1100] The Bab thus identifies himself in the *Qayyūm al- asmāᵓ* as "the servant [of God] and the gate of his proof [i.e., the Hidden Imām] unto all the worlds,"[1101] as "the servant of God and the gate of the *baqiyyat Allāh*,"[1102] and as "the gate of the *walī*."[1103] In this respect, he is no different from the *abwāb* of the past[1104] (who are, indeed, regarded as still alive),[1105] except that he is the "seal of the gates" (*khātim al-abwāb*),[1106] the "gate of your expected Imām."[1107] His appearance, then is for the express purpose of making the way ready for the Imām's parousia; his earliest books, states Qurrat al-ᶜAyn, were sent out to prepare men for the advent of the Qāᵓim,[1108] which will take place after him.[1109]

Writing in retrospect in the *Dalāᵓil-i sabᶜa'*, the Bab speaks thus of his earliest claims:

> Consider the grace of the promised one (*ḥaḍrat-i muntaẓar*) in so extending his mercy to the people of Islam (*al-muslimīn*); so that he might give them salvation, he that is the first of all created things and the manifestation of the words "Verily, I am God" revealed himself as the *bāb* of the Qā'im of the family of Muḥammad."[1110]

On the principle that belief in the *abwāb* leads to belief in the Imāms, the Prophet and God, and disbelief in them to *kufr*,[1111] the *Qayyūm al-asmāᵓ* states, in the words of the Imām, that

> There is none who has followed this remembrance [*hādhā 'l-dhikr* — — the Bab] but that he has followed me; whoever loves the remembrance for the sake of God, loves me; whoever seeks to behold me, let him behold his face, and whoever seeks to hearken to

> my words (*al-ḥadīth minnī*), let him give ear to the novelties of wisdom and the keys of the mercy from the tongue of God.[1112]

Similarly, whoever visits the Bab, it is as if he has visited the Imāms,[1113] while whoever obeys the *dhikr* and his book has obeyed God and his saints.[1114] He is, indeed, the gate of God[1115] and his remembrance;[1116] those who pledge allegiance to him have done so to God,[1117] and those who visit him have visited God on his throne.[1118]

Identification with the Imām (but not, at this stage, with God) is taken at times beyond simple representation. Thus, "the Imām" declares that "we are he and he is we, save that he is himself and is our servant, who was a witness in all the worlds in the Mother of the Book; and we are ourselves, whom God has made his proofs collectively to all the worlds, through the mighty truth."[1119] "God," he states, "has made him [the Bab] my own self in the worlds of command and creation. I am, by God's permission, never absent from him for the least period that your Lord, the merciful, can calculate, nor is he ever absent from me."[1120] Again, he says that "those that have disbelieved in God ask you about meeting me (*ʿan liqāʾī*); say "behold me, if your souls be firm, and you shall see him,'"[1121] while, in a later passage, he declares that "my proof unto you is this person [who is] my own person."[1122]

We have here perhaps the clearest and most highly developed expression of the continuance of the charismatic authority of the Imām during the period of the *ghaybat al-kubrā*. Once we move into the later stage of the Bab's claims, from about 1848 onwards, we enter a different charismatic framework; he is no longer claiming to be the channel of the Imām's authority nor even his alter ego, as it were, on earth, but to be the Imām himself and, before long, a theophanic representation of the divinity (*maẓhar ilāhī*). The Bab is the focus of charismatic attention throughout (although not the only focus), but, in the early period, his authority is delivered (latently) from the overriding charismatic image of the Imām, whereas, at a later stage, he assumes an independent authority canceling all previous notions of charismatic relationship, transforming latent into original, "prophetic" charisma.

Although even the earliest claims of the Bab constantly threaten to overturn the system of relationships on which they are postulated (by claiming, for example, to be the person of the Imām), this threat is kept in check by the presence of a dialectic tension between more developed claims on the one hand and less startling ones—and even recantations of claims—on the other. The use of *taqiyya* leads to some remarkable *voltes faces*. Thus, he states in an early prayer that "I am the bearer of a knowledge like Kāẓim, and if God should choose to reveal another cause, he will be the solace of my eyes; otherwise, I have not claimed anything and do not say that I am the bearer of a cause other than that."[1123] In the *Ṣaḥīfa-yi ʿadliyya*, he describes himself as a "servant" chosen by the Hidden Imām "in order to protect the faith of God,"[1124] and

indicates that his words are as "utter nothingness" compared to the Qurʾan and the words of the Imāms.[1125]

This tendency is most marked in the *Tafsīr Sūrat al-kawthar*, where he declares that anyone who says he claims *waḥy* and a Qurʾan is a blasphemer, as is anyone who says he claims to be "the gate of the *baqiyyat Allāh*,"[1126] and maintains that he has not claimed "special *bābiyya*".[1127] He is merely, he states, a Persian chosen to protect the faith of the Prophet and the Imāms,[1128] and a servant of God confirming the laws of the Qurʾan.[1129] In general, however, a gradual development may be observed, whereby the Bab explores most of the permutations of radical charismatic authority available to him within the terms of Shaykhi and Shiʿi theory. Taken beyond these limits, the claims inherent in extreme Shiʿi theophanology led inevitably to a complete break with Shaykhism and, in the end, to the abandonment of Islam itself.

CHAPTER SIX:

THE BĀBĪ *DA'WA* AMONG THE SHAYKHIS AND THE BREAK WITH SHAYKHISM

The *Daʿwa* in Karbala

According to al-Qatīl ibn al-KarbalāΔī, the Bab's initial "revelation" (*ẓuhūr*) to the *ḥurūf al-ḥayy* lasted from the tenth (*al-ʿashr al-awwal*) of Jumādā I to 20 Jumādā II 1260/7 July 1844.[1130] He then instructed them to return to their homes,[1131] telling them not to reveal his name or identity,[1132] but urging them to announce that the *bāb* or *nāʾib-i khāṣṣ* of the Hidden Imām had appeared.[1133] Through these "forerunners" (*sābiqūn*) and the men they met and converted, the claims of the new teacher were rapidly made known, principally to the Shaykhi communities in the areas they visited. Mullā Yūsuf Arbabīlī succeeded in converting most or all of the large Shaykhi population of Mīlān in Azerbaijan.[1134] Mullā Aḥmad Ibdāl Marāghaʾī acquainted Mullā Ḥusayn Dakhīl Marāghaʾī with the Bab's claims; the latter in turn traveled to Shīrāz, only to find that the Bab had left on the *ḥajj*. Returning to Marāgha, he made a point of telling the Shaykhis in every town and village en route of the Bab's appearance, while he succeeded in converting most of the Shaykhis in Marāgha itself.[1135] Mullā Jalīl Urūmī was instructed to go to Qazvīn, where he married and stayed for some three years teaching Babism, his converts consisting in the main of Shaykhis from the town.[1136]

Mullā Ḥusayn Bushrūʾī, along with his inseparable brother and cousin, was sent to Khurāsān via Tehran, where he attempted to present a letter from the Bab to Muḥammad Shah and his prime minister, Ḥājī Mīrzā Āqāsī. In this missive, the king was called on to embrace the Bab's cause in return for a promise of victory over foreign states.[1137] Bushrūʾī finally proceeded to Mashhad, where he established a flourishing center for Babi propaganda, again drawing much support from Shaykhi ulama.[1138] In this way, a growing section of the Shaykhi school followed the Bab in the period of the earliest claims, even if—as happened in Marāgha, for example—many of these abandoned him some three years later on his assumption of the station of Qāʾim and his abrogation of the Islamic *sharīʿa*. The unity of

Shaykhism was irretrievably shattered, and a core of convinced Babis created, who were eager to put into practice the radical changes implicit in the Bab's later claims.

The most shattering impact made by the dissemination of Babi propaganda on the Shaykhi world occurred, inevitably, at its heart, in Karbala. Most or all of the group which had arrived in Shīrāz with Mullā ᶜAlī Basṭāmī returned to Karbala, although it would seem that Basṭāmī himself did not accompany them on this occasion. Al-Karbalāᵓī states that they arrived there on 26 Rajab/11August.[1139] The following day, 27 Rajab/12 August, was the *ziyārat al-mabᶜath*, and Shaykhis from Baghdad, Ḥilla, and elsewhere had gathered in Karbala with those from the town itself; on hearing that Basṭāmī's group had returned, they met with them and were told something of what had occurred.[1140] According to al-Karbalāᵓī, "the cause of the Imām was manifested in the month of Rajab and was so much spread about that there remained no-one in this region who had not heard of it."[1141] It seems likely that the Bab's identity was, in fact, revealed by some of the *ḥurūf al-ḥayy*, for al-Karbalā'ī notes that

> those who had seen the Bab before that said "if such a person is making a claim, then I shall accept him (*fa-anā min al-muslimīn*)"; this included Bālāsarīs and persons weak in their faith in Shiᶜism, among the people of Kāẓimiyya, and likewise servants of the blessed shrines.[1142]

The Bab himself states in an early letter that he never mentioned his name in any of his works, but that some of his first followers revealed it.[1143]

Although he may have left Shīrāz before the other members of his group, possibly shortly after Bushrūᵓī's departure,[1144] Basṭāmī did not arrive in Karbala until about October 1844.[1145] He traveled by way of Būshehr (where he visited the Bab's uncle, Sayyid ᶜAlī), Najaf and Kufa,[1146] carrying with him a copy of the *Qayyūm al-asmāᵓ*,[1147] a *ziyārartnāma* to be read at the shrine of ᶜAlī in Najaf,[1148] and a copy of the *Ṣaḥīfa al-makhzūna*.[1149] With Basṭāmī's arrival at the ᶜ*atabāt,* events began to move at an increasingly rapid pace, precipitating a final break in the already disintegrating Shaykhi community, lending fresh impetus to the new movement of the Bab, and giving to the Shiᶜi ulama in Iraq their first premonition of the alarming developments which were to take place there and in Iran in coming years.

While in Najaf, on instructions from the Bab, Basṭāmī made known the latter's claims to Shaykh Muḥammad Ḥasan al-Najafī; to whom we have referred to in our first chapter as the leading Shiᶜi *ᶜālim* and *marjaᶜ al-taqlīd* of this period. According to Kāẓim Samandar, Mullā ᶜAlī carried with him a letter from the Bab addressed to al-Najafi.[1150] The Shaykh 's reaction and that of his *ṭullāb*—among whom were numbered several Shaykhis—was necessarily negative, and they expelled Basṭāmī from Najaf as a heretic[1151] —the first of many cases in which the Bab's claim served as a means of identifying the interests of Shaykhis and Bālā-Sarīs, by providing a target which both could condemn.

According to Samandar, the Bab instructed his followers to call a meeting of the *ulama* in Karbala and to challenge them to a *mubāhala.*[1152] Whether or not Mullā ᶜAlī actually issued such a challenge, his activities in Karbala certainly aroused fierce opposition from the *mujtahids* there. Concentrating his preaching among the Shaykhis, he soon succeeded in winning over, what, in Sir Henry Creswick Rawlinson's (1810-1895) words, constituted

> a considerable section. . . of the Sheeahs of Nejef, who. . . have lately risen into notice as the disciples of the High Priest Sheikh Kazem [i.e., Rashti], and who are in avowed expectation of the speedy advent of the Imām.[1153] If anything, Basṭāmī's influence was much greater among the Shaykhis of Karbala than among those of Najaf. Although he was himself arrested soon after his arrival in Karbala,[1154] imprisoned and tried in Baghdad,[1155] and finally exiled to Istanbul,[1156] where he was sentenced to labor in the docks,[1157] he succeeded in converting large numbers even while in prison, through the mediation of Shaykh Muḥammad Shibl Baghdādī, the late Sayyid Kāẓim's *wakīl* in Baghdad.[1158]

During his stay at the ᶜ*atabāt*, Basṭāmī had, in fact, awoken something of a chiliastic fervor among the Shaykhis of the region. There already existed a sense of messianic expectation in Karbala and Baghdad. According to al-Karbalāᵓī (who had by then accepted the Bab's cause without, at that time, knowing anything of his identity), people expected that "the cause would be revealed to them and the veil lifted from them so that the secret might conquer them in the year 1261".[1159] The same writer, who was present in Karbala at this period, indicates that a considerable sense of expectancy

centered on the year 1261. He cites Mullā Jaᶜfar Kirmānshāhī as saying that he was once with al-Ahsaᵓi during the latter's preparations for his last journey to Mecca in 1826; some people asked him concerning the signs of the appearance of the Imām; and he merely replied "Sixty-one."[1160] Mulla Ja'far is said to have spread this "prophecy" before and after the death of Rashti. According to al-Karbalāᵓī some Jews in Karbala referred to the Bab's cause as being "what we awaited in the month of Rabīᶜ I of the year Sixty-one,"[1161] while many Ṣūfīs, particularly those of the Niᶜmatullāhī order, were expecting the Imām to appear—al-Karbalāᵓī claims that he had heard twenty-five years previously certain prophecies from them referring to the year Sixty-one.[1162] Everyone, he writes, expected the promised one to appear from his own group, and he specifically mentions here the Ṣūfīs, Bālāsarīs, Ismailis, other Shᶜ'is, and even Sunnis.[1163]

How widespread this sense of expectancy really was outside the circles of the Shaykhi school (and even within these circles) is extremely difficult to say without independent evidence, but it is clear that it was by no means restricted to the Shaykhi community.

The purpose of the *Qayyūm al-asmāᵓ*, one of the works of the Bab brought to the ᶜ*atabāt* by Basṭāmī was, in the words of Rawlinson,

> to prepare the Mohammedan world for the immediate manifestation of the Imām, and to identify the individual to whom the emendations of the text [of what was regarded, as we have noted, as a corrupted copy of the Qurᵓan] were revealed, as his inspired and true precursor.[1164]

Basṭāmī's arrest and trial did little to calm the growing unrest and messianic expectancy; in his account of the trial, Rawlinson writes:

> I understand that considerable uneasiness is beginning to display itself at Kerbela and Nejef, in regard to the expected manifestation of the Imām, and I am apprehensive that the measures now in progress will rather increase than allay the excitement.[1165]

The nervous anticipation which this activity aroused was further intensified by the arrival of news that, on leaving for pilgrimage in September,[1166] the Bab had said that he would reveal his cause in Mecca, enter Kufa and Karbala, and fulfill the prophecies.[1167] In various letters, he

called on his followers to gather together in Karbala, in order to aid the Qā'im when he would appear.[1168] In one of these letters, he writes:

> In this month, there has occurred that which your Lord had promised unto everyone, old or young. He shall, indeed triumph over the holy land (*al-arḍ al-muqaddaṣa*—i.e. Karbala) by virtue of a word through which all that is in the heavens and on the earth shall be cleft asunder; wait, therefore…. He who shall arise in truth (*al-qāᵓim bi 'l-ḥaqq*) is the one who shall dispense justice; he shall be made manifest from Mecca…. Lend your support, then, unto the Qāᵓim (whose advent) you have awaited, in the company of those who expect him, from every direction, and do not create mischief in the land. Truly, behind Kufa a new cause shall be manifested.[1169]

In an early letter to Mīrzā Ḥasan-i-Khurāsānī (d. 1852),[1170] the Bab instructs him to "send greetings from him who is the remembrance of the name of your Lord unto those who were the first to believe (*al-sābiqūn*) and tell them to travel to Karbala (*al-arḍ al-muqaddaṣa*)."[1171]

Large numbers of Babis appear to have responded to the Bab's appeal and headed for Karbala to await his arrival, many of them, apparently, preparing to fight a holy war in the company of the Imām, in conformity with the explicit exhortations of the *Qayyūm al-asmāᵓ*.[1172] Numbers of these seem to have brought with them or obtained arms with which to wage this *jihād*, in accordance with the Bab's instructions in that book to "purchase arms for the day of the gathering together (*yawm al-jamᶜ*)."[1173]

According to Kirmānī, the followers of the Bab spread out, telling men of his promise to come to Karbala with the intention of leaving the shrine of Ḥusayn on the day of ᶜĀshūrā, bearing a sword, in order to lead his followers in *jihād*.[1174] On 27 January, 1845, Rawlinson reported to Sir Stratford Canning that "the concourse of Persian pilgrimage at Kerbela at the present season is immense—it is estimated that between twenty and thirty thousand of these devotees are now assembled at the shrine of Ḥusayn."[1175]

It is unclear how many of those assembled at Karbala at this period anticipated an actual war and how many believed that they would go forth in the company of the Imām to re-enact the suffering and martyrdom of the day of ᶜĀshūrā. Al-Karbalāᵓī maintains that some said the Bab commanded his followers not to rise up in Karbala, and quoted the tradition "the heads of my followers shall be given as presents even as those of the Turks and the

Daylāmites."[1176] This passion motif certainly loomed large in the minds of the Babis besieged in the fort of Shaykh Tabarsī in 1848.

The ᶜĀshūrā rites, which had developed in Iran in the sixteenth century, had for a long time been proscribed by governors of Iraq, but during the governorship of Alī Riḍāᵓ Pasha, a Bektāshī Ṣūfī with Shiᶜi sympathies, permission was given, and both *taᶜziyas* and processions began to be held in 1832.[1177] Religious tension between Sunnis and Shiᶜis in Karbala, already unusually tense following the sack of the city in 1842, was all too easily heightened during the Muḥarram mourning period. Turkish-Persian relations were particularly bad at this period and, since Basṭāmī's trial had already stirred up considerable animosity on this basis, even between the two governments, the influx of Iranian Shiᶜis anticipating some form of messianic upheaval was clearly a matter of concern. The situation in Karbala threatened to be explosive and, if the Bab had actually arrived, it is hard to say what might have happened.

Kirmānī maintains, however, that the Bab had miscalculated the distance from Mecca to Karbala and that, realizing he could not succeed in reaching his destination by the 10th of Muḥarram, he was compelled to put back the date of his arrival to Naw-Rūz (21 March).[1178] In the event, the land-route from Mecca to Karbala was closed by Arab tribes and the Bab was forced to return to Iran by way of Būshehr.[1179] When Muharram and then Naw-Rūz passed and the Bab did not put in an appearance, no one knew whether "he had been drowned at sea or burnt on land" and, in the end, his followers felt ashamed of the claims they had put forward on his behalf.[1180] Rawlinson noted that

> the religious excitement which has been for some time prevalent among the Sheeahs of this quarter, is beginning gradually to subside, the imposter who personated the character of the forerunner of the Imām Mehdi, and who was expected to declare himself at Kerbela during the present month on his return from Mecca, having been deterred by a sense of personal danger from attempting any further agitation, and having accordingly joined as a private individual the caravan of pilgrims which is travelling to Persia by the route of Damascus and Aleppo.[1181]

Kirmānī himself regarded both the Bab's call to wage *jihād* and his eventual failure to fulfill the promises he had made as evidence of the falsehood of his mission.[1182]

What happened, in fact, was that the Bab sailed from Jidda on 24 Ṣafar 1261/4 March 1845,[1183] and reached Būshehr on 8 Jumādī I/15 May, as noted previously. Shortly after his arrival there, he sent a letter to Karbala, probably with Ḥājī Sayyid Javād Iṣfahānī, telling his disciples still assembled there that it had proved necessary to alter his plans in order to return directly to Iran, and that they ought to proceed to Isfahan and remain there until the arrival of further instructions.[1184] Whatever the reasons for the Bab's change of plans, it precipitated a serious breach in the ranks of his followers in Karbala, leading large numbers to abandon him. According to al-Karbalāʾī, "only a tiny band" remained after this incident, the trial of Mullā ʿAlī, and the arrest, some six months later of, Mullā Ṣādiq Khurāsānī, Mullā Muḥammad-ʿAlī Bārfurūshī, and Mullā ʿAlī Akbar Ardastānī in Shīrāz.[1185] This small group of diehards regarded the change in intentions as the interposition of *bidʿa* and were, if anything, reinforced in their new allegiance.[1186]

The Bab himself indicated that, because of opposition to his cause and attacks on his messengers, God had become angry with men and decreed a postponement of five years in which they might increase in sins and the divine proclamation to them be completed.[1187] In his *Kitāb al-fihrist*, completed in Bushehr about one month after his return to Iran, he writes "Woe to you, O people of the earth! Some of you have contended against our signs; as a result we have forbidden our signs to all men for a period of five years, as a punishment for their lies."[1188] In effect, the proclamation of *qāʿimiyya* and *qiyāma* was "postponed" to the fifth year of the Bab's career. Up to that point—and possibly after it—he seems to have retained a desire to return to Karbala, the most appropriate place for such a proclamation. This is evidenced by a short letter written by him from prison in Mākū to Sayyid Aḥmad Yazdī, one of the group of Babis who formed a close circle in Karbala under the leadership of Qurrat al-ʿAyn, in which he writes: "I beseech God that he may gladden the hearts of the believers through his grace and make it possible for us to rise up and enter the holy land (*al-arḍ al-muqaddaṣa*)."[1189]

With the Bab's arrival in Shīrāz in early July 1845, it became possible for those who remained loyal to him in Karbala either to travel to meet him in person or to receive news of him at first hand from those who returned

from Shīrāz. A considerable movement between Karbala and Shīrāz now began, as a result of which the Bab's now precarious position was again strengthened and his authority extended over what was by now developing into a more consciously radical group of Shaykhis under the leadership of Qurrat al-ᶜAyn in Karbala. Mīrzā Hādī Nahrī and his brother Mīrzā Muḥammadᶜ Alī Nahrī, who had frequently met the Bab in Karbala, had already gone to Shīrāz while he was in Arabia, the former then returning to the ᶜ*atabāt*, where he doubtless brought further information about the absent Sayyid to his companions.[1190] Other Shaykhis traveled between the two towns, among them Shaykh Ṣāliḥ Karīmī, a convert of Basṭāmī's,[1191] Shaykh Sulṭān al-Karbalāᵓī,[1192] Shaykh Ḥasan Zunūzī,[1193] Sayyid Javād Karbalāᵓī,[1194] and Āqā Sayyid ᶜAbd al-Hādī Qazvīnī, who later married a niece of Qurrat al-ᶜAyn.[1195]

Māzandarānī states that, in 1261/1845, pilgrims returned from Mecca to Karbala, where they mentioned the claims of the Bab, having heard of them while taking part in the *ḥajj*; these individuals probably returned to Karbala in the early months of 1845.[1196] In an early prayer, the Bab gives the names of a number of individuals whom he informed of his claims while in Mecca; these included Sayyid ᶜAlī Kirmānī, to whom we have previously referred as the leading supporter of Karīm Khān in Karbala.[1197] It appears that Sayyid ᶜAlī had, in fact, accepted the Bab's claims for a time, following the return of the *ḥurūf al-ḥayy* from Shīrāz, but that he had become nervous when arrests began among the Babis (presumably after Basṭāmī's arrival) and headed for Mecca.[1198] He appears to have been accompanied on the *ḥajj* by Mīrzā Muḥīṭ Kirmānī and Mullā Ḥasan Gawhar, both of whom also met the Bab in Mecca and were challenged by him there to *mubāhala*, or mutual imprecation.[1199] As we have noted, the Bab's *Ṣaḥīfa bayna 'l-ḥaramayn* was addressed to Sayyid ᶜAlī and Mīrzā Muḥīṭ; the latter received a copy on his return to Karbala.[1200] In view of the position held by these three men in the Shaykhi community generally and in Karbala in particular, there is no doubt that their meeting with the Bab and their negative reaction to his claims were important factors in shaping the views of their followers in this respect, and may also have had an influence on the response of Karīm Khān, with whom Sayyid ᶜAlī and Mīrzā Muhīt were generally on good terms.

Writings of the Bab were also reaching Karbala in this period. As mentioned previously, Basṭāmī carried several of these to Iraq (and the other *ḥurūf al-ḥayy* may have brought some as well), and they were soon circulating in the Karbala region. An important early manuscript collection of works of the Bab, containing the *Qayyūm-al asmāᵓ*, *Ṣaḥīfa aᶜmāl al-sana*,

Ṣaḥīfa makhzūna, numerous *khuṭub*, *ziyārāt*, and prayers, was transcribed in Karbala in mid 1262/1846 by a certain Muḥammad ᶜAlī, in the Mīrzā Jaᶜfar *madrasa*.[1201]

In a letter from Karbala, dated 1263/1847, from Shaykh Sulṭan al-Karbalāᵓī to Babis in Iran, the Bab's commentary, the *Tafsīr ḥadīth al-jāriyya*, his *Qayyūm al-asmāᵓ*, a *khuṭba*, and several letters are quoted in a context which suggests that they were familiar to the Babis in Karbala.[1202] Among the early writings of the Bab are five prayers addressed in direct reply to individuals resident in Karbala[1203]—evidence that communication existed between the Bab and his followers there from almost the earliest period. We may also note that, according to al-Baghdādī, Qurrat al-ᶜAyn read portions of the *Tafsīr Sūrat al-kawthar* to the ulama in Karbala.[1204]

Qurrat al-ᶜAyn

Leadership of the nascent Babi community at the heart of the Shiᶜi world fell, curiously enough, to the one woman nnumbered among the *ḥurūf al-ḥayy*, Qurrat al-ᶜAyn. Born in Qazvīn in 1814,[1205] she was raised under the tutelage of her father, Ḥājī Mullā Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ Baraghānī (1753-1854), and her uncles Ḥājī Mullā Muḥammad Taqī Baraghānī (1752-1847—who pronounced the *takfīr* against al-Ahsaᵓi) and Ḥājī Mullā Muḥammad ᶜAlī Baraghānī (b. 1761) (who was a Shaykhi). Married at the age of fourteen to Muḥammad Taqī's son, Mullā Muḥammad Baraghānī (d. 1878), she traveled soon afterwards with him to Karbala, where he studied for some thirteen years.[1206] Already well educated by her father and uncles, she continued to acquire a knowledge of *fiqh*, *kalām*, and other religious sciences.

At some period, whether during this or a subsequent stay in Karbala, she associated with the leading *ulama* there and eventually determined to ask for *ijāzāt* from various *mujtahids.* It seems that, on the basis of her writings, they admitted she was sufficiently learned to merit an *ijāza*, but said that it was not customary for one to be given to a woman.[1207]

This was not strictly true. It was not uncommon for the daughters of ulama to be as well educated as their sons and, indeed, to become ulama (or, more correctly, *ᶜālimāt*) themselves, even, in some cases, being granted *ijāzāt*. The daughters of Shaykh Jaᶜfar ibn Khiḍr al-Najafi Kāshif al-Ghiṭāᵓ, for example, were regarded as *faqīha*,[1208] while Muḥammad ibn Sulaymān

Tanakābūnī states that "among the generality of women, there have been many with *ijāzāt*"[1209] and gives the names of several of them.[1210] In the modern period, a woman *mujtahid* named ᶜAlawiyya attained considerable fame in Isfahan, receiving *ijāzāt* from three of the leading *marājiᶜ al-taqlīd* of her time.[1211] Significantly, many of the early female converts to Babism were also well educated, including Qurrat al-ᶜAyn's sister Marḍiyya Khānum (1817-1895), and the mother and sister of Mulla Ḥusayn Bushrūᵓī.[1212]

Whether independently or, as has been suggested, under the influence of her maternal cousin, Mullā Javād Vilyānī,[1213] or her uncle, Ḥājī Mullā Muḥammad ᶜAlī,[1214] she became attracted to Shaykhism and appears to have studied under Rashti in Karbala.[1215] She seems to have returned to Qazvīn with her husband and children in 1841,[1216] but our sources are contradictory as to her movements in the next few years. Most authorities have assumed that she was again in Karbala when she received news of the Bab's appearance, possibly through Mulla ᶜAlī Basṭāmī, but, in fact—as we have noted above ——she herself clearly states in a letter to Mullā Javād Vilyānī that she was still in Qazvīn when she first heard of young claimant. It would seem, however, that she headed for Karbala shortly after this, and may even have been there when Basṭāmī arrived.[1217] According to the *Kitāb-i nuqṭat al-kāf*, she professed "outward belief" after the perusal of some of the writings of the Bab, possibly those brought to Karbala by Basṭāmī.[1218]

Qurrat al-ᶜAyn's position in Karbala was greatly enhanced by the fact that, from the time of her arrival, she took up residence in the house of the late Sayyid, her classes there taking the place of those given by him.[1219] The importance of thus securing for the followers of the Bab the seat of the leadership of the Shaykhi school is stressed by Shirazi in a letter to Ḥājī Mīrzā Ḥasan Khurāsānī, apparently written after his return from the *ḥajj*. In this letter, he states that "it is incumbent on one of you to teach our verses in the house of the previous gate of God (*bāb Allāh al-muqaddam* [i.e., Rashti])."[1220] Qurrat al-ᶜAyn appears to have given three separate classes in Rashti's house—the first a general class open to anyone, the second for Babi men, and the third for Babi women. Apart from this, it seems that, in keeping with the practice of al-Ahsaᵓi and Rashti, she gathered about her a small band of elite disciples (*khawwāṣ*), to whom she imparted the more recondite, gnostic elements of the Shaykhi and, as time passed, Babi *taᶜlīm*.[1221] It was not long, indeed, before the Babis in Karbala became divided into two groups: those who followed Qurrat al-ᶜAyn and those who refused to do so. At the beginning of a letter discussing this division, Mullā

Aḥmad ibn Ismāʿīl Khurāsānī states that there are many religious sects in existence: there are, to begin with, Sunnis and Shiʿis; these latter are, in turn, divided between Bālāsarīs and Shaykhis; the latter are themselves divided into two groups—the Babis and the rest; and the Babis have also been split into two parties—those who follow the daughter of Ṣāliḥ Qazvīnī (i.e., Qurrat al-ʿAyn) and the rest.[1222]

The composition of the group centered around Qurrat al-ʿAyn is of some interest. Whereas those who went with Bushrūʾī or Basṭāmī to Shīrāz were, with the exception of an Indian, Saʿīd Hindī, all Iranians, Qurrat al-ʿAyn's circle contained a number of Arabs from Baghdad and Karbala. This fact is particularly important in indicating that, whatever the causes of later dissension in the Babi community of Iraq, Arab-Iranian rivalry seems to have played little or no part in it. Similarly, in apparent contrast to the group which initiated the Babi movement, several of Qurrat al-ʿAyn's supporters were elderly members of the ulama class. Considering that the views associated with her and her followers came to be regarded as the most revolutionary of those held by any Babi group in the early period, there is a strong indication here that youthful kicking against the traces of precedent was not the only nor even the dominant element to be found in the dynamic of the new sect in its attempt to generate a paradigm shift. In general, the role of elderly figures in revolutionary or messianic movements has been to mitigate to some extent the earliest extremes as the movement has begun to move into a phase tending towards rapprochement with the established order, whereas here we can observe a number of elderly divines consciously going in the vanguard of the most radical departure from religious and social norms.[1223]

This Karbala-based group was largely composed of ulama, most if not all of whom had studied under Rashti and one or two under al-Ahsaʾi. Their activities centered mostly around the classes given by Qurrat al-ʿAyn, although there is some evidence that she herself initiated lecture groups held by other scholars.[1224] It would appear that, during her earlier stay in Karbala, and probably in the early period of her later residence, she lectured on works by al-Ahsaʾi and Rashti,[1225] but, as time passed and more of the Bab's works became available, her classes eventually concentrated on them to the exclusion of others.

Although it is clear from her letters that she persisted in intellectual debate to the end of her life, various accounts indicate that her lecturing became more and more akin to preaching and that her preaching became increasingly impassioned. At her more popular classes, as distinct from

those limited to the elite circle of scholars and close initiates to whom we have referred, her fervor and eloquence won her large audiences and created a stir wherever she went.[1226] These preaching activities, with their ever-heightening air of tension and messianic expectancy, were ultimately responsible for much of the public outcry against her that led, in the end, to her expulsion from Iraq in 1847; but it was in the course of her more specialized classes and her discussions with other Babi intellectuals that the ideas voiced to a wider audience were initially formulated and the startling conclusions she drew from the Bab's writings reached.

The Shaykhi Reaction to the Babi *Daʿwa*

Relations between the Babis, especially the "Qurratiyya" branch, and the rest of the Shaykhi community in Karbala became progressively worse. It appears that, at some point, Mullā Ḥasan Gawhar claimed *wiṣāya* and Mīrzā Muḥīṭ Kirmānī *niẓāra*,[1227] implying some form of succession to Rashti and a degree of authority over the school. Mīrzā Muḥīṭ seems to have vacillated between making a claim to personal leadership and giving support to Karīm Khān, for whom he probably acted as an agent in Karbala; but his attitude towards Babism appears to have remained negative.[1228] Mullā Ḥasan retained the greatest influence among the non-Babi Shaykhis and followed Rashti's policy of fostering ties with the governor of Karbala.[1229] His relations with Qurrat al-ʿAyn and her followers were particularly bad; having fallen into a serious disagreement with her during a visit to Kāẓimiyya,[1230] he preached against her and her circle in his own class and those of Mīrzā Muḥīṭ,[1231] and was active in making complaints against her to the authorities in Baghdad and Istanbul, as a result of which she was held under house arrest in the former city and finally expelled from Iraq in the spring of 1847.[1232] Relations between the Shaykhi groups in Karbala were complicated by Karīm Khān Kirmānī's unfavorable reaction to the Bab.

As far as can be determined, Mullā Íādiq Khurāsānī, an elderly Shaykhi who had studied under Rashti, was the first Babi to communicate the claims of Sayyid ʿAlī Muḥammad to Karīm Khān. Converted by Bushrūʾī in the course of the latter's visit to Isfahan in mid-1844, Khurāsānī headed for Kirman,[1233] carrying with him, in the words of Karīm Khān, "a number of suras in the style of the Qurʾan, a number of books in the style of the *Ṣaḥīfa al-Sājjādiya*, and several *khuṭub* in the style of the *Nahj al-balāgha*."[1234] The "suras" in question were a number of chapters from the

Qayyūm al-asmāʾ, as is clear from those parts of them quoted by Karīm Khān in several of his works. Mullā Ṣādiq was, according to Kirmānī, brought to a meeting presided over by him, defeated in argument, and sent on his way.[1235]

Khurāsānī was followed to Kirman after some time by Mullā Muḥammad ʿAlī Bārfurūshī, probably the best acquainted of all the Bab's followers with his teachings at this stage. Bārfurūshī brought with him a letter for Kirmānī in the Bab's own hand, and succeeded in delivering it to him before being expelled like his predecessor;[1236] the letter in question is quoted in full by Kirmānī in *al-Shihāb al-thāqib*.[1237] Mullā Ṣādiq and Mullā Muḥammad ʿAlī were, according to Kirmānī, the only Babis he ever met.[1238] However, in his final attack on the Bab (written in 1283/1867), he refers to and quotes from the *Bayān-i Fārsī*, and gives detailed references to what would seem to be the Arabic *Bayān*,[1239] evidence that, even if he did not have further direct contact with Babis, he was at least able to obtain their literature.

In 1845, Karīm Khān was aged thirty-five and was at the height of his powers. As we have indicated previously, he was already a firm claimant to the position of supreme leader of the Shaykhi school. Between 1247/1832, the date of his first extant *risāla*, and 1260/1844, he had written a total of twenty works, principally untitled treatises. From about 1844, his output began to increase markedly, a minimum of ninety-five titles being produced between that date and 1270/1854. These included important works such as the *Irshād al-ʿawāmm* (written in four parts between 1263/1847 and 1267/1851), the *Risāla-yi hidāyat al-ṭālibīn* (1261/1845), the *Jawāmiʿ al-ʿallāj* (1269/1853), and the *Rujūm al-shayāṭīn* (1268/1852).

It is hardly surprising, then, that Karīm Khān's response to the Bab's claims took the form of a series of refutations in Arabic and Persian, which were spread widely—to Shaykhis in particular. Māzandarānī maintains that Kirmānī attacked the Bab in no less than twelve of his works, although he fails to give all but a few of their titles.[1240] Kirmānī himself writes in his *Risāla-yi ṣī faṣl* (1269/1853):

> I have written five or six books in refutation of him [i.e., the Bab], and have sent them to different parts of Azerbaijan, Persian Iraq, Arab Iraq, Hejaz, Khurāsān, and India. I have also written letters to the ulama and sent petitions to officials of the various governments. At times in Yazd and Kirman, and on a

journey to Khurāsān, I have made clear their unbelief from pulpits, with proof and evidences.[1241]

Of these "five or six books," only three are actually known: *Izhāq al-bāṭil* (1261/1845); *Risāla-yi tīr i shihāb* (1262/1846); and *al-Shihāb al-thāqib* (1265-1849). A fourth complete work in refutation of the Bab, the *Risāla dar radd-i Bab-i murtād*, was written by Kirmānī at the request of Nāṣir al-Dīn Shāh in 1283/1867.

Karīm Khān's numerous and often complex objections to the claims of the Bab are, perhaps, best summarized in his own list of ten items in the Bab's teachings (as found in his early writings) which he identifies as opposed to Islam, some of them being regarded as *bidᶜa*. These are listed in the *Risāla-yi tīr i shihāb* as follows:[1242]

1. The claim of *wahy* after that of Muḥammad.
2. The claim to bring a new book after the Qurʾan.
3. Legitimization of *jihād*, which is illegitimate in the time of the *ghayba.*
4. The prohibition on writing his books in black ink, and the requirement to write them in colored ink.
5. The promulgation of claims regarded as the prerogatives of the Prophet and Imāms.
6. The decree that his name be mentioned in the *adhān.*
7. The claim to *niyāba khāṣṣa.*
8. The decree that all must obey him, and that whoever refuses to do so is a *kāfir.*
9. The claim that all must worship him and regard him as the *qibla* and *masjid*.
10. Deceits relating to the twelfth Imām [apparently in respect of prophecies relating to his advent, or the claim to have revelation from him].

On the basis of such points, Kirmānī declares the Bab a *kāfir*, maintaining that "our God is not his God, our Prophet is not his Prophet, and our Imām is not his Imām."[1243]

The fierceness of Kirmānī's attacks and his outright condemnation of the Bab as a *kāfir*, whose claims and teachings were *bidᶜa*, immediately polarized the Shaykhi community. For the Babis, Karīm Khān became the embodiment of opposition to their cause: in the writings of the Bab, he

appears to be identified with "the first to disbelieve" (corresponding negatively to Bushrūʾī, "the first to believe"), the "Tree of Negation," and the "Embodiment of Hellfire," whose abode is "the Land of Fire" and whose food is "the Tree of Zaqqūm".[1244] Al-Karbalā'ī draws a comparison between Kirmānī and the Umayyads, the Sufyanids (those of the Umayyad rulers descended from Abū Sufyān), the followers of Muʿāwiyya, and the first Umayyad caliph Muʿāwiyya ibn Abī Sufyān (r. 661-680),[1245] while Zarandī speaks of him as the "Antichrist" (Dajjāl?) of the Babi revelation.[1246] Elsewhere, Mīrzā Muḥammad ʿAlī Zunūzī, identifying Ḥājī Mīrzā Āqāsī as Dajjāl, refers to Kirmani as "the manifestation of Sufiyān" (*ẓuhūr-i Sufyānī*).[1247] When copies of *Iẓhāq al-bāṭil* reached Karbala, both Qurrat al-ʿAyn and al-Qatīl ibn al Karbalāʾī wrote counter-polemics against it.[1248] Sayyid ʿAlī Kirmānī and Mīrzā Muḥīṭ were informed of Qurrat al-ʿAyn's refutation of Karīm Khān[1249] and, as a result, relations between them and her appear to have further deteriorated.

Equally serious in the effect on Babi/orthodox Shaykhi relations in Karbala was the defection to Karīm Khān of Mullā Javād Vilyānī, Qurrat al-ʿAyn's maternal cousin, who had, for a time, been a convert to Babism but apostatized after meeting the Bab in Shīrāz. One of the first in Qazvīn to acknowledge the Bab as the new Shaykhi leader, he had been one of those awaiting his arrival in Karbala in 1845.[1250] Disappointed by the Bab's failure to appear, he traveled to Shīrāz with a group of fellow-Shaykhis, including Mullā ʿAbd al-ʿAlī Harātī and Mīrzā Ibrāhīm Shīrāzī. Within a short time of their arrival in Shīrāz, Mullā Javād and these two companions came into conflict with the Bab and his other followers there, including Mullā Ḥusayn Bushrūʾī.[1251] Serious disagreements seem to have occurred, in the course of which these three men were expelled from the community of believers and allied themselves in some way with the Bab's enemies in the city. This schism appears to have led to the outbreak of disturbances of some kind between Babis and non-Babis, resulting in the expulsion from Shīrāz of Mullā Javād and his companions by the civil authorities.[1252] It is not clear why these men rather than the Bab's other newly-arrived disciples, defying a ban on meeting with their *magister spiritualis*, should have been expelled.

Having by now rejected the Bab as a legitimate successor to Rashti, Vilyānī and his fellow-recusants made for Kirman, where they joined forces with Karīm Khān. In Kirman, Vilyānī appears to have adopted the role of spokesman on behalf of Kirmānī and to have written letters in support of his claims to various individuals, as is indicated by al-Karbalāʾī, who refers to Vilyānī as Kirmānī's "herald" (*munād*).[1253] The secession of three followers

of the Bab and the transfer of their allegiance to himself was without a doubt a valuable factor in enhancing Kirmānī's reputation at this critical juncture. Undoubtedly, too, these men were able to supply him with very much of the fresh information which he incorporated into his second and third attacks on the Bab. Two untitled treatises in refutation of the latter were, in fact written by Karīm Khān in reply to questions from Vilyānī.[1254] The latter returned after some time to Qazvīn, where he himself is reported as having written a polemic against the Bab, the text of which does not, unfortunately, seem to have survived.[1255]

The Bab, for his part, regarded this act of apostasy on the part of Mullā Javād, Mullā ᶜAbd al-ᶜAlī, and Mīrzā Ibrāhīm, as a serious setback, and wrote at length and in very strong terms deprecating their actions. In a letter written in Shīrāz, probably not long after these events, he states that

> the worst thing which has befallen me is the action of Khuwār al-Vilyānī [i.e., Mullā Javād] in his injustice to me; at the time when I was writing the decree of his expulsion, it was as if I heard one calling within my heart 'Sacrifice the most beloved of all things unto you, even as Ḥusayn made sacrifices in my path'.[1256]

In another letter, quoted by Zarandī, he refers to Mullā Javād and Mullā ᶜAbd al-ᶜAlī as "the Jibt and Tāghūt, the twin idols of this perverse people [the Shaykhis?],"[1257] while elsewhere he speaks of them and Mīrzā Ibrāhīm as "the Golden Calf, and its body and its lowing."[1258] Vilyānī, in particular, is often referred to in Babi and Baha°i literature as "*khuwār*", the "lowing" of the Golden Calf.[1259] The opening passage of the *Tafsīr Sūrat al-kawthar*, written not long after these events in Shīrāz, makes lengthy and pained reference to the infidelity of these three men.[1260]

Mullā Javād's rejection of the Bab and his expulsion from the ranks of his followers had repercussions in Karbala. He himself wrote a letter to Qurrat al-ᶜAyn, evoking an impassioned and, at times, severe reply from her, addressed to him, Mullā ᶜAbd al-ᶜAlī and "others".[1261] Written in 1261/1845, this would seem to be the earliest dated work of Qurrat al-ᶜAyn's which we possess. It contains fairly detailed references to the content of Vilyānī's original letter, outlining the nature of his objections before proceeding to refute them. Among the points raised by Mullā Javād were: the Bab's failure to appear in Karbala,[1262] the difficulty for most people in reading the Arabic writings of the Bab,[1263] his acceptance of parts of the

Bab's writings but not others,[1264] the possibility that God may establish the truth in a person or place not fit to receive it,[1265] his own claim to have written a "Qurʾan" more eloquent and complete than the Bab's *tafsīr* [i.e., the *Qayyūm al-asmāʾ*],[1266] the confusion of the language of the latter work,[1267] and the station accorded Mullā Ḥusayn Bushrūʾī by the Bab.[1268]

Taken together, the arguments raised by Vilyānī—most of which are of little consequence in isolation—indicate a general attitude which seems to lie at the root of his eventual abandonment of the Bab. Already shaken in his convictions by the latter's failure to appear in Karbala as he had promised, Mullā Javād had clearly headed for Shīrāz with the express intention of engaging in *mubāhala* with him; a major factor in his eventual disenchantment with and rejection of the Bab was certainly the latter's reaction to his attempt to put his claims to the proof.

Mubāhala was common at this period, and the Bab not only engaged in it himself, but instructed several of his followers to do so on his behalf, or else approved of their doing so.[1269] In this case, however, the Bab regarded such a challenge as unacceptable and even improper. In a prayer written after Vilyānī's departure from Shīrāz, he writes:

> Know that Javād Qazvīnī has written in his letter in Persian, which he wrote with the images of hell, vain words, among which were those in which he sought to put our proof to the test… In his letter, he has challenged me to *mubāhala*, thus making a liar of himself—for it is as if he had not read in the book of God that *mubāhala* is my decree and my sign, and that he has no authority to issue a challenge to it.[1270]

The point at issue is that of the station to be accorded the Bab. In declaring himself to be the sole source of divine guidance then on earth—whatever the precise nature of his claim—the Bab demanded a degree of non-rational obedience which Mullā Javād and other Shaykhis seem to have been unwilling to give. The history of Babism up to 1848 is marked by a high measure of tension between the cautious intellectualizing of the large numbers of Shaykhi Babis who became more and more disillusioned and abandoned the Bab in greater and greater numbers as his doctrines and injunctions jarred increasingly with established theory, and the unthinking dedication of bands of saints and fanatics who argued, fought, and were, in the end all but wiped out for a cause they often understood little of. There is, in many respects, a useful analogy here with the epistemological stance of

the Nizārī Ismailis of Ḥasan Ṣabbāḥ and his successors, in which reason is abandoned in favor of existential recognition of the Imām as the only source of truth and guidance.[1271]

The emphasis which the Bab placed on observance of the Islamic laws and his references to his station as being below that of the Imām, attracted much of that section of the Shaykhi community which sought for a formal continuation of the leadership provided by al-Ahsaʾi and Rashti in the context of a rigid adherence to Islamic practice and veneration for the Imāms, thereby tending towards the routinization of charisma within the school.

On the other hand, it soon became apparent to some individuals that, even at this stage, there existed in the claims and ideas of the Bab elements which were clearly in a state of tension with his apparently normative and traditionalist injunctions. There thus emerged a group which, although initially amenable to the claims explicit or implicit in the Bab's writings, persisted in judging those claims in terms of existing theology. When the Bab seemed to jettison much of the theory on which their judgments were based, the ideological edifice of their faith appeared to collapse for such individuals.

Mullā Javād seems to have been one of the first (probably a little after Sayyid ʿAlī Kirmānī) to detect an incongruity between the Bab's claims and the modes in which he actually proposed to establish them. Thus, the Bab's writings did not conform to the established criteria of Quranic style or grammar, his answers to questions appeared to function outside the framework of normal question-answer relationships, even of accepted epistemological approaches, and his most favored disciples seemed to be ascribed roles alien to the established religious roles available to the ulama. Joining Karīm Khān, who sought to approximate Shaykhi doctrine more and more closely to the established norms of Twelver Shiʿism, he was able to find in the books of his new shaykh a consistency between claims and criteria which he had not found in the writings of the Bab.

By contrast, Qurrat al-ʿAyn, as is clear from her letter to Vilyānī, had both seen the implications of the Bab's claims and ideas and found them consonant with her own attitudes. Where Vilyānī saw only purposeless contradictions, she seems to have apprehended a dialectical process. Where he appears to have wanted to see in Sayyid ʿAlī Muḥammad a third *bāb* succeeding to and, to some extent, continuing the charisma of al-Ahsaʾi and Rashti, she, while speaking of these latter as " the two previous gates,"[1272] nevertheless saw in the role of the Bab a distinct break with the charismatic

modes of Shaykhism and a thrust in a wholly new direction, into a new "universe of discourse". In her letter to Vilyānī, she quotes Rashti as having said near his death that he was "but as a herald (*mubashshir*) for that great cause."[1273]

Elsewhere in the course of her reply to Mullā Javād, Qurrat al-ᶜAyn cites a tradition of Imam Jaᶜfar al-Ṣādiq, to the effect that *waḥy* could be given to someone other than the Prophet, and this is a context referring to the Qā'im himself.[1274] That she regarded the writings of the Bab as inspired in such a manner seems clear from her numerous comparisons between them and the Qurᵓan, and her quotation of a passage from the *Qayyūm al-asmāᵓ,* which declares that "my proof is this book from God."[1275]

It is likewise clear from several of her references to the Bab that she looked on him, if not as a prophet or imām, certainly as the possessor of a most exalted spiritual station. In various places in her letter, she refers to him as "the central Point of the Circle of Existence,"[1276] and "the Lord of Lords, Manifestation of the grace and loving-kindness of the King of Beneficence."[1277] These titles do not seem to refer to any particular station for the Bab, such as *qāᵓimiyya*, and they certainly do not provide grounds for believing that Qurrat al-ᶜAyn thought of him at this point as the promised Imām himself. But such titles, coupled with the general tone of profound respect with which she refers to the Bab in this letter, indicate a preparedness on her part to accept as valid any role which he might assign to himself in the future.

Division Within the Babi Community

Vilyānī's defection must have caused profound anxiety to the Babi enclave in Karbala, where the issue of relations between Shaykhism and Babism was most sharply felt. More serious, however, were the problems raised in the course of a violent split among the Babis, involving Qurrat al-ᶜAyn and her supporters on the one hand and Mullā Aḥmad Khurāsānī and his followers on the other. Although communications between the Bab and his devotees were never entirely severed, contact did, at times, become difficult, and it was, in any case, impossible to refer to him any and every question for elucidation or arbitration. For this reason, Mullā Ḥusayn Bushrūᵓī was empowered by the Babi prophet to reply to questions and issue challenges to *mubāhala* on his behalf.[1278]

However, the task of exposition of Babi doctrines in a number of provincial centers fell increasingly on the leading followers of the Bab in those areas: in Mashhad, Mullā Muḥammad ᶜAlī Bārfurūshī assisted Bushrūᵓī in this task;[1279] in Burūjird, Kurdistan, Tehran, Qazvīn, Isfahan, Qum, and elsewhere, the peripatetic Sayyid Yaḥyā Dārābī taught and expounded the new *daᶜwa*;[1280] in Tehran, Mullā Muḥammad ᶜAlī Zanjānī, despite restrictions placed on him there by the civil authorities, was able to give advice to his fellow-Babis;[1281] and, in Qazvīn, Mullā Jalīl Urūmī gave classes in Babi doctrine on the Bab's personal instructions.[1282]

Qurrat al-ᶜAyn's role as a center of authority for the Babis of Karbala was confirmed by the Bab himself in more than one letter,[1283] but it was inevitable that her performance of this function should excite suspicion and hostility in some quarters. Whereas Vilyānī and his companions rejected the Bab and his doctrines as such, and thereby separated themselves from the Babi community, Mullā Aḥmad and his supporters maintained adamantly that their opposition to Qurrat al-ᶜAyn was based on a desire to purify the faith of the Bab from the false interpretations and harmful innovations which she was introducing into it. Unlike the defection of Vilyānī, therefore, this disagreement resulted in an actual division within Babism, rather than a retraction from it.

Mullā Aḥmad Khurāsānī (also known as Muᶜallim-i Ḥisārī)[1284] was a *mujtahid* from Nāmiq near Turshīz, who had undertaken the task of teaching the children of Rashti. Informed of the Bab's claims in a letter from Bushrūᵓī, he had become one of his earliest followers in Karbala. He spent some time after his conversion in Khurāsān, where he became better acquainted with Bushrūᵓī, but decided, in the end, that his place was in Iraq and so returned to Karbala, possibly early in 1262/1846.

During his absence, however, Qurrat al-ᶜAyn and others had risen to prominence in the community there, and friction began to develop between them and Mullā Aḥmad around Ramadan 1262/September 1846. Shaykh Sulṭān al-Karbalāᵓī describes an altercation on 23 Ramadan/13 September between Mullā Aḥmad and Mullā Bāqir Tabrizī over the question of smoking, which the former did not regard as prohibited. Qurrat al-ᶜAyn and Rashti's widow (whom she had converted) were drawn into the dispute and from petty beginnings the matter grew into a serious argument.[1285]

Khurāsānī himself, in his version of the disagreement, makes no reference whatever to the smoking incident, and instead locates the origins of the dispute between him and Qurrat al-ᶜAyn in a much less trivial debate

concerning her position and that of Mullā Bāqir. According to Khurāsānī, Mullā Bāqir interpreted a letter from the Bab in praise of Qurrat al-ᶜAyn as evidence that the Babis should gather about her and, despite his protests, proceeded to assemble a group of men in support of her, including Shaykh Sulṭān al-Karbalāᵓī, Shaykh Ṣāliḥ Karīmī, and Mīrzā Hādī Nahrī. Khurāsānī continued to protest and, in the end was condemned for his pains as an unbeliever and forbidden either to lecture to the believers or to teach the children (presumably those of Rashti). Qurrat al-ᶜAyn, for her part, decreed that whatever might be said by Mullā Bāqir should be regarded as true and accepted by all.[1286]

Khurāsānī sought support for his views, writing letters to a number of individuals, including the Bab (by then probably in Isfahan), Mullā Shaykh ᶜAlī Turshīzī in Shīrāz, Sayyid Ḥusayn Yazdī in Isfahan, and Sayyid ᶜAlī [Shubbar?] in Kāẓimiyya.[1287] According to Mullā Aḥmad, replies were received from both the Bab and Sayyid Ḥusayn Yazdī in condemnation of the words and behavior of his opponents—but these were not specific refutations of Qurrat al-ᶜAyn or Mullā Bāqir, since he had not referred to them by name in his original letters.[1288]

The disagreement soon developed doctrinal justifications and elaborations. Wardī mentions several points of doctrinal difference, including two which are not referred to elsewhere. The first of these is that Mullā Aḥmad regarded the works of al-Ahsaᵓi and Rashti as immortal and continued reading from them (and presumably, lecturing from them). Qurrat al-ᶜAyn and her followers, on the other hand, looked on these works as abrogated by the Bab.[1289] Although, as we shall see, the Bab did at a later date specifically forbid his followers to read the works of al-Ahsaᵓi or Rashti or to sit with their followers, the only passage known to me in his early writings which might be interpreted this way is his general statement in the *Qayyūm al-asmāᵓ* that all the books of the past, except those from God, had been abrogated.[1290] That Qurrat al-ᶜAyn and her supporters may have drawn a more specific conclusion with regard to the works of the founders of Shaykhism is a fact of no little moment.

The other point mentioned by Wardī is that Qurrat al-ᶜAyn was said to have forbidden mourning for the Imām Ḥusayn or the performance of *ziyāra* to the shrines of the Imāms, on the grounds that there is no real meaning in references to the "thirst" or "death" of Ḥusayn.[1291] If this be true, she was clearly opposed here to the Bab's own teaching.[1292]

Her position was, however, much enhanced at this juncture by the arrival of several letters from the Bab, in which he spoke of her in terms of the highest praise and approbation.[1293] Strengthened in her position by statements in her favor from such a source, Qurrat al-ᶜAyn continued to emphasize the significance of the role of the *ḥurūf al-ḥayy* as the *sābiqūn* who had recognized the Bab before all others. Mullā Aḥmad and his companions—for he seems to have acquired a following of his own by this stage—objected vigorously to what they regarded as unwarranted interpretations by her of certain passages in the Bab's writings referring to the *sābiqūn*, while their opponents countered with various quotations of a more explicit nature.[1294] Khurāsānī went on to allege that his rivals believed "that the remembrance (*al-dhikr*) [i.e., the Bab], is a lord apart from God, and his gate and the first to believe in him, Mullā Ḥusayn is Muḥammad ibn ᶜAbd Allāh [i.e., the Prophet], and the second to believe in him, Mullā ᶜAlī, is ᶜAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib, and Qurrat al-ᶜAyn is the reality of Fāṭima, and the remaining eleven [sic] *sābiqūn* are the other Imāms, and the Shaykh and the Sayyid [i.e. al-Ahsaᵓi and Rashti] were created from the surplus matter of the bodies of the *sābiqūn*."[1295] A meeting was called in Rashti's house (where Khurāsānī also seems to have lived) in order to resolve this particular issue, attended by Mullā Aḥmad and several of his companions.

The matter appears to have remained unresolved, however; both sides stayed intransigent and tension continued as before. Shaykh Sulṭān refers to the accusations of Khurāsānī regarding the claims made for the *sābiqūn* as mere "falsehoods".[1296] As we have already noted, however, the Bab himself did teach that the *ḥurūf al-ḥayy* where identical with the Prophet, Imāms, *abwābs*, and Fāṭima, and there seems little doubt that this doctrine was being promulgated in some form by the group around Qurrat al-ᶜAyn and Mullā Bāqir.

The former in particular appears to have been the object of great veneration in this respect, becoming the center of a cult in which she was regarded as "the fair and spotless emblem of chastity and the incarnation of the holy Fatima."[1297] The *Kitāb-i nuqṭat al-kāf* describes the origins of this veneration as follows: originally, the followers of Qurrat al-ᶜAyn practiced extremely severe forms of asceticism; they would not eat bread bought from the bazaar because they regarded it as unclean, inasmuch as anyone who rejected the Bab thereby rejected the Prophet and, in so doing, rejected God[1298] (that is, they became *kuffār*, whose persons and property were considered *najis*).

This situation continued until the Bab's *Risāla furūᶜ al-ᶜAdliyya* reached Karbala. Here it was stated that the glances of Fāṭima and the Imāms (*āl Allāh*) were among the agents whereby impure and forbidden (*ḥarām*) materials could be rendered lawful (*ḥalāl*).[1299] When she read this, Qurrat al-ᶜAyn claimed to be "the manifestation of Fāṭima (*maẓhar-i jināb-i Fāṭima*)" and said that "the glance of my eye has the same effect as that of hers, and whatever I cast my gaze upon shall be made pure." She then instructed her companions to bring whatever they bought in the bazaar for her to render *ḥalāl*.[1300] According to Māzandarānī, she was also regarded by some as "the point of divine knowledge" after Rashti.[1301] It is not, perhaps, surprising that, according to ᶜAbbās Effendi she claimed to be divine in the course of the Babi conclave held at Badasht in Mazandaran in 1848.[1302]

Despite attempts by Qurrat al-ᶜAyn to defuse the tension within the Babi community by calling on her partisans to tone down their remarks about her,[1303] and to placate Mullā Aḥmad in person,[1304] no lasting rapprochement was possible. The Bab himself remained eager to effect a reconciliation even at the cost of some doctrinal blurring. In general, it seems that, although he disapproved of the behavior of Khurāsānī and was strongly in favor of Qurrat al-ᶜAyn, he deprecated antagonism on either side, instructed the followers of Qurrat al-ᶜAyn to avoid attacking Mullā Aḥmad, and instructed all involved to remain united in spite of their disagreements. In a letter from prison in Mākū, he writes:

> I have read your letter and informed myself of what you mentioned in it. I had heard from your companion about the dissension in the holy land [Karbala]…. Know that the *sābiqūn*, so long as they do not have doubts or misgivings in their own affair, have been chosen for that honor above all others. But neither their words nor their actions are proof for anyone—rather, in this day the proof is but one individual [i.e., the Bab himself]. Even if there servants enter the faith of God who leave them behind in knowledge or deeds, yet that honor is theirs from God and nobody may rival them in that. No one has the right to reject them, as long as he does not see them commit what would be contrary to the faith. This is the measure of justice in what concerns them.
>
> Nor do any of those who arrive from the house of justice [i.e., the house of Rashti] have the right to condemn the pure one (*al-ṭāhira*) [i.e., Qurrat al-ᶜAyn] in respect of her learning, for she

> has understood the [various] aspects of the cause through the grace of God. In this day, she is an honor to this sect, and whoever wrongs her in the faith will commit a manifest sin.
> The same goes for those who have followed her—none of them has the right to reject Aḥmad in the house of justice, for he has understood our message in the verses of justice; though I am aware that he has committed a clear iniquity in this disagreement, I won't reveal it in this letter or speak of it, so they can return to what they were commanded and no-one may condemn anyone else.[1305]

In a letter to Mullā Aḥmad himself, the Bab speaks favorably of Qurrat al-ᶜAyn, defends her from the charge of having denied the identity between outward and inward realities, and goes on:

> As for what you have asked about the pure leaf, concerning the fact that she has claimed for herself the station of being a proof for others—there's nothing dreadful or serious about this, since laudable meanings can be attributed to "being a proof"…. She has recognized the aspects of my decree and has pondered on the lights shining from my verses. Let none of my followers repudiate her, for she only speaks with evidences that have shone forth from the people of sinlessness [i.e., the Imāms] and tokens that have radiated from the people of truth. This is enough for her as an honor among this sect. [1306]

We can see, then, that in spite of serious accusations on the one hand and excessive adulation on the other, Qurrat al-ᶜAyn appears to have succeeded in steering a middle course which evoked a favorable reaction from the Bab and preserved her position in the Babi hierarchy as a leading exponent of the new doctrines. As far as it is accurate at this stage to speak of such a thing, we may consider her a representative of the orthodox mainstream of Babi thought, even if her expression of that thought was to prove at times controversial even to other exponents of it.

Her insistence on turning to the Bab for guidance or on referring to his writings for information on doctrine and practice was to prove a valuable unifying factor in a religious movement which had expanded numerically more rapidly than its tenets had been expounded or published abroad. The Bab not yet attempted to systematize his theories. Changes in doctrinal

emphasis which occurred from time to time as his claims developed in complexity or as circumstances demanded caution in their exposition, combined with a serious lack of manuscript copies of even his major writings and the existence of incorrectly copied versions of some of them, all led to a degree of doctrinal confusion in the widely-scattered Babi communities. This confusion became particularly marked in the period following the Bab's execution in 1850. In this context, it was inevitable that there should be clashes both of personality and opinion, particularly where someone as outspoken and impatient of contradiction as Qurrat al-ᶜAyn was concerned. There is little doubt but that, in the end, she would have carried the day with the Babis in Karbala in her struggle with Mullā Aḥmad; but other events intervened before a final and decisive clash could take place.[1307]

First Steps Towards the Abrogation of the Islamic *Sharīᶜa*

Qurrat al-ᶜAyn was by now making unequivocal claims for the Bab as the bearer of a divine mission expanding and fulfilling that of al-Ahsaᵓi and Rashti, and as the immediate precursor of the Imām, while asserting the no-one could be saved unless he believed in him.[1308]

Such a position could not but be extremely embarrassing to the non-Babi Shaykhi leadership in Karbala, especially Mullā Ḥasan Gawhar and Muḥīṭ Kirmānī. Many of the points advanced by Qurrat al-ᶜAyn in evidence of the claims of the Bab—such as the identity of station between prophet and Imām or the divine inspiration of the Bab's writings[1309]—were among those adduced by Karīm Khān in his refutation of him. Although the orthodox Shaykhi community of Iraq does not seem to have been unduly hostile to the Babis in the early period, the growing prestige and influence of Karīm Khān and his demand to be recognized as overall head of the sect made it necessary for them to clarify their position vis-à-vis the followers of a man whom he had categorically condemned as a heretic. This final break with Shaykhism was to be given a sharp impetus by a serious worsening of relations between Qurrat al-ᶜAyn and the Shiᶜi community at large.

Mullā Aḥmad Khurāsānī states that, during the period of his disagreement with Qurrat al-ᶜAyn, she became increasingly well-known to the population of Karbala and that, after some time, certain people became so disturbed by her behavior that they went to the governor, to whom they complained that she was an unbeliever (*kāfira*).[1310] The *Nuqṭat al-kāf*

suggests that it was her behavior in rendering food from the bazaar lawful which excited the suspicions of the populace.[1311]

It is also likely that the strife between her party and that of Mullā Aḥmad, as well as the increasing hostility between her and the Shaykhi leadership, may have given cause for concern in a city already seriously divided by factional disputes of various kinds. In a letter written shortly after her arrival in Baghdad, following her departure from Karbala around the beginning of 1847, she complains that her enemies had condemned her followers and issued a *fatwā* of *takfīr*, and that the outcry produced had reached the ears of the "unbelievers" (presumably the Shiᶜi populace as a whole).[1312]

But at the root of her trouble with the Shiᶜi population lay Qurrat al-ᶜAyn's crucial decision to abrogate part or all of Islamic law, possibly as a preparation for the introduction of innovations to be recommended by the Bab.

At the beginning of the *daᶜwa*, he had insisted on full observance of the *sharī'a*. Thus, for example, he writes in the *Qayyūm al-asmāᵓ* that "God has made the laws of Muḥammad and his *awliyāᵓ* [i.e., the Imāms] binding in every book until the resurrection."[1313] He himself confirms in his later *Dalāᵓil-i sabᶜa* that it was his intention in the *Qayyūm al-asmāᵓ* to "command observance of the law of the Qurᵓan, so that men might not be disturbed by a new book and a new cause."[1314] In the *Saḥīfa-yi ᶜAdliyya*, he states that

> since no change may be decreed for [the faith of God], this blessed *sharīᶜa* shall never be abrogated. Nay, what Muḥammad has declared lawful (*ḥalāl Muḥammadin*) shall remain lawful to the day of the resurrection, and what he has declared unlawful (*ḥarām Muḥammadin*) shall remain unlawful until the day of resurrection."[1315]

This same point regarding the inviolability of the *ḥalāl* and *ḥarām* of Muḥammad was made publicly by the Bab in the course of a *khuṭba* [sermon] delivered by him in the Vakīl mosque of Shīrāz in 1845,[1316] and in the contemporary *Tafsīr Sūrat al-kawthar*.[1317] In this latter work, the Bab describes himself as "the servant of God confirming what you possess of the injunctions of the Qurᵓan"[1318] and declares that "it is incumbent on all to act in accordance with it [the Qurᵓan]; whoever rejects a word of it has disbelieved in the prophets and messengers and shall have his punishment in

the fire of hell."[1319] Similarly, in an early letter to Qurrat al-ᶜAyn, he writes, "rest assured that all the externals of the *sharīᶜa* are observed. Whoever neglects the least of its laws, it shall be as if he has neglected all of them."[1320] In a letter written as late as his stay in Isfahan he maintains that "I have not instructed anyone save [to observe] the laws of the Qurᵓan."[1321]

In general, the Bab sought to clarify obscure or tangled issues related to the details of the *sharīᶜa*. In the *Tafsīr Sūrat al-kawthar*, he refers to the inability of the ulama to give correct judgments on *furūᶜ*,[1322] and, in the *Qayyūm al-asmāᵓ*, states that he has clarified certain laws over which there had been disagreement.[1323] The *Risāla furūᶜ al-ᶜAdlīyya* is, as we have noted, a systematic attempt to set out in detail the finer points of observance relating to certain major aspects of the *sharīᶜa*, such as *ṣalāt*, *zakāt*, and *jihād*. Beyond this, however, he introduced a number of ordinances which extended and intensified the standard Qurᵓanic regulations. Thus, for example, he prohibited smoking in the *Khaṣāᵓil-i sabᶜa* and recommended supererogatory prayer and fasting in the *Ṣaḥīfa bayna 'l-ḥaramayn*. Mīrzā Muḥammad ᶜAlī Zunūzī[1324] writes that, in his early letters, the Bab

> put desirable matters (*mustaḥabbāt*) in the place of obligatory (*wājibāt*), and undesirable matters (*makrūhāt*) in the place of forbidden (*muḥarramāt*). Thus, for example, he regarded it as obligatory to have four tablets (*muḥr*) of the soil [from the shrine] of the prince of martyrs [i.e., Imām Ḥusayn] on which to place the hands forehead and nose during the prostration of *namāz*; he considered the pilgrimage on ᶜĀshūrā a duty; he laid down prayers (*adīᶜa*) and supererogatory observances (*taᶜqībāt*); he proclaimed the obligation of Friday prayer…; and he fashioned amulets (*hayākil*), charms (*aḥrāz*), and talismans (*tilismāt*) such as are prepared among the people[1325]…. All his companions acted with the most circumspection according to the *usūl* and *furū* of Islam.[1326]

The early followers of the Babi movement appear to have been as noted for the strictness of their observance of Islamic law as they were later to be characterized for their abandonment of it; in this respect they significantly resemble the pre-*qiyāma* Niẓārī Ismailis.[1327] Ḥājī Muḥammad Muᶜīn al-Salṭana Tabrizī quotes several individuals, including Ḥājī Aḥmad Mīlānī and Mullā Bāqir Tabrizī, on the attitude of the Babis at this period to the Islamic *sharīᶜa*. Mīlānī, for example, performed a fast of three

consecutive months during Rajab, Shaᶜbān and Ramaḍān. Similarly, they would not wear black clothes because the Imāms had forbidden this color as belonging to the ᶜAbbāsid dynasty, which had persecuted them. For this same reason, even the writing of books in black ink was prohibited (red or gold ink normally being used instead); the Bab himself wrote in red ink before the composition of the *Bayān-i Fārsī.*[1328]

In many of her early letters, Qurrat al-ᶜAyn herself emphasized that "this is the traditional way (*sunna*) of God, which was in the past and shall be in the future. You shall find no change in the *sunna* of God."[1329] Innovative in her interpretation of Islamic doctrine as she may have been, it was as a staunch defender of Shiᶜi orthodoxy (as she understood it) that she represented herself to her fellow-believers in the Bab and to the population at large. So long as the Bab appeared to command strict obedience to the law, she strove to enforce such obedience within the Babi community. But, by the summer of 1846, she began to infer from the Bab's writings that it was time to suspend the laws of the Islamic revelation.

Samandar clearly states that "she understood the [need for] the abrogation of the laws of the Qurʾan before all or most of the people of the *Bayān* [i.e. the Babis], deriving this from the stage of development reached by the words of the Bab."[1330] Muᶜīn al-Salṭana also refers to her originality in abrogating the Qurʾanic laws, laying stress on what he regards as her spiritual perception in so doing before it was made known that the Bab had done so; he does, however, incorrectly attribute this behavior to the period when she was in Qazvīn and Tehran, from 1847.[1331]

Mīrzā Muḥammad ᶜAlī Zunūzī also refers to the fact that "with the permission of the Sayyid [i.e., the Bab], Qurrat al-ᶜAyn in practice rendered null and void all the previous laws and observances."[1332] Shaykh Maḥmūd ibn ᶜAbd Allāh Ālūsī (1802-1853), the well-known Sunni *muftī* of Baghdad (with whom Qurrat al-ᶜAyn stayed for two months in 1847), remarks that

> She was one of those who followed the Bab after the death of Rashti, and then disobeyed him in some matters, among them religious obligations (*takālīf*). It is said that she used to speak of permitting women to be seen by men (*ḥall al-furūj*) and the suspension of all religious obligations whatsoever.[1333]

Qurrat al-ᶜAyn herself dates the beginning of her move to abrogate the *sharīᶜa* from the month of Rajab 1262/June-July 1846. In a letter written about this time, she states that "the gate of tribulations was opened through

the revelation of the blessed leaf from the blessed, crimson tree [i.e., a letter from the Bab] in the month of God (*shahr Allāh*) [i.e., Rajab]… in which he addressed this insignificant one, calling on her to carry out his commands."[1334] This letter from the Bab seems to have instructed her to tell her husband (*qul* [sic][1335] *li-baᶜliki*) that this new cause was not like that of Muḥammad who came before. Strengthened, as she puts it, by God's grace and might, she read these verses to the believers, telling them of the greatness of God's cause and calling on them to strive to understand "the verses of innovation" (*āyāt al-badᶜ*). She then summoned them to "enter the gate of innovation, prostrating yourselves." Some, she says, accepted this summons and "discarded restraints and shut their eyes to rules and regulations," while others objected and censured her.[1336]

Not enough detail is given by Qurrat al-ᶜAyn in her letter for us to tell exactly what was involved in the abandonment of the more severe Islamic laws (*ḥudūd*).[1337] It was certainly not a full-scale abrogation such as took place later, under her direction, at the conclave of Badasht, nor is there any evidence that it involved a wholesale plunge into antinomianism such as seems to have occurred at Alamut in 1164, when the Ismaili leader Ḥasan ibn Muḥammad proclaimed the advent of the *Qiyāma* and abolished all observances of the *sharīᶜa*.[1338] There are, nevertheless, numerous and significant parallels with the latter event, especially in terms of doctrine. When Ḥasan addressed his followers assembled at Alamut, he announced to them that a letter had come to him from the hidden Ismaili Imām, containing new guidance:

> The Imām of the age sends his blessings unto you and mercy, and designates you his servants, whom he has singled out. He has removed from you the burden of obedience to the *sharīᶜa*, and has brought you to the time of resurrection (*al-qiyāma*).[1339]

"The ties and chains of *sharī'at* restrictions," writes Abu Ishaq Ibrahim Quhistani, "were taken from the necks of the faithful."[1340] Juwa'ynī writes concerning the Ismaili beliefs at this period that

> They explained paradise and hell… in such a way as to give a spiritual meaning to these concepts. And then on the basis of this they said that the Resurrection is when men shall come to God and the mysteries and truths of all Creation be revealed, and acts of obedience abolished, for in the world to come all is

> reckoning and there is no action. And this is the spiritual [Resurrection] and the Resurrection promised and awaited in all religions and creeds is this, which was revealed by Ḥasan. And as a consequence thereof men have been relieved of the duties imposed by the Shari^{c}a because in this period of the Resurrection they must turn in every sense towards God and abandon the rites of religious law and established habits of worship."[1341]

It is of particular interest to note how closely the development of Ḥasan's claims parallels that of the Bab's—from *dā^{c}ī* and *ḥujja* of the Imām, to the Imām himself in spiritual reality (*al-ḥaqīqa*), to the Qā$^{\circ}$im proclaiming the age of *qiyāma*.[1342]

Although it is necessarily difficult to know what motivated Qurrat al-^{c}Ayn to begin to abandon the *sharī^{c}a* at this point, it seems very likely that it was for reasons similar in many respects to those adduced by the Niẓārīs for their own abrogation of those same laws. As we have briefly noted before, many Shaykhis, like the Ismailis, placed considerable emphasis on the distinction between the outward observances of the faith (*al-ẓāhir*) and its inward realities (*al-bāṭin*), and believed that the age of *bāṭin* had commenced with al-Ahsa$^{\circ}$i and would culminate in the appearance of the Hidden Imām. Thus, side by side with the central "polar motif" emphasizing the role of the bearer of charisma, we find a "gnostic motif" in which revelation of *bāṭin* takes precedence over other elements of faith and doctrine.[1343] In our chapter on Rashti, we referred briefly to an important passage in his *Sharḥ al-qaṣīda*, in which he refers to the inception of an age of *bāṭin* with al-Ahsa$^{\circ}$i; it will be worthwhile at this point to look again at this passage in somewhat greater detail.

The Sayyid begins by stating that the prophet Muḥammad possesses two names, one on earth (Muḥammad) and one in heaven (Aḥmad). Since the name is a revelation (*al-ism huwa 'l-ẓuhūr*), this means that Muḥammad is revealed twice (*lahu ẓuhūrān*). One revelation is in the outward worlds (*al-^{c}awālim al-ẓāhiriyya*), with respect to the external aspect of bodies, their regulations, acts, and so on, and has its location (*maẓhar*) in the name Muḥammad. The other is in the inward worlds (*al-^{c}awālim al-bāṭiniyya*) and its location is known as Aḥmad. Since creation is on the arc of ascent (*al-qaws al-su^{c}ūdī*) and, as it rises back to its origin, becomes progressively more refined;[1344] and since, from the time of the Prophet, there has appeared at the beginning of each century someone to propagate (*man yurawwiju*) the

laws appropriate to that stage (of development); and since the beginning of the arc was education for the appearance of outward laws, and its propagator (*al-murawwij*) in each century has propagated the *sharīᶜa* according to the outward exigencies of the people; and since the outward body has two stations, one relating to differences, accidents and changes, the other free of these; and since each stage reaches perfection only through six phases (*aṭwār*)—therefore, the outward laws related to the manifestation of the name of Muḥammad reached a state of perfection only after twelve hundred years.

On the completion of these twelve hundred years, the first age (*al-dawra al-ūlā*) connected with the outward aspects of the sun of *nubuwwa* and the twelve periods of the moon of *wilāya* were ended.[1345] The second age is for the purpose of making explicit the laws relating to the appearance of inner truths and mysteries. By way of another analogy, the first age was for the education of bodies and the spirits belonging to them, like the fetus in the womb, while the second age is for the education of pure souls and spirits, unconnected to bodies. In this second age, outward realities are subordinate to inward, in distinction to the first age, in which the reverse was true. The name of the Prophet in this age is his heavenly name, that is Aḥmad; the *murawwij* and leader (*raᵓīs*) of this age was also named Aḥmad (al-Ahsaᵓi).[1346]

In a treatise written by an anonymous Babi who had, clearly been a Shaykhi, reference is similarly made to two ages; that of *ẓāhir*, ending in the twelfth century, and that of *bāṭin*, beginning with the appearance of al-Ahsaᵓi.[1347] The Shaykh himself "revealed of hidden knowledge what men could bear,"[1348] but throughout his lifetime and in the early days of Rashti, concealment of their real teachings (*taqiyya*) was completely observed.[1349] This author uses a similar analogy to that adopted by Rashti in the last section of the above passage: he compares the world to a body without a spirit, in the same way that a child develops by degrees. At the beginning of the thirteenth century, it resembled a child of bout ten, endowed with powers of discretion and, in the time of the seal of the gates (i.e., the Bab),[1350] developed to the stage of a child on the verge of maturity. The beginning of maturity will, he says, occur on the appearance of the Hidden Imām.[1351]

Much the same analogy is used by al-Karbalā'ī, who states that the period of Shaykh Aḥmad (*al-shaykh al-bāb*) and Sayyid Kāẓim dated from the beginning of the first century of the second age (*dawra*) up to the appearance of the Bab; their period was "a body (*jasad*) for this substance (*li-hādhā 'l-jism*) and a substance (*jism*) for that spirit (*li-tilka 'l-rūḥ*), and an

outward form (*ẓāhir*) for that inward reality (*li-dhālika 'l-bāṭin*) and an inward reality for the inward reality of all inward realities (*li-bāṭin al-bāṭin*)."[1352]

In a *risāla* written at a slightly later date, Qurrat al-ᶜAyn states that, in this day, the decree of the *bāṭin al-bāṭin* of the Qurᵓan is manifest,[1353] and indicates that the outward meaning of the holy book is related to the Prophet while its inner meaning belongs to the Imāms.[1354] The Bab himself made it clear that he spoke concerning the *bāṭin al-bāṭin*, in the same way that the Imām Ḥusayn spoke of the *bāṭin al-ẓāhir*.[1355] By contrast, Karīm Khān Kirmānī objected that, since the work of al-Ahsaᵓi and Rashti was as yet incomplete and the *bāṭin* had not been perfected, it cannot be time for the revelation of the *bāṭin al-bāṭin*.[1356] He, however, agreed that "the outward stages of the holy law reached perfection in the twelfth century, that is, in one thousand two hundred."[1357]

As we shall see presently, Qurrat al-ᶜAyn had concluded that the time for concealing the true meaning of Islam and observing its outward form had ended. Her decision to dispense with the Islamic *sharīᶜa* at this period must be carefully distinguished from her later announcement, at the Badasht gathering, that the dispensation of Islam was abrogated. In the latter case, the rationale for the abrogation of the entire Islamic system was the conviction that the *qiyāma* had occurred and that the Qā'im had appeared and revealed a new *sharīᶜa* (even if it was not yet made known to his followers).

In Karbala, it was not the end of the Islamic religious dispensation as such which was at issue, but, rather, the open revelation of the *bawāṭin* of the faith and, hence, the abandonment of all outer practices. As may be expected, this move was to provoke considerable consternation in the Babi community and, as the decision became public, among the Shaykhi and orthodox Shiᶜi and Sunni populations. Serious opposition came first from the Shaykhis and the Shi'is but, in Baghdad, Qurrat al-ᶜAyn's behavior was to provoke heavy and determined criticism from a large section of the Babi community.

Following an incident on 1 Muharram 1263/ 20 December 1846,[1358] in which Qurrat al-ᶜAyn and her sister celebrated the Bab's birthday in the house of Sayyid Kāẓim, interrupting a meeting for *rawḍa-khwānī* while dressed in bright clothing and henna,[1359] she was arrested and imprisoned for a few days.[1360] It appears that she was then kept confined in her home, although free to receive visitors, for some three months, while the governor wrote to Baghdad for advice on how to deal with the situation.[1361] In an account of a visit made to Qurrat al-ᶜAyn, apparently at this period, Mullā

Aḥmad Khurāsānī gives, in her own words as he remembered them, an unequivocal statement of her intentions at this point, although even he does not seem to have realized how critical for the future development of Babism these intentions were to be:

> She asked me "Do you know why I summoned you". I replied "No." She said, "I was previously given the responsibility for the authority (*wilāya*) of Mullā Bāqir, and I made it incumbent on all of you to accept it. Yet no-one accepted it from me, with the exception of fourteen individuals, seven men and seven women. Now I shall present you with something else." I said, "What is that?" She replied "It has come to me, through the tongue of my inner mystic state (*bi-lisān al-ḥāl*), not through physical speech, that I wish to remove all concealment (*taqiyya*) and to establish the proof of the remembrance and go to Baghdad.[1362]

An argument ensued, at the end of which Mullā Aḥmad left, maintaining that he had himself received no fewer than seven letters from the Bab, all commanding observance of *taqiyya*.[1363] There appears to be ample evidence that Qurrat al-ᶜAyn was acting quite independently of the Bab on the basis of her own promptings and her esoteric interpretation of his writings.

In a letter addressed to various groups and written in Baghdad shortly after her arrival there from Karbala, Qurrat al-ᶜAyn refers clearly in several places to her decision to discard *taqiyya*. She remarks "how strange it is that this tiny sect, which can hardly be said to exist, so small is it, has fallen into quarrels and become scattered."[1364] She then criticized those "who do not make efforts in the path of their Lord," and who curse anyone who does, "while the Muslims reproach [the one who makes such efforts], saying his blood may be shed with impunity, since he has opposed the Lord of Might and torn aside the veil of *taqiyya.*"[1365] She complains that her opponents do not understand the real meaning of *taqiyya* and only hold to it out of fear.[1366] After this general criticism, she turns her attention to one individual, saying "you did not write out copies [of the Bab's works] after it was made incumbent on you to pen his books in gold ink, making the excuse of *taqiyya*."[1367] She then calls on this same individual to "discard the meaning which you have given to *taqiyya* and return unto the decree of your Lord."[1368] After this, addressing "the noble ones" (i.e., the followers of the

Bab), she calls on them to "carry the verses of God unto every soul… and follow the decree of innovation in the latter book."[1369] Referring to the distinction between *ẓāhir* and *bāṭin*, she speaks of "the community of believers who have reached the station of outwardly demonstrating Islam but who turn aside from its reality."[1370] There then follows the passage quoted above, in which she describes how, following the arrival of a letter from the Bab, she began to call on the Babis to discard the laws of Islam. Finally, towards the end, she claims that God has freed her from sins and error and that whatever may be said by her or, indeed by her followers, is the truth.[1371]

Qurrat al-ᶜAyn left Karbala early in 1263/1847; in just over a year, having in the meantime been at the center of several controversies in Baghdad (where she was condemned by a section of the Babi community for appearing unveiled in the presence of men), Hamadān, Kirmanshah, and Qazvīn (where she was accused of plotting the murder of her uncle, Ḥājī Mullā Muḥammad Taqī), she spearheaded the movement for the abrogation of Islam at a gathering of some eighty-one Babis at Badasht in Mazandaran,[1372] following the Bab's own declaration of *qāᵓimīyya* in prison at Mākū.[1373] As the extreme views adopted by her, the Bab, and other leaders forced large numbers to abandon the movement, either to return to Shaykhism or mainline Shiᶜism,[1374] Babism acquired the radical, non-Islamic form in which it is best known. The roots of later Babi doctrine lie in Shaykhi theories of charismatic leadership and revealed inner truth. The Bab and his followers carried these and other, related, concepts to what was a logical conclusion but, in so doing, broke entirely from the Shaykhi school, from Shiᶜism and, in the end, from Islam.

The Babi Rejection of Shaykhism

Karīm Khān's rejection and refutation of the Bab, his identification of him as a heretic, and his continued efforts to emphasize the validity of the Shaykhi school as a legitimate *silsila*—a sort of *eccesiola* or personal prelature—within the framework of strictly orthodox Twelver Shiᶜism, made it difficult for the followers of the Bab to continue to describe themselves as Shaykhis without a large measure of confusion. The distinctions between "Shaykhis", "Babis", or even "Karīm Khānis" were blurred for quite some time in the public mind,[1375] and it rapidly became almost as desirable for the followers of the Bab to dissociate themselves from the Shaykhi school as it was for the latter to dissociate any real link with Babism.

As early as 1846, in his commentary on the *Sūrat al-kawthar*, the Bab, referring to the Shaykhis, spoke of "the falsehood of this sect (*fiʾa*)", the followers of which had "committed what Pharaoh did not commit before this" and who were "in this day of the people of perdition."[1376] He takes pains, however, to point out that both al-Ahsaʾi and Rashti would agree that the Shaykhis had gone astray. At the same time, he makes clear his relationship to his predecessors when he writes that "all that Kāẓim and Aḥmad before him have written concerning the truths of theology and sacred topics does not match a single word of what I have been revealing to you."[1377] Similarly, he takes care to refute the charge that his Quranic commentaries were merely references to the words of al-Ahsaʾi and Rashti, maintaining that no one, not even they, could rival him in writing,[1378] although their words were confirmed by his verses.[1379]

Continued opposition to his cause by the Shaykhi leadership seems to have hardened the Bab's attitude with regard to the school. In his *Risāla dar radd-i Bāb-i murtād*, Karīm Khān, in order to make it clear that the Bab was actually opposed to Shaykhism, quotes a passage from the latter's writings on this subject. The passage in question, although not identified as such would appear from its description as "concerning the knowledge of the [divine] name *al-Quddūs*, in the first stage (*martaba*)", to be one of several sections missing from standard texts of the Bab's *Kitāb al-asmāʾ*, all the *abwāb* of which are similarly headed.

Kirmānī begins by quoting the Bab's statement that

> we have forbidden you… [to read] the *Tafsīr al-ziyāra* [i.e., the *Sharḥ al-ziyāra al-jāmiʿa al-kabīra*] or the *Sharḥ al-Khuṭba* [i.e., the *Sharh al-Khuba al-ṭuṭunjiyya*], or anything written by either Aḥmad or Kāẓim…. Should you look on even a letter of what we have forbidden you, even should it be for but the twinkling of an eye or even less, God shall, in truth, cause you to be veiled from beholding him whom he shall manifest [*man yuẓhiruhu*—the messianic figure of later Babi literature].[1380]

He then proceeds to quote a statement from the same passage, in which the Bab says that "Aḥmad and the *fuqahāʾ* are incapable of either comprehending or bearing the mystery of the divine unity, whether in their acts or in the core of their beings, for they are indeed people of limitation

and their knowledge is as nothing before God."[1381] Finally he quotes the following:

> O people of the remembrance and the *Bayān;* we have prohibited you today, just as we have prohibited you from reading the fairy-tales of Aḥmad and Kāẓim and the *fuqahāʾ*, from sitting down in the company of those who have followed them in the decree, in case they lead you astray and cause you to become unbelievers. Know, O people of the *Furqān* [Qur'an] and the *Bayān*, that you are now enemies to those who have followed Aḥmad and Kāẓim, and they are enemies to you; you have no greater enemy on the face of the earth than them, nor have they any enemy greater than you…. Whoever allows into his heart seven sevenths of ten tenths of the head of a grain of mustard of love for these people, the one God manifests will punish him with a painful fire upon the day of resurrection.[1382]

The Shiᶜi insistence on knowing and shunning the enemies of the true faith is present here in all its force; it recurs again and again in the course of divisions within the Babi and Bahaʾi communities.

The Bab's attitude to al-Ahsaʾi and Rashti had not changed fundamentally—at quite a late date, for example, he wrote a *ziyāratnāma* for the former[1383]—but it is quite clear that, towards the end of his life, he came to regard the Shaykhi school as represented by Kirmānī as not merely misguided but as positively inimical to true religion. This hardening of attitude may well have been immediately occasioned by the actively hostile role of several Shaykhi *ulama* in the Bab's examination at Tabriz in 1848, to which we have referred previously; but this would not, in itself, seem sufficient to explain it. Of greater significance was the proclamation of *qāʾimiyya* at this time.

If it had been necessary for Kirmānī and other Shaykhi leaders to disclaim any relationship with the Bab or his ideas, it was now equally vital for the latter to dissociate himself from Shaykhism, in order to avoid continued ambiguity concerning his role and station. By stressing, at this point, the alienation of the Bab from Shaykhism, his followers (more and more of whom were coming from a non-Shaykhi background)[1384] were able to focus more clearly the nature of their radical departure from Islam itself.

In the total separation which we have, thus, seen develop between Babism and Shaykhism, we can observe not only the beginning of a

processes whereby the latter school effectively acquired the status of an *ecclesiola* within the wider community of Twelver Shiᶜism, but also—and, perhaps, more vividly still—the mechanics of the development which transformed Babism from a movement within the Shaykhi school to a distinct sect of Shiᶜism and, in the end, to an idiosyncratic religious movement claiming independence from the revelatory jurisdiction of Islam.

With the transformation of Babism into an independent religious affiliation eschewing (in theory at least) all sectarian connection with Islam, it passes out of the area of our immediate concern. At this juncture, the study of Babism proper may be said to begin—an important and useful study, but one not immediately relevant to the questions we have sought to answer, however tentatively, in these pages. What I have to say about that later phase may be found in the books and articles I have devoted to it.

With the development of independent Babism, its suppression, and its eventual failure in that form, the latest and perhaps the last of the great sectarian responses to the problems of charisma and authority in Shiᶜism had run its course. The impact of the West and the subsequent secularization of much of Iranian society were to raise fresh problems and to demand new responses from the religious institutions, responses that have worked themselves on the political and social stages since the 1979 revolution, and in Iraq since the fall of Saddam Husayn.

Babism and, indeed the later Bahaᵓi sect to which it gave birth,[1385] were lessons for the ulama: charisma, unless controlled within routinized forms, could run riot and lead, in the end, beyond Shiᶜism and Islam itself. The modern development of Iranian Shiᶜism has, in many ways, been a search for these routinized forms, be it in the office of Ayatollah or the re-organization of theological studies in Qum by Ayatollah Burujirdī (1875-1961), or the attempt to define the role of the *marjaᶜ al-taqlīd* (as in the exposition *Baḥthī dar bāra-yi rūḥāniyyat wa marjaᶜiyyat*).[1386] As the Iranian revolution and the regime it founded have succeeded in establishing for the ulama a leading position in society and a formal role within the sphere of government, we have witnessed a further, more thorough, routinization and organization of charismatic authority in Shiᶜism. There are, as I write, early signs that President Mahmoud Ahmadinezhad anticipates an early appearance of the Hidden Imam. Whether this, in turn, will lead to further outbursts of prophetic charisma in heterodox movements remains a matter for speculation; the study of Shaykhism and Babism may, at least, help us to speculate more clearly.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Introduction

The following bibliography contains all the books, articles, and manuscripts listed in my original thesis. However, since much time has passed, new books and articles have been published, and I have wanted to draw the attention of my readers to these. To round things out, I have also added earlier academic and quasi-academic materials that were not in the original bibliography, but which have a direct relationship to Shaykhism, Babism, or both. Given the surge in interest in Shiʿite Islam since 1979, it has not been remotely possible to include here moe than a tiny portion of materials published on that subject in the intervening years. Many items are now available on a number of websites, including some assiduously compiled by various Baha'i organizations and individuals: my thanks to everyone involved for the hard work they and their helpers have put into this. Accessing facsimiles of manuscripts and rare books in this way was simply unimaginable when I was doing my research for this book: I wish the next generation of researchers well of it.

I have made a point of including here practically everything I have written and published on the Shaykhis and Babis since 1979, for no other reason than to make these titles available to the younger generation, who are often in ignorance of my contribution to the field. That, and a sense of rounding things up as I approach the advanced age of sixty.

Manuscript Collections

Public Records Office, London
Diplomatic and consular correspondence (FO)

Iran National Bahaʾi Archives, Tehran (INBA)
[*Iran National Bahaʾi Manuscript Collection*]. 103 vols [1970s].
A limited set of Xeroxed manuscripts from the INBA.

International Bahaʾi Archives, Haifa

British Library, London
Babi manuscripts

Cambridge University Library (CUL)

Edward Granville Browne collection (CUL Browne Or. MS)

Shīrāzī, Sayyid ʿAlī Muḥammad (the Bab). [Corespondence in Arabic]. CUL Browne Or. MS. F 21 and F. 28, item 7.

University of Chicago Library

Shaykhi Manuscript Collection

The Shaykhi Collection consists of 7 sections, each one containing the works of a different author. The authors are, in order of appearance, Shaykh Ahmad ibn Zayn al-Din Ihsa'i, Sayyid Kazim ibn Qasim Rashti, Muhammad Karim Khan Kirmani, Muhammad Khan Kirmani, Zayn al-'Abidin Khan Kirmani, Abu al-Qasim Khan Kirmani, and 'Abd al-Riza Khan Ibrahimi. Please note that one author's work can end, with a second author's work beginning on the same reel.

Reel 1: Fihrist
Reel 2: Books 1-7

** Alif: Writings of Shaykh Ahmad ibn Zayn al-Din Ihsa'i **

Book 1, alif 2: Mukhtasar al-Risalah al-Haydariyah
Book 2, alif 3: Majmu'at risalat
Book 3, alif 4: Diwan mirathi
Book 4, alif 5-7: Majmu'at risalat
Book 5, alif 9: al-Kashkul, vol. 1
Book 6, alif 10: al-Kashkul, vol. 2
Book 7, alif 14: Sharh al-ziyarah, vol. 1

Reel 3: Books 8-14

Book 8, alif 15: Sharh al-ziyarah, vol. 2
Book 9, alif 16: Sharh al-ziyarah, vol. 3

** Bih: Writings of Sayyid Kazim ibn Qasim Rashti

Book 10, bih 2-4: Rasa'il
Book 11, bih 5: Rasa'il

** Jim: Writings of Muhammad Karim Khan Kirmani **

Book 12, jim 1: Rasa'il
Book 13, jim 2: Rasa'il
Book 14, jim 3: Rasa'il

Reel 4: Books 15-20

Book 15, jim 4: Rasa'il
Book 16, jim 5: Salwah fi fasl al-khitab

Book 17, jim 6: al-Fitrah al-salimah
Book 18, jim 7: Rasa'il
Book 19, jim 8: Rasa'il
Book 20, jim 9: Rasa'il

Reel 5: Books 21-25
Book 21, jim 10: Rasa'il
Book 22, jim 11: Rasa'il
Book 23, jim 12: Rasa'il
Book 24, jim 13: Rasa'il
Book 25, jim 14: Rasa'il

Reel 6: Books 26-31
Book 26, jim 15: Rasa'il
Book 27, jim 16: Rasa'il
Book 28, jim 17: Rasa'il
Book 29, jim 18: Rasa'il
Book 30, jim 19: Daqayiq al-'ilaj fi al-tibb
Book 31, jim 20: Rasa'il

Reel 7: Books 32-36
Book 32, jim 21: Irshad al-'awwam, vol. 1
Book 33, jim 22: Irshad al-'awwam, vol. 2
Book 34, jim 23: Irshad al-'awwam, vol. 3
Book 35, jim 24: Irshad al-'awwam, vol. 4
Book 36, jim 25: Rasa'il

Reel 8: Books 37-43
Book 37, jim 26: Rasa'il
Book 38, jim 27: Fasl al-khitab al-saghir and Arba' fawa'id
Book 39, jim 28: Rasa'il
Book 40, jim 29: Diwan al-mirathi
Book 41, jim 30: Rasa'il
Book 42, jim 31: Tariq al-najah, vol. 1
Book 43, jim 32: Tariq al-najah, vol. 2

Reel 9: Books 44-50
Book 44, jim 33: Tariq al-najah, vol. 3
Book 45, jim 34: Risalat al-jami' al-ahkam al-sharayi'
Book 46, jim 35: Kutub al-jami'
Book 47, jim 36: Rasa'il
Book 48, jim 37: Fiqh al-salwah
Book 49, jim 38: al-Fitrah al-salimah, vol. 1
Book 50, jim 39: Rasa'il

Reel 10: Books 51-57
Book 51, jim 40: Rasa'il
Book 52, jim 41: Nusrat al-Din
Book 53, jim 42 and 47: Rasa'il
Book 54, jim 43-44: Rasa'il
Book 55, jim 45: Rasa'il
Book 56, jim 46: Rasa'il
Book 57, jim 48: Sharh al-natayij, vol. 1
Reel 11: Books 58-67
Book 58, jim 49: Sharh al-natayij, vol. 2
Book 59, jim 50: al-Tadhkirah fi 'ilm al-nahw
Book 60, jim 51: Kashkul dar matalib-i mutafarriqah
Book 61, jim 52: Jung dar matalib-i mutafarriqah
Book 62, jim 53: Kitab al-fusul fi al-sina'ah wa al-falsafah
Book 63, jim 54: Rasa'il
Book 64, jim 55: Da'awat
Book 65, jim 57: Risalat hidayat al-'awwam
Book 66, jim 58: Risalatayn

** Dal: Writings of Muhammad Khan Kirmani **
Book 67, dal 1: Rasa'il
Reel 12: Books 68-73
Book 68, dal 2: Rasa'il
Book 69, dal 3: Rasa'il
Book 70, dal 4: Rasa'il
Book 71, dal 5: Rasa'il
Book 72, dal 6: Rasa'il
Book 73, dal 7: Rasa'il
Reel 13: Books 74-77
Book 74, dal 8: Risalatayn
Book 75, dal 9: Rasa'il
Book 76, dal 10: Rasa'il
Book 77, dal 11: Rasa'il
Reel 14: Books 78-82
Book 78, dal 12: Rasa'il
Book 79, dal 13: Rasa'il
Book 80, dal 14: Rasa'il
Book 81, dal 15: Rasa'il

Book 82, dal 16: Rasa'il
Reel 15: Books 83-87
Book 83, dal 17: Rasa'il
Book 84, dal 18: Rasa'il
Book 85, dal 19: Rasa'il
Book 86, dal 20: Risalah li-Muhammad KhanKirmani wa rasa'il li Muhammad
Karim Khan Kirmani
Book 87, dal 21: Rasa'il
Reel 16: Books 88-91
Book 88, dal 22: Burhan-i qati'
Book 89, dal 23: Yanabi' al-hikmah, vol. 1
Book 90, dal 24: Yanabi' al-hikmah, vol. 2
Book 91, dal 25: Yanabi' al-hikmah, vol. 3
Reel 17: Books 92-103
Book 92, dal 26: Wajizat al-ahkam
Book 93, dal 27: Sharh al-du'a' al-rajabiyah
Book 94, dal 28: al-Hujjah al-sati'ah
Book 95, dal 29: Risalat al-raw´ah
Book 96, dal 30-31: Risalat al-Durur and al-Muntakhab fi al-ad'iyah
Book 97, dal 32: Risalah-'i falahat
Book 98, dal 33: Kashkul-i buzurg, vol. 3
Book 99, dal 34: Lu'lu'-i mansur
Book 100, dal 35: Kashkul, vol. 1
Book 101, dal 36: Durus
Book 102, dal 37: Kashkul, vol. 2
Book 103, dal 38: Tarjumah-'i risalah-'i Wajizat al-ahkam
Reel 18: Books 104-108

** Ha: Writings of Zayn al-'Abidin Khan Kirmani **
Book 104, ha 1: Rasa'il
Book 105, ha 2: Rasa'il
Book 106, ha 3: Rasa'il
Book 107, ha 4: Rasa'il
Book 108, ha 5: Rasa'il
Reel 19: Books 109-114
Book 109, ha 6: Rasa'il
Book 110, ha 7: Rasa'il
Book 111, ha 8: Rasa'il

Book 112, ha 9: Rasa'il
Book 113, ha 10: Rasa'il
Book 114, ha 11: Rasa'il
Reel 20: Books 115-118
Book 115, ha 12: Rasa'il
Book 116, ha 13: Mujaz (in Arabic and Persian)
Book 117, ha 14: Sawa'iq al-burhan
Book 118, ha 15: Kitab al-tijarah, vol. 1
Reel 21: Books 119-128
Book 119, ha 16: Kitab al-tijarah, vol. 2
Book 120-121, ha 17-18: Kitab al-taharah, vols. 1-2
Book 122, ha 19: al-Adillah al-'aqliyah
Book 123, ha 20: Kitab al-taharah, vol. 3
Book 124, ha 21: Nur al-'uyun
Book 125, ha 22: Usul al-fiqh
Book 126, ha 23: Majma' al-fataw‡
Book 127, ha 24: Kashkul

** Vav: Writings of Abu al-Qasim Khan Kirmani **
Book 128, ha 25: Tanzih al-awliya
Reel 22: Books 129-137
Book 129, vav 2: Wadi al-Islam
Book 130, vav 3: Rasa'il
Book 131, vav 4: Rasa'il
Book 132, vav 5: Rasa'il
Book 133, vav 6: Rasa'il (Idah al-ishtibah and Shikayat'namah)
Book 134, vav 7: Rasa'il
Book 135, vav 8: Fihrist kutub Mashayikh, vol. 2
Book 136, vav 9: Rasa'il

** Za: Writings of 'Abd al-Riza Khan Ibrahimi **
Book 137, za 1: Rasa'il
Reel 23: Books 138-142
Book 138, za 2: Dar'ha-yi bihisht
Book 139, za 3: Rasa'il
Book 140, za 4: Rasa'il
Book 141, za 5: Rasa'il
Book 142, za 6: Rasa'il
Reel 24: Books 143-150

Book 143, za 7: Rasa'il
Book 144, za 8: Dusti-yi dustan
Book 145, za 9: Rasa'il
Book 146, za 10-12, 14-15: Rasa'il
Book 147, za 13: Risalah fi 'ilm usul al-fiqh
Book 148, za 16-17: Mustatrafat, vols. 1-2
Book 149, za 18-19: Kashkul
Book 150, za 20: Rasa'il

The following Shaykhi URLs have recently (re-)appeared on the Internet. [With thanks to Stephen Lambden.]

Kuwaiti Shaykhi site: http://www.alahsai.net/

Syrian -Damascus Shaykhi site: http://www.alawhad.net/

Persian Kirmānī Shaykhī site: http://www.alabrar.info/

The UCLA-Elmiyeh coll. includes Shaykhi vols

http://www.library.ucla.edu/libraries/url/colls/mideast/elmiyeh.htm

Published and nonpublished material

ᶜAbbas Effendi, ᶜAbd al-Bahāᵓ. *Makātīb-i ᶜAbd al-Bahāᵓ*. 3 vols. Cairo: Maṭbaᶜa Kurdistān al-ᶜIlmiyya, 1330 [1910-21].

ᶜAbbas Effendi, ᶜAbd al-Bahāᵓ. *Tadhkirat al-wafā' fī tarjumati hayāti qudamā'i 'l-ahibbā'* (trans. As Memorials of the Faithful). Haifa: 'Abbasiyya Press, 1342 [1924].

ᶜAbbas Effendi, ᶜAbd al-Bahāᵓ (as ᶜAbdu'l-Bahā. *Memorials of the Faithful*. Translated by Marzieh Gail. Wilmette, Ill.: Bahaᵓi Publishing Trust, 1971 (trans. of *Tadhkirat al-wafāᵓ*).

[ᶜAbbas Effendi, ᶜAbd al-Bahāᵓ]. *A Traveller's Narrative: Written to Illustrate the Episode of the Bab = Maqala-yi Shakhṣī Sayyāḥ*. Ed. and trans., with an introduction and explanatory notes by Edward G. Browne. 2 vols. Cambridge: The University Press, 1891. Facsimile reprint, Amsterdam,

Philo Press, 1975. Available online at: www.h-net.org/~bahai/diglib/books/A-E/B/browne/tn/hometn.htm.

ᶜAbd al-Bahāʾ/ᶜAbdu'l-Bahā, see ᶜAbbas Effendi, ᶜAbd al-Bahāʾ

Abū Faḍl Gulpāyagānī, *see* Gulpāyagānī, Mīrzā Abū 'l-Faḍl.

Ādamīyat, Farīdūn. *Amīr Kabīr va Irān*. 4th ed. Tehran: Intishārāt-i Khwārazmī, 1354 Sh/1975.

ᶜAḍud al-Dawla, Sulṭān Aḥmad Mīrzā. *Tārīkh-i ᶜAḍudī*. Edited by ᶜAbd al-Ḥusayn Navā'ī. Tehran: Intishārāt-i Bābak, 2535 Shsh/1976.

Afnan, Muḥammad. "'Marāḥil-i daᶜwat-i Ḥaḍrat-i Nuqṭa-yi Ūlā'". *Mutāliᶜa-yi Maᶜārif-i Bahāʾī* (Tehran) 10 (132 B./1976).

Afnan, Muhammad, Hatcher, William S. "'Western Islamic Scholarship and Baha'i Origins'." *Religion* (London) 15 (1985): 29-51.

Āghā Buzurg al-Tihrānī, Muḥammad Muḥsin: see under Ṭihrānī, Āghā Buzurg al-

Aḥmadi Kirmānī, Yaḥyā. *Farmāndihān-i Kirmān*. Edited by (Muḥammad Ibrāhīm) Bāstānī Pārīzī. Tehran, [s.n.], 1354 Sh [1976].

Aḥsāʾī, ᶜAbd Allāh al-. *Sharḥ-i ḥālāt-i Shaykh Aḥmad al-Aḥsāʾī*. Bombay: Ḥājī Muḥammad Ḥasan Ṣāḥib, 1309 [1892].

Aḥsāʾī, Aḥmad ibn Zayn al-Dīn al-. *Ḥayāt al-nafs*. Translated by Sayyid Kāẓim Rashtī. 2nd ed. Kirman: Maṭbaᶜat al-Saᶜādat, 1353 Sh [1974].

Aḥsāʾī, Aḥmad ibn Zayn al-Dīn al-. *Jawāmiᶜ al-kalim*. 2 vols. Tabriz: Muḥammad Taqī Nakhjavānī, 1273-76 [1856-60].

Aḥsāʾī, Aḥmad ibn Zayn al-Dīn al-. Untitled *Risāla*. In *Sīrat al-Shaykh Aḥmad al-Aḥsāʾī*, by Ḥusayn ᶜAlī Maḥfūẓ. Baghdad: Maṭbaᶜat al-Maᶜārif, 1376/1957.

Aḥsāʾī, Aḥmad ibn Zayn al-Dīn al-. *Jawāmiᶜ al-kalim* [collected writings], vol. 1, pt. 3, pp. 87-108. Tabriz: Muḥammad Taqī Nakhjavānī, 1273-76 [1856-60]. Parts available online at: www.hurqalya.pwp.blueyonder.co.uk/SHAYKHISM/JKYES-reprint1.htm

Aḥsāʾī, Aḥmad ibn Zayn al-Dīn al-. *Risāla dhū raʾsayn*. In *Jawāmiᶜ al-kalim*, vol. 1, pt. 3, pp. 87-108. Tabriz: Muḥammad Taqī Nakhjavānī, 1273-76 [1856-60].

Aḥsāʾī, Aḥmad ibn Zayn al-Dīn al-. *al-Risāla al-Baḥrāniyya*." In *Jawāmiᶜ al-kalim*, vol. 1, pt. 2, pp. 217-19. Tabriz: Muḥammad Taqī Nakhjavānī, 1273-76 [1856-60].

Aḥsāʾī, Aḥmad ibn Zayn al-Dīn. *al-Risāla al-khāqāniyya*. In *Jawāmiᶜ al-kalim*, vol. 1, pt. 1, pp. 120-29. Tabriz: Muḥammad Taqī Nakhjavānī, 1273-76 [1856-60].

Aḥsāʾī, Aḥmad ibn Zayn al-Dīn al-. *al-Risāla al-sulṭāniyya*. In *Jawāmiᶜ al-kalim*, vol. 2, pp. 245-9. Tabriz: Muḥammad Taqī Nakhjavānī, 1273-76 [1856-60].

Aḥsāʾī, Aḥmad ibn Zayn al-Dīn al-. *Sharḥ al-fawāʾid*. [Tehran?: Muḥammad Shafīq],1272 [1856].

Aḥsāʾī, Aḥmad ibn Zayn al-Dīn al-. *Sharḥ al-Mashāᶜir*. Tabriz : [s.n.], 1278 [1861].

Aḥsāʾī, Aḥmad ibn Zayn al-Dīn al-. *Sharḥ al-risāla al-ᶜIlmiyya*. In *Jawāmiᶜ al-kalim*, vol. 1, pt. 2, pp. 166-200. Tabriz: Muḥammad Taqī Nakhjavānī, 1273-76 [1856-60].

Aḥsāʾī, Aḥmad ibn Zayn al-Dīn al-. *Sharḥ al-ziyāra al-jāmiᶜa al-kabīra*. Tehran, 1267 [1850].

Aḥsāʾī, Aḥmad ibn Zayn al-Dīn al-. *Sharḥ al-ᶜArshiyya.* Tabriz: [s.n.], 1278 [1861].

Aḥsāʾī, Aḥmad ibn Zayn al-Dīn al-. "Sirāt al-yaqīn." In *Jawāmi ʿ al-kalim*, vol. 1, pt. 3, pp. 1-84. Tabriz: Muḥammad Taqī Nakhjavānī, 1273-76 [1856-60].

Aḥsāʾī, Aḥmad ibn Zayn al-Dīn al-. *Maʿrifat Kayfiyyat al-Suluk ila Allah*. (Beirut: Dar al-ʿAlamiyyah, 1993). Selected and reprinted from a 19th century Iranian lithograph. Digitally reprinted, East Lansing, Mi.: H-Bahai, 2003, at: www.h-net.org/~bahai/areprint/ahsai/suluk/suluk.htm.

Aḥsāʾī, Aḥmad ibn Zayn al-Dīn al-. *Rasa'il al-Hikmah*. (Beirut: Dar al-`Alamiyyah, 1993). Selected and reprinted from a 19th century Iranian lithograph. Digitally reproduced and corrected, East Lansing, Mi.: H-Bahai, 2001, at: www.h-net.org/~bahai/areprint/ahsai/hikma/hikma.htm.

Aḥsāʾī, Aḥmad ibn Zayn al-Dīn al-. *Risalah fi Jawab Masa'il Fath `Ali Khan Zand*. In *Jawami` al-Kalim*, 2 vols. (Tabriz: Muhammad Taqi Nakhjavani, 1273-1276), vol. 2, pp. 92-100. East Lansing, Mi.: H-Bahai, 2002, at: www.h-net.org/~bahai/areprint/ahsai/jawami/fathali.htm

Aʾīn-i Bāb. [Iran]: [Privately published by the Azali Babis], n.d.

Āl Kāshif al-Ghiṭāʾ, Muḥammad al-Ḥusayn. *Aṣl al-Shīʿa wa uṣūluhā.* 9th ed. Najaf: Manshūra al-Maktaba al-Haydariyya wa Maṭbaʿatihā, 1962. Trans as *The Origin of Shi'ite Islam and Its Principles*. Qum: Ansariyan Publications, 1982.

Āl Maḥbūba, Shaykh Jaʿfar Bāqir. *Māḍī al-Najaf wa hāḍiruhā*. 2nd ed., 3 vols. Najaf: Maṭbaʿat al-Ādāb, 1955-58.

Algar, Hamid. "The Oppositional Role of the Ulama in Twentieth-Century Iran." In *Scholars, Saints and Ṣūfīs: Muslim Religious Institutions in the Middle East since 1500*, ed. Nikki R. Keddie. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972.

Algar, Hamid. *Religion and State in Iran 1785-1906: The Role of the Ulama in the Qajar Period.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969.

Ālūsī, Abū 'l-Thanāʾ Maḥmūd. *Rūḥ al-maʿānī fī tafsīr al-Qurʾān al-ʿaẓim wa 'l-sabʿ al-mathānī.* Bulaq, Egypt: [s. n.], 1301-10 [1883-92]; 2nd. ed. Cairo 1363/1964—?

Amanat, Abbas. *Resurection and Renewal: The Making of the Babi Movement in Iran, 1844-1850.* Ithaca; London: Cornell University Press, 1989.

Amanat, Abbas. "The Early Years of the Babi Movement: Background and Development." D. Phil., Oxford, 1981, vi, 472 pp.

ʿĀmilī, Shaykh Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan al-Hurr al-. *Amal al-Āmil*. 2 vols. Baghdad: Makṭabat al-Andalūs, 1965-66.

ʿĀmilī, Shaykh Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan al-Hurr al-. *Waṣāʾil al Shīʿa ilā taḥsīl masāʾil al-sharīʿa*. 5th ed., 20 vols. Beirut: Dār Iḥyāʾ al-Turāth al-ʿArabī, 1983.

ʿĀmilī, Sayyid Muḥsin al-Ḥusaynī al-Amīn al-. *Aʿyān al-Shīʿa*. 37 vols. Beirut: Maṭbaʿat al-Inṣāf, 1950-61.

Amīn, Sayyid Muhsin al- *see*: ʿĀmilī, Sayyid Muḥsin al-Ḥusaynī al-Amīn al-.

Amoretti, B. S. *see* Scarcia Amoretti, Biancarmia

Andreas, Friedrich Carl. *Die Babis in Persien*. Leipzig: Verlag der Akademischen Buchhandlung (W. Taber), 1896. With Goeje, M[ichael] J[an] de. *De Babis*, Amsterdam (?), 1893, 20 pp. Reprinted from *De Gids* 10, 1893.

Anṣārī, Murtaḍā al-. *Zindigānī va shakhṣiyyat-i Shaykh Anṣārī*. Tehran: Chapkhāna-yi Ittiḥād, [1960].

Arakelian, H. "'Le Babisme en Perse'." *Actes du 1er Congrès international d'histoire des religions* 2ème partie (fasc. 1 1900): 93-104. Also in: *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions* (Paris) 43 (1901): 333-344.

Arbāb, Furūgh. *Akhtarān-i tābān*. Vol. 1. Tehran: Muʾassas-yi Millī-yi Maṭbūᶜāt-i Amrī, 128 B.[1972].

Arjomand, Said Amir. *The Shadow of God and the Hidden Imam: Religion, Political Order and Societal Change in Shiᶜite Iran from the Beginning to 1890* (Publications of the Center for Middle Eastern Studies), Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984.

Arsharuni, A. M. *Babizm: istoricheskii ocherk*. Moscow, OGIZ Moskovskii rabochii, 1931, 78 pp.

Aryanpūr, Yaḥyā. *Az Sabā tā Nīmā*. 4th ed. 2 vols. Tehran [s.n.], 2535 Sh [1976].

Astarābādī, Mullā Muḥammad Jaᶜfar. *Ḥayāt al-arwāḥ*. [s.l.: s.n.], 1240 [1824].

Astarābādī, Muḥammad Amīn ibn Muḥammad Sharif. *al-Fawaʾiḍ al-madaniyya fi al-raddi ᶜalā man qāla bi 'l-ijtihād.* Tabriz: Maṭbaᶜa-i Mashha, 1321 [1904].

Avery, Peter. *Modern Iran*. London: E. Benn, 1965.

Āyatī, ᶜAbd al-Ḥusayn Āvāra. *Al-kawākib al-durriyya fī maʾāthir al-Bahāʾiyya*. Cairo: Maṭbaᶜa al-Saᶜāda, 1342 [1924]. Available online at: www.h-net.org/~bahai/areprint/vol4/kd/kd.htm

ᶜAzzāwī, ᶜAbbās. *Taʾrīkh al-ᶜIrāq bayna iḥtilālayn*. 8 vols. Baghdad: Maṭbaᶜa Baghdad, 1353-76 [1935-56].

Bāb, see under Shīrāzī, Sayyid ᶜAlī Muḥammad, the Bāb.

Bābūya, Ibn *see* Ibn Bābāwayhi al-Qummī, Muḥammad ᶜAlī

Baghdādī, Muḥammad Mustafā al-. *Risāla amriyya*. With *al-Risāla al-tisᶜ ᶜashrata*, by Mirza Aḥmad Sohrab. Cairo: Maṭbaᶜat al-Saᶜāda, 1338 [1919], pp. 102-28. Digitally reprinted, Lansing, Mi.: H-Bahai, 1998. Available at: /~bahai/areprint/vol2/baghdadi/risalah19.htm

Baghdadi, Ismāᶜīl Pāshā al-. *Hadiyyat al-ᶜārifīn, asmāᵓ al-muᵓallifīn wa-āthār al-muṣannifīn*. 2 vols. Istanbul: Wikālat al-Maᶜārif, 1951-55.

Baghdadi, Ismāᶜīl Pāshā al-. *Kitāb iḍāḥ al-maknūn fī ’l-dhayl ᶜalā Kashf al-ẓunūn*. 2 vols. in 1. Istanbul: Wikālat al-Maᶜārif, 1945-47.

Bagley, F. R. C. “Religion and State in Modern Iran.” *Islamic Studies* (Islamabad) vol. 10, (1971), pp. 1-22.

Bahāᵓ Allāh/Bahā’u’llāh, *see* Nūrī, Mīrzā Ḥusayn ᶜAli.

Baḥrānī, Shaykh Yūsuf al-. *Luᵓluᵓatayi ’l-Baḥrayn*. Bombay: [s.n., n.d.].

Baḥthī dar radd-i yād-dāshthā-yi majhūl muntaṣib-bi kīnyāz-i Dālgorūkī [Dolgorukov]. 2nd. ed., [Tehran]: Baha'i Publishing Committee, 129 B./1972-73.

Bāmdād, Mahdī. *Sharḥ-i ḥāl-i rijāl-i Īrān dar qarn-i 12, 13, 14 Hijrī*. 6 vols. Tehran: Kitābfurūshī-i Zuvvār, 1347-53 Sh. [1968-1974].

Balyuzi, H. M. *The Bab: The Herald of the Day of Days*. Oxford: George Ronald, 1973.

Balyuzi, H.M. *Khadijih Bagum: The Wife of the Bāb*. Oxford: George Ronald, 1981.
Balyuzi, H. M. *Edward Granville Browne and the Baha’i Faith*. London: George Ronald, 1970.

Baraghānī, Mullā Muḥammad Taqī. *Majālis al-muttaqīn*. Tehran : [s.n.], 1280 [1863].

Barbier de Maynard. “Review of Gobineau, *Les Religions et les philosophies* (item x), 3rd. ed.” *Journal Asiatique* (Paris) 14 (9e`me serie 1899): 568-71.

Barbier de Meynard. “Review of Browne, *A Traveller's Narrative*.” *Journal Asiatique* (Paris) 20 (8e`me serie 1892): 297-302.

Bārfurūshī, Mullā ᶜAlī Muḥammad (Quddūs), “Collected writings”, available online at www.bayanic.com/ (under Sacred Writings).

Bāstānī Pārīzī, Muḥammad Ibrāhīm. *Vādī-yi haft vād*. Vol. 1. Tehran: Anjuman-i Anṣār-I Milli, 2535 Shsh [1976].

Batyushkov, Georgy. *Babidy: Persidskaya Sekta*. St. Petersburg, 1897. Available online at: www.h-net.org/~bahai/diglib/books/A-E/B/Batyushkov/batyush.htm.

Bausani, Alessandro. "Ḥurūfiyya." In *Encyclopedia of Islam*. 2nd ed. London: Luzac; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1960, vol. 3, p. 600.

Bausani, Alessandro. *Persia religiosa: da Zaratustra a Bahā'u'llāh.* Milan: Il saggiatore, 1959; trans. as *Religion in Iran: From Zoroaster to Baha'ullah*. Translated by J. M. Marchesi. New York: Bibliotheca Persica Press, 2000.

Bayat, Mangol. *Mysticism and Dissent: Socioreligious Thought in Qajar Iran*. Syracuse, New York. Syracuse University Press, 1982.

Bayḍāʾī, Niᶜmat Allāh Dhukāʾī. *Tādhkira-yi shuᶜarā- yi qarn-i avval-i Bahāʾī*. 4 vols. Tehran: Muʾassasa-yi Millī-yi Maṭbūᶜāt-i Amrī, 121-26 B. [1965-70].

Berger, Peter L. "From Sect to Church: A Sociological Interpretation of the Baha'i Movement." Ph.D. diss., New School for Social Research (New York City), 1954.

Berger, Peter L. "Motif messianique et processus social dans le Bahaisme." *Archives de Sociologie des Religions* (Paris) vol. 4 (1957), pp. 93-107.

Bernasovskii. *Babizm: Istoriia Vozniknoveniia*. Tiflis, 1909.

Bill, James A. *The Politics of Iran*. Columbus, Ohio: Merrill, 1972.

Binder, Leonard. "The Proofs of Islam: Religion and Politics in Iran." In *Arabic and Islamic Studies in Honor of Hamilton A. R. Gibb,* edited by George Makdisi. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1965.

Bi-yād-i ṣadumīn sāl-i shahādat-i nābigha-yi dawrān Qurrat al-ᶜAyn. [Tehran: s.n.], 1368 [1949].

Bouvat, L. "Review of Nicolas' translation of *Le Beyan persan*, vols. 2-4". *Revue du Monde Musulman* (Paris) 27 (1914): 439-441.

Braun, Helmut. "Iran under the Safavids and in the 18th Century." In *The Muslim World: A Historical Survey*, part 3, *The Last Great Muslim Empires*, by Bertold Spuler. Translated by F.R.C. Bagley. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1969.

Brockelmann, Carl. *Geschichte der Arabischen Litteratur*. 2. den Aufl. 5 vols. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1937-43.

Browne, Edward Granville. "Bab, Babis." In *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, ed. James Hastings. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1909, vol. 2, pp. 299-308.

Browne, Edward Granville. "Babis of Persia. I. Sketch of Their History and Personal Experiences among Them." *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (London), vol. 21 (1889), pp. 485-526.

Browne, Edward Granville. "Babis of Persia. II. Their Literature and Doctrines." *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (London) vol. 21 (1889), pp. 881-1009.

Browne, E.G. "Babiism". In *Religious Systems of the World*, pp.333-53. 2nd. ed. ed., Vol. London: 1892. Reprinted in several later eds.; also photomechanic reprint with editorial footnotes in Momen, *Selections from the Writings of E.G. Browne on the Babi and Baha'i Religions*.

Browne, E.G. "Bab, Babis". In *Hastings Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, pp.299-308. 2. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1909.

Browne, Edward Granville. "A Catalogue and Description of 27 Babi Manuscripts." *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (London) vol. 24 (1892), pp. 433-99, 637-710.

Browne, Edward Granville. *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Oriental MSS. Belonging to the Late E. G. Browne*. Edited by R. A. Nicholson. Cambridge:

University Press, 1932. Selected pages available online at: www.h-net.org/~bahai/diglib/books/A-E/B/browne/cat/Cat.htm.

Browne, Edward Granville. "The First Examination of the Bab at Tabriz." In idem (ed.) *A Traveller's Narrative Written to Illustrate the Episode of the Bab*, Cambridge: The University Press, 1891, vol. 2, pp. 277-90.

Browne, Edward Granville. "Further Notes on the Literature of the Ḥurūfīs and Their Connection with the Bektashi Order of Dervishes." *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (London) vol. 39 (1907), pp. 533-81.

Browne, Edward Granville. *Literary History of Persia*. 4 vols. London: T. F. Unwin, vols. 1-2, 1902-04; Cambridge: The University Press, vols. 3-4, 1920-24.

Browne, Edward Granville. *Materials for the Study of the Babi Religion*. Cambridge: The University Press, 1918. Sections available online at: www.h-net.org/~bahai/diglib/books/A-E/B/browne/material/msbrtoc.htm.

Browne, Edward Granville. "Some Notes on the Literature and Doctrines of the Ḥurūfī Sect." *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (London) vol. 30 (1898), pp. 61-89.

Browne, Edward Granville. "Some Remarks on the Babi Texts Edited by Baron Victor Rosen in Vols. I and VI of the *Collections Scientifiques de l'Institut des Langues Orientales de Saint Petersbourg*." *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (London), vol. 24 (1892), pp. 259-332.

Browne, Edward Granville. *A Year Among the Persians*. 3rd ed. London: A. and C. Black, 1950; new ed. With introduction by Denis MacEoin London, Century, 1984. Available online at: www.h-net.org/~bahai/diglib/books/A-E/B/browne/year/yeartoc.htm.

Browne, E. G. *Selections from the Writings of E. G. Browne on the Babi and Baha'i Religions*. Edited by Moojan Momen. Oxford, George Ronald, 1987

Browne, Edward Granville. See also: [ʿAbbas Effendi, ʿAbd al-Bahāʾ]. *A Traveller's Narrative*; Hamadānī, Mīrzā Ḥusayn. *The New History.*

Bukhārī, Muḥammad ibn Ismāᶜīl al-. *Ṣaḥīh al-Bukhārī*. 9 vols. in 2. Cairo: al-Maṭbaᶜa al-Amīriyya, 1314 [1896]. Arabic text available online at: http://hadith.al-islam.com/Display/Hier.asp?Doc=0&n=0; English translation with Arabic text, M.M. Khan, Apex Books Concern, 1980; this translation also available online at: http://islam.about.com/gi/dynamic/offsite.htm?zi=1/XJ&sdn=islam&zu=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.usc.edu%2Fdept%2FMSA%2Freference%2Fsearchhadith.html
Bush, Richard C. "Review of *Selections from the Writings of the Bab*." *New York Review of Books and Religion* (New York) 2 (9 May 1978).

Busse, Heribert. "Iran under the Būyids." In *The Cambridge History of Iran*, vol. 4, *The Period from the Arab Invasion to the Seljuqs*, edited by R. N. Frye. London: Cambridge University Press, 1975.

Cadwalader, Robert. "'Persia:' An Early Mention of the Bab". *World Order* (Wilmette, Ill.) 11 (2 1976/77): pp.30-34.

The Cambridge History of Iran, vol. 4, *The Period from the Arab Invasion to the Seljuqs*. Edited by R. N. Frye. London: Cambridge University Press, 1975.

Chardin, John, Sir. *Travels in Persia*. London: Argonaut Press, 1927.
Chahārdihī, Murtaḍā Mudarrisī, see Mudarrisī Chahārdihī, Murtaḍa.

Chardin, John, Sir. *Voyages du chevalier Chardin, en Perse, et autres lieux de l'Orient*. 3 vols. Amsterdam: chez Jean Louis de Lorne, 1711.

Cohn, Norman. *The Pursuit of the Millennium: Revolutionary Millenarians and Mystical Anarchists in the Middle Ages*. Rev. ed. London: Maurice Temple Smith, 1970.

Cole, Juan, "Nuqtat al-Kaf and the Babi Chronicle Traditions", *Research in Shaykhi, Babi and Baha'I Studies*, 2:6 (August 1998), http://www.h-net.org/~bahai/notes/vol2/babihist.htm.

Cole, Juan. "Shaykh Aḥmad al-Aḥsāᵓī on the Sources of Religious Authority", paper delivered at the Center for Iranian Studies, Columbia

University, October 1993. Available at: http://www-personal.umich.edu/~jrcole/ahsai1.htm

Cole, Juan. “The World as Text: Cosmologies of Shaykh Aḥmad al-Aḥsāʾī”, *Studia Islamica* 80 (1994): 1-23. Available at: http://www-personal.umich.edu/~jrcole/ahsai2.htm

Cole, Juan. "Individualism and the Spiritual Path in Shaykh Aḥmad al-Aḥsāʾī" *Occasional Papers in Shaykhi, Babi and Baha'i Studies* no. 4 (September, 1997).

Cole, Juan Ricardo. "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* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2001).

Cole, Juan. (September 1997). “Individualism and the Spiritual Path in Shaykh Ahmad al-Ahsaʾi”. *H-Net (H-Baha'i), Occasional Papers in Shaykhi, Babi and Baha'i Studies*.

Cole, Juan (ed.). “Shaykh Aḥmad al-Aḥsāʾī *Collected Works: al-Aʿmal al-Kamilah*”. At: www.h-net.org/~bahai/areprint/ahsai/ahsai.htm.

Corbin, Henry. “L’École Shaykhie en Théologie Shî’ite’.” *Annuaire—École Pratique des Hautes Études, Section—Sciences Religieuses* (Paris) (1960-1), pp. 1-59.

Corbin, Henry. *En Islam iranien*. 4 vols. Paris: Gallimard, 1971-2.

Corbin, Henry. *Histoire de la philosophie islamique*. Paris: Gallimard, 1964. English translation by Liadain Sherard, with the assistance of Philip Sherard, *History of Islamic Philosophy*. London: Kegan Paul International, 1993.

Corbin, Henry. *Maktab-i* Shaykhi *az hikmat-i ilāhī* Shī*’aī*. Translated by Farīdūn Bahmanyār. Tehran: Dānishgāh-i Taḥqīqāt-i ʿĀliyya (Surbun), 1346 [1967].

Corbin, Henry, ed. *Spiritual Body and Celestial Earth: From Mazdean Iran to Shīʿite Iran.* Translated by Nancy Pearson. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1989.

Corbin, Henry. *Terre céleste et corps de résurrection de l'Iran mazdéen à l'Iran shî'ite*. Paris : Buchet/Chastel, 1960.

Curzon, George Nathaniel. *Persia and the Persian Question*. 2 vols. London: Longmans, Green, 1892.

Davānī, ᶜAlī. *Ustād-i kull Āqā Muḥammad Bāqir ibn Muḥammad Akmal maᶜrūf bi Wahīd-i Bīhbihānī*. Qum: Dār al-ᶜIlm, [1337/1958].

Dawlatābādī, Yaḥyā. *Tārīkh-i muᶜāṣir: yā ḥayāt-i Yaḥyā*. 4 vols. Tehran: Ibn Sīnā, 1328-1336 [1949-1957].

"'Die Babis in Persien' [Review of Gobineau, *Religions et philosophies*]" *Allgemeine Zeitung* (Tubingen) (March 1866):

Dihkhudā, ᶜAlī Akbar. *Lughatnāma*. 32 vols. in 51. Tehran: Chāpkhāna-yi Majlis, 1325-52 [1947-74].

Dolgorukov, Dimitri Ivanovich. "Excerpts from Dispatches written during 1848-1852 by Prince Dolgorukov, Russian Minister to Persia". *World Order* (Wilmette, Ill.) 1 (1 1966): pp.17-24.

Donaldson, Dwight M. *The Shi'ite Religion: A History of Islam in Persia and Irak*. London: Luzac, 1933.

Dorn, Bernard. "Die vordem Chanykov'sche, jetzt der Kaiserl. öffentlichen Bibliothek zugehorige Sammlung von morgenlandischen Handschriften". *Bull. Acad. Imp. Sc. St. Pet.* (St Petersburg) 8 (1865): pp.245-91. [Includes an account of a Babi text brought to Russia in 1864 by N.V. Khanykov, Russian Consul in Tabriz.] Also published in *Melanges Asiatiques*, Vol.5, St. Petersburg, 1864-68, pp.221-313; printed separately as *Die Sammlung von Morgenländischen Handschriften welche die Kaiserliche Öffentlichen Bibliothek zu St Petersburg im Jahre 1864 von Hrn. V. Chanykov erworben hat*, St. Petersburg, 1865.

Dorn, Bernard. "Nachtrage zu dem Verzeichniss der von der Kaiserlichen öffentlichen Bibliothek erworbenen Chanykov'schen Handschriften und den da mitgetheilten Nachrichten über die Baby und deren Koran". *Bull. Acad.*

Imp. Sc. St Pet. 9 (1865): pp.202-3. [The second of two articles read by Dorn to the Historico-Philological Section of the Russian Academy of Sciences in 1865. This deals with a manuscript dialect history of the Babi uprising in Mazandaran, obtained by Dorn while travelling in that region in 1860.] Also published in *Melanges Asiatiques*, Vol.5, St Petersburg, 1864-68, pp.377-419; printed separately as *Morgenländische Handschriften der Kaiserlichen Öffentlichen Bibliothek zu St Petersburg: Nachtrage zu dem Verzeichniss der im Jahre 1864 erworben Chanykov'schen Sammlung*, St Petersburg, 1865

Eliash, Joseph. "The Ithnā'asharī-Shiᶜi Juristic Theory of Political and Legal Authority." *Studia Islamica* (Paris) vol. 29 (1969), pp. 17-30.

Elwell-Sutton, L. P. "Review of H. M. Balyuzi, *The Bab*." *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 1 (1975): 67.

Encyclopaedia of Islām. 4 vols. in 6. [1st ed.] London: Luzac; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1908-1936.

Encyclopaedia of Islam. New ed., 11 vols. + London: Luzac; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1960-.

Esposito, John (ed.). *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Islam in the Modern World* 4 vols., New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995

Ethé, Hermann. "Ein moderner Prophet des Morgenlandes." In *Essays und Studien*. Berlin: F. Nicolai, 1872.

Ethe, Herman. "Review of Browne, *A Traveller's Narrative*." *Deutsche Literaturzeitung* (Berlin) 13 (30 July 1892): 1014-15.

Farmayan, Hafez F. "Observations on Sources for the Study of Nineteenth- and Twentieth-Century Iranian History" *International Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* (Cambridge) vol. 5 (1974), pp. 32-49.

Fasāʾī, Ḥasan ibn Ḥasan. *History of Persia under Qajar Rule*. Translated by Heribert Busse. New York: Columbia University Press, 1972.

Fasāʾī, Ḥasan ibn Ḥasan. *Fārsnāmah-i Nāṣirī*. 3 vols. in 1. [Tehran]: Intishārāt-i Kitābkhāna-yi Nisāʾī, 1312-14 [1895-97].

Fayḍī, Muḥammad ʿAlī. *Haḍrat-i Nuqṭa-yi Ūlā*. Tehran: [s.n.], 1352 Sh [1973].

Fayḍī, Muḥammad ʿAlī. *Khāndān-i Afnān ṣadra-yi Raḥmān*. Tehran: Muʾassasa-yi Millī-yi Maṭbūʿāt-i Amrī, 127 B. [1971].

Fayḍī, Muḥammad ʿAlī. *Nayrīz-i mushkbīz*. Tehran: Muʾassasa-yi Millī-yi Maṭbūʿāt-i Amrī, 129 B. [1972].

Fernea, Robert A. and Elizabeth Fernea. "Variations in Religious Observance among Islamic Women." In *Scholars, Saints and Ṣūfīs: Muslim Religious Institutions in the Middle East since 1500*, edited by Nikki R. Keddie. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972.

Festinger, Leo. *When prophecy fails: A social and psychological study of a modern group that predicted the destruction of the world*, New York: Harper & Row, 1964.

Franck, Adolphe. "Review of Gobineau, *Les Religions et les philosophies* 1st. ed." *Journal des Savants* (Paris) (1865): 665-81, 767-87. Reissued as "Une Nouvelle Religion en Perse" in the author's *Philosophie et Religion*, Paris, 1867, pp. 281-340.

Fraser, James Baille. *An Historical and Descriptive Account of Persia, from the Earliest Ages to the Present Time.* Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1834.

Fuad, Ahmad Nur Subaya, *The Babi Movement in Iran: From Religious Dissent to Political Revolt, 1844 – 1853*, M.A. Dissertation, McGill University, n.d.

Gawhar, Mullā Ḥasan: *see* Qarāchadāghī, Mullā Muḥammad Ḥasan.

Gellner, Ernest. "Concepts and Society." In *Rationality*. Edited by Bryan R. Wilson. New York: Oxford University Press, 1977.

Gobineau, Arthur, comte de. *Religions et philosophies dans l'Asie Centrale*. 1st. ed. Paris: Didier & Cie [Perrin?], 1865. 2nd. ed., Paris, Didier & Cie [Perrin?], 1866; 3rd. ed., ed. Ludwig. Schemann, Paris, Editions Ernest Leroux, 1900; reprinted, Paris, Cres & Cie, 1923, 1928; reprinted, Paris, Librairie Gallimard, 1933, 1957; new ed. as vol. 2 of *Oeuvres*, Paris, Gallimard, Bibliothe`que de la Pleiade, 1983, texte presente par Jean Gaulmier, etabli et annote par Jean Gaulmier et Vincent Monteil; reissued Paris, 1988, Editions du Trident ed., 10th ed. Paris: Gallimard, 1957.

Goeje, M[ichael] J[an] de. *De Babis*, Amsterdam (?), 1893, 20 pp. Reprinted from *De Gids* 10, 1893. With Andreas, Friedrich Carl. *Die Babis in Persien*. Leipzig: Verlag der Akademischen Buchhandlung (W. Taber), 1896.

Goldsmid, F. J. "Review of Hamadani, *The Tarikh-i-Jadid* [Trans. and ed. E. G. Browne." *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (1894): 640-46.

Goldziher, Ignaz. "Verhaltnis des Bab zu früheren Sufi-Lehren" *Der Islam* (Berlin) Vol.11 (pp.252-54 1921).

Grohmann, Adolf. "Yām." In *Encyclopaedia of Islam*. London: Luzac; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1908-1936.

Gulpāyagānī, Abū 'l-Faḍl. *Kashf al-ghiṭāʾ ʿan ḥiyal al-aʿdāʾ*. Ashkhabad: [s. n.], 1334 [1916].

Gulpāyagānī, Abū 'l-Faḍl. *Kitāb al-farāʾid*. Cairo: Maṭbaʿa Hindiyya, 1315 [1897].

Gulpāyagānī, Abū 'l-Faḍl. "al-Bāb wa 'l-Bābiyya". *al-Muqṭataf* 20 (7 1 July 1896).

Gurūh-i Badr *see* Shīrāz University. Gurūh-i Badr.

Ḥabībābādī, Muḥammad ʿAlī Muʿallim. *Makārim al-āthār dar aḥwāl-i rijāl-i dawrah-yi Qājār*. 5 vols. in 4. Isfahan: Kamāl, [1978?].

Hāʾirī, ʿAbd al-Hādī. *Shi'ism and Constitutionalism in Iran: A Study of the Role Played by the Persian Residents of Iraq in Iranian Politics*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1977.

Ḥalabī, ᶜAlī Aṣghar. *Tārikh-i falāsifa-yī Īrān az āghāz-i Islām tā imrūz.* Tehran: Kitābfurūshī-yi Zavvār, 1972.

Hallaq, Wael B. "On the Origins of the Controversy about the Existence of Mujtahids and the Gate of Ijtihad", *Studia Islamica* 63 (1986): 129-141.

Hallaq, Wael B. "Was the Gate of Ijtihad Closed?", *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 16 (1984): 3-41.

Hallaq, Wael B. "Ijtihād", in Esposito (ed.), *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Islam in the Modern World* 4 vols., New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995, vol. 2, pp. 178-81

Hamadānī, Mīrzā Ḥusayn. *Tārīkh-i jadīd*. Manuscript in CUL E. G. Browne Collection. Facsimile available online at: www.h-net.msu.edu/~bahai/arabic/vol2/jadid/jadid.htm

Hamadānī, Mīrzā Ḥusayn. *The New History (Tārīkh-i-Jadīd) of Mīrzā ᶜAlī Muḥammed the Bāb by Mīrzā Ḥuseyn of Hamadān.* Translated and edited by Edward Granville Browne. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1893. Facsimile reprint, Amsterdam, Philo Press, 1975. Available online at: www.h-net.org/~bahai/diglib/books/K-O/M/MirzaHuseyn/TarikhiJadid.htm.

Hamadānī, Muḥammad Bāqir ibn Muḥammad Ja'far. *Al-naᶜl al-ḥāḍira*. In *Kitāb al-Ijtināb*. [s.l.: s.n.], 1308 [1890].

Hamadānī, Hāj Muḥammad Bāqir. *Kitāb al-Ijtināb*. [s.l.: s.n.], 1308 [1890].

Hamadānī, Rashīd al-Dīn Faḍl Allāh. *Jāmiᶜ al-tawārikh: qiṣmat-i Ismāᶜīlīyān va Fāṭimīyān va Nizārīyān va Duᶜāyān va Rāfiqān* ed. Muḥammad Taqī Dānish-pizhū, Muḥammad Mudarrisī Zanjānī (Tehran: Bungāh-i Tarjuma va Nashr-i Kitāb, 1338 [1959])

Hamid, Idris Samawi "The Metaphysics and Cosmology of Process According to Shaykh Ahmad al-Ahsa'i," (Ph.D. dissertation: State University of New York at Buffalo, 1998)

Ḥasanī, ᶜAbd al-Razzāq. *Al-Bābīyūn wa 'l-Bahāᵓīyūn*. 2nd ed. Sidon: Maṭbaᶜat al-ᶜIrfān, 1962.

Hāshimī Kirmānī, Sayyid Muḥammad. "Ṭāᵓifa-yi Shaykhiyya." *Majalla-yi mardumshināsī* (Tehran) vol. 2 (1337 Sh [1958]), pp. 240-55.

Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich. *Lectures on the Philosophy of World History*. Translated by H. B. Nisbet. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975.

Hidāyat, Riḍā Qulī Khān. *Tārīkh-i Rawḍāt al-ṣafā-yi Nāṣirī*. Vols. 8-10, *Tārīkh-i Rawḍāt al-ṣafā*, by Muḥammad ibn Khvāndshāh Mīr Khvānd. [Tehran?]: Markaz-i Khayyām Pīrūz, [1959-60?].

Ḥillī, Abū 'l-Qāsim Najm al-Dīn Jaᶜfar al-Muḥaqqiq al-. *Al-Mukhtaṣar al-nāfiᶜ fī fiqh al-Imāmiyya*. Tehran: [s.n.], 1387 [1967].

Ḥillī, al-Ḥasan bin Yūsuf ibn al-Muṭṭahar, al-. *Tabṣirat al-muta'allimīn fī ahkām al-dīn*. Beirut: Muᵓassasat al-Aᶜlamī, 1984.

Himmat, Mahmūd. *Tārīkh-i mufaṣṣal-i Kirmān*. 3rd ed. Kirman: Furūshgāh-i Himmat, 1350 [1971].

Hodgson, Marshall G. S. *The Order of Assassins: The Struggle of the Early Nizari Isma'ilis Against the Islamic World*. The Hague: Mouton, 1955.

Hollister, John Norman. *The Shi'a of India*. London: Luzac, 1953.

"'How They Punish Treason in Persia'." *The Times* (London) (13 October 1852b): 4, col. 4. [An account of the executions of two Babis, Ḥājī Sulaymān Khān Tabrīzī and Qurrat al-ᶜAyn, following the attempt on the life of Nāṣir al-Dīn Shāh in 1852.] Reprinted: *Allen's Indian Mail* (London), 16 October 1852, p. 588; *New York Times*, 28 October 1852, p. 6; *Southern Cross* (Auckland, New Zealand), 22 February 1853, p. 3; Momen, *The Babi and Baha'i Religions*, p. 132.

Huart, Clément. *La Religion du Bab, réformateur persan du XIXe siècle*. Paris : Ernest Leroux, 1889.

Huart, Clement. “Review of Nicolas’ translation of *Le Beyan arabe*." *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions* (Paris) 53 (1906): 384-92.

Huart, Clement. “Review of Nicolas’ translation of *Le Beyan persan*, vol. 1”. *Journal Asiatique* (Paris) 2 (11ème serie 1913): 697-99.

Huart, Clement. “Reviews of Nicolas, *Seyyèd Ali Mohammed dit le Bâb* and Nicolas’ translation of *Le Beyan arabe*”. *Revue de l’Histoire des Religions* 53 (1906): 384-92.

Huart, Clement. “Review of Nicolas’ translation of *Le Beyan persan*, vols. 2-4”. *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions* (Paris) 71 (1915): 275-277.

Huart, Clement. “‘Notes sur trois ouvrages Babis’.” *Journal Asiatique* (Paris) 10 (8e`me serie 1887): 133-44.

Huart, Clement. “*Babis”.* In *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 1st ed. Edited by. T. W. Arnold et al. Vol. I. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1913-38. Also in French ed., Paris, A. Picard, C. Klincksieck, 1913-38 ed.

Huart, Clement. “Review of Edward G. Browne. *Materials for the Study of the Babi Religion*”. *Journal Asiatique* (Paris) 12 (11ème serie 1918): 465-68.

Huart, Clement. “La Religion du Bab”. *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions* (Paris) 18 (1888): 279-96.

Huart, Clement. “Le Babisme et le Behaisme—Edward G. Browne, *Materials for the Study of the Babi Religion*”. *Journal des Savants* (Paris) (1918): 312-20.

Ḥurr al-ᶜĀmilī, Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan al-: see under al-ᶜĀmilī.

Ḥusaynī, Haydar ibn Ibrāhīm ibn Muḥammad al-. *Al-bāriqa al-Haydariyya fī naqḍ mā abramathu ’l-Kashfiyya*. CUL Browne Or. MS Y.12.

Ibn Bābāwayh al-Qummī, Muḥammad ᶜAlī: *see* Qummī, Muḥammad ᶜAlī ibn Bābawayh al-.

Ibn al-Karbalāᵓī, al-Qatīl. *Risāla*. In *Tārikh-i ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq* by Mīrza Asad Allāh Fāḍil-i Māzandarānī, vol. 3, pp. 502-32. Tehran: [s. n.], 1944.

Iqbāl, ᶜAbbās. "Ḥujjat al-Islām Ḥājj Sayyid Muḥammad Bāqir Shaftī." *Yādgār* (Tehran) vol. 5, no. 10 (1327 Sh [1948]), pp. 28-42.

Iqbāl, ᶜAbbās. *Khāndān-i Nawbakhtī*. 2nd ed. Tehran: Kitabkhāna-i Ṭāhurī, 1966.

Iṣbihānī, Mīrzā Muḥammad Bāqir al-Mūsawī, al- *see* Khwānsārī, Muḥammad Bāqir

Ishrāq Khāvarī, ᶜAbd al-Ḥamīd. *Muḥāḍirāt*. 2 vols. Tehran: Muᵓassasa-yi Millī-yi Maṭbūᶜāt-i Amrī, 126 B.. [1963].

Ishrāq Khāvarī, ᶜAbd al-Ḥamīd. *Qāmūs-i Īqān*. 4 vols. Tehran: Muᵓassasa-yi Millī-yi Maṭbūᶜāt-i Amrī, 128 B. [1972].

Ishrāq Khāvarī, ᶜAbd al-Ḥamīd. *Raḥīq-i makhtūm*. 2 vols. Tehran: Muᵓassasa-yi Millī-yi Maṭbūᶜāt-i Amrī, 130-31 B. [1973-74].

Ishrāq Khāvarī, ᶜAbd al-Ḥamīd. *Taqvīm-i tārīkh-i amr*. Tehran: Muᵓassasa-yi Millī-yi Maṭbūᶜāt-i Amrī, 126 B. [1970].

Ishrāq Khāvarī, ᶜAbd al-Ḥamīd. ed. *Māᵓida-yi Āsmānī*. 9 vols. Tehran: Muᵓassasa-yi Millī-yi Maṭbūᶜāt-i Amrī, 128-29 B. [1971-73].

Istakhrī, Iḥsān Allāh ᶜAlī. "Tasawwuf-i Dhahabiyya." *Majalla-yi Mardumshināsī* (Tehran) vol. 2 (1337 Sh [1958]), pp. 8-15.

Iᶜtiḍād al-Salṭana, ᶜAlī Qulī Mīrzā. *Fitna-yi Bāb*. Edited by ᶜAbd al-Ḥusayn Navāᵓī. Tehran: [s.n.], 1351[1972].

Iᶜtimad al-Salṭana, Muḥammad Ḥasan Khān, *Kitāb al-maᶜāthir wa 'l-āthār*. Tehran: Dār al-Ṭabᶜa Khāsa Dala, 1306 [1888].

Iᶜtimad al-Salṭana, Muḥammad Ḥasan Khān, 3 vols. *Khayrāt Ḥisān*. Tehran: [s.n.], [1886-1889].

Ivanov, Mikhail Sergeevich. *Babidskie vosstaniia v Irane (1848-1852)*. Moscow : Izd-vo Akademii Nauk SSSR, 1939.

Jafri, Syed Husain M. *The Origins and Early Development of Shi'a Islam.* London; New York: Longman, 1979.

Jahāngīr Mīrzā. *Tārīkh-i naw*. Edited by ᶜAbbās Iqbāl. Tehran: ᶜAlī Akbar ᶜIlmī, 1948.

Jamālzāda, Muḥammad ᶜAlī. "Shuyūkh-i silsila-yi Shaykhiyya." *Yaghmā* (Tehran) vol. 14, pp. 402-9, 440-8, 487-93, 538-43.

Johnson, Vernon Elvin. "An Historical Analysis of Critical Transformations in the Evolution of the Baha'i World Faith," Ph.D. diss., Baylor University (Waco, Texas), 1974.

Justi, Ferdinand. "Review of 3rd. ed. of Gobineau, *Religions et philosophies" Archiv fur Religionswissenschaft* (Tubingen) 4 (1901): 75-78.

Juwaynī, ᶜAlāᵓ al-Dīn ᶜAtā Malik. *The History of the World-conqueror*. Translated by John Andrew Boyle. 2 vols. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1958.

Juwaynī, ᶜAlāᵓ al-Dīn ᶜAtā Malik. *The Tārīkh-i-Jahān-gushā of ᶜAla 'u 'd-Din ᶜAta Malik-i-Juwayni*. Edited by Mirza Muḥammad ibn ᶜAbdu'l-Wahhab-i-Qazwini. 3 vols. Leyden: E. J. Brill ; London : Luzac, 1912-37.

Kaḥḥāla, ᶜUmar Riḍāᵓ. *Muᶜjam al-muᵓallifīn*. 15 vols. Damascus: al-Maktaba al ᶜArabiyya, 1957-61.

Kantūrī, Iᶜjāz Ḥusayn al-Nisābūrī. *Kashf al-ḥujūb wa 'l astār ᶜan asmāᵓ al kutub wa 'al aṣfār, or, The Bibliography of Shi'a Literature of Mawlana I'jaz Husain al-Kanturi*; Edited by M. Hidayat Husain. 2 vols. Calcutta: Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1914-1935.

Karbalā'ī, al-Qatīl ibn al- *see* Ibn al- Karbalā'ī

Karbalāᵓī, Shaykh Sulṭān al-. "Maktūb." In *Tārikh-i ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, by Mīrzā Asad Allah Fāḍil-i Māzandarānī. Vol. 3, pp. 254-59. Tehran: [s.n.], 1944.

Kāshānī, Muḥammad ibn Murtaḍā, Fayḍ-i. *Kitāb al-Wāfī*. 3 vols. Qum: Maktabat Āyat Allāh al-ᶜUẓmā al-Marᵓashī al-Najafī, 1983-84.

Kāshānī, Muḥammad ibn Murtaḍā, Fayḍ-i. *Sharḥ al-ᶜArshiyya*. Tabriz: [s.n.] 1278 [1861].

Kāshānī, Hājī Mīrzā Jānī. [*Kitāb-i nuqṭat al-*Kāf] Kitāb-*i Nuqtatu'l-Kāf, Being the Earliest History of the Babis*. Edited by Edward Granville Browne. Leyden: E. J. Brill; London: Luzac, 1910. Available online at: www.h-net.org/~bahai/areprint/nk/nuqta.htm

Kashmīrī, Muḥammad ᶜAlī. *Nujūm al-samāᵓ fi tarājim al-ᶜulamāᵓ*. Lucknow: Maṭbaᶜa Jaᶜfar, 1303 [1885-86].

Kashmīrī, Mīrzā Muḥammad Mahdī. *Nujūm al-samāᵓ: takmila*. Qum, 1396/1976.

Kashshī, Shaykh Abū ᶜAmr Muḥammad al-. *Kitāb maᶜrifa akhbār al-rijāl.* Bombay: 'al-Matba'ah 'al-Mustafawiyah, 1317 [1899-1900].

Kazem-Bek, Aleksandr. "Bab et les Bābis, ou Soulèvement politique et religieux, de 1845 à 1853." *Journal Asiatique* (Paris) vol. 7 (1866), pp. 329-84, 457-522; vol. 8 (1866) pp. 196-252, 357-400, 473-507.

Kazem-Bek, Aleksandr. *Bab i babidy: Religiozno-polit. Smuty v Persii v 1844-1852 g.* Saint Petersburg: Tip. V. N. Maikova, 1865.

Kazemi, Farhad. "Some Preliminary Observations on the Early Development of Babism." *Muslim World* (Hartford, Conn.) vol. 63, no. 2 (1973), pp. 119-31.

Kazemzadeh, Firuz. "Two Incidents in the Life of the Bab". *World Order* (Wilmette, Ill.) 5 (3 1971): pp.21-24.

Kāẓimī, Muḥammad Mahdī. *Aḥsan al-wadīᶜa*. 2 vols. Baghdad: Maṭbaᶜat al-Najāḥ, 1928-29.

Keddie, Nikki R. "Religion and Irreligion in Early Iranian Nationalism." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* (Cambridge) vol. 4, no. 3. (1962), pp. 265-95.

Keddie, Nikki R. *Religion and Rebellion in Iran: The Tobacco Protest of 1891-1892*. London: Frank Cass, 1966.

Keddie, Nikki R. "The Roots of the Ulama's Power in Modern Iran." In *Scholars, Saints and Ṣūfīs: Muslim Religious Institutions in the Middle East since 1500*, edited by Nikki R. Keddie. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972.

Keddie, Nikki R., ed. *Scholars, Saints and Ṣūfīs: Muslim Religious Institutions in the Middle East since 1500*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972.

Khan Bahadur Agha Mirza Muḥammad. "Some New Notes on Babiism." *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (London) (July 1927), pp. 442-70.

Khomeini, Ruhollah. *Vilāyat-i faqīh dar khuṣūṣ-i ḥukūmat-i Islāmī*. [Tehran: s.n., 1979?].

Khumaynī, Imām (Rūh Allāh al-Mūsawī) *see* Khomeini, Ruhollah

Khurāsānī, Ḥusayn. *Maktab-i tashayyuᶜ dar sayr-i tārīkh*. Tehran: Muḥammadī, 1962.

Khurmūjī, Muḥammad Jaᶜfar. *Tārīkh-i Qājār: Ḥaqāᵓiq al-akhbār-i Nāṣirī*. Edited by Ḥusayn Khadīv Jam. Tehran: Kitābfurūshī-yi Zavvār, 1344 [1965].

Khwānsārī, Mīrzā Muḥammad Bāqir al-Mūsawī al-Iṣbihānī al-. *Rawḍāt al-jannāt fī aḥwāl al-ᶜulamāᵓ wa 'l-sādāt*. 3rd ed. [s.l., s.n.], 1367 [1947].

Kirmānī, Mīrzā Abd al-Ḥusayn Āqā Khān; Shaykh Aḥmad Rūḥī. *Hasht bihisht*. [Tehran ?: s.n., 1960?]

Kirmānī, Abū 'l-Qāsim ibn Zayn al-ᶜĀbidīn Khān. *Fihrist-i kutub-i Shaykh-i ajall-i awḥad marḥūm Shaykh Aḥmad Aḥsāᵓī va sāyir-i mashāyikh-i ᶜiẓām*

va khulāsa-yi sharḥ-i aḥvāl-i īshān. 2 vols. in 1. 3rd ed. Kirman: Chāpkhāna-yi Saᶜādat, [1977].

Kirmānī, Shaykh Aḥmad Rūhī. "Faṣl al-khiṭāb fī tarjumati aḥwāl al-Bāb." CUL Browne Or. MS F.27.

Kirmānī, Muḥammad Karīm Khān. *Faṣl al-khiṭāb*. 2nd ed. Kirman: Maṭbaᶜat al-Saᶜādat, 1392 [1972].

Kirmānī, Muḥammad Karīm Khān. *al-Fiṭra al-salīma.* 3rd ed., 3 vols. in 1. Kirman: Maṭbaᶜat al-Saᶜādat, 1378 [1958].

Kirmānī, Muḥammad Karīm Khān. *Irshād al-ᶜawāmm.* 4th ed., 4 vols. in 2. Kirman: Chāpkhāna-yi Saᶜādat, 1380 [1960-61].

Kirmānī, Muḥammad Karīm Khān. *Izhāq al-bāṭil*. Kirman: Maṭbaᶜat al-Saᶜādat, 1392 [1972].

Kirmānī, Muḥammad Karīm Khān. *Majmaᶜ al-rasāᵓil-i fārsī*. 15 vols. Kirman: Chāpkhāna-yi Saᶜādat, 1386/1966-7.

Kirmānī, Muḥammad Karīm Khān. *Risāla-yi tīr i Shihāb*. In *Majmaᶜ al-rasāᵓil-i fārsī*. Vol. 1. Kirman: Chāpkhāna-yi Saᶜādat, 1386 [1966-7].

Kirmānī, Muḥammad Karīm Khān. *Risāla dar jawāb-i Mullā Ḥusayn ᶜAlī Tawīsargānī*. In *Majmaᶜ al-rasāᵓil.* Vol.15. Kirman: Chāpkhāna-yi Saᶜādat, 1380 [1961].

Kirmānī, Muḥammad Karīm Khān. *Risāla dar jawāb-i yik nafar Iṣfahānī*. In *Majmaᶜ al-rasāᵓil*. Vol.15. Kirman: Chāpkhāna-yi Saᶜādat, 1380 [1961].

Kirmānī, Muḥammad Karīm Khān. *Risāla dar rafᶜ-i baᶜḍ-i shubahāt*. In *Majmaᶜ al-rasāᵓil*. Vol. 15. Kirman: Chāpkhāna-yi Saᶜādat, 1380 [1961].

Kirmānī, Muḥammad Karīm Khān. *Risāla dar radd-i Bāb-i murtād*. With *Risāla-yi tazvīl*. 2nd ed. Kirman: [s.n.], 1384 [1964-5].

Kirmānī, Muḥammad Karīm Khān. *Risāla-yi chahār faṣl*. Kirman: [s.n.], 1324 Sh [1946].

Kirmānī, Muḥammad Karīm Khān. *Risāla-yi hidāyat al-ṭālibīn*. 2nd ed. Kirman: Chāpkhāna-yi Saᶜādat, 1380 [1960-61].

Kirmānī, Muḥammad Karīm Khān. *Risāla-yi sī faṣl*. Kirman: Chāpkhāna-yi Saᶜādat 1368 [1949].

Kirmānī, Muḥammad Karīm Khān. *Rukn-i rābiᶜ*. 2nd ed. Kirman: [s.n.], 1368 [1949].

Kirmānī, Muḥammad Khān. *Al-kitāb al-mubīn.* 2nd ed., 2 vols. [Kirman]: Chāpkhāna-yi Saᶜādat, 1354 Sh [1975].

Kirmānī, Muḥammad Khān. *al-Shihāb al-thāqib fī rajm al-nawāṣib*. Kirman: Chāpkhāna-yi Saᶜādat, 1353 Sh./1974-75.

Kirmānī, Muḥammad Khān. *Yanābīᶜ al-ḥikma*. 3 vols. Kirman: Maṭbaᶜat al-Saᶜāda, 1353-56 [1963-66].

Kirmānī, Shaykh Aḥmad Rūhḥ. *Faṣl al-khiṭāb fī tarjumati aḥwāl al-Bāb.* CUL Browne Or. MS F.27.

Kirmānī, Zayn al-ᶜĀbidīn Khān. Risāla dar javāb-i Āqā-yi Niẓām al-Islām Iṣfahānī." In *Majmaᶜ al-rasāᵓil-i fārsī*, vol. 8. Kirman: Matbaᶜat al-Saᶜādat, 1352 Sh [1973].

Kohlberg, Etan. "From Imāmīyya to Ithnā-'Asharīyya." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* (London) vol. 39 (1976), pp. 521-34.

Kramer, Robert S. "Mahdī", *The Oxford Encyclopedia of the Modern Islamic World,* New York, Oxford, OUP, 1995, vol. 3, pp. 18-19

Kuhn, Thomas. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962; 3rd. ed., 1996.

Kulaynī, Abū Ja'far Muḥammad ibn Ya'qūb al-. *al-Kāfī*. 8 vols. Tehran: Maktabat al-Ṣadūq: Dār-al-Kutub al-Islamiyya, 1957-61.

Kulaynī, Abū Ja'far Muḥammad ibn Ya'qūb al-. *Al-Uṣūl min al-Kāfī*. Edited by Muḥammad Bāqir al-Bihbūdī and ᶜAlī Akbar al-Ghaffārī. Translated by and commentary by Āyat Allāh Ḥājj Shaykh Muḥammad Bāqir al-Kamraʾī. 4 vols. Tehran: [s.n.], 1392 [1972].

Kulaynī, Abū Ja'far Muḥammad ibn Ya'qūb al-. *Rawḍat al-Kāfī*. Najaf: [s.n.],1385 [1965].

[Lambden, Stephen]. "Early Shaykhism: Some Bibliographical Notes, Translations and Studies". Available at: www.hurqalya.pwp.blueyonder.co.uk/ SHAYKHISM/SHAYKHISM.htm

Lambden, Stephen. "Some Notes upon select works and published writings of Shaykh Aḥmad al-Ahsā'ī". www.hurqalya.pwp.blueyonder.co.uk/ SHAYKHISM/SA-writings.htm

Lambden, Stephen. "The Writings of Sayyid Kāẓim Rashtī". At: www.hurqalya.pwp.blueyonder.co.uk/SHAYKHISM/sayyidK.htm

Lambden, Stephen. "A Select, Annotated Listing of Sources for the Study of the Various Branches of the Shaykhī School of Shīᶜī Islam". At: www.hurqalya.pwp.blueyonder.co.uk/SHAYKHISM/shaykhism-bib1.htm

Lambden, Stephen. "An annotated bibliography of post-1260/1844 Shaykhī anti-Bābī-Bahā'ī polemical writing and associated Bābī-Bahā'ī responses". At: www.hurqalya.pwp.blueyonder.co.uk/SHAYKHISM/Shaykhi%20anti-B&B.htm

Lambden, Stephen. On the possible Hebrew, Judaic roots of the Ishrāqī-Shaykhī term *hūrqalyā* (= Per. *havarqalyā*) [sic.] and a survey of its Islamic and Shīᶜī-Shaykhī uses. At: www.hurqalya.pwp.blueyonder.co.uk/ SHAYKHISM/HURQALYA.htm

Lambton, Ann K. S. "Persian Society under the Qajars." *Journal of the Royal Central Asiatic Society* (London) vol. 48 (1961), pp. 123-39.

Lambton, Ann K. S. “Quis Custodiet Custodes: Some Reflections on the Persian Theory of
Government.” *Studia Islamica* (Paris) vol. 5 (1956), pp. 125-48; vol. 6 (1956),
pp. 125-46.

Lambton, Ann K. S. “A Reconsideration of the Position of the Marja‘ al-Taqlīd and the
Religious Institution” *Studia Islamica* (Paris) vol. 20 (1964), pp. 115-35.

Lawson, Todd. “Orthodoxy and Heterodoxy in Twelver Shi’ism: Ahmad al-Ahsa’i on Fayd Kashani (the *Risalat al-ᶜIlmiyya*),” in *Religion and Society in Qajar Iran* ed. Robert Gleave, London & New York: RoutlledgeCurzon, 2005, pp. 127-54.

Lawson, Todd. “Reading Reading Itself: The Bab's ‘Sura of the Bees,’ A Commentary on Qur'an 12:93 from the Sura of Joseph— Text, Translation and Commentary,” *Occasional Papers in Shaykhi, Babi and Baha'i Studies*, vol. 1, no. 5 (November, 1997)

Lawson, Todd, "The Bab's 'Journey towards God': Translation and Text." *Translations of Shaykhi, Babi and Baha'i Texts*, vol. 2, no. 1 (January, 1998)

Lawson, Todd. “The Bab’s Epistle on the Spiritual Journey towards God: provisional translation, commentary and preliminary edition of the Arabic text of the *Risalatus’suluk*” in *The Baha’i Faith and the World Religions*, ed. Moojan Momen, Oxford: George Ronald, [2005], pp. 231-47.

Lawson, Todd. “Qurᵓan Commentary as Sacred Performance,” in *Der Iran um 19 Jahrhundert und die Enstehung der Baha'i Religion*. Edited by Johann-Christoph Burgel & Isabel Schayani. Georg Olms Verlag, Hildesheim, 1998, pp.145-58.

Lawson, Todd. “Akhbari Shi’i Approaches to tafsir,” in *Approaches to the Qurᵓan*, edited by G.R. Hawting & Abdul-Kader A. Shareef, Routledge: New York & London, 1993, pp.173-210.

Lawson, Todd. “The Structure of Existence in the Bab's Tafsir and the Perfect Man Motif” in *Studia Iranica: Cahiers 11: Recurrent Patterns in*

Iranian Religions from Mazdaism to Sufism. Proceedings of the Round Table held in Bamberg (30th September - 4th October 1991). Association pour l'avancement des Études iraniennes, 1992, pp.81-99.

Lawson, Todd. "The Terms Remembrance (dhikr) and Gate (báb) in the Bab's Commentary on the Sura of Joseph," *Bábi and Bahá'í Studies in Honour of H.M. Balyuzi*, ed. M. Momen, Kalimat Press, Los Angeles, 1989, pp. 1-63.

Lawson, Todd. "Interpretation as Revelation: The Qur'án Commentary of Sayyid 'Ali Muhammad Shirazi, the Bab," in *Approaches to the History of the Interpretation of the Qur'án*, ed. A. Rippin. Oxford University Press: Oxford, 1988, pp. 223-253.

Lawson, Todd. "Exegesis iii: Akhbárí and post-Safavid esoteric Shí'í Exegesis," *Encyclopaedia Iranica vol. 7*, pp. 118-20.

Lawson, Todd. "Exegesis: Bábí and Bahá'í," *Encyclopaedia Iranica*.

Lawson, Todd. "Ebn Abí Jomhúr al-Aḥsá'í," *Encyclopaedia Iranica, vol. 7*, pp. 662-3.

Lawson, Todd. "Qayyúm al-asmá," *Encyclopédie philosophique universelle: Les Oeuvres philosophiques. Volume III*, Presses Universitaires de France, Paris, 1992.

Lawson, Todd. "Review of Denis MacEoin. *The Sources for Early Babi Doctrine and History: A Survey*." *Journal of Semitic Studies, 38* (1993): 355-7.

Lawson, Todd. "Review of Abbas Amanat, *Resurrection and Renewal". Iranian Studies, 22:4* (1989): 112-113.

Lawson, Todd. "The Qur'an Commentary of Sayyid ᶜAlī Muḥammad, the Bāb", PhD thesis, McGill University, 1987, available online at: http://bahai-library.com/?file=lawson_quran_commentary_bab.

Todd Lawson. "Coincidentia Oppositorum in the Qayyum al-Asma: the terms 'Point' (nuqta), 'Pole' (qutb), 'Center' (markaz) and the Khuṭbat al-tatanjiya". *Occasional Papers in Shaykhi, Babi and Baha'i Studies*, vol. 5,

no. 1 (January, 2001). Available online at: www.h-net.org/~bahai/bhpapers/vol5/tatanj/tatanj.htm

Lewis, Bernard. *The Assassins: A Radical Sect in Islam*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1967.

Lewy, Guenter. *Religion and Revolution*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1974.

Linard, Thomas. "Bibliographie des ouvrages de langue française mentionnant les religions babie ou baha'ie (1844-1944)". Occasional Papers in Shaykhi, Babi and Baha'i Studies no.3 (June, 1997). Available online at: www.h-net.org/~bahai/bhpapers/frbib.htm.

Lockhart, Laurence. *The Fall of the Safavi Dynasty and the Afghan Occupation of Persia*. Cambridge: University Press, 1958.

Lockhart, Laurence. *Nadir Shah: A Critical Study Based Mainly on Contemporary Sources*. London: Luzac, 1938.

Loisy, Alfred. "Review of Nicolas' translation of *Le Beyan persan*, vol. 1." *Revue d'Histoire et de Littérature Religieuses* (Paris) 3 (1912): 484.

Longrigg, Stephen Hemsley. *Four Centuries of Modern Iraq*. Beirut : Librarie du Liban, 1968.

Lorimer, J. G. *Gazetteer of the Persian Gulf, Oman and Central Arabia*. 2 vols. in 6. Calcutta: Superintendent Government Printing, India, 1908-1915.

McCants, William and Miklani, Kavian, 'The History and Provenance of an Early Manuscript of the *Nuqtat al-kaf* Dated 1268 (1851-53), *Iranian Studies* 37:3 (September 2004), pp. 431-49.

Macdonald, Duncan Black. "Al-Mahdī." In *Encyclopaedia of Islam*. London: Luzac; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1908-1936.

MacEoin, Denis M. "Babism", in L.P. Elwell-Sutton (ed.), *Bibliographical Guide to* Brighton and Totowa, Harvester Press, 1983

MacEoin, Denis M. Shaykhism", in L.P. Elwell-Sutton (ed.), *Bibliographical Guide to Iran*, Brighton and Totowa, Harvester Press, 1983

MacEoin, Denis M. "The Shiᶜi Establishment in Modern Iran", in D. MacEoin and A. al-Shahi (edd.), *Islam in the Modern World*, London, Croom Helm, 1983, pp.88-108

MacEoin, Denis M. "The Concept of *Jihād* in the Babi and Bahaᵓi Movements." Paper presented at the third Bahaᵓi Studies Seminar, Lancaster University, 7-8 April 1979.

MacEoin, Denis M. "Early Shaykhi Reactions to the Bab and his Claims", in M. Momen (ed.), *Studies in Babi and Bahaᵓi History*, Los Angeles, Kalimat Press, 1983, pp.1-47.

MacEoin, Denis M. "Changes in Charismatic Authority in Qajar Shiᶜism", in E. Bosworth and C. Hillenbrand (edd.), *Qajar Iran: Political, Social and Cultural Change*, Edinburgh, EUP, 1983, pp.148-76.

MacEoin, Denis M. Introduction to *A Year Amongst the Persians*, by E. G. Browne, new ed., London, Century, 1984.

MacEoin, Denis M. "From Shaykhism to Babism: A Study in Charismatic Renewal in Shiᶜi Islam." Ph.D. dissertaion, University of Cambridge, 1979.

MacEoin, Denis M. "A Revised Survey of the Sources for Early Babi Doctrine and History." Diss., King's College, Cambridge, 1977.

MacEoin, Denis M. 'Hierarchy, Authority and Eschatology in Early Babi Thought', in P. Smith (ed.), *In Iran*, Los Angeles, Kalimat Press, 1986, pp.95-155.

MacEoin, Denis M. *The Sources for Early Babi Doctrine and History*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1992. [A much-revised version of the author's 1977 dissertation.]

MacEoin, Denis M. *Ritual in Babism and Baha'ism*, Pembroke Papers, Pembroke College, Cambridge, published I. B. Tauris, London, 1994.

MacEoin, Denis M. "The Trial of the Bab: Shiᶜite orthodoxy confronts its mirror image", in Carole Hillenbrand (ed.) *Studies in Honour of Clifford Edmund Bosworth 2 The Sultan's Turret* (Brill, 2000), pp. 272-317.

MacEoin, Denis M. "The Babi Concept of Holy War", *Religion*, 12 (1982): 93-129.

MacEoin, Denis M. "Some Baha'i and Shaykhi Interpretations of 'The mystery of reversal'",*Baha'i Studies Bulletin* 1:1 (1982), pp.11-23.

MacEoin, Denis M. "From Babism to Baha'ism: problems of militancy, quietism and conflation in the construction of a religion", *Religion* 13 (1983): 219-255.

MacEoin, Denis M. "Seven Manuscripts Attributed to Bahāᵓ Allāh", *Baha'i Studies Bulletin*, 1:4 (1983), pp.52-56.

MacEoin, Denis M. "The Fate of Mullā ᶜAlī Bastāmī", *Baha'i Studies Bulletin*, 2:1 (1983), p.77.

MacEoin, Denis M. "The Identity of the Bab's "Lawḥ-i ḥurūfāt'", *Baha'i Studies Bulletin,* 2:1 (1983), pp.78-79.

MacEoin, Denis M. "A Note on the Numbers of Babi and Baha'i Martyrs", *Baha'i Studies Bulletin*, 2:2 (1983), pp.84-88.

MacEoin, Denis M. "Aspects of Militancy and Quietism in Shiᶜi Islam", *British Society for Middle East Studies Bulletin*, 11:1 (1984), pp.18-27.

MacEoin, Denis M. "Nineteenth-Century Babi Talismans", *Studia Iranica* 14:1 (1985), pp.77-98.

MacEoin, Denis M. "Baha'i Fundamentalism and the Academic Study of the Babi Movement', *Religion* 16 (1986): 57-84.

MacEoin, Denis M. "Afnan, Hatcher, and an Old Bone", *Religion* 16 (1986): 193-195

MacEoin, Denis M. "Divisions and Authority Claims in the Babi Community, 1850-1866", *Studia Iranica*, 18 (1989): 93-129.

MacEoin, Denis M. "Babi and Baha'i Studies: a Crisis in Academic Freedom?", *British Society for Middle East Studies Bulletin*, 15: 3/4 (1990).

MacEoin, Denis M. "Orthodoxy and Heterodoxy in Nineteenth-Century Shiᶜism: The Cases of Shaykhism and Babism", *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 110.2 (1990): 323-29.

MacEoin, Denis M. "Shaikh Aḥmad ibn Zayn al-Din Aḥsāʾī", *Encyclopaedia Iranica* 1:7 (1984), pp.674-79.

MacEoin, Denis M. 'Bāb, Sayyed ᶜAlī Moḥammad Shīrāzī", *Encyclopaedia Iranica* 3:3. (1988), pp.278-284.

MacEoin, Denis M. "Babism: i The Bābī Movement', *Encyclopaedia Iranica* 3:3 (1988), pp.309-315.

MacEoin, Denis M. "Babism: ii Bābī Executions and Uprisings', *Encyclopaedia Iranica* 3:3 (1988), pp.315-17.

MacEoin, Denis M. "Azali Babism", *Encyclopaedia Iranica* 3:2 (1988), pp.179-81.

MacEoin, Denis M. "Bayan", *Encyclopaedia Iranica* 3:8 (1988), pp.878-82.

MacEoin, Denis M. "Bahāʾī and Bābī Schisms', *Encyclopaedia Iranica* 3:4 (1988), pp.447-449.

MacEoin, Denis M. "Bālāsarī", *Encyclopaedia Iranica* 3:6 (1988), pp.583-85.

MacEoin, Denis M. "Shaykhī Cosmologyæ, *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, 6:3 (1993), pp. 326-8.

MacEoin, Denis M. "Shaykhism", *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 1996, Leiden, Brill, pp. 403-5.

MacEoin, Denis M. “Kurrat al-ᶜAyn” (with L.P. Elwell-Sutton), *Encyclopaedia of Islam.*

MacEoin, Denis M. “ᶜAbd al-Rezā Khan Ebrāhīmī”, *Encyclopaedia Iranica* 1:2 (1983), p.161.

MacEoin, Denis M. “Abū ’l-Qāsem Khān Ebrāhīmī’, *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, 1:4 (1983), pp.363-4.

MacEoin, Denis M. “Mollā ᶜAlī Bestāmī”, *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, 1:8 (1985), p.860.

MacEoin, Denis M. “Bāb” (general term), *Encyclopaedia Iranica* 3:3 (1988), pp.277-278.

MacEoin, Denis M. “Badīᶜ Calendar”, *Encyclopaedia Iranica* 3:4 (1988), p.376.

MacEoin, Denis M. “Mollā Moḥammad ᶜAlī Qoddūs Bārforūshī”, *Encyclopaedia Iranica* 3:8 (1988), p.794.

MacEoin, Denis M. “Mollā Moḥammad Ḥosayn Boshrūʾī”. *Encyclopaedia Iranica* 4:4 (1989), p.383.

MacEoin, Denis M. “Mollā Moḥammad Taqī Baraghānī”, *Encyclopaedia Iranica* 3:7 (1988), p.740.

MacEoin, Denis M. “Mazhar”, *Encyclopaedia of Islam*.

MacEoin, Denis M. “Shaykh Aḥmad al-Aḥsāʾī”, in J.R. Hinnells (ed.) *Who's Who ofReligions*, MacMillan, London, 1991

MacEoin, Denis M. ‘’Ali Muḥammad Shirazi the Bab’, in J.R. Hinnells (ed.) *Who's Who of Religions*, MacMillan, London, 1991.

MacEoin, Denis M. “Qurrat al-ᶜAyn”, in J.R. Hinnells (ed.) *Who's Who of Religions*, MacMillan, London, 1991.

MacEoin, Denis M. "Ṣubḥ-i Azal", in J.R. Hinnells (ed.) *Who's Who of Religions*, MacMillan, London, 1991.

MacEoin, Denis M. "Muḥammad Ḥusayn Bushrūʾī", in *Encyclopaedia of Islam.*

MacEoin, Denis M. "Muḥammad ʿAlī Bārfurūshī", in *Encyclopaedia of Islam.*

MacEoin, Denis M. "Muḥammad ʿAlī Zanjānī", in *Encyclopaedia of Islam.*

MacEoin, Denis M. "Nuktat al-kafʾ", in *Encyclopaedia of Islam.*

MacEoin, Denis M. "Sābikūn", in *Encyclopaedia of Islam.*

MacEoin, Denis M. "Qurrat al-ʿAyn", in *The Encyclopaedia of Censorship* (2001).

MacEoin, Denis M. "Babis", in Jack Goldstone (ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Political Revolutions*, Washington D.C., 1998.

MacEoin, Denis M. "Questions of Sayyid Muḥammad Shīrāzī, Uncle of the Bab." *Translations of Shaykhi, Babi and Baha'i Texts* vol. 1, no. 2 (June, 1997). Available online at: www.h-net.org/~bahai/trans/iqanques.htm.

MacEoin, Denis M. *"The Persian Bayan* of Sayyid ʿAlī Muḥammad Shīrāzī, the Bab." [A partial translation.] *Translations of Shaykhi, Babi and Baha'i Texts* vol. 1, no. 4 (July, 1997). Available online at: www.h-net.org/~bahai/trans/bayan/bayan.htm

MacEoin, Denis M. "Review of *The Bābī and Bahā'ī Religions* by M. Momen", *Religion* 12 (1982): 405-408.

MacEoin, Denis M. "Review of *From Iran, East and West: Studies in Bābī and Bahā'ī History* ed. by R. Cole and M. Momen'". *British Society for Middle East Studies Bulletin*, 13:1 (1986), pp.85-91.

MacEoin, Denis M. "Review of *The Bābī and Bahā'ī Religions* by P. Smith', *School of Oriental and African Studies Bulletin.*

MacEoin, Denis M. "Review of *The Bābī and Bahā'ī Religions* by P. Smith". *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 109:3 (1989), pp.452-3.

MacEoin, Denis M. "Review of *The Bābī and Bahā'ī Religions"* by P. Smith', *Times Higher Education Supplement* 18.3.1988.

MacEoin, Denis M. "Review of *Selections from the Writings of E.G. Browne on the Bābī and Bahā'ī Religions*, ed. M. Momen', *Iranian Studies* 28:1-2 (1995), pp. 106-08.

MacEoin, Denis M. "Babism, Baha'ism and the Constitutional Revolution", Conference on the Iranian Constitutional Revolution, Harvard University, 1980.

MacEoin, Denis M. "Aspects of Militancy and Quietism in Imami Shi'ism, British Society for Middle East Studies Conference, Durham University, 1982.

MacEoin, Denis M. "Religious Authority in Middle Babism, c.1850-1866", Baha'i History Conference, Los Angeles, 1984.

MacEoin, Denis M. "Problems of Babi History, 1850-1870", Baha'i History Conference, Los Angeles, 1985.

MacEoin, Denis M. "Orthodoxy and Heterodoxy in Nineteenth-Century Shi^{c}ism: the Cases of Shaykhism and Babism". Colloquium on Official and Unofficial Islam, University of Exeter, 1986.

MacEoin, Denis M. "Babism in Iran". Seminar, Cambridge University Oriental Faculty, November 1990.

MacEoin, Denis M. "Deconstructing and Reconstructing the *Shari^{c}a*: the Babi and Baha'i Solutions to the Problem of Immutability". British Society for Middle East Studies Conference, 1997, available online at: http://bahai-library.org/unpubl.articles/sharia.html.

MacEoin, Denis M. "Babism and Baha'ism". Seminar at Edinburgh University, 2002.

Madelung, Wilferd. "Hishām ibn al- Ḥakam." In *Encyclopedia of Islam*. 2nd ed. London: Luzac; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1960-.

Madelung, Wilferd. "Mahdī", *Encyclopedia of Islam,* new ed., (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1960-), vol. 5, pp. 1230-38.

Maḥfūz, Ḥusayn ᶜAlī. *Sīrat al-Shaykh Aḥmad al-Aḥsāᵓī*. Baghdad: Maṭbaᶜat al-Maᶜārif, 1957.

Maḥfūz, Ḥusayn ᶜAlī. *Sīra Abī Jaᶜfar Muḥammad ibn Yaᶜqūb ibn Isḥāq al-Kulaynī al-Rāzī*. Tehran: Maṭbaᶜat al-Ḥaydarī, 1955.

"'Mahometan Schism'." *Literary Gazette and Journal of Belles Lettres, Arts, Sciences, etc.* (London) (1504 Nov. 15, 1845): 757. Reprinted in *Eclectic Magazine of Foreign Literature, Science and Art* (New York, Philadelphia), Jan-Apr. 1846, p.142. [The earliest mention of Babism in the Western press: records the arrest and punishment of followers of the Bab after his return to Shiraz in 1845].

Majlisī, Muḥammad Bāqir ibn Muḥammad Taqī. *Biḥār al-anwār*. Edited by Muḥammad Bāqir Biḥbūdī. 110 vols. Tehran: Dār al-Kutub al-Islāmiyya, 1376-92 [1956-72].

Majlisī, Muḥammad Bāqir ibn Muḥammad Taqī. *Ḥaqq al-yaqīn*. Qum: [199-?].

Makdisi, George, ed. *Arabic and Islamic Studies in Honor of Hamilton A. R. Gibb*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1965.

Malcolm, Sir John. *The History of Persia from the Early Period to the Present Time*. 2 vols. London: Murray, 1815.

Malik Khusravī, Muḥammad ᶜAlī. *Tārīkh-i shuhadā-yi amr*. 3 vols. Tehran: Muᵓassasa-yi Millī-yi Maṭbūᶜāt-i Amrī, 130 B. [1974].

Malik Khusravī, Muḥammad ᶜAlī. *Manābiᶜ-i tārīkh-i amr*, in *Āhang-i Badīᶜ*, No. 326 (1974-75/131 B.):11-35. Digitally reprinted, Lansing, MI: H-Bahai, 1998, at /~bahai/vol2/malikkh/manabi/manabi.htm.

Māmaqānī, Mīrzā Muḥammad Taqī. *Guft-u-shunūd-i Sayyid ᶜAlī Muḥammad-i Bāb bā rawḥānīyūn-i Tabrīz*. [*Nāmūs-i Nāṣirī*, 1306/1889] Edited by Ḥasan Mursilvand.Tehran, Nashr-i Tārīkh-i Iran, 1374 Sh./1995.

Manuchehri, Sepehr. "The Primal Point's Will and Testament". *Research Notes in Shaykhi, Babi and Baha'i Studies*, Vol. 7, no. 2 (September 2004). Available online at: www.h-net.org/~bahai/notes/vol7/BABWILL.htm.

Manuchehri, Sepehr. "Historical Accounts of two Indian Babis: Sa'in Hindi and Sayyid Basir Hindi".*Research Notes in Shaykhi, Babi and Baha'i Studies*, Vol. 5, no. 2 (April 2001). Available online at: www.h-net.org/~bahai/notes/vol5/hunud.htm

Margoliouth, David Samuel. "Mahdī." In *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, edited by James Hastings. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1908-26.

Markham, Clements R. *A General Sketch of the History of Persia.* London: Longmans Green, 1874.

Mashkūr, Muḥammad Javād. *Tārīkh-i Shīᶜa va firqahā-yi Islām tā qarn-i chahārum*. Tehran: Intishārāt-i Ishrāqī, 2535 Sh [1976].

Massignon, Louis. "Esquisse d'une bibliographie Qarmate." In *A Volume of Oriental Studies: Presented to Edward G. Browne*, edited by Thomas Walker Arnold and Reynold Alleyne Nicholson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1922.

Massignon, Louis. "Karmatians." In *Encyclopaedia of Islam*. London: Luzac; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1908-1936.

Maᶜṣūm ᶜAlī Shāh, *see* Shīrāzī, Muḥammad Maᶜṣūm.

Māzandarānī, Mīrzā Asad Allāh, Fāḍil-i. *Asrār al-āthār*. 5 vols. Tehran: Muᵓassasa-yi Millī-yi Maṭbūᶜāt-i Amrī, 124-9 B. [1968-74].

Māzandarānī, Mīrzā Asad Allāh, Fāḍil-i. *Tārikh-i ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*. Vol. 3. Tehran: [s.n.], 1944.

Mazzaoui, Michel M. *The Origins of the Safawids:* Shī*'ism, Sūfism, and the Ghulāt*. Wiesbaden: F. Steiner, 1972.

Milani, Kavian. "The Bab's Stay in Kashan: A Historiographical Analysis of the Kitab-i-Nuqtatu'l-Kaf based on the Kashan Pericope". *Baha'I Studies Review* 12 (2004).

Millward, William G. "Aspects of Modernism in Shī'a Islam." *Studia Islamica* (Paris) vol. 37 (1977), pp. 111-28.

Minorsky, V. "Review of M. S. Ivanov, *Babidskie Vosstaniia v Irane*." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* (London) 11 (1947): 878-80.

Moezzi, Mohammad Ali Amir. "An Absence Filled with Presences. Shaykhiyya Hermeneutics of the Occultation", in Rainer Brunner and Werner Ende, eds., *The Twelver Shia in Modern Times* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2001).

Momen, Moojan. *The Bābī and Bahāʾī Religions, 1844-1944: Some Contemporary Western Accounts*. Oxford: George Ronald, 1981.

Momen, Moojan. "The Social Basis of the Babi Upheavals in Iran (1848-1853): A Preliminary Analysis." *International Journal of Middle East Studies* (Cambridge) vol. 15 (1983), pp. 157-183.

Momen, Moojan. "The Trial of Mullā ʿAlī Basṭāmī: A Combined Sunnī-Shīʿī *Fatwā* against the Bāb", *Iran* 20 (1982), 113-43.

Momen, Moojan. "The works of Shaykh Aḥmad al-Aḥsāʾī: A bibliography according to the *Fīhrist kutub mashāyikh ʿiẓām,* of Shaykh Abu'l-Qāsim Kirmānī." *Baha'i Studies Bulletin. Monograph* 1. Available at: www.hurqalya.pwp.blueyonder.co.uk/SHAYKHISM/BSBM1-MOMEN.htm.

Momen, Moojan. 'The family and early life of Qurrat al-ʿAyn". *Baha'I Studies Review* 11 (2003).

Momen, Moojan and Peter Smith. “The Early Bābī Movement (1844-53)”. Available at: www.northill.demon.co.uk/relstud/history.htm#babi.

Momen, Moojan and Peter Smith. “The Bábí Collapse and Revival (1853-66)”. Available at: www.northill.demon.co.uk/relstud/history.htm#babicol.

Morier, James Justinian. *A Journey through Persia, Armenia and Asia Minor to Constantinople in the Years 1808 and 1809.* London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme and Brown, 1812.

Mottahedeh, Negar. “The Mutilated Body of the Modern Nation: Qurrat al-ᶜAyn’s Unveiling and the Persian Massacre of the Babis circa 1852." *Paper written for a Panel at The Interdisciplinary 19th Century Studies Conference, at the University of California at Berkeley, in April 1997*. Available online at: http://bahai-library.org/conferences/babi.html.

Mottahedeh, Negar. “Ruptured Spaces and Effective Histories: The Unveiling of the Babi Poetess Qurrat al-ᶜAyn- Tahirih in the Gardens of Badasht”.*Occasional Papers in Shaykhi, Babi and Baha'i Studies*, vol. 2, no. 2 (February, 1998). Available online at: www.h-net.org/~bahai/bhpapers/vol2/ruptured.htm.

Muᶜāwin al-Fuqarāᵓ, Mīrzā Abū ’l-Ḥasan Hāfiẓ al-Kutub. “Mukhtaṣarī dar sharḥ-i ḥāl-i ḥaḍrat-i Waḥīd al-Awliyāᵓ, wa asāmī-yi aqṭāb-i silsila-yi mubāraka-yi Dhahabiyya wa shuᶜūbāt-i ān.” *Majalla-yi mardumshināsī* (Tehran) vol. 2 (1337 Sh [1958]), pp. 74-83.

Mudarrisī Chahārdihī, Murtaḍā. *Shaykh Aḥmad Aḥsāᵓī*. Tehran: ‘Ilmī, 1334 Sh. [1955].

Mudarrisī Chahārdihī, Murtaḍā. *Shaykhigarī, Bābīgarī*. 2nd ed. Tehran: Kitābfurūshī-i Furūghī, 1351 Sh [1972].

Mufīd, Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad, al-Shaykh al-. *Kitāb al-irshād*. Ed. Sayyid Kāẓim al-Mūsawī al-Miyāmawī. Tehran: [s.n.], 1337 [1957].

Mughniyya, Muḥammad Jawād. *Maᶜa ᶜulamāᵓ al-Najaf al-ashraf*. Beirut: al-Makataba al-Ahliyya, 1962.

Mughniyya, Muḥammad Jawād. *Shīᶜa wa tashayyuᶜ*. Translated into Persian by Sayyid Shams al-Dīn Marᶜashī. Tehran: [s.n.], 1355 [1976].

Muᶜīn al-Salṭana Tabrizī, Ḥājī Muḥammad. "Sharḥ-i ḥāl-i Ṭāhira Qurrat al-ᶜAyn." Appended to *Tārīkh-i Muᶜīn al-Salṭana.* mms. INBA 19.

Muᶜīn al-Salṭana Tabrizī, Ḥājī Muḥammad. *Tārīkh-i Amr* [*Tārīkh-i Muᶜīn al-Salṭana*]. mms. INBA 19. Available online at: http://www.h-net.org/~bahai/arabic/vol4/muin/muin.htm

Muʾminī, Bāqir. *Īrān dar āstāna-yi inqilāb-i mashrūṭiyyat*. Tehran: [s.n.], 1966.

Muslim ibn al-Ḥajjāj al-Qushayrī. *Saḥīḥ Muslim bi-sharḥ al-Nawawī*. 18 vols. in 6. Cairo: Maṭbaᶜa Ḥijāzī, 1930. Arabic text available online at: http://hadith.al-islam.com/Display/Hier.asp?Doc=1&n=0.

Muslim ibn al-Ḥajjāj al-Qushayrī. *Saḥīḥ Muslim.* Translated by A. Hameed Siddiqi. London, Islamic Book Service, 2005.

Muᶜtamad, Mahmūd Farhād. *Mushīr al-Dawla Sipahsālār-i aᶜẓam*. Tehran: [s.n.], 1326 [1947].

Muzaffarī, Muḥammad al-Ḥusayn al-. *Taʾrīkh al-shīᶜa*. Najaf: [s.n.], 1352 [1933].

Nabīl Zarandī, see Zarandī, Mullā Muḥammad Nabīl.

Najafī, Shaykh ᶜAbd al-Ḥusayn Amīnī al-. *Shahīdān-i rāh-i fazīlat*. Tehran: Intishārāt-i Rūzbih, [1977?].

Najafī, Muḥammad Ḥasan ibn Bāqir. *Jawāhir al-kalām fī sharh Sharaʾiᶜ al-Islam*. 43 vols. 6th and 7th ed. Tehran: Dār al-Kutub al-Islāmīyah, 1392-1401 [1972-81].

Najāshī, Aḥmad ibn ᶜAlī. *al-Rijāl*. Tehran: Markaz-i Nashr-i Kitāb, [196-?].

Nāṣir-i Khusraw. *Kitāb-i vajh-i dīn*. Berlin: Kaviani, 1343 [1925].

Nasr, Seyyed Hossein. *Islamic Studies: Essays on Law and Society, the Sciences, and Philosophy and Sufism*. Beirut : Librarie du Liban, 1967.

Nasr, Seyyed Hossein. *Sadr al-Dīn Shīrāzī and His Transcendent Theosophy: Background, Life and Works*. Tehran: Imperial Iranian Academy of Philosophy, 1978.

Nasr, Seyyed Hossein. "Sadr al-Dīn Shīrāzī (Mullā Sadrā)." In *A History of Muslim Philosophy*, edited by M. M. Sharif. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1963-66.

Nasr, Seyyed Hossein. "The School of Isfahān." In *A History of Muslim Philosophy*, edited by M. M. Sharif. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1963-66.

Nasr, Seyyed Hossein and M. Mutahhari. "The Religious Sciences." In *The Cambridge History of Iran*, vol. 4, *The Period from the Arab Invasion to the Seljuqs*, edited by R. N. Frye. London: Cambridge University Press, 1975.

Navā'ī, ʿAbd al-Ḥusayn. "Ḥājj Muḥammad Karīm Khān Kirmānī." *Yādgār* (Tehran) vol. 4/5 (1328 Sh [1949]), pp. 106-18; vol. 6/7 (1328 Sh [1949]), pp. 62-73.

Nazif, Süleyman. *Nasiruddin Shah ve Babiler*. Istanbul: Kanaat Kütüphanesi, 1923 [Yeni Kutuphane series 11].

Nāẓim al-Islām Kirmānī. *Tārīkh-i bīdārī-yi Īrānīyān*. Edited by Saʿīdī Sīrjānī. 5 vols. in 4. Tehran: Bunyād-i Farhang-i Iran, 1967-70.

Necati Alkan. "Süleyman Nazif's *Nasiruddin Shah ve Babiler*: an Ottoman Source on Babi-Baha'i History. [With a Translation of Passages on Tahirih]". *Research Notes in Shaykhi, Babi and Baha'i Studies*, Vol. 4, no. 2 (November 2000). Available online at: www.h-net.org/~bahai/notes/vol4/nazif.htm.

Newman, Andrew. "Towards a Reconsideration of the Isfahan School of Philosophy: Shaykh Baha'i and the Role of the Safawid Ulama", *Studia Iranica* (Paris), Tome 15, fasc. 2 (1986), 165-199.

Newman, Andrew. "The Nature of the Akhbari/Usuli Dispute in Late-Safawid Iran. Part One: ᶜAbdallah al-Samahiji's 'Munyat al-Mumarisin'", *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies,* Vol. 55, i (1992), 22-51.

Newman, Andrew. "The Nature of the Akhbari/Usuli Dispute in Late-Safawid Iran. Part Two: The Conflict Reassessed", *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, Vol. 55, ii (1992), 250-261.

Newman, Andrew. "Anti-Akhbari Sentiments among the Qajar *ᶜUlama*: The Case of Muhammad Baqir al-Khwansari (d. 1313/1895)", in R. Gleave, ed., *Religion and Society In Qajar Iran* (London: Routledge/Curzon, 2004), 155-173.

Nicolas, A.-L.-M. [Louis Alphonse Daniel]. *Essai sur le Chéïkhisme*. Vol. 1, *Cheïkh Ahmed Lahçahi*. Paris: P. Geuthner, 1910.

Nicolas, A.-L.-M. [Louis Alphonse Daniel]. *Essai sur le Chéïkhisme*. Vol. 2, *Séyyèd Kazem Rechti*. Paris: P. Geuthner, 1914.

Nicolas, A.-L.-M. [Louis Alphonse Daniel]. *Essai sur le Chéïkhisme*. Vol. 3, *La Doctrine*. Paris: P. Geuthner, 1911.

Nicolas, A.-L.-M. [Louis Alphonse Daniel]. *Essai sur le Chéïkhisme*. Vol. 4, *La Science de Dieu*. Paris: P. Geuthner, 1911.

Nicolas, A.-L.-M. [Louis Alphonse Daniel]. *Seyyèd Ali Mohammed, dit le Bâb: Histoire*. Paris: Dujarric, 1905.

Nicolas, A.-L.-M. [Louis Alphonse Daniel]. Introduction to *Le Livre des Sept Preuves de la Mission du Bâb* [*Dalāʾil-i sabᶜa*]. Translated by A.-L.-M. Nicolas. Paris: J. Maisonneuve, 1902.

Nicolas, A.-L.-M. [Louis Alphonse Daniel]. *Qui est le successeur du Bab?* 16. Librairie d'Amerique et d'Orient, Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve, 1933.

Nicolas, A.-L.-M. [Louis Alphonse Daniel]. "Le Dossier russo-anglais de Seyyed Ali Mohammed dit le Bab". *Revue du Monde Musulman* (Paris) 14 (1911): pp.357-63.

Nicolas, A.-L.-M. [Louis Alphonse Daniel]. “Quelques documents relatifs au Babisme”. *Journal Asiatique* (Paris) 224 (1934): pp.107-42.

Nicolas, A.-L.-M. [Louis Alphonse Daniel]. “A propos de deux manuscrits ‘Babis’ de la Bibliothèque Nationale”. *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions* (Paris) 47 (1903): 58-73.

Nicolas, A.-L.-M. [Louis Alphonse Daniel]. “Le Bab astronome”. *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions* (Paris) 114 (1 1936): pp.99-101. Issued separately as an offprint.

Nicolas, A.-L.-M. [Louis Alphonse Daniel]. “Les behahis et le Bab”. *Journal Asiatique* Vol.222 (pp.257-264 April-June 1933). Issued as an offprint, Paris, Imprimerie Nationale, Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1933. [Includes lengthy translation from the Bab’s *Khuṭba-yi qahriyya*.]

Niebuhr, Carsten. *Description de l’Arabie.* Translated by F. L. Mourier. Amsterdam: S. J. Baalde, 1774.

Niebuhr, Carsten. *Travels Through Arabia and Other Countries in the East*. Translated by Robert Heron. 2 vols., facs. ed. Reading: Garnet, 1994.

Nivishtijāf wa āthār-i aṣḥāb-i avvaliyya-yi amr-i ᶜlā. Vol. 80, INBA. Digitally reprinted at: www.h-net.org/~bahai/index/diglib/arapub.htm

Nöldeke, Prof. T. “Orientalischer Socialismus”. *Deutsche Rundschau* 18 (1879): 284-91.

Nuqabāʾī, Ḥusām. *Manābiᶜ-i tārīkh-i amr-i Bahāʾī*. Tehran: [s.n.], 133 B. [1976].

Nuqabāʾī, Ḥusām. *Ṭāhira: Qurrat al-ᶜAyn*. Tehran, [s.n.], 128 BE [1971].

Nūrī, Mīrzā Ḥusayn ᶜAlī Bahāʾ Allāh. *Alwāḥ-i mubāraka-yi ḥaḍrat-i Bahāʾ Allāh*. [facs. ed.] [Delhi?: s.n.], 1310 [1892].

Nūrī, Mīrzā Ḥusayn ᶜAlī Bahāʾ Allāh. *al-Kitāb al-aqdas*. [Plus numerous other writings], [Bombay: n.d.].

Nūrī, Mīrzā Ḥusayn ʿAlī Bahāʾ Allāh. *The Kitāb-i-Aqdas* [sic]*: the Most Holy Book*. Haifa: Bahaʾi World Centre, 1992.

Nūrī, Mīrzā Ḥusayn ʿAlī Bahāʾ Allāh. *Kitāb-i-īqān*. Cairo: Faraj Allāh Zakī, 1934.

[Nūrī, Mīrzā Ḥusayn ʿAlī Bahāʾ Allāh.] Bahā'u'llāh. *The Kitāb-i-Iqān: The Book of Certitude*. Translated by Shoghi Effendi. London: Bahaʾi Publishing Committee, 1946.

Nūrī, Mīrzā Ḥusayn ʿAlī Bahāʾ Allāh. *Majmūʿa-yi alwāḥ-i mubāraka* [Title-page reads: *Huwa 'llāh taʿālā. Īn majmūʿaʾī maṭbūʿa-yi alwāḥ-i mubāraka-yi Ḥaḍrat-i Bahaʾ Allāh ast*]. Edited by Muhy'd-Din Sabri. 1st. Photomechanic reproduction, [Tehran, n.d.] ed., Cairo: Maṭbaʿa al-Saʿāda, 1338/1920.

Nūrī, Mīrzā Yahyā, Ṣubḥ-i Azal. "Writings of the Bab and Subh-i-Ezel." In *A Traveller's Narrative: Written to Illustrate the Episode of the Bab*, by ʿAbdu'l-Bahā. Translated and edited by Edward G. Browne. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1891, vol. 2, pp. 335-47.

Nūrī, Mīrzā Yahyā, Ṣubḥ-i Azal. *Majmūʿaʾī az āthār-i Nuqṭa-yi Ūlā va Ṣubḥ-i Azal*. [Tehran], n.d.

Nūrī, Mīrzā Yahyā, Ṣubḥ-i Azal. *Mustayqiẓ*. [Iran]: [Privately published by the Azali Babis], n.d.

Nūrī, Mīrzā Yahyā, Ṣubḥ-i Azal. *Mutammim-i Bayān*. [Iran]: [Azali Community of Iran], n.d.

Ouseley, Sir William. *Travells in Various Countries of the East; More Particularly Persia, etc.* 3 vols. London: Rodwell and Martin, 1819-23.

"'Persia.'" *Sun* (London) (7 October 1852b): 4, col. 3. [A brief account of the Babi attempt on the life of Nasir al-Di Shah, based on a letter from Tabriz dated 26 August 1852.] Reprinted *The Times* (London), 8 October 1852, p. 6; *Daily News* (London), 8 October, p. 5; *Guardian* (London), 13 October, p. 674; *Allen's Indian Mail* (London), 16 October, p. 588; *Southern*

Cross (Auckland, New Zealand), 22 February 1853, p. 4 (from the *Melbourne Argus*).

"'Persia'." *The Times* (London) (1 November 1845): 5, col. 3. [The very first mention (though not, of course, by name) of Babism in any print medium. An abbreviated version was subsequently widely reprinted.]

Philby, Harry St. John Bridger. *Sa'udi Arabia*. London: Benn, 1955.

Porter, Sir Robert Kerr. *Travels in Georgia, Persia, Armenia, Ancient Babylonia, &c., &c. during the years 1817, 1818, 1819, and 1820.* 2 vols. London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme and Brown, 1821-22.

Qatīl ibn al-Karbalā'ī: *see* Ibn al-Karbalā'ī, al-Qatīl.

Qarāchadāghī, Mullā Muhammad Ḥasan [Mullā Ḥasan Gawhar]. *Sharḥ Ḥayāt al-arwāḥ*. [s.l.: s.n.], 1252 [1837].

Qazvīnī, Mullā Ja'far. *Tārīkh-i Mullā Ja'far Qazvīnī*. In *Tārīkh-i Samandar va Mulḥaqāt*, by Kāẓim Samandar. Edited by Mahdī Samandarī, pp. 446-500. Tehran: Mu'assasa-yi Millī-yi Maṭbū'āt-i Amrī, 131 B. [1974-75] [Removed from subsequent editions.] Available online at: www.h-net.org/~bahai/areprint/vol2/jafar/jafar.htm

Qazvīnī, Ḥājj Muḥammad Naṣīr. "Tārīkh-i Ḥājj Naṣīr Qazvīnī". In *Tārīkh-i Samandar va Mulḥaqqāt*, by Kāẓim Samandar. Edited by Mahdī Samandarī. pp.500-520. Tehran: Mu'assasa-yi Millī-yi Maṭbū'āt-i Amrī, 131 B. [1974-75] [Removed from subsequent editions.]

Qūhistānīi, Abū Isḥaq Ibrāhīm. *Haft Bab, or, Seven Chapters*. Translated and edited by W. Ivanow. Bombay: Ismaili Society, 1959. [Persian and English].

Qummī, Muḥammad 'Alī ibn Bābawayh al-. *Man lā yahduruhu al-faqīh*. 4 vols. Najaf: Dār al-Kutub al-Islāmīyah, 1957-59.

Qummī, Muḥammad 'Alī ibn Bābawayh al-. *A Shi'ite Creed: A Translation of Risālatu'l-I'tiqādāt of Muhammad b. 'Alī Ibn Babawayhi al-Qummī, known as Shaykh Sadūq.* Translated by Asaf A. A. Fyzee. London: Oxford

University Press, 1942; rev. ed. Tehran, World Organization of Islamic Services, 1982.

Qurrat al-ᶜAyn [Ṭāhira], Fāṭima Baraghānī. Some works are available online at www.h-net.org/~bahai/areprint/tahirih/tahirih.htm

Qurrat al-ᶜAyn [Ṭāhira], Fāṭima Baraghānī. "Risāla." [Author's copy of the original ms. from a private Azalī collection in Tehran].

Qurrat al-ᶜAyn [Ṭāhira], Fāṭima Baraghānī. "Risāla." In *Kashf al-ghiṭāʾ ᶜan ḥiyal al-aᶜdāʾ* by Mīrzā Abū 'l-Faḍl Gulpāyagānī and Sayyid Mahdī Gulpāyagānī. Tashkent: [s. n.], [1919?], appendix I.

Qurrat al-ᶜAyn [Ṭāhira], Fāṭima Baraghānī. "Risāla." In *Tārikh-i-ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, vol. 3 by Mīrza Asad Allah Fāḍil-i-Māzandarānī. Tehran: [n.p.], 1944, appendix 1, pp. 484-501.

Qurrat al-ᶜAyn [Ṭāhira], Fāṭima Baraghānī. "A Prayer by Tahirih: 'O Thou to Whose pure and unique quintessence praise is owed': Text and Translation." Translated by Juan Cole. *Translations of Shaykhi, Babi and Baha'i Texts* vol. 1, no. 6 (July, 1997). Available online at: www.h-net.org/~bahai/areprint/tahirih/tahirih.htm#Ay%20Ankih and www.h-net.org/~bahai/trans/tahir1.htm.

Rabbani, Ahang. "The Bab in Shiraz: An account by Miraz Habibu'llah Afnan". *Baha'i Studies Review* 12 (2004).

Rabbani, Ahang. "The Family of Vahid Darabi". *Research Notes in Shaykhi, Babi and Baha'i Studies*, Vol. 7, no. 1 (April 2004). Available online at: www.h-net.org/~bahai/notes/vol7/darabi.htm.

Raḍavī Sharīf, Niᶜmat Allāh. *Tadhkirat al-awliyāʾ*. Bombay: [s.n.], 1895.

Rafati, Vahid. "The Development of Shaykhi Thought in Shiᶜī Islam." Ph.D. diss., University of California (Los Angeles), 1979.

Rafati, Vahid "The Development of Shaykhí Thought in Shi'i Islam." In *The Bahá'í faith and Islam: Proceedings of a Symposium, McGill University, March 23-25, 1984.* Association for Baha'i Studies, 1990.

Rashtī, Sayyid Kāẓim ibn Qāsim. *Dalīl al-mutaḥayyirīn*. [s.l., s.n.], 1276 [1849].

Rashtī, Sayyid Kāẓim ibn Qāsim. *Sharḥ qaṣīda.* [Tabriz?: s.n.], 1269 [1853].

Rashtī, Sayyid Kāẓim ibn Qāsim. *Al-risāla al-ᶜāmiliyya* [s.l., s.n., n.d.].

Rashtī, Sayyid Kāẓim ibn Qāsim. *Al-risāla al-suᶜūdiyya wa 'l-nuzūliyya*. [s.l., s.n., n.d.].

Rashtī, Sayyid Kāẓim ibn Qāsim. *Risāla asrār al-shahāda* [s.l., s.n., n.d.].

Rashtī, Sayyid Kāẓim ibn Qāsim. *Risāla-yi uṣūl al-ᶜaqāᵓid*. Vol. 4, INBA.

Rashtī, Sayyid Kāẓim ibn Qāsim. *Sharḥ Duᶜā al-samāt* [s.l., s.n., n.d.].

Rashtī, Sayyid Kāẓim ibn Qāsim. *Sharḥ al-Qaṣīda al-lāmiyya*. Tabriz: [s.n.], 1270 [1853].

"Review of Zarandi, *Dawn-Breakers*", *Theology Digest, v.* I9 no.3 , p. 280. (Autumn 1971).

Roemer, Hermann. *Die Babi-Beha'i: Die jüngste Mohammedanische Sekte*. Potsdam: [s.n.], 1912.

Rozen, Viktor Romanovich. "Les manuscrits arabes." In *Les Manuscrits arabes (non compris dans le no. 1), karchounis, grecs, coptes, éthiopiens, arméniens, géorgiens et bâbys de l'Institut des langues orientales*. Collections Scientifiques de l'Institut des Langues Orientales du Ministère des Affaires Étrangères, vol. 6. Saint Petersburg : [Impr. de l'Académie impériale des sciences], 1891.

Rozen, Viktor Romanovich. *Les Manuscrits arabes de l'Institut des langues orientales*. Collections Scientifiques de l'Institut des Langues Orientales du Ministère des Affaires Étrangères, vol. 1. Saint Petersburg : Eggers & Comp., 1877.

Rozen, Viktor Romanovich. *Les Manuscrits persans de l'Institut des langues orientales*. Collections Scientifiques de l'Institut des Langues Orientales du Ministère des Affaires Étrangères, vol. 3. Saint Petersburg : [Impr. de l'Académie impériale des sciences], 1886.

Rawḥānī-Nayrīzī, Muḥammad Shafī'. *Lamaᶜāt al-anwār*. 2 vols. Tehran: [s.n.], 130 B. [1973].

Sachedina, Abdulaziz. *Islamic Messianism: The Idea of Mahdī in Twelver Shīᶜism* (Albany, N.Y., 1981).

Sachedina, Abdjulaziz "Messianism", *The Oxford Encyclopedia of the Modern Islamic World,* New York, Oxford, OUP, 1995, vol. 3, pp. 95-99

Ṣadr al-Dīn Shīrazī, Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm. *Kitāb al-ᶜArshiyya*. Beirut: Muᵓassassat al-Taᵓrīkh al-ᶜArabi, 2000.

Ṣadr al-Dīn Shīrazī, Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm. *al-Maẓāhir al-ilāhiyya*. Mashhad: Chāpkhāna-i Khurāsān, 1380 [1960].

Ṣadrā, Mullā *see* Ṣadr al-Dīn Shīrazī, Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm

Samandar, Kāẓim. *Tārīkh-i Samandar wa mulhaqāt*. Edited by Mahdī Samandarī. Tehran: Muᵓassasa-yi Millī-yi Maṭbūᶜāt-i Amrī, 131 B. [1974].

Scarcia, Gianroberto. "A Proposito del Problema della Sovranita preso gli Imamiti." *Annali del Instituto Orientale Universitario di Napoli* (Naples) vol. 7 (1957), pp. 95-126.

Scarcia, Gianroberto. "Intorno alle Controversie tra Ahbārī e Usuli presso gli Imāmiti di Persia." *Rivista degli Studi Orientali* (Rome) vol. 33 (1958), pp. 211-50.

Scarcia, Gianroberto. "Kerman 1905: La 'Guerra' tra Šeihī e Bālāsarī." *Annali del Instituto Universitario di Napoli* (Naples) vol. 13 (1963), pp. 186-203.

Scarcia Amoretti, Biancarmia. "Sects and Hersies." In *The Cambridge History of Iran*, vol. 4, *The Period from the Arab Invasion to the Seljuqs*, edited by R. N. Frye. London: Cambridge University Press, 1975.

Scharf, Betty R. *The Sociological Study of Religion*. London: Hutchinson, 1970.

Shahristānī, Muḥammad Ḥusayn al-Ḥusaynī. *Tiryāq-i fārūq dar farq-i bayn-i Shaykhiyya va mutasharic̣a*. [s.l..: s.n.], 1302 [1884].

Sharif, Mian Mohammed, ed. *A History of Muslim Philosophy*. 2 vols. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1963-6.

Sharīf al-Raḍī, Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥusayn. *Nahj al-balāgha*. 2 vols. Cairo: Dār Iḥyāʾ al-Kutub al-ᶜArabiyya, 1963.

Shehabi, Mahmoud. "Shī'a." In *Islam: The Straight Path; Islam Interpreted by Muslims*, edited by Kenneth W Morgan. New York: Ronald Press, 1958.

Shīrāz University. Gurūh-i Badr. "Rizhīm dar andīsha-yi tuti'a-ī dīgar." Shīrāz, 1979. [mimeographed]

Shīrāzī, Luṭf ᶜAlī Mīrzā. [untitled ms. concerning the Māzandarān uprising]. CUL Browne Or. MS f. 28, item 3.

Shīrāzī, Luṭf ᶜAlī Mīrzā. *Tārīkh-i vaqāyiᶜ-i Māzandarān: A Chronicle of the Babi Uprising at Fort Shaykh Tabarsi in Mazandaran*. East Lansing, Mich.: H-Bahai, 2001. [Facsimile ed. of the above published on the Internet at: http://www.h-net.org/~bahai/arabic/vol5/lutfali/lutfali.htm]

Shīrāzī, Muḥammad Maᶜṣūm (Maᶜṣūm ᶜAlī Shāh). *Ṭarāʾiq al-ḥaqāʾiq*. 3 vols. Tehran: Kitābkhāna-yi Bārānī, 1960-66.

Shīrāzī, Sayyid ᶜAlī Muḥammad, the Bāb, For links to a large collection of online texts of the Bab's works, go to : http://www.h-net.org/~bahai/index/albab.htm. Another extensive collection can be found online at a Babi site, www.bayanic.com (under Sacred Writings).

Shīrāzī, Sayyid ᶜAlī Muḥammad, the Bāb. *Le Béyân Arabe: Le Livre Sacré du Bâbysme de Séyyèd Ali Mohammed dit le Bâb*. Translated by A.-L.-M. Nicolas. Paris: E. Leroux, 1905.

Shīrāzī, Sayyid ᶜAlī Muḥammad, the Bāb. "Ketab-e`-Hukkam (Le Livre des Preceptes)." In appendix to Gobineau, *Religions et philosophies dans l'Asie Centrale*. Paris: Perrin, 1865. [Ostensibly an independent work by the Bab, this is, in fact, merely a poor translation of the *Bayān al-ᶜArabī* (minus the eleventh and last section), preceded by a letter from the Bab to Mulla ᶜAbd al-Karīm Qazvīnī.]

Shīrāzī, Sayyid ᶜAlī Muḥammad, the Bāb. *Le Béyân Persan*. Translated by A.-L.-M. Nicolas. 4 vols. Paris: P. Geuthner, 1911-14.

Shīrāzī, Sayyid ᶜAlī Muḥammad, the Bāb. *Dalāᵓil-i sabᶜa ᶜArabī wa Fārsī* (Seven proofs). [Tehran: s.n., 1950?].

Shīrāzī, Sayyid ᶜAlī Muḥammad, the Bāb. *Le Livre des Sept Preuves de la Mission du Bâb* [*Dalāᵓil-i sabᶜa*]. Translated by A.-L.-M. Nicolas. Paris: J. Maisonneuve, 1902.

Shīrāzī, Sayyid ᶜAlī Muḥammad, the Bāb. “Excerpts from the Qayyūmu’l-Asmā.” In *Selections from the Writings of the Bab*. Compiled by the Research Department of the Universal House of Justice. Translated by Habib Taherzadeh. Haifa: Bahaᵓi World Centre, 1982.

Shīrāzī, Sayyid ᶜAlī Muḥammad, the Bāb. “Journey towards God’ (Risālah-fi’s-Sulūk): Translation and Text.” Translated by Todd Lawson. *Translations of Shaykhi, Bābi and Baha’i Texts* (East Lansing, Mich.) vol. 2, no.1 (January 1998.) http://www.h-net.org/~bahai/trans/vol2/suluk/suluktr.htm.

Shīrāzī, Sayyid ᶜAlī Muḥammad, the Bāb. *Khuṭba fī Jidda*. Manuscript in INBA 5006C, pp. 330-5.

Shīrāzī, Sayyid ᶜAlī Muḥammad, the Bāb. *Kitāb al-asmāᵓ*. Manuscript. British Library. Oriental Mms. Or. 6255.

Shīrāzī, Sayyid ᶜAlī Muḥammad, the Bāb. *Kitāb al-fihrist*. Manuscript in INBA 6003 C, pp. 285-293.

Shīrāzī, Sayyid ᶜAlī Muḥammad, the Bāb. *Kitāb al-rūh.* Manuscript in INBA 4011.C, pp. 61-100; 7005C.

Shīrāzī, Sayyid ᶜAlī Muḥammad, the Bāb. *Kitāb al-ṭahāra*. Manuscript in INBA 5010 C, pp. 166-75.

Shīrāzī, Sayyid ᶜAlī Muḥammad, the Bāb. *Kitāb aᶜmāl al-sana*. *see* Shīrāzī, Sayyid ᶜAlī Muḥammad, the Bāb. *Ṣaḥīfa aᶜmāl al-sana*.

Shīrāzī, Sayyid ᶜAlī Muḥammad, the Bāb. *Bayān-i Fārsī*. [Tehran: n. d.].

Shīrāzī, Sayyid ᶜAlī Muḥammad, the Bāb. *Al-Bayān al-ᶜArabī*. [Tehran: n.d.].

Shīrāzī, Sayyid ᶜAlī Muḥammad, the Bāb and Mīrzā Yaḥyā Nūrī Ṣubḥ-i Azal. *Majmūᶜaʾī az āthār-i Nuqṭa-yi Ūlā va Ṣubḥ-i Azal*. [Tehran: s.n., 196-?].

Shīrāzī, Sayyid ᶜAlī Muḥammad, the Bāb. *Muntakhabāt-i āyāt az āthār-i ḥadrat-i Nuqṭa-yi Ūlā*. Tehran: [s.n.], 134 BE [1977].

Shīrāzī, Sayyid ᶜAlī Muḥammad, the Bāb. *Qayyūm al-asmā.* Manuscript in CUL Browne Or. MS. F. 11. [dated 1891].

Shīrāzī, Sayyid ᶜAlī Muḥammad, the Bāb. *Qismatī az alvāḥ-i khaṭṭ-i Nuqṭa-yi Ūlā va Āqā Sayyid Ḥusayn Kātib*. [Tehran: s.n., 1958?].

Shīrāzī, Sayyid ᶜAlī Muḥammad, the Bāb. *Risāla-fī ʾl-sulūk*. Manuscript in INBA 4011.C, pp. 123-7; INBA 6006.C.

Shīrāzī, Sayyid ᶜAlī Muḥammad, the Bāb. *Risāla furūᶜ al-ᶜAdliyya*. Manuscript in INBA 5010 C, pp. 86-119.

Shīrāzī, Sayyid ᶜAlī Muḥammad, the Bāb. *Risāla furūᶜ al-ᶜAdliyya*. [Persian translation by Mullā Muḥammad Taqī Harawī] Manuscript in INBA 5010 C, pp. 119-66.

Shīrāzī, Sayyid ᶜAlī Muḥammad, the Bāb. *Ṣaḥīfa-yi ᶜadliyya*. [Tehran?: s.n. [Azali Babis], n.d.]

Shīrāzī, Sayyid ᶜAlī Muḥammad, the Bāb. *al-Ṣaḥīfa bayna 'l-ḥaramayn*. [In the hand of Ridvān ᶜAlī, 1905]. Manuscript in CUL, Browne Or. MS. F. 7.

Shīrāzī, Sayyid ᶜAlī Muḥammad, the Bāb. *al-Ṣaḥīfa al-rābiᶜa fī sharḥ duᶜā'ᵓihi fī zamān al-ghayba*. In *Majmūᶜa-yi āthār-i Ḥaḍrat-i Aᶜlā*. Vol. 60, *Iran National Bahaᵓi Manuscript Collection*. [c 1977], no. 13, pp. 150-154.

Shīrāzī, Sayyid ᶜAlī Muḥammad, the Bāb. *Ṣaḥīfa aᶜmāl al-sana* [*Kitāb aᶜmāl al-sana*]. Manuscript in INBA 5006C, pp. 262-78.

Shīrāzī, Sayyid ᶜAlī Muḥammad, the Bāb. *Al-Ṣaḥīfa al-makhzūna* [*Duᶜā-yi ṣaḥīfa.*] Manuscript in INBA 6009 C, pp. 1-171; CUL Add. 3704 (6).

Shīrāzī, Sayyid ᶜAlī Muḥammad, the Bāb. *al-Ṣaḥīfa al-Raḍawiyya*. (= *Risāla-yi Dhahabiyya*). Manuscript CUL, Browne Or. MS. F. 28, item 6.

Shīrāzī, Sayyid ᶜAlī Muḥammad, the Bāb. *Selections from the Writings of the Bab*. Compiled by the Research Department of the Universal House of Justice. Translated by Habib Taherzadeh. Haifa: Bahaᵓi World Centre, 1982.

Shīrāzī, Sayyid ᶜAlī Muḥammad, the Bāb. *Tafsīr al-basmala*. In *Majmūᶜa-yi āthār-i Ḥaḍrat-i Aᶜlā*. Vol. 60, *Iran National Bahaᵓi Manuscript Collection*. [c 1977], pp. 1-56.

Shīrāzī, Sayyid ᶜAlī Muḥammad, the Bāb. *Tafsīr ḥadīth al-jāriyya*. Manuscript in INBA 6004C, pp. 189-92; also in *Majmūᶜa-yi āthār-i Ḥaḍrat-i Aᶜlā*, Vol. 67, Iran National Bahaᵓi Manuscript Collection [c 1977], pp. 157-160.

Shīrāzī, Sayyid ᶜAlī Muḥammad, the Bāb. *Tafsīr Sūrat al-baqara*. CUL, Browne Or. MS. F.8. Another ms. in In *Majmūᶜa-yi āthār-i Ḥaḍrat-i Aᶜlā*, Vol. 67, Iran National Bahaᵓi Manuscript Collection [c 1977]; Digital reprint. Lansing, Mich.: H-Bahai, 1999, at: http://www.h-net.org/~bahai/areprint/bab/S-Z/tafbaq/baqarah.htm.

Shīrāzī, Sayyid ʿAlī Muḥammad, the Bāb. *Tafsīr Sūrat al-ḥamd*. In *Majmūʿa-yi āthār-i Ḥaḍrat-i Aʿlā*, Vol. 69, Iran National Bahaʾi Manuscript Collection [c 1977];, pp. 120-155.

Shīrāzī, Sayyid ʿAlī Muḥammad, the Bāb. *Tafsīr Sūrat al-kawthar*. Manuscript in CUL Browne Or. MS. F. 10; another ms. in *Majmūʿa-yi āthār-i Ḥaḍrat-i Aʿlā*, Vol. 53, Iran National Bahaʾi Manuscript Collection [c 1977]], pp. 181-383.

Shīrāzī, Sayyid ʿAlī Muḥammad, the Bāb. "Texts from the Persian Beyān giving the Bab's age at the Commencement of His Mission, an the Date Thereof." In *A Traveller's Narrative: Written to Illustrate the Episode of the* Bab. Edited and translated by Edward G. Browne. Cambridge: The University Press, 1891, vol. 2, pp. 218-26, note C.

Shīrāzī, Sayyid ʿAlī Muḥammad, the Bāb. "Translation of and Commentary on the *Qayyum al-Asma'*, Sura 93." Translated by B. Todd Lawson. [s.l.]: *Bahaʾi Library Online*, [n.d.]. Internet document at http://bahai-library.com/provionals/qayyum.al-asma.html

Shīrāzī, Sayyid ʿAlī Muḥammad, the Bāb. ["*Ziyāratnāma* for Shaykh Aḥmad al-Ahsaʾī"]. CUL, Browne Or. MS. F.20 ff. 85b-87b.

Shīrāzī, Sayyid ʿAlī Muḥammad, the Bāb. *Der Bab: Kleine Auswahl aus Seinen Schriften*. Langenhain: Baha'i-Verlag, 1980.

Shīrāzī, Sayyid ʿAlī Muḥammad, the Bāb. *Mukhtaṣarī az dastūrāt-i Bayān* Tehran: n.d.

Shīrāzī, Sayyid ʿAlī Muḥammad, the Bāb. *A Compilation of Passages from the Writings of the Bab*. Also 1980, [Manila, Philippines], BPT of the Philippines ed., ed. comp. Universal House of Justice. New Delhi: Baha'i Publishing Trust, 1980.

Shīrāzī, Sayyid ʿAlī Muḥammad, the Bāb. *Natījat al-Bayān fī man yuẓhiruhu 'llāh*. Tehran: 1332/1913-14; reprinted [Tehran]: Baha'i Publishing Committee, 105 B./1947-48.

Shīrāzī, Sayyid ʿAlī Muḥammad, the Bāb. *Inspiring the Heart*, London,

Baha'i Publishing Trust, 1981, 200 pp.

Shīrāzī, Sayyid ᶜAlī Muḥammad, the Bāb. *Lawḥ-i haykal al-dīn.* With Shīrāzī, Sayyid ᶜAlī Muḥammad, the Bāb, *al-Bayān al-ᶜArabī* [Tehran: n.d.].

Shīrāzī, Sayyid ᶜAlī Muḥammad, the Bāb. *O My Beloved Friends! You are the bearers of the name of God in this Day*. n.p. [United States]: n.d. [197-]. The so-called "Address to the Letters of the Living".

Shīrāzī, Sayyid ᶜAlī Muḥammad, the Bāb. *Selections from the Writings of the Bab*. Translated by Habib Taherzadeh and "a Committee". Ed. comp. Research Dept. of the Universal House of Justice. Haifa, Israel: Baha'i World Centre, 1976The original texts have been published in Shīrāzī, Sayyid ᶜAlī Muḥammad, the Bāb, *Muntakhābāt-i āyāt*.

Shīrāzī, Sayyid ᶜAlī Muḥammad, the Bāb. *Some Prayers of the Bab*. n.p. [London]: Baha'i Education Committee of the National Spiritual Assembly of the Baha'is of the UK, n.d. [1981?].

Shīrāzī, Sayyid ᶜAlī Muḥammad, the Bāb [?]. *The Bab's Address to the Letters of the Living*. Also as *The Bab's Instructions to the Letters of the Living*, Wilmette, Ill., Baha'i Publishing Committee, 1944. [The text of an address supposedly delivered by the Bab to his chief disciples. In fact, the only source for this sermon is Nabil-i Zarandi *The Dawn-Breakers*; no Persian or Arabic original is known to exist, nor is the style consistent with the Bab's work of that period.

Shīrāzī, Sayyid ᶜAlī Muḥammad, the Bāb. [On title-page: Nuqṭa-yi Ūlā jalla shaʾnuhu]. [*Kitab-i*] *panj shaʾn*. n.p. [Tehran]: [Azali community of Iran], n.d.

Shīrāzī, Sayyid ᶜAlī Muḥammad, the Bāb. [On title page: Nuqṭa-yi Ūlā jalla shaʾnuhu]. [*Kitab-i*] *panj shaʾn: qismat-i Fārsī* . n.p. [Iran]: [Azali community of Iran], n.d. [The twelve Persian sections of the Bab's predominantly Arabic work, the *Kitāb-i panj shaʾn*].

Shīrāzī, Sayyid ᶜAlī Muḥammad, the Bāb. [On title-page: Ḥaḍrat-i Nuqṭa-yi Ūlā]. *Majmūᶜa-yi munājāt*. n.p. [Tehran]: Baha'i Publishing Committee, 126

B.1969-70.

Shīrvānī, Zayn al-ᶜĀbidīn. *Bustān al-siyāha*. Tehran: Kitābkhāna-yi Sanāᵓī, [1895?].

Shoghi Effendi. *God Passes By.* Wilmette: Bahaᵓi Publishing Committee, 1944.

Shūstarī, Sayyid Nūr Allāh ibn Sharīf. *Majālis al-mumīnīn*. Tehran: [s.n.], 1268 [1852].

Sipihr, Muḥammad Taqī. *Nāsikh al-tawārīkh: Salāṭīn-i Qājār*. Edited by Muḥammad Bāqir Bihbūdī. 4 vols. Tehran: 1344 [1965].

Smith, Peter. "Millenarianism in the Babi and Bahaᵓi Religions." Paper presented at the third Bahaᵓi Studies Seminar, Lancaster University, 7-8 April 1979.

Smith, Peter. "Motif Research: Peter Berger and the Baha'i Faith." *Religion* (London) vol. 8, no. 2 (1978), pp. 210-34.

Smith, Peter, Moojan Momen. "The Bábí Movement: A Resource Mobilization Perspective", *In Iran: Studies in Bábí and Bahá'í History* vol. 3, ed. Peter Smith (Los Angeles: Kalimat Press, 1986) pages 33-93. Available online at: www.bahai-library.org/articles/babi.movement.html.

Suhrāb, Mirza Aḥmad. *al-Risāla al-tisᶜ ᶜashrata fī taᵓrīkh Ḥaḍrat al-Aᶜlā*. Cairo: Maṭbaᶜat al-Saᶜāda, 1338 [1919].

Strothmann, Rudolf. "Shīᶜa." In *Encyclopedia of Islam*. London: Luzac; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1908-1936.

Strothmann, Rudolf. *Die Zwölfer Schī'a: zwei religionsgeschichtliche Charakterbilder aus der Mongolenzeit*. Leipzig: Harrassowitz, 1926.

Stuart, Charles. *Journal of a Residence in Northern Persia and the Adjacent Provinces of Turkey*. London: R. Bentley, 1854.

Ṣubhī, Aḥmad Maḥmūd. *Naẓariyyat al-imāma ladā 'l-Shīᶜa al-ithnaᵓ-ᶜashariyya*. Cairo: Dār al-Maᶜārif, 1969.

Ṣubh-i Azal, Mīrzā Yahyā. See Nūrī, Mīrzā Yahyā, Ṣubh-i Azal.

Suhrāb, Aḥmad Afandī *see* Sohrab, Mirza Aḥmad.

Surūsh, Aḥmad. *Muddaᶜīyān-i mahdaviyyat az ṣadr-i islām ta ᶜaṣr –i ḥāḍir*. Tehran: Bungāh-i Maṭbūᶜātī-yi Afshārī, 1348 [1969].

Ṭabarsī, Ḥājj Mīrzā Ḥusayn Nūrī. *Jannat al-maᵓwā*. Appended to *Biḥār al-anwār*, by Muḥammad Bāqir ibn Muḥammad Taqī Majlisī. Edited by Muḥammad Bāqir Bihbūdī. Tehran: Dār al-Kutub al-Islāmiyya, 1376-92 [1956-72], vol. 53, pp. 199-336.

Ṭabāṭabāᵓī, Muḥammad Ḥusayn. *Shiᶜite Islam*. Translated by Seyyed Hossein Nasr. London: Allen and Unwin, 1975.

Ṭabāṭabāᵓī, Muḥīṭ. "Kitābī bī nām bā nāmī tāza." *Gawhar* (Tehran) vol. 11/12 (1353 [1974]), pp. 952-61.

Ṭabāṭabāᵓī, Muhīt. "Tarīkh-i qadīm wa jadīd." *Gawhar* (Tehran) vol. 5/6 (1354 [1975]), pp. 343-8, 426-31.

Tabrīzī, Ḥājj Mullā ᶜAlī Vāᵓiẓ-i Khiyābānī. *Kitāb-i ᶜulamaᵓ-i muᶜāṣirīn*. Tabriz: Matbaᶜat-i Islāmiyya, 1366 [1947].

Tabrizī, Muḥammad Mahdī Khān. *Miftāḥ Bāb al-abwāb, yā tārīkh-i Bāb va Bahāᵓ*. Translated by Ḥasan Farīd Gulpāyagānī. 3rd ed. Tehran: Farāhānī, 1346 [1967].

Tabrīzī, Muᶜīn al-Salṭana *see* Muᶜīn al-Salṭana Tabrizī, Ḥājī Muḥammad

Ṭāhira *see* Qurrat al-ᶜAyn

Tag, Abd el-Rahman. ᶜ*Le Babisme et l'Islam: Recherches sur les origines du Babisme et ses rapports avec l'Islam*." Doctoral dissertation, Université de Paris, 1942.

Tanakābunī, Mullā Muḥammad ibn Sulaymān. *Qiṣaṣ al-ᶜulamāᵓ*. Tehran: Intishārāt-i ᶜIlmiyya-yi Islāmiyya, [n.d.].

Ṭihrānī, Āghā Buzurg al-. *al-Dharīᶜa ilā ṭaṣānīf al-Shīᶜa.* 25 vols. Najaf: Maṭbaᶜat al-Gharrī; Tehran: Dānishgāh 1335-1398 [1916-78].

Ṭihrānī, Āghā Buzurg al-. *Ṭabaqāt Aᶜlām al-Shīᶜa.* 2 vols. in 5 parts. Najaf: al-Maṭbaᶜa al-ᶜIlmiyya, 1373-1388 [1954-68].

Tumanski, Aleksandr Grigor'evich. *K voprosu ob avtorakh istorii babidov, izvestno pod imenem Tārīkh manukchi ili Tārīkhe dzedid*. St. Petersburg: Tip. Akad nauk, 1893.

Turner, Bryan S. *Weber and Islam: A Critical Study*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1974.

Ṭūsī, Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan. *al-Fihrist*. Edited by Sayyid Muḥammad Bāqir Āl Baḥr al-ᶜUlūm. Najaf: al-Maktaba wa 'l-Maṭbaᶜa al-Haydariyya,1380 [1960].

Ṭūsī, Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan. *Rijāl al-Ṭūsī*. Edited by Sayyid Muḥammad Bāqir Āl Baḥr al-ᶜUlūm. Najaf: al-Maktaba wa 'l-Maṭbaᶜa al-Haydariyya, 1381 [1961].

Tūsī, Naṣīr al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad. *The Rawḍatu'l-Taslīm: Commonly called Taṣawwurāt*. Edited by and translated W. Ivanow. Leiden: E. J. Brill, for the Ismaili Society, 1950. [Persian and English]

Upton, Joseph M. *The History of Modern Iran: An Interpretation*. Cambridge, Mass.: Center for Middle Eastern Studies of Harvard University, 1960.

Vazīrī Kirmānī, Aḥmad ᶜAlī Khān. *Tārīkh-i Kirmān (Sālāriyya)*. Edited by Muḥammad Ibrāhīm Bāstānī Pārīzī; Tehran: Kitabhā-yi Īrān, 1962.

Velasco, Ismael. "A Prolegomenon to the Study of Babi and Baha'i Scripture: The Importance of Henry Corbin to Babi and Baha'i Studies". *Baha'i Studies Review* 12 (2004).

Vidal, F. S. *The Oasis of al-Hasa.* [New York?]: Arabian Oil Co., Local Govt. Relations, Arabian Research Division, 1955.

Voll, John. "The Sudanese Mahdī: Frontier Fundamentalist." *International Journal of MiddleEastern Studies* (Cambridge) vol. 10 (1979), pp. 145-66.

Waḥīdī, Hājī Sayyid Muḥammad al-Ḥusaynī al-Shabistarī. *Sharḥ-i Ziyārat-i jāmiᶜa-yi-kabīra*. Tehran: [s.n.], 1333 Sh [1954].

John Walbridge. "The Bab's *Panj Shaᵓn* (Five Modes)": *Research Notes in Shaykhi, Babi and Baha'i Studies*, Vol. 2, no. 3 (April, 1998). Available online at: www.h-net.org/~bahai/notes/vol2/panjshn.htm.

John Walbridge. "Document and Narrative Sources for the History of the Battle of Zanjan." *Occasional Papers in Shaykhi, Babi and Baha'i Studies*, vol. 2, no. 4 (May, 1998). Available online at: www.h-net.org/~bahai/bhpapers/vol2/nabilz.htm.

John Walbridge. "Essays and Notes on Babi and Baha'i History". *Occasional Papers in Shaykhi, Babi and Baha'i Studies*, vol. 6, no.1 (March, 2002), *Special Monograph Edition*. Available online at: www.h-net.org/~bahai/bhpapers/vol6/waless/waltoc.htm.

Walbridge Linda, ed., *The Most Learned of the Shiᶜa, The Institution of the Marjaᶜ Taqlid* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001)

Warburg, Margit. "Babisme". In *Den Store Danske Encycklopaedi*, 229. 2. Copenhagen: Nationalleksikon, 1995.

Wardī, ᶜAlī. *Lamaḥāt ijtimāᶜiyya min taᵓrīkh al-ᶜIrāq al-ḥadīth*. 6 vols. in 7. Baghdad: Maṭbaᶜat al-Irshād, 1969-1976.

Watson, Robert Grant. *A History of Persia from the Beginning of the Nineteenth Century to the Year 1858.* London: Smith Elder, 1866.

Watt, W. Montgomery. "The Conception of the Charismatic Community in Islam." *Numen* (Leiden), vol. 7 (1960) pp. 77-90.

Watt, W. Montgomery. *The Formative Period of Islamic Thought*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1973.

Watt, W. Montgomery. *Truth in the Religions: A Sociological and Psychological Approach*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1963.

Wilson, Samuel Graham. "'The Bayan of the Bab'." *Princeton Theological Review* (Princeton, N. J.) 13 (4 Oct. 1915): 633-54.11.1102

Winters, Jonah. (1997) *Dying for God: Martyrdom in the Shii and Babi religions.* Thesis (M.A.)—University of Toronto (Ont.), 1997.

Za'im al-Dawla, Mirza Mahdī Khan *see* Tabrizī, Muḥammad Mahdī Khān

Zarandī, Mullā Muḥammad Nabīl. *The Dawn-Breakers: Nabīl's Narrative of the Early Days of the Bahaʾi Revelation.* Translated and edited by Shoghi Effendi. Wilmette, Ill.: Bahaʾi Publishing Committee, 1932.

Zarandī, Mullā Muḥammad Nabīl. *Maṭāliᶜ al-anwār*. [=*The Dawn-Breakers*] Translated by ᶜAbd al-Ḥamīd Ishrāq Khāvarī, [Tehran]: Baha'i Publishing Committee, 129 B./1972-73.

Zarandī, Mullā Muḥammad Nabīl. *Maṭāliᶜ al-anwār aw Taʾrīkh al-Nabīl*, [=*The Dawn-Breakers*] Translated by ᶜAbd al-Jalīl Saᶜīd. 4th. printing Arabic ed., Alexandria, 1940.

Zavāraʾī, Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn. *Majlis-i shahādat-i ḥaḍrat-i awwal man āmana, Qāʾim-i Khurāsānī*. CUL Browne Or. MS. F. 28, item 2.

Zavāra'ī, Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn. *Waqāyiᶜ-i Mīmiyya*. CUL Browne Or. MS. F. 28, item 1.

Zwemer, Samuel M. "Review of A. L. M. Nicolas (trans.), *Le Beyan Persan*." *The Moslem World* (Hartford, Conn.) 2 (2 Apr. 1912): 202.11.1127.

FOOTNOTES

Preface

[1] Translated into English as *The Dawn-Breakers: Nabīl's Narrative of the Early Days of the Baha'i Revelation*. Translated and edited by Shoghi Effendi, Wilmette, Ill.: Baha'i Publishing Committee, 1932.

Introduction

[2] See Guenter Lewy, *Religion and Revolution* (New York: Oxford University Press), 1974.

[3] Notice, for example, the scant space devoted to the religious element in the chapter on opposition in Fred Halliday, *Iran: Dictatorship and Development* (Harmondsworth: Penguin), 1979.

[4] See Lewy, *Religion and Revolution*, pp. 104-7.

[5] Werner Stark (1910-1985), quoted in ibid., p. 105.

[6] Ibid.

[7] Ibid., pp. 104-105.

[8] John Voll , "The Sudanese Mahdī: Frontier Fundamentalist," *International Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* (Cambridge) vol. 10 (1979), p. 145.

[9] Edward Granville Browne, introduction to *The Tārīkh-i-Jadīd, or New History of Mīrzā ᶜAlī Muḥammad the Bab*, by Mīrzā Husain Hamadānī; translated by Edward Granville Browne (Cambridge: The University Press, 1893), p. vii.

[10] Edward Granville Browne, introduction to *Kitāb-i Nuqṭatu'l-Kāf, Being the Earliest History of the Babis*, by Ḥājī Mīrzā Jānī Kāshānī. Edited by

Edward Granville Browne (Leiden: E. J. Brill; London: Luzac, 1910), p. xlix.

[11] Hamid Algar, *Religion and State in Iran 1785-1906: The Role of the Ulama in the Qajar Period* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969), p. 151.

Chapter One

[12] See Henry Corbin, *En Islam iranien* (Paris: Gallimard, 1971-2), vol. 4, pp. 205-300; idem, *Terre céleste et corps de resurrection de l'Iran mazdéen à l'Iran shî'ite* (Paris: Buchet/Chastel, 1960), pp. 183-7, 281-401; idem, "L'École Shaykie en Théologie Shî'ite," *Annuaire—École Pratique des Hautes Études, Section—Sciences Religieuses* (Paris) (1960-61), pp. 1-59. In *Terre céleste* (p. 183), Corbin observes of the Shaykhi school "qu'elle marque une revivification puissante de la gnose shî'ite primitive et des enseignements contenus dans les traditions remontant aux saints Imâms."

[13] "He [Shaykh Aḥmad] opposed the Platonists, the Stoics, and the Aristotelians (*ḥukamā-yi ishrāqīyīn wa rawāqīyīn wa mashāʾīn*) on most questions, and insisted on refuting them and demonstrating the falsity of their arguments", (Sayyid Kāẓim Rashti, *Dalīl al-mutaḥayyirīn* ([s.l.: s.n.], 1276 [1859]), p. 21; cf. ibid., pp. 39, 50-2.) See also Shaykh Aḥmad al-Ahsaʾi , *Sharḥ al-ziyāra al-jāmiᶜa al-kabīra* (Tehran, 1267 [1850]), part 1, pp. 24, 70; Sayyid Kāẓim Rashti, introduction to his translation of the *Ḥayāt al-nafs* by Shaykh Aḥmad al-Ahsaʾi, 2nd ed. (Kirman, 1353 Sh [1974]), pp. 5, 10-11; idem, *Risāla-yi uṣūl al-ᶜaqāʾid*, vol. 4, *Iran National Bahaʾi Manuscript Collection* (Tehran: Muʾassasa-yi Milli-yi Maṭbūᶜāt-i Amrī, [c 1977]), pp. 10, 13, 61-2, 63-4, 202; Ḥājj Muḥammad Bāqir Hamadānī, *Kitāb al-Ijtināb* ([s.l.: s.n.], 1308 [1890]), pp. 113-4. For the views of the Bab on these groups, see various *khuṭub* in Iran National Bahaʾi Archives (INBA) 5006 C, pp. 317-35, 339-40, 354-63.

[14] See, for example, Bryan S. Turner, *Weber and Islam: A Critical Study* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1974), pp. 84-91; W. Montgomery Watt, "The Conception of the Charismatic Community in Islam," *Numen* (Leiden) vol. 7 (1960), pp. 77-90; W. Montgomery Watt, *Truth in the Religion: A*

Sociological and Psychological Approach (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1963), pp. 115-6, 144-5.

[15] Rudolf Strothmann, "Shīᶜa," in *Encyclopedia of Islam* (London: Luzac; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1908-1936), p. 353.

[16] Muḥammad al-Ḥusayn al-Muẓaffarī, *Taʾrīkh al-shīᶜa* (Najaf, 1352 [1933]), p. 65.

[17] Muḥammad Javād Mashkūr, *Tārīkh-i Shīᶜa va firqahā-yi Islām tā qarn-i chahārum* (Tehran: Intishārāt-i Ishrāqī, 2535 Sh [1976]), pp. 142-6; cf. Muḥammad Bāqir ibn Muḥammad Taqī Majlisī, *Biḥār al-anwār*, edited by Muḥammad Bāqir Bihbūdī (Tehran: Dār al-Kutub al-Islāmīyya, 1376-92 [1956-72]), vol. 51, pp. 367-81.

[18] The traditional sources maintain that the Imām addressed a last letter to al-Sāmarrī, in which he instructed him to appoint no-one in his place. See Majlisī, *Biḥār al-anwār*, vol. 51, p. 361.

[19] For traditions relating to this doctrine, see Muḥammad ibn Yaᶜqūb al-Kulaynī, *al-Uṣūl min al-Kāfī*, edited by Muḥammad Bāqir al-Bihbūdī and ᶜAlī Akbar al-Ghaffārī, translation and commentary by Āyat Allāh Ḥājī Shaykh Muḥammad Bāqir al-Kamra'ī (Tehran: s.n., 1392[1972]), vol. 1, pp.332-5; Muḥammad Karīm Khān Kirmānī, *Faṣl al-khiṭāb*, 2nd ed. (Kirman, 1392 [1972]), pp. 72-4; Muḥammad Khān Kirmānī, *al-Kitāb al-mubīn*, 2nd ed., [Kirman]: Chāpkhānih-i Sa'ādat, 1354 Sh [1975], vol. 1, pp. 199-207.

[20] Recorded in Muḥammad ibn Yaᶜqūb al-Kulaynī, *Rawḍat al-Kāfī* (Najaf, 1385/1965), p. 129.

[21] On the nature and significance of this interworld, see Corbin, *Terre céleste* passim. For a discussion of visions of the Imām from a later Shaykhi viewpoint, see Zayn al-ᶜĀbidīn Khān Kirmānī, "Risāla dar jawāb-i Āqā-yi Niẓām al-Islām Iṣfahānī," in *Majmaᶜ al-rasāʾil-i fārsī* (Kirman) vol. 8 (1352 Sh [1973]), pp. 72-103.

[22] See Corbin, *En Islam*, vol. 4, pp. 322-89.

[23] Ḥājī Mīrzā Ḥusayn Nūrī Ṭabarsī, "Jannat al-maʾwā," in Muḥammad Bāqir ibn Muḥammad Taqī Majlisī, *Bihār al-anwār*, vol. 53, pp. 199-336. On Nūrī see Muḥammad Muḥsin Āghā Buzurg al-Ṭihrānī, *Ṭabaqāt aʿlām al-Shīʿa* (Najaf: al-Matbaʿa al-ʿIlmiyya, 1373-88 [1954-68]), vol. 1, pp. 543-5.

[24] The Hidden Imām is believed to visit this mosque every Thursday. The prophets Abraham, Idrīs, and al-Khiḍr are believed to have lived and prayed there.

[25] Nūrī, "Jannat al-maʾwā," p. 243.

[26] It was first published thus by Ḥājī Muḥammad Ḥasan Iṣfahānī (Kumpānī) in his first edition of the *Bihār al-anwār* (see Āghā Buzurg al-Ṭihrānī, *al-Dharīʿa ilā ṭaṣānīf al-Shīʾa* (Najaf: Matbaʿa al-Gharri; Tehran: Danishgah 1335-98 [1916-78], 19 vols.), vol. 5, pp. 159-60.

[27] Ernest Gellner, "Concepts and Society," quoted in Bryan S. Turner, *Weber and Islam: A Critical Study*, p. 68.

[28] Betty R. Scharf, *The Sociological Study of Religion* (London: Hutchinson, 1970), p. 154.

[29] It is relevant to note here that one of the best examples of such further routinization following the death of the bearer of hereditary, latent charisma is to be found in the Bahaʾi movement after the demise of Shoghi Effendi, the *walī amr Allāh*, in 1957; the subsequent increase in organizational elements, the introduction of a vastly expanded complex of appointed officials, and the combination of charismatic and legal authority in an elected body have all resulted in a very high degree of routinization and a much more 'church-like' image. See Vernon Elvin Johnson, "An Historical Analysis of Critical Transformations in the Evolution of the Baha'i World Faith," Ph.D. diss., Baylor University (Waco, Texas), 1974. For earlier routinization in the movement, see Peter L. Berger, "From Sect to Church: A Sociological Interpretation of the Baha'i Movement," Ph.D. diss., New School for Social Research (New York City), 1954.

[30] See Berger, "From Sect to Church"; idem, "Motif messianique et processus social dans le Bahaisme," *Archives de Sociologie des Religions* (Paris) vol. 4 (1957), pp. 93-107; Johnson, "An Historical Analysis."

[31] See Muḥammad al-Ḥusayn Āl Kāshif al-Ghiṭā, *Aṣl al-Shīᶜa wa uṣūluhā,* 9th ed. (Najaf: [s.n.], 1381 [1962]), p. 92; Muḥammad Ḥusayn Ṭabāṭabāᵓī, *Shiᶜite Islam,* translated by Seyyed Hossein Nasr (London: Allen and Unwin, 1975), p. 190. A large number of such traditions is cited by the Bab in his "Tafsīr Sūrat al-kawthar" (Manuscript in Cambridge University Library, Browne Or. MS. F. 10), pp. 44b, 45b, 46b, 48a, 49a. This question is discussed in detail in Etan Kohlberg, "From Imāmiyya to Ithnaᵓ-ᶜAshariyya," *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* (London) vol. 39 (1976), pp. 521-34.

[32] See Rashti. *Risāla-yi uṣūl al-ᶜaqāᵓid*, pp. 174-5.

[33] On the Mahdī in Sunni and, to a lesser extent, Shiᶜi belief, see D. S. Margoliouth, "Mahdī," in James Hastings, ed. *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1908-26); D. B. Macdonald, "Al-Mahdī," in *Encyclopaedia of Islam* first ed. (London: Luzac; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1908-1936); Wilferd Madelung, "Mahdī", *Encyclopedia of Islam,* new ed., (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1960-), vol. 5, pp. 1230-38; Robert S. Kramer, "Mahdī", *The Oxford Encyclopedia of the Modern Islamic World,* New York, Oxford: OUP, 1995, vol. 3, pp. 18-19; Abdulaziz Sachedina, "Messianism", in ibid, vol. 3, pp. 95-99 On the Shīᶜī concept, see A. A. Sachedina, *Islamic Messianism: The Idea of Mahdī in Twelver Shīᶜism* (Albany, N.Y., 1981). On the concept in the early period, see Syed Husain M. Jafri, *The Origins and Early Development of Shiᶜa Islam*. London; New York: Longman, 1979.

The most popular *Shiᶜi* source for traditions on the *rajᶜa* of the twelfth Imām is Majlisī, *Biḥār al-anwār*, vol. 53, pp. 1-144. An excellent systematic compilation of traditions relating to resurrection in general (*maᶜād*), *qiyāma,* and *rajᶜa* is to be found in Muḥammad Khān Kirmānī, *al-Kitāb al-mubīn,* 2nd ed. ([Kirman]: Chāpkhānih-i Saʻādat, 1354 Sh [1975-6]), vol. 2, pp. 115-57. Succinct accounts of this topic (which is particularly relevant to our later discussion of Shaykhi expectation) may be found in Shaykh Aḥmad al-Ahsaᵓi, *Ḥayāt al-nafs*. Trans. Sayyid Kāẓim Rashti, 2nd ed. Kirman: Matbaᶜat al Saᶜādat, 1353 Sh [1974], pp. 91-134 and Muḥammad Karīm Khān Kirmānī, *Irshād al-'awwām,* 4th ed. (Kirman: Chāpkhānih-i Saʻādat, 1380 [1960]), vol. 3, pp. 338-453. An early Babi compilation of messianic traditions, largely derived from the *ᶜAwālim* may be found in an anonymous *risāla* in *Nivishtijāt wa āthār-i aṣḥab-i awwaliyya-yi amr-i aᶜlā*

(photocopied MS in bound format, Tehran: Muʾassasa-yi Millī-yi Maṭbūʿāt-i Amrī, [1970s]), pp. 1-196.

[34] Kirmānī, *al-Kitāb al-mubīn*, vol. 1, pp. 264-7; Muḥammad ʿAlī Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī, *A Shi'ite Creed: A Translation of Risalatu'l-Iʿtiqadat of Muḥammad b. ʿAli Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummi, known as Shaykh Saduq*, trans. Asaf A. A. Fyzee (London: Oxford University Press, 1942; rev. ed. World Organization of Islamic Services: Tehran (Iran), 1982), pp. 99-100.

[35] Compare Macdonald, "Al-Mahdī," p. 113.

[36] Berger, "From Sect to Church"; Berger, "Motif messianique." For a divergent view, see Peter Smith, "Millenarianism in the Babi and Bahaʾi Religions," paper presented at the third Bahaʾi Studies Seminar, Lancaster University, 7-8 April 1979.

[37] An example of this view relevant to the present study may be found in Muḥammad Karīm Khān Kirmānī, "Risāla-yi tīr i shihāb," in *Majmaʿ al-rasāʾil-i fārsī*, vol. 1, pp. 167-81, especially pp. 178-81.

[38] In Kirmānī, *al-Kitāb al-mubīn*, vol. 1, p. 434.

[39] Ibid., p. 435.

[40] Kirmānī, *Faṣl al-khiṭāb*, p. 95.

[41] Kirmānī, *al-Kitāb al-mubīn*, vol. 1, p. 95.

[42] On the value of the polar motif in this context, see Peter Smith, "Motif Research: Peter Berger and the Baha'i Faith," *Religion* (London) vol. 8, no. 2 (1978), pp. 210-34.

[43] See Mullā Muḥammad ibn Sulaymān Tanakābunī, *Qiṣaṣ al-ʿulamāʾ* (Tehran: Intishārāt i ʿIlmiyya-yi Islāmīyya, [n.d.]), p. 204.

[44] For this reason *Shiʿi* ulama are often referred to by titles incorporating the names of their most important works, such as "Ṣāḥib al-Wasāʾil", "Ṣāḥib al-Madārik", 'Ṣāḥib Kashf al-Ghiṭāʾ" or even "Kāshif al-Ghiṭāʾ".

[45] Kirmānī, *al-Kitāb al-mubīn,* vol. 1, pp. 434-435.

[46] Kirmānī, *Faṣl al-khiṭāb*, p. 95.

[47] Kirmānī, *al-Kitāb al-mubīn,* vol. 1, p. 435.

[48] For general lists of early Iranian *Shiᶜi* exponents of these disciplines, see Seyyed Hossein Nasr and M. Mutahhari, "The Religious Sciences," in *The Cambridge History of Iran*, vol. 4, *The Period from the Arab Invasion to the Seljuqs*, ed. R. N. Frye (London: Cambridge University Press, 1975), pp. 468, 472, 473-74, 478. On early Rāfīᶜī scholars, including Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam (d. 807), ᶜAlī ibn Maytham al-Tammār and Hishām ibn Sālim al-Jawālīqī, see W. Montgomery Watt, *The Formative Period of Islamic Thought* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1973), pp. 157-62. The most comprehensive lists of *Shiᶜi* scholars who were companions of the Imāms, listed under each name in turn, can be found in Abū Jaᵓfar Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan al-Ṭūsī, *Rijāl al-Ṭūsī* (Najaf: al-Maktaba wa-al-Maṭbaᶜa al-Haydariyya, 1381[1961]) and Abū ᶜAmr Muḥammad ibn ᶜUmar al-Kashshī, *Kitāb maᶜrifa akhbār al-rijāl*, ed. Hājī Shaykh ᶜAlī al-Maḥallātī (Bombay: [s.n.], 1317 [1899]). See also Sayyid Muhsin al-Amīn al-ᶜĀmilī, *Aᶜyān al-Shīᶜa* (Beirut: Maṭbaᶜa al-Insāf, 1950 -).

[49]See Abū 'l-ᶜAbbās Aḥmad al-Najāshī. *al-Rijāl* (Tehran: Markaz-i Nashr-i Kitāb, [196-?]), pp. 235-6; Abū Jaᶜfar Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan al-Ṭūsī, *al-Fihrist*, ed. Sayyid Muḥammad Bāqir Al Baḥr al-ᶜUlūm, 2nd ed. (Najaf: al-Maktaba wa 'l-Maṭbaᶜa al-Haydariyya, 1380 [1960]), pp. 150-1; al-Kashshī, *Maᶜrifa akhbār al-rijāl*, pp. 333-7.

[50] ᶜAbbās Iqbāl, *Khāndān-i Nawbakhtī*, 2nd ed. (Tehran: Kitabkhāna-yi Tāhurī, 1966), pp. 80-1, and bibliography there.

[51] See Iqbāl, *Khāndān* pp. 79-80, and bibliography there; al-Najāshī, *al-Rijāl*, p. 338; al-Ṭūsī, *al-Fihrist,* pp. 203-5; al-Kashshī, *Maᶜrifa akhbār al-rijāl*, pp. 165-81; Watt, *Formative Period*, pp. 186-9; Wilferd Madelung, "Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam," in *Encyclopedia of Islam*, 2nd ed. (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1960-).

[52] Iqbāl, *Khāndān*, p. 69.

[53] Ibid., pp. 72, 74.

[54] Ibid., p. 74.

[55] See ibid., pp. 84-7, and bibliography there.

[56] See ibid., pp. 87-9, and bibliography there.

[57] *Formative Period*, p. 274.

[58] Ṭabāṭabāʾī, *Shiᶜite Islam*, p. 63.

[59] Heribert Busse, "Iran under the Būyids" in *The Cambridge History of Iran*, vol. 4, *The Period from the Arab Invasion to the Seljuqs*, ed. R. N. Frye (London: Cambridge University Press, 1975), p. 288.

[60] On the development of Shiᶜism in these regions, see al-Muẓaffarī, *Ta'rīkh al-Shīᶜa*, pp. 76-7, 108-10, 139-48, 149-60, 261-4.

[61] Hamid Algar, *Religion and State in Iran 1785-1906: The Role of the Ulama in the Qajar Period* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969), p. 5.

[62] Ibid.

[63] Rūḥ Allāh Khomeini, *Vilāyat-i faqīh dar khuṣuṣ-i ḥukūmat-i Islāmī* (Tehran: s.n., 1357 Sh./1979), pp. 74-89.

[64] Ibid., p. 64.

[65] Ibid., p. 142.

[66] Ibid., p. 49

[67] Watt, *Truth in the Religions* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1963), pp. 67-8; cf. pp. 115-6, 144-5, where he limits this distinction to the Kharijites (Khawārij) and the early Shiᶜa.

[68] There are numerous *akhbār* on this theme: see, for example, al-Kulaynī, *Rawḍat al-Kāfī*, pp. 68, 128, 180-1, 201, 300-1; Kirmānī, *al-Kitāb al-mubīn*, vol. 1, pp. 234-546.

[69] Kirmānī, *Irshād al-ᶜawāmm*, vol. 4, pp. 142-449; Kirmānī, *al-Kitāb al-mubīn*, vol. 1, pp. 437-8.

[70] Kirmānī, *Faṣl al-khiṭāb*, p. 95.

[71] Muḥammad Karīm Khān Kirmānī, a*l-Fitra al-salīma,* 3rd ed. (Kirman: Maṭbaᶜat al-Saᶜāda. [1958]), vol. 3, p. 258.

[72] Kirmānī, *Irshād*, vol. 4, pp. 160-4.

[73] Ibid., pp. 166-75.

[74] Muḥammad Karīm Khān Kirmānī, *Izhāq al-Bāṭil* (Kirman: [s.n.], 1392 [1972]), pp. 177-262; Kirmānī, "Risāla-yi tīr-i shihāb," pp. 212-25.

[75] Iqbāl, *Khāndān*, p. 71.

[76] Ibid., p. 65.

[77] Mashkūr, *Tārīkh-i Shīᶜa*, p. 139.

[78] Mullā Muḥammad Amīn Astarābādī, *Fawāᵓid al-madaniyya*, quoted in Muḥammad Bāqir Khwānsārī, *Kitāb rawḍāt al-jannāt fī aḥwāl al-ᶜulamāᵓ wa 'l-sādāt*. 3rd ed. ([s.l., s.n.], 1367 [1947]), p. 34; Leonard Binder, "The Proofs of Islam: Religion and Politics in Iran," in *Arabic and Islamic Studies in Honor of Hamilton A. R. Gibb,* ed. George Makdisi (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1965), p. 124.

[79] Khwānsārī, *Rawḍāt al-jannāt,* p. 174; Mullā Muḥammad ibn Sulaymān Tanakābunī, *Qiṣaṣ al-ᶜulamāᵓ*, p. 360.

[80] Muḥammad Karīm Khān Kirmānī, "Risāla-yi tīr-i shihāb," p. 175.

[81] Muḥammad Jawād Mughniyya, *Maᶜa ᶜulamāᵓ al-Najaf* (Beirut: al-Makataba al-Ahlāya, 1962), p. 81.

[82] Tanakābunī, *Qiṣaṣ al-ᶜulamāᵓ*, p. 198.

[83] Berger, "From Sect to Church," pp. 161-2.

[84] See Aḥmad Sohrab, *Al-risāla al-tisᵓ ᶜashariyya*. (Cairo: Maṭbaᶜa al-Saᶜāda, 1338 [1919]), p. 9; Mīrzā Ḥusayn Hamadānī, *The Tārīkh-i-Jadīd,* preface, pp. 180, 185, 321-2; Zarandī, *The Dawn-Breakers: Nabīl's Narrative of the Early Days of the Bahaᵓi Revelation*, trans. and ed. Shoghi Effendi (Wilmette, Ill.: Bahaᵓi Publishing Committee, 1932), pp. 1-2.

[85] For discussions of relations between church and state in the Safavid period, see Algar, *Religion and State*, pp. 27-30; Nikki R. Keddie, "The Roots of the Ulama's Power in Modern Iran," in Nikki R. Keddie ed., *Scholars, Saints and Ṣūfīs: Religious Institutions in the Middle East since 1500* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972), pp. 217-22; Michel M. Mazzaoui, *The Origins of the Safawids: Shiᶜism, Sufism, and the Ghulāt* (Wiesbaden: F. Steiner, 1972), passim; Helmut Braun, "Iran under the Safavids and in the 18th Century," in Berthold Spuler, *The Muslim World: A Historical Survey*, part 3, *The Last Great Muslim Empires*, trans. F.R.C. Bagley (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1969); Ann K. S. Lambton, "Quis Custodiet Custodes: Some Reflections on the Persian Theory of Government, part II," *Studia Islamica* (Paris) vol. 6 (1956), pp. 131-42; Said Amir Arjomand, *The Shadow of God and the Hidden Imam: Religion, Political Order and Societal Change in Shi'ite Iran from the Beginning to 1890* (Publications of the Center for Middle Eastern Studies), Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984.

[86] For a detailed discussion of relations between the state and the ulama in the Qājār period, see Algar, *Religion and State*; R. Gleave, ed., *Religion and Society in Qajar Iran* (London: Routledge/Curzon: 2005).

[87] On his accession, Nādir Shāh had the Shaykh al-Islām of Isfahan strangled in his presence. He also confiscated *waqf* properties, restricted the functioning of the *sharīᶜa* legal system and had many ulama put to death when they attempted to organize risings against him in several regions. On Nādir Shāh generally, see Laurence Lockhart, *Nadir Shah: A Critical Study based mainly on Contemporary Sources* (London: Luzac, 1938).

[88] Āl Maḥbūba, Shaykh Jaᶜfar ibn Bāqir, *Māḍī al-Najaf wa hāḍiruhā*, 2nd ed. (Najaf: [s.n.], 1378 [1958]), p. 380.

[89] See Stephen Longrigg, *Four Centuries of Modern Iraq* (Beirut: Librarie du Liban, 1968), pp. 123 ff.

[90] Sayyid Muḥammad Hāshimī Kirmānī, "Tā'ifa-yi Shaykhiyya," *Majalla-yi mardum-shināsī* (Tehran) vol. 2 (1337 Sh [1958]), p. 247.

[91] "Ḥujjat al-Islām Hājj Sayyid Muḥammad Bāqir Shaftī," *Yādgār* (Tehran) vol. 5, no. 10 (1327 Sh [1948]), p. 28.

[92] Algar, *Religion and State*, pp. 33-4. For details concerning the four men named by Iqbāl and Algar, see the following:

1. On Mullā Ismā'īl Khwājūī: Khwānsārī, *Rawḍāt*, pp. 31-3; Mullā Muḥammad ᶜAlī Kashmīrī, *Nujūm al-samāᵓ* (Lucknow, 1303 [1885]), pp. 268-9.
2. On Mullā Muḥammad Rafī' Gīlānī: Kashmīrī, *Nujūm*, pp. 232-3.
3. On Muḥammad Bīdābādī: Khwānsārī, *Rawḍāt*, pp. 614-615; Kashmīrī, *Nujūm*, p. 320; Muḥammad Maᶜsūm Shīrāzī (Maᶜsūm ᶜAlī Shāh), *Ṭarāᵓiq al-ḥaqāᵓiq* (Tehran: Kitābkhāna-yi Bārānī, [1960-66]), vol. 3, pp. 214-5; al-Ṭihrānī, *Ṭabaqāt*, vol. 2, p. 15.
4. On Shaykh Yūsuf ibn Aḥmad Bahrānī: Khwānsārī, *Rawḍāt,* pp. 741-3; Kashmīrī, *Nujūm*, pp. 279-83; Tanakābunī, *Qiṣaṣ,* pp. 271-4.

[93] On Majlisī, see Khwānsārī, *Rawḍāt*, pp. 119-124; Kashmīrī, *Nujūm*, pp. 160-6; Tanakābunī, *Qiṣaṣ*, pp. 204-28.

[94] Khwānsārī*, Rawḍāt,* p. 331.

[95] The author of the *Wasāᵓil al Shīᶜa* and *Amal al-Āmil*. See Khwānsārī, *Rawḍāt,* pp. 616-9; Kashmīrī, *Nujūm*, pp. 157-60; Tanakābunī, *Qiṣaṣ,* pp. 289-93; al-Sayyid Aḥmad al-Ḥusaynī, introduction to Shaykh Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan al-Ḥurr al-ᶜĀmilī, *Amal al-Āmil* (Baghdad: Maktabat al-Andalus, 1965-66), vol. 1, pp. 8-52. A large number of his works are listed in Iᶜjāz Ḥusayn al-Naysāburī Kantūrī, *Kashf al-ḥujūb wa 'l astār ᶜan asmāᵓ*

al kutub wal asfār, ed. M. Hidayat Husain (Calcutta: Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1912); see also al-Ḥusayni, introduction to al-ᶜĀmilī, *Amal al-Āmil*, pp. 27-33. The latter provides a list of the main pupils and *rāwīyūn* of al-ʻĀmilī (pp. 15-18).

[96] The author of *Kitāb al-Wāfī*, etc. See Khwānsārī, *Rawḍāt ,* pp. 516-23; Kashmīrī, *Nujūm*, pp. 9-25; Tanakābunī, , pp. 322-33; ᶜAlī Aṣghar Ḥalabī, *Tārikh-i falāsifa-yi īrānī* (Tehran: [s.n.], 1972), pp. 745-51.

[97] Khwānsārī, *Rawḍāt,* pp. 301-2; Corbin, *En Islam iranien*, vol. 4, book 5, chapter 3.

[98] Khwānsārī, *Rawḍāt,* pp. 194-6; Tanakābunī, , p. 265; Ḥalabī, *Tārīkh-i falāsifa*, pp. 752-3.

[99] See Khwānsārī, *Rawḍāt ,* pp. 728-30; Kashmīrī, *Nujūm*, pp. 167-72; Tanakābunī, *Qiṣaṣ*, pp. 436-53; E. G. Browne gives a summary of his autobiography in his *Literary History of Persia* (Cambridge: The University Press, 1924), vol. 4, pp. 360-7.

[100] See Khwānsārī, *Rawḍāt,* pp. 621-3; Kashmīrī, *Nujūm*, pp. 211-2; Tanakābunī, *Qiṣaṣ*, pp. 312-3.

[101] See Khwānsārī, *Rawḍāt,* pp. 331-2; he is there described as "one of the great investigators (*muḥaqqiqīn*) of the period… between Majlisī and Bihbihānī."

[102] Kashmīrī, *Nujūm*, pp. 238-42.

[103] See Khwānsārī, *Rawḍāt,* pp. 365-6; Kashmīrī, *Nujūm*, pp. 251-8.

[104] Kashmīrī, *Nujūm*, pp. 302-3.

[105] See brief accounts in biographies of his son.

[106] Kashmīrī, *Nujūm*, pp. 294-5; brief account in biography of Baḥr al-ᶜUlūm in Khwānsārī, *Rawḍāt,* p. 649.

[107] Kashmīrī, *Nujūm*, pp. 276-7.

[108] Al-Ṭihrānī, *Ṭabaqāt*, vol. 2, pp. 174-5; Tanakābunī, *Qiṣaṣ*, p. 196.

[109] It is not entrely true to say, as does Algar, that "the few ulama whose names attained any prominence resided there [the *ᶜatabāt*]", Algar, *Religion and State*, p. 30. Of the four ulama referred to by Algar himself as eminent, only one—Yūsuf Bahrānī—lived at the *ᶜatabāt* (and only for a limited time), the other three residing in Isfahan and Mashhad.

[110] Namely, Āqā Mīrzā Muḥammad Mahdī Shahristānī, Shaykh Ḥusayn ibn Muḥammad al-Darāzī al-Baḥrānī, Shaykh Aḥmad ibn Ḥasan al-Bahrānī al-Damastānī, and Sayyid Muḥammad Mahdī Ṭabāṭabāᵓī Baḥr al-ᶜUlūm. Details of these men may be found in this and the next chapter.

[111] See note 76 above.

[112] The idea that the *bāb al-ijtihād* was permanently closed by he start of the 10th century is a myth developed by Western scholars and modern Muslims alike. On this, see Wael B. Hallaq, "On the Origins of the Controversy about the Existence of Mujtahids and the Gate of Ijtihad", *Studia Islamica* 63 (1986): 129-141; idem "Was the Gate of Ijtihad Closed?", *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 16 (1984): 3-41; idem "Ijtihād", in Esposito (ed.), *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Islam in the Modern World* 4 vols., New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995, vol. 2, pp. 178-81. "There exists no evidence of such a closure either in the tenth century or thereafter, and there certainly was no consensus on it. To the contrary, evidence shows that the practice of *ijtihād* continued throughout the centuries, although on a smaller scale than before because of the stability the legal system had attained" (ibid, p. 180).

[113] On the absence of genuine renewal or reformism among the *Shiᶜi* ulama by reason of their attachment to precedent, see William G. Millward, "Aspects of Modernism in Shīʻa Islam," *Studia Islamica* (Paris), vol. 37 (1977), pp. 112-3.

[114] See Algar, *Religion and State,* passim and in particular, pp. 21-5; Joseph Eliash, "The Ithnāᶜasharī-Shiᶜi Juristic Theory of Political and Legal Authority," *Studia Islamica* (Paris), vol. 29 (1969), pp. 17-30; Lambton, "Quis Custodiet Custodes"; Keddie, "The Roots of the Ulama's Power in

Modern Iran"; and Gianroberto Scarcia, "A Proposito del Problema della Sovranità preso gli Imāmiti," *Annali del Instituto Orientale Universitario di Napoli* (Naples), vol. 7 (1957), pp. 95-126.

[115] Since this was written, a convincing argument for the acceptance of a Shiᶜi state has been made by Arjomand in *The Shadow of God*.

[116] Keddie, "The Roots of the Ulama's Power," p. 216.

[117] Ṭabāṭabāᵓī, *Shiᶜite Islam*, pp. 39-50, 173-84..

[118] On this see, Jean Chardin, *Voyages du chevalier Chardin, en Perse, et autres lieux de l'Orient* (Amsterdam: chez Jean Louis de Lorne, 1711), vol. 2, pp. 207-8, 208, 337.

[119] Keddie, "The Roots of the Ulama's Power in Modern Iran," p. 216.

[120] Yūsuf ibn Aḥmad al-Baḥrānī, *Luᵓluᵓatay al-Baḥrayn* (Bombay: [s.n., n.d.]), p. 122.

[121] Kashmīrī, *Nujūm*, p. 41; cf. Khwānsārī, *Rawḍāt*, p. 169, where he is described as the founder (*muᵓassis*) of the school. On Muḥammad Amīn, see ibid, pp. 33-9; Tanakābunī, *Qiṣaṣ*, pp. 321-2; Kashmīrī, *Nujūm*, pp. 41-2; al-Bahrānī, *Luᵓluᵓatay al-Baḥrayn*, pp. 122-3.

[122] Kantūrī, *Kashf al-ḥujūb*, p. 210; al-Ṭihrānī, *al-Dharīᶜa*, vol. 8, p. 46.

[123] Thiqat al-Islaām Muḥammad ibn Yaᶜqūb al-Kulaynī (d. 329/940) is the compiler of the important Shiᶜi *ḥādith* collection *al-Kāfī*, and is regarded as the *mujaddid* of the fourth century. See Khwānsārī, *Rawḍāt*, pp. 524-7; Sayyid Nūr Allāh ibn Sharīf Shūshtarī, *Majālis al-muᵓminīn* (Tehran: [s.n.], 1852), pp. 185-186; Ḥusayn ᶜAlī Maḥfūẓ, *Sīra Abī Jaᶜfar Muḥammad ibn Yaᶜqūb ibn Isḥāq al-Kulaynī al-Rāzī* (Tehran: Maṭbaᶜat al-Ḥaydarī, 1955), with bibliography.

[124] See Khwānsārī, *Rawḍāt*, p. 33.

[125] See Khwānsārī, *Rawḍāt*, pp. 601-4; Tanakābunī, *Qiṣaṣ*, pp. 281-2; Kashmīrī, *Nujūm*, pp. 4-5; al-Ḥurr al-ᶜĀmilī, *Amal al-Āmil*, vol. 1, pp. 167-9.

[126] See Kantūrī, *Kashf al-ḥujūb,* p. 499.

[127] Khwānsārī, *Rawḍāt*, pp. 179-80; Tanakābunī, *Qiṣaṣ*, pp. 282-5; Kashmīrī, *Nujūm*, pp. 5-9; al-Ḥurr al-ᶜĀmilī, *Amal al-Āmil*, vol. 1, pp. 57-63.

[128] Kantūrī, *Kashf al-ḥujūb*, p. 532.

[129] Khwānsārī, *Rawḍāt*, pp. 599-601; Tanakābunī, *Qiṣaṣ*, p. 322; Kantūrī, *Kashf al-ḥujūb,* pp. 138, 171, 324, 488; al-Ṭihrānī, *al-Dharīᶜa*, vol. 10, pp. 121, 141.

[130] Astarābādī, *Dānish-nāma-yi shāhī*. Quoted in Khwānsārī, *Rawḍāt*, p. 33

[131] Kantūrī, *Kashf al-hujūb*, p. 406. The book was completed in 1031[1622] in Mecca.

[132] Astarābādī, *Dānish-nāma-yi shāhī*. Quoted in Khwānsārī, *Rawḍāt*, p. 34.

[133] A Persian commentary on Ibn Bābawayh's *Man lā yaḥḍuruhu 'l-faqīh*. See Kantūrī, *Kashf al-hujūb*, p. 481-482; al-Tihrānī, *al-Dharīᶜa*, vol. 18, pp. 369-70 (under *al-Lawāmiᶜ al-qudṣiyya*).

[134] Muḥammad Taqī ibn Maqṣūd ᶜAlī Majlisī, *Lawāmiᶜ-i ṣāḥibqirān*, quoted Khwānsārī, *Rawḍāt*, p. 38.

[135] Astarābādī*, al-Fawāᵓīd al-madaniyya*, quoted Khwānsārī, *Rawḍāt*, p. 34. Ḥasan ibn ᶜAlī ibn Abī Aqīl is the author of a work on *fiqh* entitled *al-Mutamassik bi-ḥabl āl al-rasūl*. He is described by Baḥr al-ᶜUlūm as "the first to elaborate jurisprudence (*awwal man hadhaba 'l-fiqh*), to theorize, and to open discussion on *uṣūl* and *furūᶜ* in the beginning of the greater occultation; after him came the illustrious Shaykh Ibn Junayd," *Fawā'id al-rijāliyya*, quoted after Khwānsārī. *Rawḍāt*, p. 168. For details see ibid, pp. 168-9. Abū ᶜAlī Muḥammad ibn Junayd al-Baghdādī (d. 991) is the author of several works, none of them well known. Khwānsārī describes him as

"the first to make progress in *ijtihād* concerning the laws of the *sharīᶜa*." (*Rawḍāt*, p. 534.) For details, see ibid, pp. 534-6; and Tanakābunī, *Qiṣaṣ*, pp. 430-1.

[136] Abū ᶜAbd Allāh Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad al-Hārithī al-Baghdādī; see Khwānsārī, *Rawḍāt*, pp. 536-43; Tanakābunī, *Qiṣaṣ*, pp. 398-406; Shūshtarī, *Majālis al-muᵓmīnīn*, pp. 191-2.

[137] Astarābādī simply writes "ᶜAllāma", al-Ḥillī being the ᶜAllāma par excellence (*al-ᶜallāma ᶜalā zz'l-iṭlāq*). On him, see Khwānsārī, *Rawḍāt*, pp. 172-7; Tanakābunī, *Qiṣaṣ*, pp. 355-64; Shūshtarī, *Majālis*, pp. 236-8. For his works, see Carl Brockelmann, *Geschichte der Arabischen Literatur* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1937-43), supp. 2, pp. 206-9.

[138] Khwānsārī, *Rawḍāt*, pp. 589-94; Tanakābunī, *Qiṣaṣ*, pp. 337-42; Āmilī, *Aᶜyān al-Shīᶜa*, vol. 1, pp. 181-3.

[139] Khwānsārī, *Rawḍāt*, pp. 390-4; Tanakābunī, *Qiṣaṣ*, pp. 346-8; Āmilī, *Aᶜyān al-Shīᶜa*, vol. 1, p. 123. According to Khwānsārī, some Sunnis referred to him as "the originator of the *Shiᶜi madhhab* (*mukhtariᶜ madhhab al-shīᶜa*)".

[140] Khwānsārī, *Rawḍāt*, pp. 287-98; Tanakābunī, *Qiṣaṣ*, pp. 248-63; Āmilī, *Aᶜyān al-Shīᶜa*, vol. 1, pp. 85-91.

[141] Khwānsārī, *Rawḍāt*, pp. 34, 604-13; Tanakābunī, *Qiṣaṣ*, pp. 233-47; Ḥalabī, *Tārīkh-i falāsifa*, pp. 680-96.

[142] Apart from those referred to, he mentions in passing Sayyid Murtaḍā Abū 'l-Qāsim ᶜAlī ibn Ḥusayn al-Mūsawī ᶜAlam al-Hudā (966-1044: see Khwānsārī, *Rawḍāt*, pp. 374-9), and his close associate Abū Jaᶜfar Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan al-Ṭūsī (d. 1066), see ibid, pp. 353-63.

[143] The "first three Muḥammads" were Muḥammad ibn Yaᶜqūb al-Kulaynī, Muḥammad ibn ᶜAlī Ibn Bābawayh, and Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan al-Ṭūsī, the compilers of the "Four Books". The "later three Muḥammads" were: Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan al-Ḥurr al-ᶜĀmilī, Muḥammad ibn Murtaḍā Fayḍ al-Kāshānī, and Muḥammad Bāqir ibn Muḥammad Taqī Majlisī, the

compilers of the "Three Books" of the later period (See Browne, *Literary History*, vol. 4, pp. 358-9). On al-Ḥurr al-ᶜĀmilī, see note 84 above.

[144] Tanakābunī describes him as a "pure Akhbārī" (*Akhbārī ṣarf*), and gives the titles of several books in which he attacks the *mujtahids*. *Qiṣaṣ*, p. 323. See note 86 above.

[145] See note 86 above.

[146] See note 88 above.

[147] See Khwānsārī, *Rawḍāt*, pp. 625-9; Kantūrī, *Kashf al-ḥujūb*, pp. 61, 63, 185, 293, 314, 363, 533, 569, 570, 576; Algar, *Religion and State,* pp. 64-6; Muḥammad ᶜAlī Muᶜallim Ḥabībābādī, *Makārim al-āthār dar aḥwāl-i rijāl-i dawra-i Qājār* (Isfahan: Nafāᵓis-i Makhṭūṭāt, 1957-74), vol. 3, pp. 925-44. Muᶜallim Ḥābībābādī considers him to have been one of the most learned and capable ulama in a long time (p. 929).

[148] See note 90 above. Kashmīrī, *Nujūm al-samāᵓ*, p. 282, mentions that he was originally an Akhbārī but later avoided the dispute between Akhbārīs and Uṣūlīs, choosing a middle path. The beginning of his *al-Ḥadāᵓiq* contains a discussion of the differences between the two schools.

[149] See note 101 above. Kashmīrī, *Nujūm al-samāᵓ*, p. 255, mentions his adoption of a middle position between Akhbārīs and Uṣūlīs in *furūᶜ*.

[150] For his works see Kantūrī, *Kashf al-ḥujūb*, under ᶜAbd Allāh ibn al-Hājj Ṣāliḥ al-Samāhijī.

[151] For a summary of twenty-nine of the more important of these, see Khwānsārī, *Rawḍāt,* pp. 35-6.

[152] Quoted in Khwānsārī, *Rawḍāt*, pp. 35-6.

[153] Hāshimī Kirmānī, "Ṭāᵓifa-yi Shaykhiyya," p. 247; Khwānsārī, *Rawḍāt*, p. 124; Kashmīrī, *Nujūm*, p. 304; Tanakābunī, *Qiṣaṣ*, p. 204.

[154] Khwānsārī, *Rawḍāt*, p. 124; Kashmīrī, *Nujūm*, pp. 303-7; Tanakābunī, *Qiṣaṣ*, pp. 198-204; al-Ṭihrānī, *Ṭabaqāt*, vol. 2, pp. 171-4; Ḥabībābādī,

Makārim al-āthār, vol. 1, pp. 220-33; ᶜAlī Davānī, *Ustād-i kull Āqā Muḥammad Bāqir ibn Muḥammad Akmal maᶜrūf bi Vaḥīd-i Bīhbīhānī* (Qum: Dār al-ᶜIlm, [1337[1958?]).

[155] Muḥammad Akmal had *ijāzāt* from Āqā Jamāl Khwānsārī, Mullā Mīrzā Muḥammad Shīrvānī, Shaykh Jaᶜfar Qāḍī, and Muḥammad Bāqir Majlisī. Tanakābunī, *Qiṣaṣ*, p. 199.

[156] Kashmīrī, *Nujūm*, p. 244. See there and al-Ṭihrānī, *Ṭabaqāt*, vol. 2, p. 171.

[157] Ḥabībābādī, *Makārim al-āthār*, vol. 1, pp. 224, 229.

[158] Ibid., pp. 229-30; Khwānsārī, *Rawḍāt*, p. 650.

[159] His father's mother was the daughter of Shaykh Nūr al-Dīn, a son of Mullā Muḥammad Sālih ibn Aḥmad Māzandarānī (d. 1670), whose wife was the daughter of Muḥammad Taqī Majlisī. Nūr al-Dīn was the youngest of Mullā Ṣāliḥ's ten sons.

[160] Ḥabībābādī, *Makārim al-āthār*, vol. 1, p. 231.

[161] Al-Tihrānī, *Ṭabaqāt*, vol. 2, p. 174.

[162] Ḥabībābādī, *Makārim al-āthār,* vol. 1, pp. 231-3.

[163] See Khwānsārī, *Rawḍāt*, pp. 400-2; Muḥammad ᶜAlī Kashmīrī, *Nujū,m*, pp. 338-40; Tanakābunī, *Qiṣaṣ*, pp. 175-80.

[164] See Khwānsārī, *Rawḍāt*, pp. 124-5, 632-3; Tanakābunī, *Qiṣaṣ*, pp. 199-204 (these two under his father's biography); Ḥabībābādī, *Makārim al-āthār,* vol. 2, pp. 561-7. It is Aqā Muḥammad ᶜAlī, and not his father, as Algar mistakenly notes in *Religion and State*, p. 34 n. 34, who was known as 'Ṣūfī-slayer' (*Ṣūfī-kush*)—see *Qiṣaṣ*, p. 199; cf. *Rawḍāt*, p. 633.

[165] See Khwānsārī, *Rawḍāt*, pp. 124-5; Kashmīrī, *Nujūm*, pp. 336-7; Tanakābunī, *Qiṣaṣ*, pp. 199-204 (under his father's biography); Ḥabībābādī, *Makārim al-āthār*, vol. 1, p. 235.

[166] See Khwānsārī, *Rawḍāt*, pp. 648-52; Kashmīrī, *Nujūm*, pp. 313-8; Tanakābunī, *Qiṣaṣ*, pp. 168-75; Ḥabībābādī, *Makārim al-āthār*, vol. 2, pp. 414-29 (including the best lists of teachers and pupils).

[167] See Khwānsārī, *Rawḍāt*, pp. 152-4; Kashmīrī, *Nujūm*, pp. 341-2; Tanakābunī, *Qiṣaṣ*, pp. 183-98; al-Ṭihrānī, *Ṭabaqāt*, vol. 2, pp. 248-52; Ḥabībābādī, *Makārim al-āthār*, vol. 3, pp. 852-6.

[168] See Khwānsārī, *Rawḍāt*, p. 28; Kashmīrī, *Nujūm*, p. 379; Tanakābunī, *Qiṣaṣ*, p. 196; Ḥabībābādī, *Makārim al-āthār*, vol. 3, pp. 928-81.

[169] See Khwānsārī, *Rawḍāt*, p. 523; Kashmīrī, *Nujūm*, p. 344; Tanakābunī, *Qiṣaṣ*, p. 198.

[170] See Khwānsārī, *Rawḍāt*, pp. 493-6; Kashmīrī, *Nujūm*, pp. 340-1; Tanakābunī, *Qiṣaṣ*, pp. 180-3; al-Ṭihrānī, *Ṭabaqāt*, vol. 2, pp. 52-4; Ḥabībābādī, *Makārim al-āthār*, vol. 3, pp. 911-9. His grandson, Ḥājī Mīrzā Mūsā Tabrīzī was converted to Babism by Mullā Muḥammad Ḥusayn Bushrūʾī (1814?-1849)—see Mīrza Asad Allah Fāḍil-i Māzandarānī, *Kitābh-i ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, vol. 3 (Tehran: [s. n.], 1944), pp. 391-2.

[171] See Khwānsārī, *Rawḍāt*, pp. 647-8; Kashmīrī, *Nujūm*, p. 319; Ḥabībābādī, *Makārim al-āthār*, vol. 2, pp. 360-4.

[172] See Khwānsārī, *Rawḍāt*, pp. 27-8; Kashmīrī, *Nujūm*, pp. 343-4; Tanakābunī, *Qiṣaṣ*, pp. 129-32; Ḥabībābādī, *Makārim al-āthār*, vol. 4, pp. 1235-42.

[173] See Kashmīrī, *Nujūm*, p. 318.

[174] See Kashmīrī, *Nujūm*, pp. 330-1; Ḥabībābādī, *Makārim al-āthār*, vol. 3, pp. 645-8; ʿAbd al-Ḥusayn Aḥmad Amīnī, *Shahīdān-i rāh-i faẓīlat* (Tehran: Intishārāt-i Rūzbih, [197-?]), pp. 420-31. He was killed by Nādir Mīrzā Afshār in the course of the siege of Mashhad by Muḥammad Walī Mīrzā in 1802. See Muḥammad Taqī Sipihr, *Nāsikh al-tawārīkh: Salāṭīn-i Qājār*, ed. by Muḥammad Bāqir Bihbūdī (Tehran, 1344 [1965]), vol. 1, pp. 121, 123.

[175] See Khwānsārī, *Rawḍāt*, pp. 11-12; Tanakābunī, *Qiṣaṣ*, pp. 117-22; al-Ṭihrānī, *Ṭabaqāt*, vol. 2, pp. 14-15.

[176] See Khwānsārī, *Rawḍāt*, pp. 366-7; Ḥabībābādī, *Makārim al-āthār*, vol. 4, pp. 1164-8.

[177] See Ḥabībābādī, *Makārim al-āthār*, vol. 2, pp. 600-3.

[178] See Kashmīrī, *Nujūm*, pp. 320-1; Amīnī Najafī, *Shahīdān*, pp. 422-7; Ḥabībābādī, *Makārim al-āthār*, vol. 2, pp. 611-4.

[179] Tanakābunī, *Qiṣaṣ*, p. 176.

[180] Ibid., p. 204.

[181] Algar, *Religion and State*, p. 34.

[182] Ḥabībābādī, *Makārim al-āthār*, vol. 1, p. 222.

[183] Thus Khwānsārī, *Rawḍāt*, p. 124; Tanakābunī, *Qiṣaṣ*, p. 204; Ḥabībābādī, *Makārim al-āthār*, vol. 1, p. 222. Shaykh Aḥmad al-Ahsaʾi was also regarded by some as the *mujaddid* of the thirteenth century. See, for example Sohrab, *Al-risāla al-tisʾ ʿashariyya*, p. 11 n., citing an inscription on the Shaykh's tombstone.

[184] *Ijāza*, quoted in ʿAbd Allāh Aḥsāʾī, *Sharh-i ḥālāt-i Shaykh Aḥmad al-Aḥsāʾī* (Bombay: Hājī Muḥammad Ḥasan Ṣaḥib, 1309 [1892]), p. 88.

[185] On the role of the Ṣūfī and extreme *Shiʿi* groups in the early Safavid period, see Mazzaoui, *Origins*; Keddie,"The Roots of the Ulama's Power," pp. 217-9.

[186] On these and other individuals, see Browne, *Literary History*, vol. 4, pp. 427-36; Corbin, *En Islam iranien*, vol. 4, book 5; Ḥalabī, *Tārikh-i falāsifah*, pp. 664-751; Seyyed Hossein Nasr, "The School of Iṣfahān," and "Ṣadr al-Dīn Shīrāzī (Mullā Ṣadrā)," in *A History of Muslim Philosophy*, ed. M. M. Sharif (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1963-66), and bibliographies in these articles; idem, *Islamic Studies: Essays on Law and Society, the Sciences, and Philosophy and Sufism* (Beirut: Librarie du Liban, 1967), chapters 10 and 11; idem, *Ṣadr al-Dīn Shīrāzī and His Transcendent Theosophy:*

Background, Life and Works (Tehran: Imperial Iranian Academy of Philosophy, 1978).

[187] Kashmīrī, *Nujūm*, p. 42.

[188] See items 3, 4, 6, 7, and 8 of the summary of the *Minyat al-mumārisīn.*

[189] See Abdul-Hadi Hairi, *Shiᶜism and Constitutionalism in Iran: A Study of the Role Played by the Persian Residents of Iraq in Iranian Politics* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1977), pp. 62-3, citing a "mimeographed research" entitled "Tashkīlāt-i madhab-i shīᶜa," by Āqā Muḥammad Vakīlī Qummī.

[190] Ḥusayn Khurāsānī, *Maktab-i tashayyuᶜ dar sayr-i tārīkh* (Tehran: Muḥammadi, 1962), pp. 194-6.

[191] *Pace* Algar, who bestows this accolade on Shaykh Murtaḍā Ansārī (*Religion and State*, p. 163). On Shaykh Muḥammad Ḥasan, see Khwānsārī, *Rawḍāt*, pp. 181-2; Tanakābunī, *Qiṣaṣ*, pp. 103-6; al-Ṭihrānī, *Ṭabaqāt*, vol. 2, pp. 310-4; Muḥammad Ḥasan Khān I'timād al-Saltana, *Kitāb al-maᶜāthir wa 'l-āthār* (Tehran: Dār al-Ṭabaᶜa-yi Khaṣṣa-yi Dawlatī, 1306 [1888]), pp. 135-6; Muḥammad Riḍāᵓ Muẓaffar, introduction to *Jawāhir al-kalām fī sharḥ sharāᵓiᶜ al-Islām* by Muḥammad Ḥasan ibn Bāqir al-Najāfi, 6th and 7th eds. (Tehran: Dār al-Kutub al-Islāmiyya, 1392-1401[1972-81]); Mughniyya, *Maᶜa ᶜulamāᵓ al-Najaf*, pp. 81-5.

[192] Khwānsārī, *Rawḍāt*, p. 181.

[193] Ibid; p. 182; cf. al-Ṭihrānī, *Ṭabaqāt*, vol. 2, p. 311.

[194] Zarandī, *The Dawn-Breakers*, pp. 90-1; Shaykh Kāẓim Samandar, *Tārīkh-i Samandar wa mulḥaqāt*, edited by Mahdī Samandarī (Tehran: Muᵓassasa-yi Millī-yi Maṭbūᶜāt-i Amrī, 131 B. [1974]), p. 347.

[195] ᶜAlī Qulī Mīrzā Iᶜtiḍād al-Salṭana, "Al-mutanabbīyūn," (section on the Bab) in his *Fitna-yi Bab*, ed. ᶜAbd al-Ḥusayn Navāᵓī (Tehran: [s.n.] 1351 [1972]), p. 35; Sipihr, *Nāsikh al-Tawārīkh*, vol. 3, p. 235.

[196] Tanakābunī, *Qiṣaṣ*, p. 106; al-Tihrānī, *Ṭabaqāt*, vol. 2, p. 313. "Some time before his death, he [Muḥammad Ḥasan] made him [Ansārī] his

appointed sucessor (*khalīfa manṣūṣ*) and particular vicegerent (*nāʾib makhṣūṣ*)", Iᶜtimād al-Salṭana, *Al-maᶜāthir wa 'l-āthār*, p. 136.

[197] Compare Algar, *Religion and State*, p. 163. On Anṣārī, see Tanakābunī, *Qiṣaṣ*, pp. 106-7; Iᶜtimād al-Salṭana, *Al-maᶜāthir wa 'l-āthār*, pp. 131-7; Muḥammad Mahdī al-Kāẓimī, *Aḥsan al-wadīᶜa* (Baghdad: Maṭbaᶜat al-Najāḥ, 1928-29), vol. 1, pp. 147-50; Murtaẓā Anṣārī, *Zindigānī va shakhsiyyat-i Shaykh Anṣārī* (Tehran: Chapkhāna-yi Ittiḥād, [1960]); Ḥabībābādī, *Makārim al-āthār,* vol. 2, pp. 487-517; Mahdī Bāmdād, *Sharḥ-i ḥāl-i rijāl-i Īrān* (Tehran: Kitābfurūshī-yi Zuvvar, [1968-1972]), vol. 6, pp. 260-1; Mughniyya. *Maᶜa ᶜulamāʾ al-Najaf*, pp. 87-90.

[198] Iᶜtimād al-Salṭana, *Al-maᶜāthir wa 'l-āthār*, p. 136.

[199] Tanakābunī, *Qiṣaṣ*, p. 59.

[200] On Mīrzā-yi Shīrāzī, see Kāẓimī, *Aḥsan al-wadīᶜa*, vol. 1, pp. 159-62; Iᶜtimād al-Salṭana, *Al-maᶜāthir wa 'l-āthār*, pp. 137-8; al-Ṭihrānī, *Ṭabaqāt*, vol. 1, pp. 436-41; ᶜAlī Wāʾiz-i Khīyābānī al-Tabrīzī, *Kitāb-i ulamaʾ-i muᶜāsirīn* (Tabriz: Matbaᶜa-yi Islāmiyya, 1366 [1947]), pp. 46-50. Dawlatābādī describes his struggle to succeed to leadership of the Shiᶜi world on Anṣārī's death, vol. 1,
pp. 25-7. Al-Ṭihrānī describes him as "the greatest and the most famous of the ulama of his age, and the most important *marjaᶜ* of the Shiᶜis in the other lands of Islam in his time," *Ṭabaqāt*, vol. 1, p. 436; cf. p. 438. He studied under Shaykh Muḥammad Ḥasan Najāfi and Anṣārī.

It is not widely known that he was a relative of the Bab, being a paternal cousin of his father. A Bahaʾi writer Muḥammad-ᶜAlī Fayḍī, has provided circumstantial evidence that he was, in private, a follower of the Bab. *Khāndān-i-Afnān ṣadra-yi Raḥmān* (Tehran: Muʾassasa-yi Millī-yi Maṭbūᶜat-i Amrī, 127 B. [1971]), pp. 13-17; cf. Hasan M. Balyuzi, *The Báb: The Herald of the Day of Days* (Oxford: George Ronald, 1974), p. 33.

[201] Al-Ṭihrānī, *Ṭabaqāt*, vol. 1, p. 440.

[202] Iᶜtimād al-Salṭana, *Al-maᶜāthir wa 'l-āthār*, pp. 137-8.

[203] Hā'irī, *Shi'ism and Constitutionalism*, p. 64.

[204] We may note the following as particularly important in this context: Shaykh Muḥammad Kāẓim Khurāsānī (d. 1329/1911), Ḥujjat al-Islām Sayyid Muḥammad Kāẓim Ṭabaṭabāʾī Yazdī Najafī (d. 1337/1919), Mīrzā Muḥammad Taqī Hāʾirī Shīrāzī (d. 1338/1920), Shaykh Fatḥ Allāh Sharīᶜat-i Iṣfahānī (d. 1338/1920), Ḥājj Sayyid Abū 'l-Ḥasan Iṣfahānī (d. 1365/1946), Ḥājj Āqā Ḥusayn Qummī (d. 1366/1946), and Shayhk Muḥammad Kāẓim Shīrāzī (d. 1367/1947), and Ḥājj Āqā Ḥusayn Burūjirdī (d. 1380/1961).

[205] Binder, "The Proofs of Islam," p. 132.

[206] Ibid

[207] Mahmoud Shehabi, "Shīᶜa," in *Islam: The Straight Path: Islam Interpreted by Muslims*, edited by Kenneth W. Morgan (New York: Ronald Press, 1958), p. 202.

[208] Yaḥyā Dawlatābādī, *Tārīkh-i mu`āsir yā ḥayāt-i Yaḥyā* (Tehran: Kitābfurūshī-yi Ibn Sīnā, 1328-1336 [1949-1957]), vol. 1, p. 27.

[209] Tanakābunī, *Qiṣaṣ*, p. 132.

[210] See for example, cyclostyled letter produced by Gurūh-i Badr of students in Shīrāz University, "Rizhīm dar andīsha-yi tuṭiʾaʾī dīgar," Shīrāz, 1979.

[211] On Baḥr al-ᶜUlūm, see note 155 above.

[212] Tanakābunī, *Qiṣaṣ*, p. 191.

[213] Ibid., pp. 193-4.

[214] Khwānsārī, *Rawdāt*, p. 151.

[215] Quoted in ibid.

[216] Al-Ṭihrānī, *Ṭabaqāt*, vol. 2, pp. 248-9.

[217] Tanakābunī, *Qiṣaṣ*, p. 197. On Shaykh Jaᶜfar, see note 156 above.

[218] Khwānsārī, *Rawḍāt*, p. 493. On Mīrzā-yi Qummī, see note 159 above.

[219] See note 153 above. His elder son was the Āqā Muḥammad Ṭabāṭabāʾī who led the *jihād* against Russia in 1826, and his younger son, Sayyid Muḥammad Mahdī, became—as we shall see—the leading opponent of Sayyid Kāẓim Rashtī.

[220] James Alban Bill, *The Politics of Iran* (Columbus, Ohio: Merrill, 1972), p. 28.

[221] Abu 'l-Qāsim ibn Zayn al-ᶜĀbidīn (Khān Kirmānī) , *Fihrist-i kutub-i Shaykh-i ajall-i awḥad marḥum Shaykh Aḥmad Aḥsāʾī va sāʾir mashāyikh-i ᶜiẓam va Khulāṣa-yi sharh-i aḥvāl-i īshān*, 3rd ed. (Kirman: Chapkhāna-yi Saᶜādat, [1974?]), p. 149.

[222] Khwānsārī, *Rawḍāt*, p. 11. On Kalbāsī, see note 164 above.

[223] Algar, *Religion and State*, p. 60.

[224] Iqbāl, "Ḥujjat al-Islām," pp. 39-40.

[225] Charles Stuart, *Journal of a Residence in Northern Persia and the Adjacent Provinces of Turkey* (London: R. Bentley, 1854), p. 246.

[226] Zarandī, *Dawn-Breakers*, pp. 19-24. On Shaftī, see Khwānsārī, *Rawḍāt*, pp. 125-7; Tanakābunī, *Qiṣaṣ*, pp. 135-68; al-Ṭihrānī, *Ṭabaqāt*, vol. 2, pp. 192-6; and Iqbāl, "Ḥujjat al-Islām."

Chapter Two

[227] Aḥmad ibn Zayn al-Dīn al-Aḥsāʾī, "Risāla," in *Sīra Shaykh Aḥmad al-Aḥsāʾī*, by Ḥusayn ᶜAlī Maḥfūẓ (Baghdad: Matbaᶜat al-Maᶜārif, 1957), p. 9; Abu 'l-Qāsim Kirmānī, *Fihrist*, p. 133. See also ᶜAbd Allāh al-Aḥsāʾī, *Sharḥ-i ḥālāt*, p. 5. Alternative dates are given in Edward Granville Browne, "The Sheykhīs and Their Doctrine Concerning the 'Fourth Support'," in *A Traveller's Narrative Written to Illustrate the Episode of the Bab*, [by ᶜAbbās Effendi], trans. and ed. Edward Granville Browne (Cambridge: The University Press, 1891), vol. 2, p. 235; Zarandī, *Dawn-Breakers*, p. 18;

Khwānsārī, *Rawḍāt* p. 26; Shaykh ᶜAlī al-Aḥsāᵓī, quoted in ᶜAbd al-Ḥamīd Ishrāq Khāvarī, *Qāmūs-i Īqān* (Tehran: Muᵓassasa-yi Millī-yi Maṭbūᵓāt-i Amrī, 128 B. [1972]), vol. 4, p. 1604.

[228] On al-Aḥsāᵓ, see F. S. Vidal, *The Oasis of al-Hasa.* ([New York?]: Arabian Oil Co., Local Govt. Relations, Arabian Research Division, 1955); J. G. Lorimer, *Gazetteer of the Persian Gulf, Oman and Central Arabia*. (Calcutta: Superintendent Government Printing, India, 1908-15), vol. 2A, pp. 642-79.

[229] Lorimer, *Gazetteer*, vol. 2A, pp. 207-8.

[230] ᶜAbd Allāh al-Aḥsāᵓī, *Sharḥ-i ḥālāt-i*, pp. 4-5; Mahfūẓ, *Sīra*, p. 9; Kirmānī, *Fihrist*, p. 132.

[231] On the Mahāshir, see Harry St. John Philby, *Saudi Arabia* (London: Benn, 1955), p. 25. See also Carsten Niebuhr, *Description de l'Arabie*, translated by F. L. Mourier (Amsterdam: S. J. Baalde, 1774), p. 294

[232] Niebuhr speaks of both Jews and Sabaeans in the region in the mid-eighteenth century (*Description*, p. 293). Lorimer remarks that, after the Turkish occupation of al-Aḥsāᵓ in the 1870s, there were few Jews left, and speaks of the Sabaeans as no longer in existence there (*Gazeteer*, vol. 2A, p. 645).

[233] Browne, *Literary History*, vol. 4, p. 360. A comprehsive account of *Shiᶜi* divines from Bahrain is to be found in the lengthy *ijāza* from Shaykh Yūsuf al-Baḥrānī, published under the title of *Luᵓluᵓatayi 'l-Baḥrayn*, referred to in the last chapter. An unpublished biographical dictionary of ulama from al-Aḥsāᵓ, Qaṭīf, and Bahrain is the *Anwār al-Baḥrayn* of Shaykh ᶜAlī ibn Ḥasan al-Baladī al-Baḥrānī (1857 – 1921)—see al-Tihrānī, *al-Dharīᶜa,*vol. 2, p. 420. Al-Ḥurr al-ᶜĀmilī's *Amal al-Āmil* is also useful.

[234] See Kashmīrī, *Nujūm*, pp. 56-7; Tanakābunī, *Qiṣaṣ*, pp. 277-8. He is described as the first to develop the science of *ḥadīth* in Bahrain.

[235] See Khwānsārī, *Rawḍāt*, pp. 736-7; Kashmīrī, *Nujūm*, pp. 154-6; al-ᶜĀmilī, *Amal al-Āmil*, vol. 2, p. 341; Kantūrī, *Kashf*, index under "Hāshim al-maᶜrūf bi 'l-ᶜAllāma".

[236] See Khwānsārī, *Rawḍāt*, pp. 330-5; Kashmīrī, *Nujūm*, pp. 185-8; Tanakābunī, *Qiṣaṣ,* pp. 275-7.

[237] See Khwānsārī, *Rawḍāt*, pp. 24-5; Tanakābunī, *Qiṣaṣ*, pp. 278-9.

[238] Tanakābunī, *Qiṣaṣ*, p. 35.

[239] Louis Massignon, "Karmatians," in *Encyclopaedia of Islam* (London: Luzac; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1908-1936), p. 768.

[240] Adolf Grohmann, "Yām," in *Encyclopaedia of Islam* (London: Luzac; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1908-1936), p. 1154.

[241] Thus Philby, *Saudi Arabia*, p. 57.

[242] Niebuhr, *Description de l'Arabie*, p. 236; Grohmann, "Yām," p. 1154.

[243] Philby, *Saudi Arabia*, p. 57.

[244] Niebuhr, *Description*, p. 237.

[245] Louis Massignon, "Esquisse d'une bibliographie Qarmate," in *A Volume of Oriental Studies Presented to Edward G. Browne*, ed. Thomas Walker Arnold and Reynold Alleyne Nicholson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1922), p. 338.

[246] Al-Aḥsāʾī, *Sharḥ-i ḥālāt*, p. 22. It must not necessarily be assumed that this is a reference to *fuqahāʾ*; more likely, it refers to Ṣūfī-orientated ulama in the tradition of Ibn al-ᶜArabī (1165-1240, for whom al-Aḥsāʾī had an abiding animosity); cf. Hāshimī Kirmānī, "Ṭāʾifa-yi Shaykhiyya," p. 246.

[247] Al-Aḥsāʾī, *Sharḥ-i ḥālāt*, p. 22.

[248] Rashtī, *Dalīl*, p. 27.

[249] Hāshimī Kirmānī, "Ṭā'ifa-yi Shaykhiyya", p. 248; this article gives the names of several of these emigrés.

[250] Al-Aḥsāʾī, *Sharḥ-i ḥālāt*, p. 24.

[251] Ibid., pp. 7, 22; Maḥfūẓ, *Sīra*, p. 11; Kirmānī, *Fihrist*, p. 134.

[252] Maḥfūẓ, *Sīra*, p. 10; Kirmānī, *Fihrist*, p. 133.

[253] Al-Aḥsāʾī, *Sharḥ-i ḥālāt*, pp. 8-11; Maḥfūẓ, *Sīra*, pp. 11-13; Kirmānī, *Fihrist*, p. 134-6.

[254] For details concerning this Order, see Iḥsān Allāh ʿAlī Istakhrī, "Taṣawwuf-i Dhahabiyya", *Majalla-yi Mardum-shināsī* (Tehran) vol. 2, (1337 Sh [1958]), pp. 8-15; Mīrzā Abū 'l-Ḥasan Ḥāfiz al-Kutub Muʻāwin al-Fuqarā, "Mukhtaṣarī dar sharḥ-i ḥāl-i ḥaḍrat-i Waḥīd al-Awliyāʾ wa asāmī-yi aqṭāb-i silsila-yi mubāraka-yi Dhahabiyya wa shuʿūbāt-i ān," *Majalla-yi mardum-shināsī* (Tehran) vol. 2, 1337 Sh [1958], pp. 74-83. On Sayyid Quṭb al-Dīn Muḥammad Nayrīzī, see Maʿṣūm ʿAlī Shāh, *Ṭarāʾiq*, vol. 3, pp. 216-9.

[255] He was known as Mīrzā Bābā and bore the *takhalluṣ* of Rāz-i Shīrāzī (see Muʿāwin al-Fuqarāʾ, "Mukhtaṣarī," p. 76).

[256] On Mullā Miḥrāb, see Maʿṣūm ʿAlī Shāh, *Tarāʻiq*, vol. 3, p. 255.

[257] His full name was Āqā Mīrzā Jalāl al-Dīn Muḥammad Majd al-Ashrāf (d. 1331/ 1913); he succeeded his father as *quṭb* of the order (see Muʿāwin al-Fuqarāʾ, "Mukhtaṣarī," p. 76). The *Tāmm al-ḥikma* was an introduction to his father's *Kitāb-i sharāʾit al-ṭariqa* (see Maʿṣūm ʿAlī Shāh, *Tarāʻiq,* vol. 3, p. 339).

[258] The passages from Thiqat al-Islām referred to are quoted by Murtaẓā Mudarrisī Chahārdihī, *Shaykh Aḥmad Aḥsāʾī* (Tehran: [s.n.]; 1955), p. 110.

[259] Maʿṣūm ʿAlī Shāh, *Ṭarāʾiq*, vol. 3, p. 339. Āqā Muḥammad Hāshim Shīrāzī became Sayyid Quṭb al-Dīn's successor as head of the order (Muʿāwin al-Fuqarāʾ, "Mukhtaṣarī," p. 76).

[260] Maʿṣūm ʿAlī Shāh, *Ṭarāʾiq*, vol. 3, p. 217.

[261] Ibid., p. 216.

[262] Chahārdihī, *Aḥsāʾī*, p. 110; Hāshimī Kirmānī, "Ṭāʾifa-yi Shaykhiyya," p. 251.

[263] Reaction to this revival, which began with the propaganda of Maᶜṣūm ᶜAlī Shāh in Shīrāz during the reign of Karīm Khān Zand (d. 1779), was energetic. Maᶜṣūm ᶜAlī and his disciple Fayd ᶜAlī Shāh were severely persecuted. Another Niᶜmat Allāhī *darwīsh*, Mushtāq ᶜAlī Shāh, was put to death in 1790 in Kirman, and Nūr ᶜAlī Shāh, a son of Fayḍ ᶜAlī Shāh, appears to have been poisoned by agents of Muḥammad ᶜAlī Bihbahānī in 1215/ 1800. For details of these and related events, see Algar, *Religion and State*, pp. 38-40; Sir John Malcolm, *The History of Persia from the Early Period to the Present Time* (London: J. Murray, 1815), vol. 2, pp. 417-22; Zayn al-ᶜĀbidīn Shīrvānī, *Bustān al-siyāha* (Tehran: Kitābkhāna-yi Sanāʾī, [1895?]), pp. 77-84; Maᶜṣūm ᶜAlī Shāh, *Ṭarāʾiq*, vol. 3, pp. 170-94. Al-Aḥsāʾī was far from favorably inclined towards Sufism, as we have noted.

[264] On Rashtī's childhood, see an account by Ḥājī Mīrzā ᶜAlī Aṣghar (a classmate of his) in Mullā Jaᶜfar Qazvīnī, "Tārīkh-i Mullā Jaᶜfar Qazvīnī," in Samandar, *Tārīkh,* p. 455. Like al-Ahsaʾi, Rashtī disliked games, and would look after the books of the other children while they played. On the Bab's childhood, see ᶜAbd al-Ḥusayn Avāra, *Al-kawākib al-durriyya fī maʾāthir al-Bahāʾiyya* (Cairo: Maṭbaᶜa al-Saᶜāda, 1342 [1924]), pp. 31-2. A contemporary of the Bab, Sayyid Muḥammad Ṣaḥḥāf Shīrāzī, is quoted to the effect that the Bab did not join in the games of his classmates, but would be found in prayer in a secluded place. We may also note the ascetic childhood and youth of Faḍl Allāh Astarābādī, the founder of the Ḥurūfī sect, who also experienced dreams of the Imāms before embarking on his religious mission (see Alessandro Bausani, "Ḥurūfiyya," in *Encyclopedia of Islam*, 2nd ed. (London: Luzac; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1960-), vol. 3, p. 600).

[265] See, for example, Al-Aḥsāʾī, *Sharḥ-i ḥālāt*, pp. 5-7; Maḥfūẓ, *Sīra*, pp. 9-10; Kirmānī, *Fihrist*, p. 134.

[266] Tanakābunī states that al-Aḥsāʾī practised ascetisim greatly during the early part of his life (*Qiṣaṣ*, p. 37), and mentions that Sayyid Kāẓim Rashtī (under whom he studied for a short time) told him that Shaykh Aḥmad had performed forty *chillas* of *riyāḍāt* (ibid.). Rashti himself states that al-Aḥsāʾī

only practised severe asceticism for a two-year period following his initial vision of the Imām Ḥasan (Rashti, *Dalīl*, p. 12).

[267] Al-Aḥsāʾī, *Sharḥ-i ḥālāt*, pp. 11-12; Maḥfūẓ, *Sīra*, p. 13; Kirmānī, *Fihrist*, p. 136.

[268] See Al-Aḥsāʾī, *Sharḥ-i ḥālāt*, pp. 12-21; Maḥfūẓ, *Sīra*, pp. 14-22, 23-4; Kirmānī, *Fihrist*, pp. 136-42, 143-44; Rashtī, *Dalīl*, pp. 11-12; Al-Aḥsāʾī, *Sharḥ al-zīyāra*, pt. 1, p. 115.

[269] Al-Aḥsāʾī, *Sharḥ-i ḥālāt*, p. 17; Maḥfūz, *Sīra,* p. 17; Kirmānī, *Fihrist*, p. 139.

[270] Al-Aḥsāʾī, *Sharḥ-i ḥālāt*, pp. 18-19; Maḥfūẓ, *Sīra*, pp. 17-18; Kirmānī, *Fihrist*, pp. 139-40. These initiatory dreams of al-Aḥsāʾī are closely paralleled by a visionary experience in which the Bab dreamt he drank the blood from the severed head of the Imām Ḥusayn (see ʿAlī Muḥammad Shīrāzī, the Bāb, *Ṣaḥīfa-yi ʿadliyya* [{Tehran?: s.n., n.d.}], p. 14; Zarandī, *Dawn-Breakers*, p. 253), and by a dream similarly involving the ingestion of the saliva of the Prophet by Mullā Muḥammad Ḥusayn Bushrūʾī (see Muḥammad ʿAlī Malik Khusravī, *Tārīkh-i Shuhadā-yi Amr* (Tehran: Muʾassasa-yi Millī-yi Maṭbūʿāt-i Amrī, 130 B. [1974]), vol. 1, p. 21).

[271] Al-Aḥsāʾī himself indicates that it was extremely early, saying it took place *fī awwal infitāḥ bāb al-ruʾyā* (Maḥfūẓ, *Sīra*, p. 17; Kirmānī, *Fihrist*, p. 139).

[272] Rashti, *Dalīl*, pp. 11-12.

[273] Al-Aḥsāʾī, *Sharḥ-i ḥālāt*, p. 20; Maḥfūz, *Sīra*, p. 20; Kirmānī, *Fihristī,* pp. 141-2.

[274] Rashtī, *Dalīl*, p. 11.

[275] Shaykh Aḥmad ibn Zayn al-Dīn al-Aḥsāʾī, *Sharḥ al-fawāʾid* ([Tehran?: Muḥammad Shafīq],1272 [1856]), p. 4.

[276] Maḥfūẓ, *Sīra*, pp. 19-20; Kirmānī, *Fihrist*, p. 141.

[277] *Kuntu fī tilka 'l-ḥāl dāᵓiman arī manāmāt wa hiya ilhāmāt*; cf. Maḥfūẓ, *Sīra*, p. 19; p. 141; Tanakābunī, *Qiṣaṣ*, p. 37

[278] Ibid., p. 35

[279] Rashti, *Dalīl*, p. 9. On the distinction between various modes of revelation and cognition, such as *waḥy*, *ilhām*, and *kashf*, and their relationship to the concepts of *risāla*, *nubuwwa*, and *wilāya*, see Corbin, *En Islam iranien*, vol. 1, pp. 235-51, vol. 3, pp. 171-5; idem, *Histoire de la philosophie islamique* (Paris : Gallimard, 1964), pp. 79-92. Some inimical sources have tried to argue that al-Aḥsāᵓī laid claim to *waḥy*, but this appears to be based more on biased misreadings of passages in his works than on any straightforward remarks to that effect by him (see Hamadānī, *Kitāb al-Ijtināb*, pp. 396-7).

[280] Bausani, "Ḥurūfiyya," p. 600.

[281] Al-Aḥsāᵓī, *Sharḥ-i ḥālāt*, p. 12.

[282] Rashti, *Dalīl*, p. 12

[283] Both Shaykh ᶜAbd Allāh al-Aḥsāᵓī and Sayyid Hādī Hindī give the year 1176/ 1762, but this clashes with the most reliable date for al-Ahsa'i's birth (see al- Aḥsāᵓī, *Sharḥ-i ḥālāt*, p. 22; *Tanbīh al-Ghāfilīn*, cited in Kirmānī, *Fihrist*, p. 161). The correction to 1186/ 1772 seems the simplest solution.

[284] Lorimer, *Gazetteer*, vol. 1B, p. 1241; cf. Longrigg, *Modern Iraq*, p. 188.

[285] Al-Aḥsāᵓī, *Sharḥ-i ḥālāt*, p. 25.

[286] Ibid.

[287] For a list of al-Ahsaᵓi's wives and children, see ibid. pp. 55-7. Abū 'l-Qāsim Khān has stated that he was not aware of any living descendants of Shaykh Aḥmad, although he does mention some Arabs without learning whom he met in Mashhad, and who claimed to be descended from one of his daughters. (*Fihrist*, p. 172). Khwānsārī mentions two sons, Shaykh Muḥammad and Shaykh ᶜAlī, and maintains that the former rejected his father's teachings (*Rawḍāt,* p. 26). According to Kashmīrī (1844-1891),

Shaykh ᶜAlī was his father's successor in Kirmanshah, *Nujūm*, p. 367; cf. Tanakābunī, *Qiṣaṣ*, p. 38).

[288] Al-Aḥsāᵓī, *Sharḥ-i ḥālāt*, p. 25.

[289] Ibid.

[290] Rashti, *Dalīl*, pp. 13-6.

[291] Al-Aḥsāᵓī, *Sharḥ-i ḥālāt*, p. 26.

[292] Tanakābunī, *Qiṣaṣ*, p. 36. This tendency to polymathism is particularily marked in the cases of Ḥājj Muḥammad Karīm Khān Kirmānī and his son Ḥājj Muḥammad Khān, later heads of the Shaykhi school (see the topics on which they wrote, listed in Kirmānī, *Fihrist*, pp. 9-10, 360). On the significance of the polymathism with respect to the derivation of knowledge from the Imāms, see ibid., p. 58; Aḥmad Bahmanyār (1883-1955), quoted Chahārdihī, *Shaykh Aḥmad Aḥsāᵓī*, p. 227).

[293] See Kirmānī, *Fihrist*, pp. 228, 241. The *Sharḥ al-Mashāᶜir* (1234/1818) exists in manuscript; the *Sharḥ al-ᶜArshiyya*, written in 1236/1820 was printed in Tabriz in 1278/1861.

[294] See Kirmānī, *Fihrist,* pp. 228, 221. The *Sharḥ al-Risāla al-ᶜilmīyya* (1230/1815) was printed in the compilation of writings by al-Aḥsāᵓī, *Jawāmiᶜ al-kalim*, (Tabriz: Muḥammad Taqī Nakhjavānī, 1273-1276/1856-1860), vol. 1, pt. 2, pp. 166-200; *al-Risāla al-Baḥrāniyya* (1211/1797), which deals with various statements of Fayḍ, can be found in ibid. pp. 217-9.

[295] Kirmānī, *Fihrist*, p. 249. Entitled *Risāla dhū raᵓsayn*, this treatise was printed in *Jawāmiᶜ al-kalim*, vol. 1, pt. 3, pp. 87-108.

[296] Kirmānī, *Fihrist*, p. 249. This treatise entitled *Sirāṭ al-yaqīn*, was printed in *Jawāmiᶜ al-kalim*, vol. 1, pt. 3, pp. 1-84.

[297] Kirmānī, *Fihrist*, p. 252. Dated 1207/1792; printed in *Jawāmiᶜ al-kalim*, vol. 1, pt. 2, pp. 210-4.

[298] On whom, see al-Ṭihrānī, *Ṭabaqāt*, vol. 2, pp. 80-1.

[299] The full text of the *ijāza* is given in al- Aḥsāʾī, *Sharḥ-i ḥālāt*, pp. 81-4.

[300] Quoted in ibid., p. 82.

[301] Rashti, *Dalīl*, p. 57.

[302] Al-Aḥsāʾī, *Sharḥ-i ḥālāt*, p. 23.

[303] See note 70 above.

[304] Al-Aḥsāʾī, *Sharḥ-i ḥālāt*, p. 23.

[305] Kirmānī, *Fihrist*, p. 243; printed in al-Aḥsāʾī, *Jawāmiᶜ al-kalim*, vol. 2, pp. 141-50.

[306] These are items 18, 24, 38, 59, 63, 92, and 97 in Kirmānī, *Fihrist*.

[307] Al-Aḥsāʾī, *Sharḥ-i ḥālāt*, p. 26.

[308] Ibid., pp. 84-6; 89-93.

[309] Rashti, *Dalīl*, p. 13.

[310] Philby, *Saudi Arabia*, pp. 77-82.

[311] See for example Kāshānī, *Nuqtat al-Kāf*, pp. 99-100; Zarandī, *Dawn-Breakers*, pp. 1-2.

[312] The full text is given in Al-Aḥsāʾī, *Sharḥ-i ḥālāt*, pp. 81-4.

[313] Ibid., p. 23; cf. Kirmānī, *Fihrist,* p. 162. Compare the wording in Shaykh Aḥmad's *ijāza* from Shaykh Ḥusayn Āl ᶜAṣfūr (ᶜAbd Allāh Aḥsāʾī, *Sharḥ-i ḥālāt*, p. 69).

[314] Al-Aḥsāʾī, *Sharḥ-i ḥālāt*, p. 24. For the text of the *ijāza*, which was of general application, (ʿ*āmma*), see ibid., pp. 89-93. It is quoted in part in Rashti, *Dalīl*, p. 25.

[315] The text of Shaykh Jaʿfar's *ijāza* is given in al-Aḥsāʾī, *Sharḥ-i ḥālāt*, pp. 93-6, and is quoted in part in Rashti, *Dalīl*, p. 26. Sayyid ʿAlī's *ijāza* is given in al-Aḥsāʾī, *Sharḥ-i ḥālāt*, pp. 87-8, and qoted in part in Rashti, *Dalīl*, pp. 26-7.

[316] Kantūrī, *Kashf*, p. 523. Kantūrī gives 1240/1824 + as the date of his death, but I prefer to rely here on Kashmīrī, who quotes Āqā Muḥammad Bihbahānī's *Miʾrāt al-aḥwāl* in reference to events in Karbala in 1215; Ḥābībābādī gives 1216/1801 (Ḥābībābādī, *Makārim al-āthār*, vol. 2, p. 611). For details of Mīrzā Muḥammad Mahdī Shahristānī, see previous chapter, note 173. For the text of his *ijāza* to al-Aḥsāʾī, see ʿAbd Allāh al-Aḥsāʾī, *Sharḥ-i ḥālāt*, pp. 84-6; it is quoted in part Rashti, *Dalīl*, pp. 25-6.

[317] See his *ijāza* to al-Aḥsāʾī, quoted in ʿAbd Allāh al-Aḥsāʾī, *Sharḥ-i ḥālāt*, p. 70.

[318] Kantūrī, *Kashf*, p. 69. For details of Shaykh Husayn, see al-Ṭihrānī, *Ṭabaqāt*, vol. 2, pp. 427-9. The text of his *ijāza* to al-Ahsaʾi is given in ʿAbd Allāh Aḥsāʾī, *Sharḥ-i ḥālāt*, pp. 68-81 and in the volume containing Hamadānī, *al-Ijtināb* (pp. 2-8); it is given in part in Rashti, *Dalīl*, p. 26. See also Kashmīrī, *Nujūm*, p. 367. The *ijāza* is referred to by al-Ahsaʾi in his *Sharḥ al-ziyāra*, pt. 1, pp. 106-7.

[319] Al-Aḥsāʾī, *Jawāmiʿ al-kalim*, vol. 2, p. 42.

[320] 1204/1789, for example, would make good sense within the framework of our chronology. The date in question is written in figures.

[321] Kirmānī, *Fihrist*, p. 150. For references to al-Ahsaʾi as a teacher of Kalbāsī, see al-Ṭihrānī, *Ṭabaqāt*, vol. 2, pp. 15, 91.

[322] Al-Ṭihrānī, *Tabaqāt*, vol. 2, p. 91. On Sayyid Muḥsin, see also Kashmīrī, *Nujūm*, pp. 344-5; Khwānsārī, *Rawḍāt*, p. 523; Tanakābunī, *Qiṣaṣ*, p. 198.

[323] See, in particular, the *ijāzāt* from Sayyid ᶜAlī ibn Muḥammad Ṭabāṭabāᵓī (quoted in al-Aḥsāᵓī, *Sharḥ-i ḥālāt*, pp. 87-8) and Baḥr al-ᶜUlūm (quoted ibid., p. 90).

[324] The dated works include items 5, 14, 18, 39, 55, 72, 82, 89, and 100 in Kirmānī, *Fihrist*.

[325] *Al-Risāla al-Baḥrāniyya*: see note 68 above.

[326] Al-Aḥsāᵓī, *al-Risāla al-ijmāᶜiyya*: Kirmānī, *Fihrist,* p. 246; printed in al-Aḥsaᵓi, *Jawāmiᶜ al-kalim*, vol. 1, pt. 3, pp. 108-44.

[327] *Risāla* to Shaykh ᶜAbd al-Ḥusayn al-Baḥrānī, a son of Shaykh Yūsuf al-Baḥrānī in Kirmānī, *Fihrist*, pp. 241-2; printed in al-Aḥsāᵓī, *Jawāmiᶜ al-kalim*, vol. 2, pp. 61-9.

[328] Al-Aḥsāᵓī, *Sharḥ-i ḥālāt*, pp. 26-8.

[329] For an account of the annual Wahhabi raids between 1803 and 1810 and resistance to them, see Lorimer, *Gazetteer,* vol. 1B, pp. 1077-9.

[330] Al-Aḥsāᵓī, *Sharḥ-i ḥālāt*, p. 29.

[331] See ibid., p. 34.

[332] Ibid., p. 29; see also Rashti, *Dalīl*, p. 13.

[333] Rashti gives the names of several of these in *Dalīl*, p. 17. Muḥammad Karīm Khān Kirmānī names two others in his *Risāla-yi hidāyat al-ṭālibīn*, 2nd ed. (Kirman: Chāpkhānih-i Sa‘ādat, 1380 [1960]), p. 38.

[334] Kashmīrī, *Nujūm*, p. 418.

[335] See ibid., pp. 345-6, 418 (a separate entry); al-Ṭihrānī, *Ṭabaqāt*, vol. 2, p. 449.

[336] He is the author of *al-Ḥusn wa ’l-qabḥ* (See al-Ṭihrānī, *al-Dharīᶜa*, vol. 7, pp. 18-9) and *Ḥaqāᵓiq al-uṣūl*. For details, see Kashmīrī, *Nujūm*, pp. 417-

8; al-Ṭihrānī, *Ṭabaqāt*, vol. 2, p. 142; Ḥābībābādī, *Makārim al-āthār,* vol. 3, pp. 892-3.

[337] Quoted in al-Ṭihrānī, *Ṭabaqāt*, vol. 2, p. 142; this seems to disprove Ḥabībābādī's statement that, in 1208/1793, he travelled to Mashhad and returned from there to Yazd, where he remained (Ḥābībābādī, *Makārim al-āthār,* vol. 3, p. 892).

[338] Ḥasan Fasā'ī, *Tārīkh-i Fārsnāmah-i Nāṣirī* ([Tehran]: Intishārāt-i Kitābkhānah-i Nisā'ī, 1312-14 [1895-97]), vol. 1, p. 296. Other examples are the direct intervention by the Shaykh al-Islām of Shīrāz during the early years of the reign of Fatḥ ʿAlī Shāh, in which he forced the governor, Muḥammad Nabī Khān, to lower the price of bread and succeeded in having him dismissed (see Sir William Ouseley, *Travells in Various Countries of the East; More Particularly Persia, etc.* (London: Rodwell and Martin, 1819-23), vol. 2, pp. 209-10); the expulsion of the governor of Kāshān by Mullā Aḥmad Narāqī, and his forcing Fatḥ ʿAlī Shāh to appoint a new incumbent in his stead (see Tanakābunī, *Qiṣaṣ*, p. 130); and the role of Sayyid Kāẓim Rashti in protecting large numbers of citizens during the 1843 siege of Karbala (see next chapter). See also Algar, *Religion and State*, pp. 52-3; A. K. S. Lambton, "Persian Society under the Qajars", *Journal of the Royal Central Asiatic Society* (London) vol. 48 (1961), p. 135; Malcolm, *History of Persia*, vol. 2, p. 304.

[339] Dated works from this period include items 2, 6, 45, and 65 in Kirmānī, *Fihrist*.

[340] Niʿmat Allāh Raḍavī, *Tadhkirat al-wafā'* (Bombay: [s.n.], 1895), pp. 5-6.

[341] Hāshimī Kirmānī, "Ṭā'ifa-yi Shaykhiyya," p. 252.

[342] Al- Aḥsā'ī, *Sharḥ-i ḥālāt*, pp. 30-1.

[343] For a detailed discussion of Fatḥ ʿAlī Shāh's relations with the religious sector, see Algar, *Religion and State*, pp. 45-72.

[344] Fatḥ ʿAlī Shāh to al-Aḥsā'ī, quoted in Kirmānī, *Fihrist*, p. 166.

[345] Al-Aḥsā'ī, *Sharḥ-i ḥālāt*, p. 31.

[346] Kirmānī, *Fihrist*, pp. 240-1; printed in al- Aḥsāʾī, in *Jawāmiᶜ al-kalim*, vol. 1, pt. 1, pp. 120-9.

[347] Kirmānī, *Fihrist*, p. 241; printed in al-Aḥsāʾī, *Jawāmiᶜ al-kalim*, vol. 2, pt. 1, pp. 245-9. What appear to be this and the previous *risāla* are referred to by the single title *Khāqānīyya* by ᶜAbd Allāh al-Aḥsāʾī, *Sharḥ-i ḥālāt*, p. 59, 60; cf. Kashmīrī, *Nujūm*, p. 371.

[348] Sulṭān Aḥmad Mīrzā ᶜAḍud al-Dawla, *Tārīkh-i ᶜAḍudī,* ed. ᶜAbd al-Ḥusayn Navāʾī (Tehran: Intishārāt-i Bābak, 2535 Shsh [1976]), p. 128. On Mīrzā Muḥammad Nadīm, see notes by Navā'ī in ibid., pp. 269-70.

[349] Rashti, *Dalīl*, p. 1.

[350] Al-Aḥsāʾī, *Sharḥ-i ḥālāt*, pp. 31-2.

[351] On *ṣādirāt*, see George Nathaniel Curzon, *Persia and the Persian Question* (London: Longmans, Green, 1892), vol. 2, pp. 477-8; James Justinian Morier, *A Journey through Persia, Armenia and Asia Minor to Constantinople in the Years 1808 and 1809* (London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme and Brown, 1812), p. 237.

[352] Al-Aḥsāʾī, *Sharḥ-i ḥālāt*, p. 32.

[353] Rashti, *Dalīl*, p. 17.

[354] Al-Aḥsāʾī, *Sharḥ-i ḥālāt*, pp. 32-3; Rashti, *Dalīl*, p. 18; ᶜAḍud al-Dawla, *Tārīkh-i ᶜAḍudī*, p. 128.

[355] The exact dating of al-Ahsaʾi's visit is difficult, since none of our sources gives precise details. However, the *Risāla al-khāqāniyya*, presumably written from Yazd, is dated early Ramaḍān 1223/late October 1808; a letter dated 19 Ṣafar 1224/5 April 1809 is recorded as having been written in Yazd (Kirmānī, *Fihrist*, p. 287). Further evidence is provided by the date of the arrival of Muḥammad ᶜAlī Mīrzā's envoy in Basra, at the begining of Dhū 'l-Qaᶜda 1223/mid-December 1808. The reference to the journey as occurring in winter also helps us pinpoint the approximate date of his arrival.

It is unclear whether the *fāʾida* of al-Ahsaʾi's dated 20 Ramadān 1223/9 November 1808 was written in Yazd or Tehran (ibid, p. 229).

[356] Al-Aḥsāʾī, *Sharḥ-i ḥālāt*, p. 33.

[357] Rashti, *Dalīl*, p. 18; Muḥammad Karīm Khān Kirmānī states that, among those that visited al-Ahsaʾi in Tehran was Mīrzā Muḥammad Akhbari (*Risāla-yi hidāyat al-ṭālibīn*, p. 39).

[358] Al-Aḥsāʾī, *Sharḥ-i ḥālāt*, pp. 34-5.

[359] Ibid., p. 35; cf. ʿAḍud al-Dawla, *Tārīkh-i ʿAḍudī*, p. 128.

[360] On this policy, see Algar, *Religion and State*, pp. 51-2.

[361] On whom, see Khwānsārī, *Rawḍāt*, pp. 154-5; Kashmīrī, *Nujūm*, pp. 414-5; Tanakābunī, *Qiṣaṣ*, pp. 100-1; Ḥābībābādī, *Makārim*, vol. 1, p. 83-92. On his attack on al-Ahsaʾi, entitled *Ḥayāt al-arwāḥ*, completed in 1240/1824, see al-Ṭihrānī, *al-Dharīʾa*, vol. 7, pp. 115-6. A refutation of this work, entitled *Sharḥ Ḥayāt al-arwāḥ*, was written in 1252/1837 by Mullā Muḥammad Ḥasan Gawhar Qarācha-dāghī, a leading pupil of al-Ahsaʾi and Rashti (see ibid., vol. 13, p. 215; see also vol. 5, p. 174).

[362] See Algar, *Religion and State*, p. 51; al-Ṭihrānī, *Ṭabaqāt*, vol. 2, pp. 354-5; vol. 3, pp. 340-5; Ḥabībābādī, *Makārim*, vol. 4, pp. 1099-1102. His great-nephew, Mīrzā Muḥammad Ibrāhīm, was a follower of Mullā Ḥasan Gawhar, referred to in the last note (al-Ṭihrānī, *Ṭabaqāt*, vol. 1, p. 4; vol. 3, p. 343).

[363] Tanakābunī, *Qiṣaṣ*, pp. 31-2.

[364] Iʿtimād al-Salṭana lists a large number of these in his *Maʾāthir*, pp. 135-86.

[365] Al-Aḥsāʾī, *Sharḥ-i ḥālāt*, pp. 35-6; cf. ʿAḍud al-Dawla, *Tārīkh-i ʿĀḍudī*, p. 128; Rashti, *Dalīl*, p. 18.

[366] On these and other cases of clerical opposition to the state, see Algar, *Religion and State*, chapters 12, 13, and 14; Hamid Algar, "The

Oppositional Role of the Ulama in Twentieth-Century Iran," in *Scholars, Saints and Ṣūfīs: Religious Institutions in the Middle East since 1500*, edited by Nikki R. Keddie (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972); Nikki R. Keddie, *Religion and Rebellion in Iran: The Tobacco Protest of 1891-1892* (London: Frank Cass, 1966).

[367] Zarandī, *Dawn-Breakers*, pp. 5-13.

[368] Ibid., p. 12.

[369] Ibid., p. 13

[370] Al-Aḥsāʾī, *Sharḥ-i ḥālāt*, p. 36. Riḍāʾ Qulī Khān Hidāyat states that he was made governor of Khuzestan, Lorestan, the Bakhtiari region, and Kirmanshah in 1222/1807, when he was nineteen (Riḍāʾ Qulī Khān Hidāyat, *Tārīkh-i Rawḍat al-ṣafā-yi Nāṣirī,* ed. Muḥammad ibn Khwāndshāh Mīrkhwānd [(Tehran?): Markaz-i Khayyām Pīrūz, (1339 Sh./1959-60?)], p. 602).

[371] Al-Aḥsāʾī, *Sharḥ-i ḥālāt*, p. 36.

[372] Kirmānī, *Fihrist*, p. 287.

[373] Rashti, *Dalīl*, p. 19.

[374] Al-Aḥsāʾī, *Sharḥ-i ḥālāt*, p. 38.

[375] Ibid., pp. 40-4. Abu'l-Qāsim Khān states that the Shaykh made numerous visits to Mashhad in this period (*Fihrist*, p. 167.

[376] Hāshimī Kirmānī, "Ṭāʾifa-yi Shaykhiyya," p. 252; Zarandī, *Dawn-Breakers*, p. 5.

[377] Hāshimī Kirmānī, "Ṭāʾifa-yi Shaykhiyya," p. 252.

[378] Rashti mentions several of the ulama who were resident in Mashhad at the time of al-Ahsaʾi's visits (Rashti, *Dalīl*, p. 20. Kirmānī names two others (*Hidāyat al-ṭālibīn*, p. 40).

[379] Rashti, *Dalīl*, p. 19.

[380] Ibid.

[381] Al-Aḥsāʾī, *Sharḥ-i ḥālāt*, p. 44.

[382] Rashti, *Dalīl*, p. 20.

[383] Kirmānī, *Hidāyat al-ṭālibīn*, p. 41.

[384] Kashmīrī, *Nujūm*, p. 367, based on the *Rawḍāt al-bahiyya* of Sayyid Shafīᶜ al-Mūsawī.

[385] See Algar, *Religion and State*, p. 45.

[386] Sir Robert Kerr Porter, *Travels in Georgia, Persia, Armenia, Ancient Babylonia, &c., during the years 1817, 1818, 1819, and 1820* (London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme and Brown, 1821-22), vol. 2, pp. 201-2. On Muḥammad ᶜAlī Mīrzā (1203-37/1789-1821), the eldest son of Fatḥ ᶜAlī Shāh, see ibid., pp. 202-4; Navāʾī, notes to ᶜAḍud al-Dawla, *Tārīkh-i ᶜAḍudī*, pp. 218-9; Mahdī Bāmdād, *Rijāl*, vol. 3, pp. 430-1.

[387] The Shaykh wrote at least two letters in reply to intelligent questions from this prince: see Kirmānī, *Fihrist* pp. 236-7. The first of these is printed in al-Aḥsāʾī, *Jawāmiᶜ*, vol. 1, pt. 2, pp. 200-7. On Mahmūd Mīrzā, the fourteenth son of Fatḥ ᶜAlī, see Navāʾī, notes to ᶜAḍud al-Dawla, *Tārīkh-i ᶜAḍudī*, pp. 227-8; Bāmdād, *Rijāl*, vol. 4, pp. 51-3.

[388] Al-Aḥsāʾī, *Sharḥ-i ḥālāt*, p. 50. On ᶜAbd Allāh Khān, twice Ṣadr-i Aᶜzam, see Fasāʾī, *Fārsnāma*, vol. 1, pp. 269-71, 274; ᶜAḍud al-Dawla, *Tārīkh-i ᶜAḍudī*, pp. 60-5, 99-102; Navāʾī, notes to ibid., p. 236; Bāmdād, *Rijāl*, vol. 2, pp. 278-81.

[389] Hāshimī Kirmānī, "Ṭā'ifa-yi Shaykhiyya," p. 247.

[390] See Chahārdihī, *Shaykh Aḥmad Aḥsāʾī*, pp. 246-64.

[391] Kirmānī, *Fihrist*, p. 167.

[392] Rashti, *Dalīl*, pp. 31-2.

[393] Ibid., p. 32.

[394] Al-Aḥsāʾī, *Sharḥ-i ḥālāt*, p. 45

[395] Ibid., p. 46.

[396] Ibid.

[397] Tanakābunī, *Qiṣaṣ*, p. 36. The same source relates a similar anecdote about Āqā Sayyid Riḍāʾ Ṭabāṭabāʾī, a son of Baḥr al-ʿUlūm, who also had debts and came from Najaf to Kirmanshah (ibid.).

[398] Kashmīrī, *Nujūm,* p. 367, based on the *Rawḍāt al-bahiyya* of Murtaḍā Fayḍ-i Kāshānī.

[399] Tanakābunī, *Qiṣaṣ*, pp. 37-8.

[400] Hāshimī Kirmānī, "Ṭāʾifa-yi Shaykhiyya," p. 253. This author argues against the validity of this statement, which he has not seen recorded.

[401] Kirmānī, *Fihrist*, p. 159.

[402] Al-Aḥsāʾī, *Sharḥ-i ḥālāt*, pp. 42-7.

[403] Ibid., p. 48. Shaykh ʿAbd Allāh also names Shaykh Jaʿfar al-Najafī as one of those with whom al-Ahsaʾi associated on this occassion, but it is widely agreed that al-Najafi had died four years previously in 1228/1813. Rashti gives the names of several ulama with whom the Shaykh associated at the *ʿatabāt* during his pilgrimages in the period of his stay in Kirmanshah from 1814 (Rashti, *Dalīl*, pp. 22-3). Elsewhere, Rashti states that, on several journeys to the *ʿatabāt*, al-Ahsaʾi associated with Mīrzā-yi Qummī and Shaykh Ḥasan ibn Ḥusayn ʿAlī ʿAsfūr, both of whom showed great admiration for him (ibid., p. 24). He omits to mention here another man with whom al-Ahsaʾi probably associated during his earlier journeys to the ʿ*atabat* – Sayyid Muḥsin al-Aʿrajī (d. 1231/1816), from whom he may have received an *ijāza.*

[404] Rashti, *Dalīl*, pp. 23-4.

[405] Ibid., p. 23; Kirmānī, *Hidāyat al-ṭālibīn*, p. 48. The Shaykh's commentary on the *Risāla al-ᶜilmīyya* is referred to above in note 68 this chapter.

[406] Al-Aḥsāᵓī, *Sharḥ-i ḥālāt*, p. 48.

[407] Kirmānī, *Fihrist*, p. 226. See al-Ṭihrānī, *al-Dharīᶜa*, vol. 13, p. 305.

[408] See note 68 above, this chapter. Other works written in this period include items 3, 36, 57, and 129 in Kirmānī, *Fihrist*.

[409] Kirmānī, *Fihrist*, p. 227; see bibliography.

[410] See note 121 above, this chapter.

[411] Kirmānī, *Fihrist*, p. 228; see bibliography.

[412] Ibid., p. 241; see bibliography.

[413] Among these are items 40, 41, 85, and 109 in Kirmānī, *Fihrist*.

[414] Muḥammad Jaᶜfar Khūrmūjī, *Tārīkh-i Qājār: Ḥaqāᵓiq al-akhbār-i Nāṣirī*, edited by Ḥusayn Khadīv Jām (Tehran: Kitābfurūshī-yi Zavvār, 1344 [1965]), p. 16. The war ended with signing of the Treaty of Erzurum in 1238/1823 (see Hidāyat, *Tārīkh-i Rawḍāt al-Ṣafā-yi Nāṣirī,* vol. 9, pp. 616-7, 625-9).

[415] Ibid., vol. 9, p. 602.

[416] Ibid., p. 603.

[417] Al-Aḥsāᵓī, *Sharḥ-i ḥālāt*, p. 48.

[418] Shaykh ᶜAbdu'llah says two years (ibid., p. 49).

[419] Fasāᵓī, *Fārsnāma*, vol. 1, pp. 268-9.

[420] Mīrzā Asad Allāh Fāḍil-I Māzandarānī, *Tārikh-i-ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, p. 309.

[421] Āvāra, *al-Kawākib al-durriyya*, p. 144

[422] For varying accounts of this incident see Zarandī, *Dawn-Breakers*, pp. 276-8 (who attributes the murder to a single Shaykhi); Ḥājī Muḥammad Muᶜīn al-Salṭana Tabrīzī, *Tārīkh-i amr*, digital facsimile (Lansing, Mich.: H-Bahai, 2000), Internet document, pp. 242-5; Tanakābunī, *Qiṣaṣ*, p. 57; Samandar, *Tārīkh-i Samandar*, p. 356.

[423] On Mullā Muḥammad Taqī, see the lengthy biography (with numerous digressions) in Tanakābunī, *Qiṣaṣ*, pp. 19-66; Kashmīrī, *Nujūm,* pp. 407-11; Kāẓimī, *Aḥsan al-wadīᶜa*, vol. 1, pp. 30-5; al-Ṭihrānī, *Ṭabaqāt*, vol. 2, pp. 226-8 ; Iᶜtimād al-Salṭana, *al-Maᵓāthir*, p. 144; Bāmdād, *Rijāl*, vol. 1, pp. 203-4; Anṣārī, *Zindigānī*, pp. 192-3; Amīnī Najafī, *Shahīdān-i rāh-i faḍīlat*, pp. 476-9.

[424] Chahārdihī, *Shaykh Aḥmad Aḥsāᵓī*, p. 37.

[425] Although ᶜAbd al-Wahhāb never seems to have been regarded as a Shaykhi, his attitude towards the school, as well as to Babism, was basically favourable. On the death of Rashti, he was the only *ᶜālim* in Qazvīn to organize a memorial gathering (Qazvīnī, "Tārīkh-i Mullā Jaᶜfar Qazvīnī," p. 469). His two sons Mīrzā Muḥammad-ᶜAlī and Mīrzā Hādī, were both Shaykhis and later became Babis, being included in the small group of earliest disciples, the *ḥurūf al-ḥayy*. (Zarandī, *Dawn-Breakers*, pp. 80-1; Samandar, *Tārīkh-i Samandar*, p. 85.

[426] Chahārdihī, *Shaykh Aḥmad Aḥsāᵓī*, p. 37.

[427] Kirmānī, *Fihrist*, p. 156. Shaykh Jaᶜfar (d. 1306/1888) lived in Karbala, but later went to Kirman, where he associated with Muḥammad Khān, Karīm Khān's son and successor. Muḥammad Khān relates traditions from Shaykh Jaᶜfar in his *Kitāb al-mubīn*, and Karīm Khān's *Taqwīm al-lisān* (printed 1272/1855) was written at his request (Kirmānī, *Fihrist*, p. 396).

[428] On the method used to displace Hājī Sayyid Muḥammad Taqī, the former *Imām-Jumᶜa*, see Tanakābunī, *Qiṣaṣ*, p. 29.

[429] See ibid., pp. 19-20, 22, 22-3, 31, 31-2

[430] Ibid., p. 22.

[431] Rashti, *Dalīl*, pp. 19, 23-4, 37; Hāshimī Kirmānī, "Ṭā'ifa-yi Shaykhiyya," p. 247.

[432] Qazvīnī, "Tārīkh-i Mullā Jaᶜfar Qazvīnī," p. 448.

[433] Whereas Taqī means "pious", *shaqī* means "wretched, a wretch, a villain, a criminal" etc.

[434] Quoted in Kirmānī, *Fihrist*, pp. 157-8. Abū 'l-Qāsim Khān maintains that al-Ahsaᵓi and Baraghānī agreed on the fact of physical resuurection, but disagreed as to its manner (ibid., p. 152). This is largely true, in that al-Ahsaᵓi did not—as some sources have suggested—speak in terms of a spiritual resurrection. Babi and Bahaᵓi allegorizing is a later development.

[435] Tanakābunī, *Qiṣaṣ*, p. 43.

[436] See Bāmdād, *Rijāl*, vol. 2, pp. 496-8.

[437] Tanakābunī, *Qiṣaṣ*, p. 43.

[438] Qazvīnī, "Tārīkh-i Mullā Jaᶜfar Qazvīnī," pp. 449-50.

[439] Tanakābunī, *Qiṣaṣ*, pp. 44-8.

[440] Rashti, *Dalīl*, p. 40. Rashti also mentions the denial of physical resurrection and the physical ascension of Muḥammad. He likewise states that the four main points of disagreement with al-Ahsaᵓi concerned: *miᶜrāj*, *maᶜād*, ᶜ*ilm* (the divine kowledge), and the belief in the Imāms as the cause of creation (ibid., pp. 57-8).

[441] Since it has proved impossible to include within this dissertation even a brief discussion of Shaykhi doctrine, reference may be made to the following sources for further information. On the divine knowledge, see al-Ahsaᵓi, *Jawāmiᶜ al-kalim*, vol. 1, pt. 2, pp. 227-9, pt. 3 (a) pp. 1-8; vol. 2, pp. 69-75, 282, 285-7. On *ma'ād*, see ibid., vol. 1, pt. 1, pp. 14-111, 122-4, pt. 2, pp. 68-114, 136, pt. 3 (a), pp. 8-10; vol. 2, pp. 46-8, 114-66 (question

41), 280-2; al-Ahsaʾi. *Ḥayāt al-nafs*, pp. 91-127; al-Aḥsāʾī, *Sharḥ al-ziyāra*, pt. 4, pp. 8-10. On *miʿrāj*, see al-Ahsaʾi, *Jawāmiʿ al-kalim*, vol. 1, pt. 1, pp. 137-9, pt. 2, pp. 114-66 (question 26). On the nature of the Imāms, see ibid., vol. 1, pt. 2, pp. 233-4; vol. 2, pp. 80-2; Aḥsāʾī, *Sharḥ al-ziyāra*, passim. These main points and numerous others are dealt with by Muḥammad Ḥusayn Shahristānī in his polemical *Taryāq-i fārūq*, quoted and commented, in Hamadānī, *Kitāb al-ijtināb*; Hamadānī's "al-Naʿl al-ḥāḍira," in *Kitāb al-ijtināb*, ibid., refuting a polemic entitled *Dār al-salām*, is also useful. A convenient summary of al-Ahsaʾi's beliefs, with questions, is given in Ishrāq Khāvarī, *Qāmūs-i Īqān*, vol. 4, pp. 1615-39. Some important passages have been translated and annotated by Corbin in *Terre Célèste*, pp. 281-337. See also Denis MacEoin, "Shaikh Aḥmad ibn Zayn al-Dīn Aḥsāʾī", *Encyclopaedia Iranica* 1:7 (1984), pp.674-79; idem, 'Shaykhi Cosmology', *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, 6:3 (1993), pp. 326-8.

[442] On the ability of the Shiʿi ulama to assimilate a wide range of ideological diversity within the framework of the Twelver belief system, see Binder, "The Proofs of Islam," pp. 134-5

[443] Tanakābunī, *Qiṣaṣ*, p. 42.

[444] Hāshimī Kirmānī, "Tā'ifa-yi Shaykhiyya," p. 350.

[445] Chahārdihī, *Shaykh Aḥmad Aḥsāʾī*, p. 38.

[446] Rashti, *Dalīl*, pp. 37-8.

[447] For details of Sayyid Muḥammad Mahdī, see Tanakābunī, *Qiṣaṣ*, pp. 124-5; Kashmīrī, *Nujūm*, pp. 366-7; Kāẓimī, *Aḥsan al-wadīʿa*, vol. 1, pp. 13-15.

[448] Rashti, *Dalīl*, p. 39. The meeting referred to by Tanakābunī (*Qiṣaṣ*, pp. 43-4), that was called by Sayyid Muḥammad Mahdī after al-Ahsa'i's death and attended by Mullā Muḥammad Sharīf al-ʿUlamāʾ Māzandarānī), Ḥājī Mullā Muḥammad Jaʿfar Astarābādī, and Sayyid Kāẓim Rashtī, appears to have been a second meeting, probably identical with that described in Rashti, *Dalīl*, p. 59 (and see next chapter below).

[449] See note 135 above, this chapter.

[450] Tanakābunī, *Qiṣaṣ*, pp. 107-112; Kāẓimī, *Aḥsan al-wadīᶜa* vol. 1, pp. 59-63; Iᶜtimād al-Salṭana, *al-Maᵓāthir*, p. 139; al-Ṭihrānī, *Ṭabaqāt*, vol. 2, pp. 152-3.

[451] Tanakābunī, *Qiṣaṣ*, pp. 112-7; Kashmīrī, *Nujūm*, pp. 375-6; Hābībābādī, *Makārim al-āthār*, vol. 4, pp. 1269-72; Anṣārī, *Zindigānī*, pp. 148-50. Sharīf al-ᶜUlamāᵓ was one the teachers of Shaykh Murtaḍā al-Anṣārī.

[452] See Tanakābunī, *Qiṣaṣ*, pp. 4-19; al-Kulaynī, *Rawḍāt*, pp. 12-13; Hābībābādī, *Makārim*, vol. 2, pp. 518-26; al-Ṭihrānī, *Ṭabaqāt*, vol. 2, pp –0-11; Anṣārī, *Zindigānī*, p. 49 n.

[453] Kashmīrī, *Nujūm*, pp. 37-80; al-Ṭihrānī, *Ṭabaqāt,* vol. 2, pp. 390-1. He was himself a bitter opponent of Sharīf al-ᶜUlamāᵓ (see Kirmānī, *Fihrist*, p. 160).

[454] Tanakābunī, *Qiṣaṣ*, p 44. As mentioned previously, Shaykh Muḥammad Ḥasan had an *ijāza* from al-Ahsaᵓi. Hamadānī disputes the claim that he prounced *takfīr* against him (Hamadānī, *Kitāb al-Ijtināb*, p. 106).

[455] Rashti, *Dalīl*, p. 80.

[456] Al-Ahsaᵓi to Mullā ᶜAbd al-Wahhāb-i-Qazvīnī, quoted in Kirmānī, *Fihrist*, p. 157.

[457] Rashti, *Dalīl*, pp. 45-8; cf. al-Kulaynī, *Rawḍāt*, p. 26. The governor of Baghdad at this period was Dāᵓūd Pāshā.

[458] Chahārdihī, *Shaykh Aḥmad Aḥsāᵓī,* p. 44.

[459] See ibid., p. 38. On the term Bālāsarī, see D. MacEoin, "Bālāsarī", *Encyclopaedia Iranica* 3:6 (1988), pp.583-85; Zarandī, *Dawn-Breakers*, pp. 84-5; A.-L.-M. Nicolas, *Essai sur le Chéikhisme*, vol. 1, *Cheïkh Ahmed Lahçahi* (Paris : P. Geuther, 1910), preface, pp. 5-6. Rashti notes that one cannot really compare the Shaykhi-Bālāsarī with the Akhbari-Usuli division because the latter did not result in the declaration of *takfir*. (Rashti, *Dalīl*, p. 8).

[460] Corbin, *En Islam iranien*, vol. 4, p. 225.

[461] Rashti gives a list of the ulama at the ᶜ*atabāt* and in Isfahan who opposed Sayyid Mahdī in his *takfīr*. Rashti, *Dalīl*, pp. 79-80.

[462] Mullā Jaᶜfar Qazvīnī, *Tārīkh*, p. 450.

[463] Al-Aḥsāᵓī, *Sharḥ-i ḥālāt*, p. 49.

[464] Ibid., p. 50.

[465] Ibid.

[466] Ibid., p. 51

[467] See Kirmānī, *Fihrist*, p. 170.

[468] Ibid., p. 149. Tanakābunī says that al-Ahsa'i was a guest of Kalbāsī and prayed in his mosque, the Masjid-i Ḥakīm, while in Isfahan. (*Qiṣaṣ*, p. 35).

[469] Zarandī, *Dawn-Breakers*, pp. 19-24.

[470] See al-Kulaynī, *Rawḍāt*, pp. 402-3; Hābībābādī, *Makārim,* vol. 4, p. 1264-7; Chahārdihī, *Shaykh Aḥmad Aḥsāᵓī*, p. 54 (where it is suggested that Nuri later regretted having taught the views of al-Ahsaᵓi; cf. Tanakābunī, *Qiṣaṣ*, p. 35).

[471] See Tanakābunī, *Qiṣaṣ*, p. 117; Kashmīrī, *Nujūm*, p. 380; al-Ṭihrānī, *Ṭabaqāt*, vol. 2, pp. 215-7; Anṣārī, *Zindigānī*, pp. 18-9 n.

[472] Al-Kulaynī. *Rawḍāt*, p. 26.

[473] Al-Aḥsāᵓī, *Sharḥ-i ḥālāt*, p. 51. Al-Ahsaᵓi remained active during this period in Karbala. Two of his works are dated 1239/1823 (see Kirmānī, *Fihrist*, items 7 and 43).

[474] Rashti, *Dalīl*, pp. 37-8.

[475] Ibid., p. 39

[476] Ibid., p. 48.

[477] Al-Aḥsāʾī, *Sharḥ-i ḥālāt*, p. 53.

[478] Ibid., p. 54; Rashti, *Dalīl*, p. 48.

[479] Al-Aḥsāʾī, *Sharḥ-i ḥālāt*, p. 54.

Chapter Three

[480] The "Tanbīh al-ghāfilīn" is based on statements from the author's father, Āqā Sayyid Muḥammad Taqī. (Kirmānī, *Fihrist*, p. 114).

[481] Ibid., pp. 113, 114.

[482] Ibid., pp. 114-23.

[483] Thus Zarandī, *Dawn-Breakers*, p. 45, who states that he died in 1259/1843 "at the ripe age of sixty." This, however, contradicts an earlier statement by the same author (p. 10) to the effect that Rashti was aged twenty-two in 1231/1815.

[484] Thus Ḥabībābādī, *Makārim*, vol. 1 , p. 209, based on a statement in a manuscript copy of the *Tārikh-i Sartip* of Mīrzā ʿAbd al-Razzāq Khān Muhandis Sartīp Baghāyarī. Also Avāra, *Kawākib*, p. 27

[485] Thus Zarandī, *Dawn-Breakers*, page 10, who states that Rashti was twenty-two years old in 1231/1815. In contradiction to his statement cited in note 4 above. Nicolas cites a Shaykhi *ʿālim* called Thiqat al-Islām (presumably Mīrzā ʿAlī Thiqat al-Islām Tabrizī, the grandson of Mīrzā Shafīʿ Thiqat al-Islām, who was hanged in Tabriz by the Russians in 1330/1912), who states that Rashti died at the age of fifty, which would give a birth-date of 1209/1794 (A.-L.-M. Nicolas, *Essai sur le Chéi'khisme*, vol. 2, *Séyyèd Kazem Rechti* (Paris : P. Geuther, 1914), p. 5). Browne cites a statement to the effect that he died in 1259 "ere he had attained his fiftieth year." (Edward Granville Browne, "The Sheykhīs and Their Doctrine

Concerning the 'Fourth Support'," in *A Traveller's Narrative*, vol. 2, p. 238).

[486] Thus Ḥājj Sayyid Jawād Qarashī, quoted in Kirmānī, *Fihrist*, p. 115.

[487] Thus Nicolas, who states that Rashti may have been aged fifty-five on his death, on the authority of a Shaykhi *ᶜālim* called Shaykh ᶜAlī Jawān (Nicolas, *Séyyèd Kazem Rechti*, p. 5).

[488] Kirmānī, *Fihrist*, p. 115.

[489] Avāra, *Kawākib*, p. 26.

[490] Qazvīnī , *Tārīkh,* p. 455.

[491] Browne in "The Sheykhīs", p. 238.

[492] Qazvīnī , *Tārīkh,* p. 455; cf. Kirmānī, *Fihrist,* p. 115.

[493] Browne in "The Sheykhīs", p. 238.

[494] Qazvīnī, *Tārīkh*, p. 456.

[495] Ibid.; Kirmānī, *Fihrist* p. 115.

[496] Ibid.

[497] Ibid., pp. 115-6.

[498] Corbin, "L'École Shaykhie", p. 26.

[499] Qazvīnī, *Tārīkh,* p. 456.

[500] Zarandī, *Dawn-Breakers*, p. 10.

[501] Ibid.

[502] Qazvīnī, *Tārīkh*, p. 456.

[503] Kirmānī, *Fihrist*, p. 314.

[504] On Muḥammad Riḍāʾ Mīrzā, see Navāʾī, notes to ʿAḍud al-Dawla, *Tārīkh-i ʿAḍudī*, pp. 188-9; Bāmdād, *Rijāl*, vol. 3, p. 401. Shams-i Jahān Begum, who was converted to Babism in Hamadān in 1847 by Qurrat al-ʿAyn, was a daughter of Muḥammad Riḍāʾ.

[505] Kirmānī, *Fihrist*, p. 305; this work no longer seems to be extant.

[506] Ibid., pp. 304-5; this also no longer seems to be extant.

[507] Ibid., p. 331; this *tafsīr* has been printed (n.p., n.d.). According to Zarandī, *Dawn-Breakers*, p. 10, it was written when Rashtī was eighteen.

[508] Ibid., p. 317; printed (n.p., n.d.).

[509] Ibid., pp. 338-40; printed (n.p., n.d.).

[510] Ibid., p. 292; printed (n.p., n.d.).

[511] Ibid., p. 317; the original *risāla* is no longer extant, but a Persian translation was made by Ḥusayn ibn ʿAlī Khusrawshāhī in 1242/1827, and printed.

[512] Ibid., p. 332; printed (n.p., n.d.).

[513] Among these, we note items 138, 141, 150, 155, 157, 159, 164, 171, 188, 199, 202, 207, 213, 214, 230, 292, 297, and 302 in Kirmānī, *Fihrist*.

[514] Zarandī, *Dawn-Breakers*, p. 10.

[515] Ismāʿīl Bāshā Bābānī, *Hidāyat al-ʿārifīn, asmāʾ al-muʾallifīn wa-āthār al-muṣannifīn* (Istanbul: Wakalat al-Maʿārif, 1951-1955), p. 71. A version in Kirmānī, *Fihrist,* p. 116, reads "my son Kāẓim. . ."

[516] Kirmānī, *Fihrist*, pp. 350-2.

[517] See al-Aḥsāʾī, *Jawāmiʿ*, vol. 1, pt. 2, pp. 239-48.

[518] Kirmānī, *Fihrist*, p. 316.

[519] Ibid., p. 323.

[520] Ibid., p. 310; printed (1st ed. Tabriz?, 1276 [1859]; 2nd ed. Kirman, 1353 Sh [1974]. Referring to al-Ahsaʾi in his introduction to this translation, Rashti uses the words *atāla ʾllāh baqāhu* which implies that the Shaykh was alive at the time of writing (2nd ed., p. 12).

[521] Kirmānī, *Fihrist*, p. 289.

[522] Niᶜmat Allāh Raḍavī, *Tadhkirat al-wafāʾ*, pp. 73-4.

[523] Rashti, *Dalīl*, p. 20.

[524] Letters quoted in Kirmānī, *Fihrist*, pp. 116-22 n.

[525] Ibid, p. 121 n.

[526] Ibid, item 219.

[527] Ibid, p. 294.

[528] Al-Ṭihrānī, *Ṭabaqāt*, vol. 2, pp. 315-6; *ijāza* cited in Ḥabībābādī, *Makārim*, vol. 1, p. 217; according to al-Ṭihrānī, *Ṭabaqāt*, vol. 2, p. 315, this *ijāza* has been included by Sayyid Muḥammad ᶜAlī Rawḍatī Iṣfahānī in his *Rīyāḍ al-abrār.*

[529] *Ijāza* cited in Kirmānī, *Fihrist*, p. 126.

[530] Rashti, *Dalīl*, p. 23.

[531] al-Kulaynī, *Rawḍāt*, p. 367.

[532] Ḥabībābādī, *Makārim*, vol. 4, p. 1186.

[533] Tanakābunī, *Qiṣaṣ*, p. 91.

[534] Anṣārī, *Zindigānī*, p. 389 n.. On Sayyid ᶜAbd Allāh, see al-Kulaynī, *Rawḍāt*, pp. 366-7; Ḥabībābādī, *Makārim*, vol. 4, pp. 1164-8.

[535] al-Kulaynī, *Rawḍāt*, p. 152.

[536] Anṣārī, *Zindigānī*, p. 150.

[537] Ibid., p. 151. Anṣārī's statement that the pupils of Sharīf al-ᶜUlamāᵓ Māzandarānī left Karbala on his death in 1245/1830, in order to study in Najaf under Shaykh Mūsā is obviously impossible. On Shaykh Mūsā, see ibid, pp. 150-3; Ḥabībābādī, *Makārim*, vol. 4, pp. 1131 ff.

[538] Rashti, *Dalīl*, p. 76.

[539] Kirmānī, *Fihrist*, pp. 260-2.

[540] Rashti, *Dalīl*, p. 48; Kirmānī, *Fihrist*, p. 116.

[541] Kirmānī, *Hidāyat al-ṭālibīn*, p. 71. For a later Shaykhi attempt to interpret this passage in a manner acceptable to orthodox thought, see Kirmānī, *Risāla dar jawāb-i Āqā-yi Niẓām al-Islām Iṣfahānī*, pp. 49-72.

[542] Al-Ṭihrānī, *Ṭabaqāt*, vol. 2, p. 313.

[543] Ibid., vol. 1, p. 438.

[544] Kirmānī, *Hidāyat al-ṭālibīn*, p. 133. The Bab, in an early work, states that he is "the bearer of knowledge like Kāẓim" (prayer in INBA 6003.C, p. 188).

[545] Kirmānī, *Hidāyat al-ṭālibīn*, pp. 71-2.

[546] Kulaynī, *Rawḍāt*, p. 26.

[547] Kirmānī, *Hidāyat al-ṭālibīn*, p. 72.

[548] On the latter see Corbin, *Histoire de la philosophie islamique*, p. 303.

[549] Rashti, *Dalīl*, p. 64.

[550] Ibid., p. 11.

[551] Kirmānī, *Fihrist*, p. 293; Chahārdihī, *Shaykh Aḥmad Aḥsāʾī*, p. 139; ʿAlī Wardī, *Lamaḥāt ijtimāʿiyya min taʾrīkh al-ʿIrāq al-ḥadīth*, vol. 2 (Baghdad: Matabaʿat al-Irshad, 1971), pp. 107-8. This well known work is a commentary on the *qaṣīda* by the Mawsilī poet ʿAbd al-Bāqī ibn Sulaymān [ʿUmarī] Fārūqī (1204-1278/1789-1862), written on the occasion of the donation by Sultan Maḥmūd II (1785-1839) of a piece of the covering from the tomb of the Prophet for the Shrine of Imām Mūsā in al-Kāẓimiyya; the commentary was written on the instructions of ʿAlī Riḍāʾ Pasha. The *qaṣīda* is contained in al-ʿUmarī's *dīwān* on Shiʿi themes entitled *al-Bāqiyyāt al-ṣāliḥāt*; for a list of other commentaries on it, see Ḥabībābādī, *Makārim*, vol. 1, p. 173; on al-ʿUmarī, see ibid pp. 172-4; Wardī, *Lamaḥāt*, pp. 106-8.

[552] Text quoted from Abū 'l al-Faḍl Gulpāyagānī, *Kitāb al-farāʾid* (Cairo: al-Maṭbaʿa al-Hindiyya, 1315 [1897]),
pp. 575-7.

[553] Rashti to al-Ahsaʾi quoted in Kirmānī, *Fihrist*, p. 116 n.

[554] "Risālah," in INBA 6003 C, pp. 399, 407.

[555] Zarandī, *Dawn-Breakers*, p. 11. Zarandī specifically refers to Mullā Muḥammad Māmaqānī and Mullā ʿAbd al-Khāliq Yazdī, but since the former was later among those who issued the *fatwā* for the death of the Bab in 1850, and the latter became a renegade from Babism about 1849, it is likely that religious animosity may have played some part in his choice of individuals (cf. his references to Muḥīṭ Kirmānī, Muḥammad Karīm Khān Kirmānī, and Mīrzā Ḥasan Gawhar, all opponents of the Bab—pp. 20, 39-40, 48).

[556] Tanakābunī, *Qiṣaṣ*, p. 43. On Sayyid Abū 'l-Ḥasan, see al-Ṭihrānī, *Ṭabaqāt*, vol. 2, p. 33.

[557] Kirmānī, *Fihrist*, p. 220 (items 1 and 2). Āghā Buzurg al-Ṭihrānī suggests (*Ṭabaqāt,* vol. 2, p. 31) that this Sayyid Abū 'l-Ḥasan Jī1ānī is a distinct individual from Tanakābunī's uncle, but his only knowledge of him seems to be as the recipient of one of these letters.

[558] Qazvīnī, *Tārīkh*, pp. 457-8. On the *Sharḥ* see Kirmānī, *Fihrist*, p. 292.

[559] Kirmānī, *Fihrist*, p. 302.

[560] Cited in al-Ṭihrānī, *al-Dharī'a*, vol. 8, p. 136.

[561] Rashti, *Dalīl*, p. 67.

[562] Zarandī, *Dawn-Breakers*, p. 42.

[563] Chahārdihī, *Shaykh Aḥmad Aḥsā'ī*, p. 139.

[564] Muḥammad ᶜAlī Kashmīrī, *Nujūm*, pp. 366, 367.

[565] Rashti, *Dalīl*, p. 49.

[566] Ibid., p. 63.

[567] Rashti (ibid. p. 59) writes only "the first of Rajab"; earlier (p. 49), he refers to the lapse of some two years from the death of al-Ahsa'i. The first of Rajab 1243 did, in fact, fall on a Friday (Wednesday in Europe).

[568] Kirmānī, *Fihrist*, p. 153. Kirmānī, *Hidāyat al-ṭālibīn*, p 138, states that the house faced the Shrine of Ḥusayn.

[569] Rashti, *Dalīl*, p. 59.

[570] On this see al-Aḥsā'ī, *Sharḥ al-zīyāra,* pt. 4, pp. 8-10.

[571] Rashti, *Dalīl*, pp. 60-1. It seems to have been as a result of his writing this statement of having pronounced *takfīr* against al-Ahsa'i; a deputation of Shaykhi ulama from there visited him and were reassured that this was not the case (Qazvīnī, *Tārīkh* p. 462).

[572] Rashti, *Dalīl*, p. 62.

[573] Kirmānī, *Hidāyat al-ṭālibīn*, p. 140.

[574] Rashti, *Dalīl*, p. 63.

[575] Ibid., pp. 63-4.

[576] I have calculated the dates on the bases of a sermon given by Rashti on this occasion, in which he states that it is a Friday and also the festival of Ghadīr Khumm (17 Dhū 'l-Ḥijja). The only Ghadīr festival at this period to fall on a Friday was that of 1243.

[577] Rashti, *Dalīl*, p. 77.

[578] Kirmānī, *Hidāyat al-ṭālibīn*, pp. 141-2.

[579] Anṣārī, *Zindigānī,* p. 153. On Shaykh ᶜAlī, see ibid.; Ḥabībābādī, *Makārim*, vol. 4, pp. 1420-1.

[580] Rashti, *Dalīl*, p. 68.

[581] Ibid., pp. 69-71.

[582] Ibid., p. 69.

[583] Ibid., p. 70.

[584] Ibid.

[585] Ibid., p. 71.

[586] Ibid., p. 71-2.

[587] Ibid., p. 73.

[588] Ibid., p. 63.

[589] Ibid.; this treatise does not seem to be extant. See Kirmānī, *Fihrist*, p. 318, item 224.

[590] Ibid., p. 66.

[591] Ibid.; Kirmānī, *Hidāyat al-ṭālibīn*, p. 144.

[592] Ibid., p. 141.

[593] Mullā Muḥammad Ḥamza Sharīᶜatmadār Māzandarānī, *Asrār al-shahāda*, quoted in Chahārdihī, *Shaykh Aḥmad Aḥsāᵓī*, pp. 171-3.

[594] Rashti, *Dalīl*, p. 74.

[595] Ibid., pp. 74, 75.

[596] Ibid., p. 75.

[597] Ibid., pp. 77-8.

[598] Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, p. 312.

[599] Ibid.; Zarandī, *Dawn-Breakers,* p. 83. The fate of her treatise is unknown.

[600] Al-Ṭihrānī, *al-Dharīᶜa*, vol. 5, p. 174; vol. 13, p. 215.

[601] Ibid., vol. 5, p. 208.

[602] Kirmānī, *Fihrist*, item 258.

[603] Ibid., item 179.

[604] Ibid., items 251, 301.

[605] Ibid., items 154, 300.

[606] Ibid., items 261, 262.

[607] Ibid., items 237, 295.

[608] Ibid., item 178.

[609] Ibid., item 303 ; Tanakābunī, *Qisas al-ulama*, pp. 55-6.

[610] Rashti, *Dalīl*, pp. 76, 79.

[611] Ibid., p. 79; Kirmānī, *Fihrist*, p. 117.

[612] Ibid., pp. 116-7.

[613] Rashti, *Dalīl*, p. 80.

[614] Ibid. According to Zarandī, *Dawn-Breakers*, p. 21, Shaftī originally favoured both Shaykh Aḥmad and Sayyid Kāẓim but, in later years, adopted a neutral position; about two years before his death, Rashti sent the future Babi apostle Mullā Muḥammad Ḥusayn Bushrūʾī, to visit Shaftī with the aim of enlisting his support against his opponents at the *ʿatabāt*, in which mission he is said to have been successful (ibid., pp. 19-24). Muḥammad-ʿAlī Fayḍī prints a letter which he claims to have been written by Rashti to Bushrūʾī, praising him for this (*Ḥaḍrat-i Nuqṭa-yi ūlā* (Tehran: [s.n.], 1352 Sh. [1973]). pp. 52-3); the facsimile facing page 52 is not in the handwriting of Rashti. For what appears to be a summary of the same letter see al-Qatīl ibn al-Karbalāʾī, "Risāla," in Māzandarānī. *Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, vol. 3, p. 503.

[615] The names of these may be found in Rashti, *Dalīl*, pp. 79-80; Kirmānī, *Fihrist*, p. 117.

[616] Kirmānī, *Fihrist*, pp. 118-9. On Ālūsī see Wardī, *Lamaḥāt*, pp. 100-6, 144-51; Muḥammad Zuhrā al-Najjār (?), preface to Mahmūd ibn ʿAbd Allah al-Ālūsī, *Rūḥ al-maʿānī fī tafsīr al-Qurʾān al-ʿaẓīm wa 'l-sabʿ al-mathānī* (Bulaq, Egypt: [s. n.], 1301-10 [1883-92]); Bābānī, *Hidāyat al-ʿārifīn*, vol. 2, pp. 418-9; ʿUmar Riḍāʾ Kahhāla, *Muʿjam al-muʾallifīn* (Damascus: al-Maktaba al-ʿArabiyya, 1957-61), vol. 12, pp. 175-6 (with extensive bibliography). Al-Ālūsī later treated with favour Qurrat al-ʿAyn, who stayed under house arrest in his home in Baghdad in early 1847.

[617] Kirmānī, *Fihrist*, pp. 323, 331 (items 256, 271).

[618] Ibid., p. 293.

[619] Ibid., pp. 311-2.

[620] Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, pp. 74-5.

[621] Bāmdād, *Rijāl*, vol. 2, p. 116 and note 2; ᶜAḍud al-Dawla, *Tārīkh-i ᶜAḍudī*, pp. 68, 239, 297. Qaysar Khānum's mother was Qamar al-Nisāᵓ Khānum, a daughter of Ḥusayn Afshār (Sipihr, *Nāsikh al-Tavārīkh*, vol. 2, p. 163).

[622] Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, p. 74.

[623] Ibid., p. 75.

[624] Ibid.

[625] Zarandī, *Dawn-Breakers*, p. 235.

[626] Sipihr, *Nāsikh al-Tavārīkh*, vol. 3, pp. 257-8. For details of Sulaymān Khān, see Bāmdād, *Rijāl*, vol. 2, pp. 116-8; Navāᵓī, notes to ᶜAḍud al-Dawla, *Tārīkh-i ᶜAẓudī*, pp. 239-40.

[627] Chahārdihī, *Shaykh Aḥmad Aḥsāᵓī*, p. 138.

[628] See Heribert Busse in *The History of Persia under Qajar Rule* by Ḥasan ibn Ḥasan Fasāᵓī, trans. Heribert Busse (New York: Columbia University Press, 1972), p. 236, note 19; Bāmdād, *Rijāl*, vol. 5, pp. 47-9, 100-2.

[629] Sohrab, *al-Risāla al-tisᵓ ᶜashariyya*, pp. 19-20. On Masᶜūd ibn Nāṣir al-Dīn, Ẓill al-Sulṭān, see Bāmdād, *Rijāl*, vol. 2, pp. 381-4; Navāᵓī, notes to ᶜAḍud al-Dawla, *Tārīkh-i ᶜAḍudī*, pp. 213-8.

[630] Bāmdād, *Rijāl*, vol. 4, pp. 429-30.

[631] Rashti, *Dalīl*, p. 74.

[632] al-Qatīl ibn al-Karbalāᵓī, "Risāla," in Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, p. 502. On Sulaymān Mīrzā, the thirty-sixth son of Fatḥ ᶜAlī Shāh, who was exiled with Ẓill al-Sultān and Imāmwardī Mīrzā, see Bāmdād, *Rijāl*, vol. 5, pp. 114-5.

[633] Chahārdihī, *Shaykh Aḥmad Aḥsāᵓī*, p. 138. On ᶜAlī Qulī Mīrzā, see Bāmdād, *Rijāl*, vol. 2, pp. 442-8. He is the author of *al-Mutanabbīyūn*,

which largely consists of an inimical history of Babism (published in part as *Fitna-yi Bāb* by Navāʾī. On Farhād Mīrzā, see Bāmdād, *Rijāl*, vol. 3, pp. 86-92.

[634] Chahārdihī, *Shaykh Aḥmad Aḥsāʾī*, p. 139.

[635] Lorimer, *Gazetteer*, vol. 1B, p. 1350.

[636] Chahārdihī, *Shaykh Aḥmad Aḥsāʾī*, p. 267.

[637] Razavi, *Tadhkirat al-wafāʾ*, p. 33.

[638] Lorimer, *Gazetteer*, vol. 1B, p. 1349; Longrigg, *Four Centuries*, p. 288; ᶜAbbās al-ᶜAzzāwī, *Taʾrīkh al-ᶜIrāq bayna iḥtilālayn* (Baghdad: Maṭba'a Baghdad, 1353-76 [1935-56]), vol. 7, pp. 64, 65.

[639] I am grateful to the late Prof. Laurence P. Elwell-Sutton for suggesting that, as Colonel Francis Farrant implies, the original term for these groups was *girāmī*, although it seems to have been corrupted in later accounts to the Turkish *yaramaz* (good-for-nothings), as used by Lorimer and others.

[640] Compare the situation in al-Najaf, which was troubled by the two city factions of Shurmurd and Zugūrt until this century: Longrigg, *Four Centuries*, p. 288; al-ᶜAzzāwī, *Taʾrīkh al-ᶜIrāq*, vol. 8, p. 187.

[641] Lorimer, *Gazetteer*, vol. 1B, p. 1349.

[642] Ibid., pp. 1349, 1350; al-ᶜAzzāwī, *Taʾrīkh al-ᶜIrāq*, vol. 7, p. 65 (and note 1 where Zaᶜfarānī is described as a Shaykhi).

[643] Lorimer, *Gazetteer*, vol. 1B, p. 1350.

[644] Al-ᶜAzzāwī, *Taʾrīkh al-ᶜIrāq*, vol. 7, p. 65; letter from Najīb Pāshā to the Iranian consul in Baghdad, attached to a dispatch from Sir Justin Sheil (1803-1871), dated 9 March 1843 (FO 60/96).

[645] Al-ᶜAzzāwī, *Taʾrīkh al-ᶜIrāq*, vol. 7, p. 63.

[646] Lorimer, *Gazetteer*, vol. 1B, p. 1350.

[647] Letter from Najīb Pāshā to the Iranian consul in Baghdad, 16 Shawwāl 1238 [18 November 1842], enclosed in a letter of Farrant to Sheil, 2 May 1843 (FO 248/108).

[648] Al-ᶜAzzāwī, *Taʾrīkh al-ᶜIrāq*, vol. 7, p. 64; Lorimer, *Gazetteer*, vol. 1B, p. 1350.

[649] Report of Farrant to Sir Stratford Canning (1786-1880), 15 May 1843, enclosed in Farrant's letter to Sheil, 20 May 1843 (FO 248/108).

[650] Ibid.

[651] See letter from Najīb Pāshā to either Ẓill al-Sultān or Rashti, 11 December 1842 (FO 60/97); Zarandī, *Dawn-Breakers*, p. 36; Wardī, *Lamaḥāt*, p. 121.

[652] Farrant to Canning, 15 May 1843.

[653] Lorimer, *Gazetteer*, vol. 1B, p. 1351.

[654] Ibid.; Farrant to Canning, 15 May 1843.

[655] Farrant to Canning, 15 May 1843.

[656] Lorimer, *Gazetteer*, vol. 1B, p. 1350.

[657] Farrant to Canning, 15 May 1843.

[658] Ibid.

[659] For general accounts of the sack of Karbala, consult Lorimer, *Gazetteer*, vol. 1B, pp. 1352-8; al-ᶜAzzāwī, *Taʾrīkh al-ᶜIrāq*, vol. 7, pp. 65-9; Wardī, *Lamaḥāt*, pp. 118-22.

[660] See Algar, *Religion and State*, p. 15, note 67.

[661] Wardī, *Lamaḥāt*, p. 121, noting that Muṣṭafā Pāshā only spared those in the shrine after Hājj Mahdī Kamūna had pleaded with him for their

clemency. Those in the Shrine of ᶜAbbās tried to bar the doors against the enemy and were mercilessly butchered once they were breached. See also Farrant to Canning, 15 May 1843.

[662] See letter of Mullā ᶜAbd al-Azīz (Iranian consul in Baghdad) to Ḥājī Mīrzā Āqāsī, undated (FO 60/95); account by Mullā Āqā-yi Darbandī enclosed in a letter from Sheil to Lord Aberdeen (1784-1860), 1 April 1843 (FO 60/96); letter from Ross to Taylor, 22 January 1843 (FO 60/97): Farrant to Canning, 15 May 1843; Zarandī, *Dawn-Breakers*, p. 36; al-ᶜAzzāwī, *Taᵓrīkh al-ᶜIrāq*, vol. 7, p. 66 (on p. 65, al-Azzāwī misquotes Karīm Khān Kirmānī as stating that the homes of Shaykhis in general were spared).

[663] Zarandī, *Dawn-Breakers*, p. 36. Kirmānī states that nearly ten thousand individuals sought sanctuary there (Kirmānī, *Hidāyat al-ṭālibīn*, p. 153), but this seems impossibly high.

[664] Farrant gives sixty-six (letter to Canning, 15 May 1843), Mullā ᶜAbd al-ᶜAzīz about two hundred (letter to Āqāsī, undated).

[665] Wardī, *Lamaḥāt*, pp. 121-2.

[666] Chahārdihī, *Shaykh Aḥmad Aḥsāᵓī*, p. 266.

[667] Ibid., p. 238.

[668] Al-ᶜAzzāwī, *Taᵓrīkh al-ᶜIrāq*, vol. 7, p. 69.

[669] Aleksandr Kazem-Bek, "Bab et les Bābis, ou Soulèvement politique et religieux, de 1845 à 1853," *Journal Asiatique* (Paris) vol. 7 (1866), p. 463.

[670] See Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūr al-haqq*, p. 41.

[671] Among the Qajar notables who were Shaykhis or had contacts with the Shaykhi leadership in Kirman were: Amān Allāh Khān Majd al-Dawla (on whom see Bāmdād, *Rijāl*, vol. 5, pp. 31-2), Ḥamza Mīrzā (d. 1881) (see ibid., vol. 1, pp. 462-8), Tahmāsb Mīrzā Muᵓayyid al-Dawla (d. 1879, a son of Muḥammad ᶜAlī Mīrzā ; see ibid., vol. 2, pp. 195-200), ᶜAbbās Mīrzā, Mulk-Ārā (1839-1897; see ibid., vol. 2, pp. 222-7), ᶜAbd al-ᶜAlī Khān Adīb al-Mulk (see ibid., vol. 2, p. 270, and compare ibid., vol. 5, p. 10, n. 2), Azīz

Khān Mukrī Sardār-i Kull (see ibdi., vol. 2, pp. 326-35), Ghulāmshāh Khān (a governor of Kurdistan; see ibid., pp. 228-32), and Muḥammad Valī Mīrzā Muᶜin al-Mulk, (1789-1862) (see ibd., vol. 4, pp. 26-33), all of whom corresponded with Karīm Khān Kirmanī; Mīrzā Isḥāq Khān Mufakhkham al-Dawla (see ibid., vol. 1, pp. 167-9), Mīrzā Ḥusayn Khān Mu'taman al-Sulṭān, Bahrām Mīrzā Muᶜizz al-Dawla (1809-1882) (see ibid., vol. 1, pp. 192-5), and Mīrzā Muḥammad Ḥasan Khān Khabīr al-Mulk, all of whom corresponded with Hājj Muḥammad Khān; Asad Allāh Mīrzā (see ibid., vol. 1, pp. 114-5), Mīrzā ᶜAbd al-Karīm Khān Mukhābir al-Mulk, and Muḥammad Ḥasan Mīrzā Sartīp (see ibid., vol. 5, pp. 226-7), all of whom corresponded with Hājj Zayn al-ᶜAbīdīn Khān.

[672] Dawlatābādī, *Tārīkh-i muᶜāṣir*, vol. 1, p. 149; Bāmdād, *Rijāl*, vol. 4, p. 121; Farhād Maḥmūd Muᵓtamad, *Mushīr al-Dawla Sipahsālār-i aᶜẓam* (Tehran: [s.n.], 1326 [1947]), pp. 189-91. Three treatises by Karīm Khān Kirmānī (*Risāla-yi radd-i Bab-i murtād*, *Risāla-yi Sulṭāniyya*, and *Risāla-yi Nāṣiriyya*) were written at the request of Nāṣir al-Dīn Shāh.

[673] Introduction to Yahyā Aḥmadī Kirmānī, *Farmāndihān-i Kirmān*, edited by (Muḥammad Ibrāhīm) Bāstānī Pārīzī (Tehran, [s.n.], 1354 Sh [1976]), pp. 20-1.

[674] See Algar, *Religion and State*, pp. 243-4; Gianroberto Scarcia, "Kerman 1905: La 'Guerra' tra Šeihī e Bālāsarī," *Annali del Instituto Universitario di Napoli* (Naples) vol. 13 (1963), pp. 186-203; Nāẓim al-Islām Kirmānī, *Tārīkh-i bīdārī-yi Īrānīyān*, edited by Saᶜīdī Sīrjānī (Tehran: Bunyād-i Farhang-i Iran, 1967-70), vol. 1, pp. 69-80; Bāstānī Pārīzī, notes to Aḥmadī Kirmānī, *Farmāndihān*, pp. 190-6 n. An interesting case of a clash in Kirman between two brothers (one a Shaykhi, the other a Bālāsarī) over their father's property is mentioned by Bāstānī Pārīzī in ibid., pp. 140-1n.

[675] Rashti, *Dalīl*, p. 154.

[676] Ibid.

[677] Zarandī, *Dawn-Breakers*, p. 42. He may also have intended to visit Samarra on this ocassion (Kirmānī, *Fihrist*, p. 120).

[678] Al-Qatīl ibn al-Karbalāᵓī, "Risāla," in Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūru al-ḥaqq*,

p. 509.

[679] Ibid.; Kirmānī, *Fihrist*, p. 122. Zarandī says he died on the day of al-ᶜArafa, (*Dawn-Breakers*, p. 45).

[680] Letter quoted in Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, p. 223.

[681] See Kirmānī, *Fihrist*, pp. 121-2; Kirmānī, *Hidāyat al-ṭālibīn*, p. 153.

Chapter Four

[682] Kirmānī, *Izhāq al-bāṭil*, p. 14.

[683] Al-Qatīl ibn al-Karbalāᵓī, "Risāla," in Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, p. 508.

[684] Ibid., p. 502.

[685] Kirmānī, *Izhāq al-bāṭil*, p. 14.

[686] Majlisī, *Biḥār al-anwār*, vol. 51, p. 361; Mashkūr, *Tārīkh-i Shī'a va firqahā-yi Islām*, p. 142.

[687] Ḥabībābādī, *Makārim al-āthār,* vol. 3, pp. 625-31; al-Ṭihrānī, *Ṭabaqāt*, vol. 2, pp. 212-5.

[688] Al-Qatīl ibn al-Karbalāᵓī, "Risāla," in Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq,* p. 508; See also a letter from Qurrat al-ᶜAyn to Mullā Jawād Vilyānī [Vālīyānī], printed in ibid., p. 493.

[689] Al-Qatīl ibn al-Karbalāᵓī, "Risāla," in Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, p. 508.

[690] Zarandī, *Dawn-Breakers*, p. 42.

[691] Qazvīnī, *Tārīkh*, p. 463.

[692] Qurrat al-ᶜAyn, "Risāla," in Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq* appendix 1, pp. 484-501.

[693] Al-Qatīl ibn al-Karbalāᵓī, "Risāla," in Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, p. 509.

[694] Qazvīnī, *Tārīkh,* p. 463.

[695] Al-Ṭihrānī, *al-Dharīᶜa*, vol. 11, p. 205.

[696] See ibid., vol. 3, pp. 80, 80-1; vol. 11, p. 205; vol. 13, pp. 213, 215; idem, *Ṭabaqāt*, vol. 2, p. 341; Ḥabībābādī, *Makārim*, vol. 4, pp. 1136-7, 1137, note.

[697] Al-Ṭihrānī, *al-Dharīᶜa*, vol. 13, p. 215.

[698] Al-Qatīl ibn al-Karbalāᵓī, "Risāla," in Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq,* p. 510.

[699] Ibid

[700] Ibid., p. 508

[701] Ibid.

[702] Ibid., p. 510.

[703] Ibid.

[704] From an incomplete manuscript, quoted ibid., p. 55.

[705] Zarandī, *Dawn-Breakers*, p. 48.

[706] Bāmdād, *Rijāl*, vol. 5, pp. 116-7; Chahārdihī, *Shaykh Aḥmad Aḥsāᵓī*, p. 39.

[707] Āvāria, *al-Kawākib*, p. 179.

[708] Ibid.; on the date of ᶜUbayd Allāh's rebellion, see Maᶜṣūm ᶜAlī Shāh, *Ṭarāᵓiq*, vol. 3, p. 425.

[709] Bāmdād, *Rijāl*, vol. 5, p. 117. On Mīrzā ᶜAlī Thiqat al-Islām, a son of Mūsā and a prominent Constitutionalist, who was hanged by the Russians in 1330/1912, see Chahārdihī, *Shaykh Aḥmad Aḥsāᵓī*, pp. 187-93.

[710] Ibid, p. 176.

[711] Ibid., pp. 177-8; Bāmdād, *Rijāl*, vol. 6, p. 83. Mulla Muḥammad Ḥusayn was succeeded by his brother Mirza Ismāᶜīl Ḥujjatu al-Islām (d. 1317/1899), a pupil of Mulla Muḥammad Bāqir Uskūᵓī (d. 1301/1883)—one of the leading Shaykhis of Karbala and a pupil of Mulla Ḥasan Gawhar—who was in turn succeeded by the son of Mulla Muḥammad Ḥusayn, Mirza Abū 'l-Qāsim Ḥujjat al-Islām (d. 1308/1943), after whom the family seems to have died out (see Chahārdihī, *Shaykh Aḥmad Aḥsāᵓī*, pp. 196-8; Māzandarānī (*Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, p. 9) claims that Mīrzā Ismāᶜīl became a Bahaᵓi.

[712] Chahārdihī, *Shaykh Aḥmad Aḥsāᵓī*, pp. 49-50.

[713] Bāmdād, *Rijāl*, vol. 6, p. 83.

[714] Numerous and conflicting accounts of this important tribunal have been written. For the fullest description and analysis, see Denis MacEoin, "The Trial of the Bab: Shi'ite orthodoxy confronts its mirror image", in Carole Hillenbrand (ed.) *Studies in Honour of Clifford Edmund Bosworth 2 The Sultan's Turret* (Brill, 2000), pp. 272-317.

See also, Sipihr, *Nāsikh al-Tawārīkh*, vol. 3, pp. 125-30; Hidāyat, *Rawḍāt al-Ṣafā,* vol. 10, pp. 423-8 (based on a report by Niẓām al-ᶜUlamāᵓ); Edward Granville Browne, "The First Examination of the Bab at Tabriz," in *A Traveller's Narrative*, vol. 2, pp. 277-90; idem, *Materials for the Study of the Babi Religion* (Cambridge: The University Press, 1918), pp. 245-64; Muḥammad Mahdī Khān Tabrizī, *Miftāḥ bāb al-abwāb, yā tārīkh-i Bāb va Bahāᵓ*, trans. Ḥasan Farīd Gulpāygānī, 3rd ed. (Tehran: Farāhānī, 1346 [1967]), pp. 137-45; Zarandī, *Dawn-Breakers*, pp. 314-20; Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, pp. 9, 10, 14-20; Tanakābunī, *Qiṣaṣ*, pp. 56-9.

[715] Zarandī, *Dawn-Breakers*, p. 320.

[716] Ibid., p. 510.

[717] Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, p. 9. The same author (p. 10) also refers to an anti-Bābi tract by Mīrzā Abū 'l-Qāsim Shaykh al-Islām, entitled *Qalᶜ al-Bāb*. This work, however, is actually one of a number of polemics written by Ḥājī Mīrzā Abū 'l-Qāsim ibn Sayyid Kāẓim Zanjānī (1224-92/1809-75): see Navāʾī, notes in *Fitna-yi Bāb*, p. 156; al-Tihrānī, *al-Dharī'a*, vol. 4, p. 3; vol. 12, p. 153; vol. 17, pp. 161, 171; idem, *Ṭabaqāt*, vol. 2, pp. 61-2.

[718] Raḍavī, *Tadhkirat al-wafāʾ*, p. 7.

[719] He was the son of Mahdī Qulī Khān, a son of Muḥammad Ḥasan Khān , a son of Fatḥ-ᶜAlī Khān Qājār; Mahdī Qulī was a brother of Āghā Muḥammad Shah. The latter put his brother to death and gave his widow and child (Ibrāhīm Khān) into the keeping of his nephew, Bāba Khān (the future Fatḥ-ᶜAli Shāh). Ibrahim Khān's mother had three further children by Fatḥ-ᶜAli, these being two daughters, Zaynab Khānum and Khadīja Khānum, and a son, Muḥammad Qulī Mīrzā Mulk-Ārā (1789-1844) (see ᶜAbd al-Ḥusayn Navāʾī, "Ḥājj Muḥammad Karīm Khān Kirmānī," *Yādgār* (Tehran) vol. 4/5 (1328 Sh [1949]), pp. 112-3.

[720] Raḍavī, *Tadhkirat al-wafāʾ*, p. 4.

[721] Sipihr, *Nāsikh al-Tavārīkh*, vol. 1, p. 354; Aḥmadī Kirmānī, *Farmāndihān*, pp. 50, 55; Bāstānī Pārīzī, introduction to ibid., p. 12.

[722] She was also known as Nawwāb Mutaᶜāliyya and Dawlat Gildī; see Sipihr, *Nāsikh al-Tavārīkh*, vol. 2, p. 155; Navāʾī, notes to ᶜAḍud al-Dawla, *Tārīkh-i ᶜAḍudī*, p. 316.

[723] Rustam Khān was married to Shāh Gawhar Khānum, the nineteenth daughter of Fatḥ-ᶜAlī, and Naṣr Allāh Khān to Tājlī Bigum, his twentieth daughter (see Aḥmadī Kirmānī, *Farmāndihān*, p. 50, note 1; Sipihr, *Nāsikh al-Tavārīkh*, vol. 2, p. 158; Navā'ī notes to ᶜAḍud al-Dawla, *Tārīkh-i ᶜAḍudī*, p. 319.

[724] Maḥmūd Himmat Kirmānī, *Tārīkh-i mufaṣṣal-i Kirmān,* 3rd ed. (Kirman: Furūshgāh-i Himmat, 1350 [1971]), pp. 252-4.

[725] Bāstānī Pārīzī, notes to Aḥmadī Kirmānī, *Farmāndihān*, p. 53, note.

[726] Himmat Kirmānī, *Tārīkh-i mufasṣṣal*, p. 254; Bāstānī Pārīzī, notes to Aḥmadī Kirmānī, *Farmāndihān*, p. 52, note 2; ᶜAbd al-Majīd Mūsawī Qarābāghī states that it was expressly built for Karīm Khān, see Muḥammad ᶜAlī Jamālzāda, "Shuyūkh-i silsila-yi Shaykhiyya," *Yaghmā* (Tehran) vol. 14, p. 490.

[727] Raḍawī, *Tadhkirat al-wafāᵓ*, p. 12.

[728] Ibid.

[729] Muḥammad Ibrāhīm Bāstānī Pārīzī, *Vādī-yi haft vād*, vol. 1 (Tehran: Anjuman-i Anṣar-i Millī, 2535 [1976]), p. 358.

[730] Raḍavī, *Tadhkirat al-wafāᵓ*, pp. 14-15.

[731] Undoubtedly on account of the rebellion of Ibrāhīm Khān's son and immediate successor, ᶜAbbās Qulī Khān, against Fatḥ-ᶜAlī Shāh (see Aḥmadī Kirmānī, *Farmāndihān*, p. 55-8).

[732] The text of this *ijāza* has been printed in Raḍavī, *Tadhkirat al-wafāᵓ*, pp. 26-8.

[733] Ibid., p. 24.

[734] Ibid., p. 25. The girl was also descended, through her mother, from Shāhrukh Shāh (1748-1796).

[735] Ibid., pp. 25-6

[736] Quoted in ibid., p. 29.

[737] Quoted in ibid., p. 32

[738] Quoted in ibid., p. 30

[739] He cannot have arrived before this since, as we shall note, by the time of his arrival, Ḥājī Sayyid Jawād Shīrāzī appears to have already established

his position in Kirman quite successfully; the latter did not arrive in the city until 1254/1838 (Aḥmadī Kirmānī, *Farmāndihān*, p. 76).

[740] Chahārdihī, *Shaykh Aḥmad Aḥsāʾī*, p. 259

[741] Ibid., p. 260.

[742] Raḍavī, *Tadhkirat al-wafāʾ*, pp. 22-3.

[743] Ibid., p. 19.

[744] Aḥmadī Kirmānī, *Farmāndihān*, pp. 74-5. On Fīrūz Mīrzā, see Bāmdād, *Rijāl*, vol. 3, pp. 110-4.

[745] Aḥmadī Kirmānī, *Farmāndihān*, p. 75; Aḥmad ʿAlī Khān Vazīrī Kirmānī, *Tārīkh-i Kirmān (Sālāriyya)*, ed. Muḥammad Ibrāhīm Bāstānī Pārīzī (Tehran: Kitābhā-yi Iran, 1962), p. 387.

[746] Chahārdihī, *Shaykh Aḥmad Aḥsāʾī*, p. 260; Vazīrī Kirmānī, *Tārīkh-i Kirmān*, p. 389. Bāstānī Pārīzī states that he replaced Shaykh Niʿmat Allāh al-Baḥrānī as Imām-Jumʿa in about 1246/1830 (notes to ibid., p. 486), but he does not appear to have arrived in Kirman until about 1254/1838 (Aḥmadī Kirmānī, *Farmāndihān*, p. 76). On Ḥājī Sayyid Jawād, see ibid., pp. 76-7n. He was a cousin of the Bab's father and, according to Muḥammad-ʿAlī Fayḍī, he was secretly an adherent of the young prophet (Muḥammad-ʿAlī Fayḍī, *Khāndān-i-Afnān ṣadra-yi Raḥmān*, p. 17).

[747] Aḥmadī Kirmānī, *Farmāndihān*, p. 76 n 1.

[748] Chahārdihī, *Shaykh Aḥmad Aḥsāʾī*, p. 261.

[749] Bāstānī Pārīzī, *Vādī-i haft vād*, p. 362.

[750] Chahārdihī, *Shaykh Aḥmad Aḥsāʾī*, pp. 261-2.

[751] Ibid., p. 263

[752] Ibid.; Raḍavī, *Tadhkirat al-wafāʾ*, pp. 87, 88.

[753] Bāstānī Pārīzī in Aḥmadī Kirmānī, *Farmāndihān*, p. 149 n. 2.

[754] For details of these individuals, see the relevant chapters in Kirmānī, *Fihrist.* A temporary split occurred in Kirmānī Shaykhism when Muḥammad Raḥīm Khān Kirmānī, Karīm's eldest son, was passed over in favor of Ḥājī Muḥammad Khān; his followers, known as Raḥīm Khanīs, seem, for the most part, to have rejoined the main group on the death of Muḥammad Khān (Chahārdihī, *Shaykh Aḥmad Aḥsāʾī*, p. 247). A more serious split took place on Karīm Khān's death, when Hājī Mīrzā Muḥammad Bāqir Hamadānī (1239-1319/1824-1901), the leader of the school (under Karīm Khan) in Hamadān, opposed the succession of Muḥammad Khān on the grounds that he was himself the most learned of the ulama and that the leadership of the school ought not to become hereditary. His followers, known as Bāqīrīs (in distinction to those of Muḥammad Khān), known as Naṭīqīs or Nawāṭiq), predominate in Hamadān, Jandaq, Bīyābānak, Nāʾīn, and Isfahan (Bāmdād, *Rijāl*, vol. 6, pp. 209-11; Chahārdihī, *Shaykh Aḥmad Aḥsāʾī*, p. 247).

[755] Al-Qatīl ibn al-Karbalāʾī, "Risāla," in Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, p. 519.

[756] Ibid., p. 518.

[757] Ibid.

[758] Ibid., p. 519.

[759] Ibid. See Kirmānī, *Izhāq al-bāṭil*, p. 14.

[760] See previous chapter, note 147.

[761] Al-Qatīl ibn al-Karbalāʾī, "Risāla," in Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, p. 517.

[762] See ibid., pp. 520, 527.

[763] Raḍavī, *Tadhkirat al-wafāʾ*, pp. 100-1.

[764] Al-Kulaynī, *al-Uẓṣūl min al-Kāfī*, vol. 1, p. 456.

[765] The section referred to may be found on pages 86-93, and the original question on pp. 11-12.

[766] The best and most convenient are: Zarandī, *Dawn-Breakers*; Hamadānī, *Tārīkh-i jadīd*; Fayḍī, *Nuqṭa-i ūlā*; Balyuzi, *The Bab*; A.-L.-M. Nicolas, *Seyyèd Ali Mohammed dit le Bâb: histoire* (Paris: Dujarric, 1905); Browne in *A Traveller's Narrative*, vol. 2, notes C, G, I, L, M, and S; Āvāra, *Kawākib;* and, more recently, Amanat, *Resurrection*.

[767] Shīrāzī, *Kitāb al-fihrist*, manuscript in Iran National Bahaʾi Archives (INBA), 5014C, p. 288; cf. idem, *Qayyhūm al-asmāʾ* manuscript in Cambridge University Library (CUL), Browne Or. MS. F. 11. (dated 1891), f. 43b.

[768] Shīrāzī, *Kitab al-fihrist*, p. 286.

[769] Zarandī, *Dawn-Breakers*, pp. 72-3; Fayḍī, *Nuqṭa-yi ūlā*, p. 64; Āvāra, *Kawākib*, p. 27. The Bab himself refers to his lineage in the *Qayyūm al-asmā*, f. 43b.

[770] Shīrāzī, quoted Khan Bahadur Agha Mirza Muḥammad, "Some New Notes on Babism," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (London) (July 1927), p. 446.

[771] Zarandī, *Dawn-Breakers*, p. 30.

[772] On the Bab's schooling and childhood generally, see Balyuzi, *The Bab*, pp. 33-9; Abū 'l-Faḍl Gulpāyagānī and Sayyid Mahdī Gulpāyagānī, *Kashf al-Ghiṭāʾ ʿan ḥiyal al-aʿdāʾ* (Tashkent: [s. n.], [1919?]), pp. 82-4; Avārih, *Kawākib*, pp. 31-2.

[773] Fayḍī, *Nuqṭa-yi ūlā*, p. 82.

[774] Balyuzi, *The Bab*, p. 39.

[775] Fayḍī, *Nuqṭa-yi ūlā*, pp. 85-8. Muʿīn al-Salṭana says he was twenty when he went independent (quoted Balyuzi, *The Bab*, p. 41), but this conflicts with the Bab's own statement that he left Bushehr at that age.

[776] Shīrāzī, *Risāla-fi 'l-sulūk*, manuscript in INBA 4011.C, pp. 123-127.

[777] Shīrāzī, *al-Ṣaḥīfa bayna 'l-ḥaramayn*, (in the hand of Ridvān ᶜAlī, 1905) ms. in CUL, Browne Or. MS. F. 7. It is, however, interesting to compare a passage in Shīrāzī, *Bayān-i fārsī* (Tehran: [s. n., n. d.]), 7:6, p. 246, in which he states that the ulama, *ḥukkām*, *tujjār*, and others should marry within the limits of their own class.

[778] Among the works referred to and quoted by name by the Bab in various writings, we may note: Majlisī, *Biḥār al-anwār* (Shīrāzī, *Tafsīr Sūrat al-kawthar*, ff. 56a, 58b; idem, *Dalāᵓil-i sabᶜa,* p. 51); Majlisī, *Ḥaqq al-yaqīn* (Shīrāzī, *Tafsīr Sūrat al-kawthar*, f. 5a); al-ᶜĀmilī, *al-Bayān* (Shīrāzī, *Kitāb al-ṭahāra*, ms. in INBA 5010 C, p. 173); al-Qummī, *Man lā yaḥḍuruhu 'l-faqīh* (ibid., p. 157); al-Ṭūsī, *al-Misbāḥ* (ibid., p. 167; Shīrāzī, *Dalā'il-i sabᶜa*, p. 66); al-Aḥsāᵓī, *Sharḥ al-Fawāᵓid* (Shīrāzī, *Tafsīr Sūrat al-kawthar*, ff. 24a, 27b; idem, letter quoted in Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, p. 274); Rashti, *Lawāmiᶜ* (Shīrāzī, *Tafsīr Sūrat al-kawthar*, f. 24a).

He also quotes numerous *khuṭub* of the Imām ᶜAlī, including his *Khuṭbat al-yatīma* (Shīrāzī, *Tafsīr Sūrat al-baqara*, ms. in CUL, Browne Or. MS. F. 8, f. 4a), the *Khuṭba al-ṭuṭunjiyya* (Shīrāzī, *Dalāᵓil-i sabᶜa*, p. 46), the *Khuṭba yawm al-ghadīr* (ibid., p. 47), the *Khuṭbat al-ijmāᶜ* (Shīrāzī, *Tafsīr Sūrat al-kawthar*, f. 77b), and the *Khuṭbat al-maḥzūn* (ibid., f. 85b).

It would also appear that the Bab was familiar with the Bible, as attested by ᶜAbbās Mīrzā's physician Dr. William Cormick (1820-1877) who records that he was seen reading a copy while in custody (quoted in Browne, *Materials*, p. 262). His only quotation (as far I am aware) from the Gospels is, however, quite apocryphal (Shīrāzī, *Tafsīr Sūrat al-baqara*, f. 20b).

[779] Fayḍī, *Hadrat-Nuqta-i ūlā*, p. 88.

[780] Shirazi, *Qayyūm al-asmāᵓ*, f. 43a.

[781] Āvāra, *Kawākib*, p. 35.

[782] Nicolas, *Seyyèd Ali Mohammed,* pp. 189-90.

[783] The words "may God prolong his life (*atāla 'llāh baqāhu*)" appear only in the texts in INBC 4011.C and 6006.C.

[784] Narrative of Mīrzā Ḥabīb Allāh Afnān, quoted in Balyuzi, *The Bab*, p. 40. On Sayyid Jawād Karbalāʾī (a grandson of Baḥr al-ʿUlūm), see Gulpāyagānī, *Kashf al-Ghiṭā'*, pp. 55-90; Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, p. 238-44.

[785] Shirazi, *Qayyūm al-asmāʾ*, f. 43b.

[786] The Bab states that he was fifteen when he went to Būshehr, and that he left for Karbala five years later (prayer quoted in Fayḍī, *Ḥaḍrat-Nuqṭa-yi ūlā*, pp. 104-5). Balyuzi gives an interesting account of his departure (*The Bab*, p. 41) but, on the authority of Gulpāyagānī, gives the date as the spring of 1841.

[787] The Bab, prayer quoted in Fayḍī, *Ḥaḍrat-Nuqṭa-yi ūlā*, p. 105.

[788] Sipihr, *Nāsikh al-Tawārīkh*, vol. 3, p. 39; Zarandī, *Dawn-Breakers*, pp. 26-7.

[789] Al-Qatīl ibn al-Karbalāʾī, "Risāla," in Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, p. 529.

[790] Shaykh Aḥmad Rūḥī Kirmānī, *Faṣl al-khiṭāb fī tarjumati aḥwāl al-Bāb*, Cambridge University Library, Browne Or. MS F. 27, f. 3b.

[791] Balyuzi, *The Bab*, p. 42.

[792] Prayer in INBA 6005. C, pp. 5-6.

[793] See Mīrza Asadullah Fāḍil-i Māzandarānī, *Asrar al-āthār* (Tehran: Muʾassasa-yi Millī-yi Maṭbūʿāt-i Amrī, 124-9 B. [1968-74]), vol. 4, pp. 369.

[794] Ibid., p. 370.

[795] Zarandī, *Dawn-Breakers*, pp. 25-30. On Zunūzī, who later transcribed many of the works of the Bab, see ibid., pp. 25, 30, 212, 245, 249, 307, 593-4; Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūru al-ḥaqq*, pp. 37-8.

[796] Qazvīnī, *Tārīkh*, pp. 463-4. On Mullā Jaᶜfar, see ibid. passim; Samandar, *Tārīkh-i Samandar*, p. 332; Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, pp. 363-5.

[797] Nicolas, *Séyyèd Ali Mohammed,* pp. 191-5. On Mullā Ṣadiq, see Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, pp. 145-53; Samandar, *Tārīkh*, pp. 162-70; Zarandī, *Dawn-Breakers*, pp. 100, 145, 184.

[798] Nicolas, *Séyyèd Ali Mohammed,* p. 193.

[799] Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, p. 97. On these two brothers, see ibid, pp. 96-9; ᶜAbbas Effendi (ᶜAbd al-Bahāᵓ) *Tadhkirat al-wafāᵓ*, pp. 269-70, 276.

[800] Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, p. 159. On Mullā Aḥmad, see ibid., pp. 157-60; Samandar, *Tārīkh*, p. 252. He was, as we shall see, later Qurrat al-ᶜAyn's chief rival in Karbala.

[801] Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, p. 458. On Mirza Muḥammad, see ibid. He was one of the Bab's *ḥurūf al-ḥayy,* but later travelled travelled to Kirman and became a Shaykhi under Karīm Khān, one of whose relatives he married.

[802] Gulpāyagānī, *Kashf al-ghiṭāᵓ*, p. 57. On Sayyid Jawād, see note 103 above.

[803] Manuscript cited in Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, p. 55. Apart from Mullā Ḥusayn Dakhīl (a poet who lived with Bushrūᵓī at one time) and Mīrzā Aḥmad Ibdāl Marāghaᵓī (who became one of the *ḥurūf-i-ḥayy*), none of these individuals is well known.

[804] Kirmānī, *Iẓhāq al-Bāṭil*, pp. 104-5.

[805] Thus Balyuzi, *The Bab*, p. 41.

[806] Fayḍī, *Hadrat-i Nuqṭa-yi ūlā*, p. 158.

[807] Ibid., p. 193; Balyuzi, *The Bab*, p. 46. See also Zarandī, *Dawn-Breakers*, pp. 76-7; Shirazi, *Qayyūm al-asmāᵓ*, f. 44b. It is more likely that the child was still-born, since he appears to have been born prematurely in Ṣafar 1259/March 1843 (ibid f. 195a).

[808] This passage generally occurs before the *tafsīr* of the *Sūrat al-fātiḥa*, which precedes that of *al-Baqara* proper, but it can be found in other positions or not at all (as in the Cambridge manuscript, Browne F. 8). The manuscripts used by me for this passage are in INBA 6004.C and 6014.C.

[809] Māzandarānī, *Asrār al-āthār*, vol. 2, p. 62.

[810] Thus mss 6004.C and 6012.C in INBA, and a copy in the Haifa Bahaʾi archives, originally in possession of A.-L.-M. Nicolas. MS 6014.C in INBA bears the date Dhū ʾl-Ḥijja 1260/December 1844-January 1845; this is almost certainly corrupt since there is evidence that the second part of the *tafsīr* must have been completed by that date.

[811] Shirazi, *Khuṭba fī Jidda*, ms. in INBA 5006C, p. 332. The date as given in this manuscript is 1 Ṣafar, but on the basis of other days relating to his pilgrimage, it is clearly incorrect. Ishrāq Khāvarī cites another ms. which clearly gives 11 Ṣafar 1261/19 February 1845 (ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd Ishrāq Khāvarī, *Taqvīm-i tārīkh-i amr* (Tehran: Muʾassasa-yi Millī-yi Maṭbūʿāt-i Amrī, 126 B. [1970]), p.24).

[812] Thus dated in INBA mss. 4011.C, 6003.C, and 6007.C.

[813] Mss. 6003.C (p. 286) and 4011.C (p. 63).

[814] Shirazi, *Risāla furūʿ al-ʿAdliyya*, p. 14; cf. Zarandī, *Dawn-Breakers*, p. 253; The Bab to Muḥammad Shah, in Shirazi, *Muntakhabāt-i āyāt az āthār-i ḥaḍrat-i nuqṭa-yi ūlā* (Tehran, 134 B. [1977]), p. 14.

[815] Thus Shirazi, *Qayyūm al-asmāʾ*, ff. 25a, 71a, 120b-121a. The vision described on f. 71a is said to have occurred in Ramaḍān: the section of the *Qayyūm al-asmāʾ* in which it occurs appears to have been written in the same month (see ff. 65b, 80a), and we may conclude that Ramaḍān 1260 is intended. What may have been a vision of the Hidden Imām is described in Shirazi, *Tafsīr Sūrat al-kawthar*, ff. 68b-69a.

[816] Kirmānī, *Izhāq al-bāṭil*, p. 106.

[817] Ibid., cf. p. 175.

[818] See ᶜAbd al-Ḥamīd Ishrāq Khāvarī, *Raḥīq-i makhtūm* (Tehran: Muᵓassasa-yi Millī-yi Maṭbūᶜāt-i Amrī, 130-31 B. [1973-74]), vol. 2, pp. 309-10.

[819] Letter quoted in Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, p. 284.

[820] Letter quoted ibid., p. 286.

[821] Letter quoted Avāra, *Kawākib*, pp. 35-6. Avāra says the letter was written from Bushehr to Shiraz, but the Bab was definitely in Shiraz at this date.

[822] Shirazi to Ḥājī Mīrzā Sayyid ᶜAlī, in Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, p. 223; cf. idem, *Tafsīr Sūrat al-kawthar*, f. 88b.

[823] On Bushrūᵓī, see Denis MacEoin, "Molla Mohammad Hosayn Boshruᵓi *Encyclopaedia Iranica* 4:4 (1989), p.383; idem, "Muḥammad Ḥusayn Bushrūᵓī", in *Encyclopaedia of Islam*; Bāmdād, *Rijāl*, vol. 1, pp. 379-83; Malik Khusravī, *Tārīkh-i shuhadāᵓ*, vol. 1, pp. 19-58; Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, pp. 112-42.

[824] Malik Khusravī, *Tārīkh-i shuhadā*, vol. 1, pp. 19-20.

[825] Al-Qatīl ibn al-Karbalāᵓī, "Risāla," in Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, p. 521. On Muḥammad Qaṣīr, see Kashmīrī, *Nujūm,* pp. 378-9; Kāẓimī, *Aḥsan al-wadīᶜa*, vol. 1, pp. 15-19; Ḥabībābādī, *Makārim al-āthār*, vol. 1, p. 232.

[826] Samandar, *Tārīkh*, p. 162.

[827] Malik Khusravī, *Tārīkh-i shuhadāᵓ*, vol. 1, p. 20.

[828] Ibid.

[829] Al-Qatīl ibn al-Karbalāᵓī, "Risāla," in Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq,* p. 521.

[830] Conflicting versions are given in ibid. and Malik Khusravī, *Tārīkh-i shuhadāᵓ*, vol. 1, p. 20.

[831] Zarandī, *The Dawn-Breakers*, pp. 415-6, gives nine years, Malik Khusravī, *Tārīkh-i shuhadāʾ*, vol. 1, p. 21, eleven.

[832] Al-Qatīl ibn al-Karbalāʾī, "Risāla," in Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq,* pp. 521, 522.

[833] Ibid., pp. 521-2.

[834] Ibid., p. 522. See the Bab, quoted in Khan Bahadur Agha Mirza Muḥammad, "Some New Notes on Babism," p. 448, note.

[835] Zarandī, *Dawn-Breakers*, pp. 19-24, 416; al-Qatīl ibn al-Karbalāʾī, "Risāla," in Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq,* pp. 522-3.

[836] Qurrat al-ᶜAyn to Vilyānī, in Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, p. 499.

[837] Zarandī, *Dawn-Breakers*, p. 47.

[838] Ibid., p. 50; al-Qatīl ibn al-Karbalāʾī, "Risāla," in Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq,* p. 510. The Jāmiᶜ al-Kūfa was one of four mosques in which Shiᶜi law permitted *iᶜtikāf*, according to specific rules (see Jaᶜfar ibn al-Ḥasan Muḥaqqiq al-Ḥillī, *Al-Mukhtaṣar al-nāfiᶜ fī fiqh al-Imāmiyya* (Tehran: [s.n.], 1387 [1967]), pp. 97-8.

[839] Zarandī, *Dawn-Breakers*, p. 50; al-Qatīl ibn al-Karbalāʾī, "Risāla," in Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq,* p. 510.

[840] Zarandī, *Dawn-Breakers*, pp. 50, 66. Of the *ḥurūf al-ḥayy*, Mullā Muḥammad-Alī Bārfurūshī and Qurrat al-ᶜAyn are not included among the *muᶜtakkifūn* by Zarandī. There are close parallels between Zarandī's account of the occult manner in which the *ḥurūf al-ḥayy* were "drawn" to the Bab (see pp. 52, 63, 68, 69-70) and the "search after hidden truth" element recurrent in Ismaili biographical writing (see Marshall G. S. Hodgson, *The Order of Assassins: The Struggle of the Early Nizari Isma'ilis against the Islamic World* (The Hague: Mouton, 1955), p. 17 and n. 15). This points up the significance of the gnostic motif in Babism (and its connection with the polar and chiliastic motifs), to which we shall return. This same theme is extremely common in later Bahaʾi biographical and autobiographical materials in both Iranian and Western contexts.

[841] Hamadānī, *Tārīkh-i-Jadīd*, p. 33.

[842] Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, p. 262.

[843] Mīrzā Āqā Khān Kirmānī and Aḥmad Rūḥī, *Hasht bihisht* ([Tehran?: s.n., 1960?]), p. 276.

[844] *Abwāb al-hudā*, ms., quoted Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, p. 117. On Hashtrūdī (d. 1270/1853-4) and this work, see ibid., pp. 73-4.

[845] Ibid.

[846] Quoted in Khan Bahadur Agha, "Some New Notes on Babism," p. 448, note.

[847] Kirmānī, *Faṣl al-khiṭāb*," f. 4a.

[848] Hamadānī, *Tārīkh-i-Jadīd*, p. 34; cf. Kirmānī, *Faṣl al-khiṭāb*, f. 4b.

[849] Nicolas, *Séyyèd Ali Mohammed,* p. 193; Fayḍī, *Ḥaḍrat-Nuqṭa-yi ūlā*, pp. 101-2.

[850] Āvāra, *Kawākib*, p. 39.

[851] Zarandī, *Dawn-Breakers*, pp. 52-61.

[852] Hamadānī, *Tārīkh-i-Jadīd*, pp. 35-9. It is possible that Bushrū'ī initially decided to stay in Shīrāz in order to receive treatment for a cardiac condition from which he suffered (see ibid, p. 34; Kashani, *Nuqṭat al-Kāf*, p. 106). The Bab himself states that it was the reading of his writing which convinced Bushrū'ī of the truth of his claims (letter quoted Māzandarānī, *Asrār al-āthār*, vol. 3, p. 103).

[853] Edward Granville Browne, "A Catalogue and Description of 27 Babi Manuscripts," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (London) vol. 24 (1892), p. 499.

[854] Hamadānī, *Tārīkh-i-Jadīd*, pp. 35-6.

[855] Ibid., p. 38. For the *ḥadith*, see al-Kulaynī, *Al-Uṣūl min al-Kāfī*, vol. 1, pp. 495-6.

[856] Qazvīnī, *Tārīkh*, p. 472.

[857] See Zarandī, *Dawn-Breakers*, p. 6; Shirazi, *Dalāʾil-i*, p. 54; idem, *Bayān-i fārsī*, 1:2, p. 6; idem, *Qayyūm al-asmāʾ*, ff. 161b; al-Qatīl ibn al-Karbalāʾī, "Risāla," in Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq,* p. 521; Qurrat al-ʿAyn, "Risāla," in ibid, p. 499.

[858] Shirazi, *Bayān-i fārsī*, 2:7, p. 30.

[859] Al-Qatīl ibn al-Karbalāʾī, "Risāla," in Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq* p. 510.

[860] Ibid.

[861] Zarandī, *Dawn-Breakers*, pp. 66, 80-1. The seven additional names are: Mullā Khudā-bakhsh Qūchānī, Sayyid Ḥusayn Yazdī, Mīrzā Muḥammad Rawḍa-Khān Yazdī, Shaykh Saʿīd Hindī, Mullā Bāqir Tabrīzī, Mullā Yūsuf Arbabīlī (d. 1849), and Mirza Hādī Qazvīnī. On these thirteen individuals severally, see Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, pp. 19-22, 47, 49-52, 53-4, 63, 105-8, 169-70, 171, 304-5, 453, 459-61; idem, *Asrār al-āthār*, vol. 3, pp. 97-8, vol. 4, pp. 384-5; Malik Khusravī, *Tārīkh-i shuhadāʾ*, vol. 2, pp. 2-6, 6-10, 301-4, 204-10, 210-12, 218-9, 225-8, vol. 3, pp. 276-83; Ishrāq Khāvarī, *Qāmūs-i Īqān*, vol. 2, pp. 1126-33, vol. 4, pp. 1877-9; Samandar, *Tārīkh-i Samandar*, pp. 85-6, 153-4, 216-8, 351-2; Balyuzi, *The Bab*, pp. 58-68; Browne note F in *A Traveller's Narrative*, vol. 2, p. 247-8, 248-9.

[862] Shirazi, *Bayān-i fārsī*, 8:15, p. 300.

[863] Zarandī, *Dawn-Breakers*, pp. 66-9, 80.

[864] For details on Qurrat al-ʿAyn consult: Malik Khusravī, *Tārīkh-i shuhadāʾ*, vol. 3, pp. 129-215; Samandar, *Tārīkh-i Samandar*, pp. 72-84, 343-70; Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, pp. 310-69; anon. *Bi-yād-i sadumīn sāl-i shahādat-i nābighi-yi dawrān Qurrat al-ʿAyn* ([Tehran: s.n.], 1368 [1949]); Ḥusām Nuqabāʾī, *Manābiʿ-i Tārīkh-i Amr-i Bahaʾi* (Tehran: [s.n.],

133 B. [1976]); Wardī, *Lamaḥāt*, vol. 2, pp. 152-90; Furūgh Arbāb, *Akhtarān-i tābān,* vol. 1 (Tehran: Muᶜassasa-yi Millī-yi Maṭbūᶜāt-i Amrī, 128 B.[1972]), pp. 26-42; Muḥammad Muṣṭafā al-Baghdādī, "Risāla amriyya," in Sohrab, *Al-risāla al-tisᵓ ᶜashariyya*, pp. 102-28; ᶜAlī Akbar Dihkhudā, "Ṭāhira", in idem, *Lughat nāma* (Tehran: Chapkhāna-yi Majlis, 1325-52 [1947-74]); Ḥājī Muḥammad Muᶜīn al-Salṭana, "Sharḥ-i ḥāl-i Ṭāhira Qurrat al-ᶜAyn," appended to *Tarīkh-i-Muᶜīn al-Salṭana,* manuscript, INBA; ᶜAbbas Effendi, *Tadhkira*, pp. 291-310; Niᶜmat Allāh Dhukāᵓī Bayḍāᵓī, *Tādhkira-yi-shuᶜarā-yi qarn-i avval-I Bahaᵓi* (Tehran: Muᶜassasa-yi Millī-yi Maṭbūᶜāt-i Amrī, 121-26 B. [1965-70]), vol. 3, pp. 63-133; Gulpāyagānī, *Kashf al-Ghiṭāᵓ*, pp. 92-110.

[865] The famous 17th-century Mexican nun, a scholar, feminist, and love poet who defied the church authorities to argue her own radical ideas, including the need to educate girls. See Mary Christine Morkovsky, "Sor Juana Ines de la Cruz" *A History of Women Philosophers: Modern Women Philosohers, 1600-1900*. Edit. Mary Ellen Waithe. Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1991. Dartmouth College has an excellent online resource at www.dartmouth.edu/~sorjuana/.

[866] Qurrat al-ᶜAyn, "Risāla," in Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq,* p. 494. All other sources state that she was then already in Karbala, but her own statement is unequivocal.

[867] Zarandī, *Dawn-Breakers*, pp. 81-2.

[868] Qurrat al-ᶜAyn, "Risāla," in Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq,* p. 494.

[869] Hamadānī, *Tārīkh-i-Jadīd*, pp. 35-6; Zarandī, *Dawn-Breakers*, pp. 69-72.

[870] On Bārfurūshī, see Denis MacEoin, "Mollā Moḥammad ᶜAlī Qoddūs Bārforūshī', *Encyclopaedia Iranica* 3:8 (1988), p.794; Malik Khusravī, *Tārīkh-i shuhadāᵓ*, vol. 1, pp. 58-82; Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, pp. 405-30; Bāmdād, *Rijāl*, vol. 3, pp. 451-5.

[871] Zarandī, *Dawn-Breakers*, p. 69. Accurate lists are given in ibid., pp. 80-1 and Gulpāyagānī, *Kashf al-Ghiṭāᵓ*, p. 90.

[872] See Shirazi, *Bayān-i fārsī*, 1:2, p. 7; 2:2, p. 20; 5:17, p. 180; 6:13, p. 220.

[873] Zarandī, *Dawn-Breakers*, p. 123; Shirazi, *Bayān-i fārsī*, introduction p. 3; idem, *Le Béyan persan*, translated by A.-L.-M. Nicolas (Paris: P. Geuthner, 1911-14), vol. 1, pp. 7-9, footnote; p. 13n. On the relationship of this system on the Babi calendar, see idem, *Bayān-i fārsī*, 5:3, p. 153. A certain similarity to the Ismaili hierarchical system may be noted.

[874] See for example Shirazi, *Qayyūm al-asmāʾ* ff. 37a, 45a, 132a, 134a, 161a, 162a, 182b; idem, *al-Ṣaḥīfa bayna 'l-ḥaramayn*, p. 16; idem, letter to Mīrzā Ḥasan-i Khurāsānī (d. 1849), in INBA 6003 C., p. 321; Shaykh Sulṭān Karbalāʾī, letter in Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, pp. 249-50; Qurrat al-ʿAyn, "Risāla," in ibid, p. 500.

[875] On this use of the term, see Rashti, *Uṣūl al-ʿaqāʾid*, pp. 57, 58.

[876] See ibid, pp. 90-1; Muḥammad Khān Kirmānī, *al-Kitāb al-mubīn*, 2nd ed. ([Kirman]: Chāpkhāna-yi Saʿādat, 1354 Sh [1975]), vol. 1, pp. 304-5.

[877] Shirazi, *Bayān-i fārsī*, 1:2, pp. 6-7; 1:3-19, pp. 8-10; idem, letter to Ḥājī Mīrzā Sayyid ʿAlī Shīrāzī, quoted in Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq,* pp. 223-4; see also Mullā Shaykh ʿAlī Turshīzī, letter quoted in ibid., p. 166.

Chapter Five

[878] For a full account of the Bab's writings, see Denis MacEoin, *The Sources for Early Babi Doctrine and History*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1992.

[879] For details further to those given here, see Edward Granville Browne, "The Babis of Persia. II. Their Literature and Doctrines," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (London) vol. 21 (1889), pp. 904-9; idem, "Catalogue and Description," pp. 699-701; idem, "Some Remarks on the Babi Texts Edited by Baron Victor Rosen in Vols. I and VI of the *Collections Scientifiques de l'Institut des Langues Orientales de Saint Petersbourg*," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (London) vol. 24 (1892), pp. 261-8; Viktor Romanovich Rozen, *Les Manuscrits arabes de l'Institut des langues orientales* (Saint Petersburg: Eggers & Comp., 1877), pp. 170-91; Ishrāq Khāvarī, *Qāmūs-i Īqān*, vol. 3, pp. 277-82.

[880] Zarandī, *Dawn-Breakers*, p. 61.

[881] Hamadānī, *Tārīkh-i-Jadīd,* p. 39.

[882] Shirazi, letter quoted in Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, p. 285.

[883] See ibid., pp. 106, 121, 187.

[884] Shirazi, *Bayān-i fārsī*, 4:18, p. 148.

[885] Idem, *Qayyūm al-asmāʾ*, f. 14a.

[886] Ibid., ff. 65b, 80a.

[887] Ibid., f. 126a.

[888] See Zarandī, *Dawn-Breakers*, p. 130; on the dating of the Bab's pilgrimage, see his *Khuṭba fī Jidda*, pp. 332-3.

[889] Shirazi, *Qayyūm al-asmāʾ*, f. 137b. The passage reads : *wa idhā kashafnā 'l-ghiṭāʾ ʿan abṣārihim li 'l-bayt al-ḥarām fa-hum qad kānū tawwāfan ḥawla 'l-dhikr ka-annahum nāmū fī 'l-bayt ʿalā ḥadd al-taḥdīd min anfusihim wa lā yanẓurūn ilā 'llāh mawlāhum al-ḥaqq lamḥatan ʿalā al-ḥaqq al-qawī qalīlan*. Compare Ḥājī Mīrzā Ḥabīb Allāh Afnān, quoting Ḥājī Abū 'l-Ḥasan Shīrāzī, in Balyuzi, *The Bab*, pp. 71-2. This may, however, be a reference to the Bab's declaration and *mubāhala* challenge addressed to Mīrzā Muḥīṭ Kirmānī at the Kaʿaba on 15 Dhū 'l-Ḥijja/26 December, and again on two subsequent occasions (Shirazi, *al-Ṣaḥīfa bayna 'l-ḥaramayn*, pp. 14-15).

[890] Idem, "Qayyūm al-asmā," f. 137b.

[891] Ibid., f. 152a.

[892] Ibid., f. 154b.

[893] Ibid., 192b-193a.

[894] Supralinear annotation in Shirazi, *Ṣaḥīfa aᶜmāl al-sana,* ms. in INBA 5006C, pp. 262-78, end of first of two untitled prayers between suras 5 and 6.

[895] For a detailed discussion of this work, see Todd Lawson, 'The Qur'an Commentary of Sayyid ᶜAlī Muḥammad, the Bāb', PhD thesis, McGill University, 1987, available online at: http://bahai-library.com/?file=lawson_quran_commentary_bab.

[896] Shirazi, *Qayyūm al-asmāᵓ*, f. 7b.

[897] Ibid., ff. 35a, 53b, 65b, 67b, 72b, 141b, 167b, 174b, 196b.

[898] See in particular the passage dealing with legislation on ff. 80a-83b, 168b-173b, 179b, 183b-192a.

[899] Tanakābunī, *Qiṣaṣ*, p. 186.

[900] Rawlinson to Canning (FO 248/114), dated 8 January 1845, enclosed in Rawlinson to Sir Justin Sheil (1803-1871), 16 January 1845.

[901] Ibid., Rawlinson to Sheil, 16 January 1845 (FO 248/14).

[902] Shirazi, *Qayyūm al-asmāᵓ*, f. 2a.

[903] Ibid., f. 14a.

[904] Ibid., f. 196b; cf. 29b: "We sent down this book from God as a blessing unto our servant."

[905] Ibid., f. 4b; cf. f. 90b: "God has inspired (*awḥā)* his proof (the Imām) upon that mighty word (the Bab)." On the Imāms as recipients and mediators of *waḥy*, see al-Ahsaᵓi, *Sharḥ al-ziyāra*, vol. 1, pp. 12-13, 74, 123-4. On the application of term *waḥy* to the Bab, see Qurrat al-ᶜAyn, autograph *risāla* (ms) in possession of an Azalī Babi in Tehran, pp. 19, 22-3 (Photocopy in the author's possession).

[906] Shirazi, *Qayyūm al-asmāᵓ*, f. 109b.

[907] Ibid., f. 39a.

[908] Ibid., f. 97b.; cf. f. 76a, where the Bab is described as "the truthful tongue of God."

[909] Ibid., f. 100b.

[910] Ibid., f. 117b.

[911] Ibid., f. 106b.

[912] Ibid., f. 72b; cf. f. 53b

[913] Ibid.

[914] Ibid., f. 141b.

[915] Ibid., f. 65b.

[916] Ibid., f. 167b.

[917] Ibid., ff. 174b, 196b.

[918] Ibid., f. 65b.

[919] Ibid., ff. 49b, 66b.

[920] Ibid., ff. 14a, 27a.

[921] Ibid., f. 40b.

[922] Ibid., f. 15b.

[923] Ibid., f. 56a.

[924] Ibid., f. 41a.

[925] On these, see al-Kulaynī, *Al-Uṣūl min al-Kāfī*, vol. 1, pp. 438-40, 441-3, 456-62; Kirmānī, *al-Kitāb al-mubīn,* vol. 1, pp. 288-92, 295-6. On the

Qurʾan in all its aspects being in the keeping of the Imāms, see al-Ahsaʾi, *Sharḥ al-ziyāra*, vol. 1, p. 59. The *Kalimāt-i maknūna* of Bahā' Allāh was originally identified with the *ṣaḥīfa* of Fāṭima (see Ishrāq Khāvarī, *Raḥīq-i makhtūm*, vol. 2, p. 84).

[926] Shirazi, *Qayyūm al-asmāʾ*, f. 2a.

[927] Ibid., f. 78a.

[928] Ibid., f. 7b.

[929] Ibid., f. 76b; cf. f. 132b.

[930] Ibid., f. 55b.

[931] Ibid., f. 76b.; cf. ff. 89a, 142b.

[932] Ibid., ff. 26a., 46 b.

[933] Ibid., f. 3a., etc.

[934] Ibid., f. 49b. etc.

[935] Ibid., f. 41a.; cf. f. 68b.

[936] Ibid., f. 3a.

[937] Ibid., f. 89b

[938] Ibid., f. 102a.

[939] Ibid., ff. 26a., 121b.

[940] Ibid., f. 185b.

[941] For a detailed discussion of the Bab's views on *jihād*, see Denis MacEoin, "The Babi Concept of Holy War", *Religion*, 12 (1982): 93-129.

[942] Shirazi, *Qayyūm al-asmāʾ*, f. 41b.

[943] Ibid., f. 74b.

[944] Ibid., f 169b.

[945] Ibid., f. 172b.

[946] For a useful summary of traditions relating to the role of the Qāʾim as *mujāhid* in a Shaykhi contest, see al-Aḥsaʾi, *Ḥayāt an-nafs*, pp. 116-26

[947] Shirazi, *Qayyūm al-asmāʾ*, f. 55a.

[948] Ibid., f. 84b.

[949] Ibid., f. 99 b.

[950] For a discussion of these regulations and of the Bab's attitude to *jihād* in general, see MacEoin, "The Babi Concept of Holy War".

[951] Shirazi, *Qayyūm al-asmāʾ* ff. 25b, 81b, 83a, 83b, 183b, 187b, 188a.

[952] Ibid., ff. 74b, 80b, 179b, 185b.

[953] Ibid., ff. 80a, 83b, 186b.

[954] Ibid., ff. 81b, 83a.

[955] Ibid., ff. 81a, 183b, 184a, 190b, 191a.

[956] Ibid., f. 81b.

[957] Ibid., ff. 81b, 82a, 83a, 187a.

[958] Ibid., ff. 82a, 191b.

[959] Ibid., ff. 82b, 189b.

[960] Ibid., f. 183b.

[961] Ibid., f. 185b.

[962] Ibid.

[963] Ibid., ff. 187b, 189a.

[964] Ibid., f. 82a.

[965] Ibid., ff. 80b, 82b, 185a, 187a.

[966] Ibid., f. 80b.

[967] See A.-L.-M. Nicolas, introduction to *Le Livre des sept preuves de la mission du Bâb,* translated by A. L. M. Nicolas (Paris: J. Maisonneuve, 1902), pp. i-ii ; Ṣubḥ-i Azal, quoted in "Writings of the Bab and Subh-i-Ezel," in Browne (ed.), *A Traveller's Narrative*, vol. 2, pp. 339-40.

[968] For my reasons for naming this work, which appears in the CUL Browne MS F. 28 (item 6) as the *Saḥīfa-yi Raḍawiyya*, see my "Revised Survey" note 160, pp. 239-40.*

[969] CUL Browne F. 28 (item 6).

[970] On the identity of the works listed in the *Risāla-yi dhahabiyya*, see my "Revised Survey," pp. 65-9.*

[971] I have collated the lists in two manuscripts in INBA 4011.C (pp. 62-9) and INBA 6003.C (pp. 285-93).

[972] Shirazi, *Khuṭba fī Jidda*, p. 332. See last chapter; note 130.

[973] Shirazi, *Qayyūm al-asmāʾ*, f. 67b.

[974] Māzandarānī, *Asrar al-āthār*, vol. 4, pp. 246-7.

[975] Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, p. 106.

[976] Ibid., p. 121.

[977] Among these is an unidentified copy in CUL, Add. 3704 (6).

[978] Title of Library of the University of Leiden MS 2414. See also CUL Browne MS F. 7, pp. 4, 14. On the place of writing, see ibid., p. 10; cf. Zarandī, *Dawn-Breakers*, p. 137.

[979] Shirazi, *al-Ṣaḥīfa bayna 'l-ḥaramayn*, pp. 10, 89, 96, 97.

[980] Ibid., pp. 14-15.

[981] Ibid., pp. 27-37.

[982] Ibid., p. 35; cf. idem, *Risāla furūᶜ al-'Adlīyya*, ms. in INBA 5010 C, p. 16.

[983] Idem, *al-Ṣaḥīfa bayna 'l-ḥaramayn*, pp. 38-41.

[984] Ibid., pp. 41-6, 49-55, 50-64, 66-84. In the *Risāla furūᶜ al-ᶜAdliyya* (p. 32), the Bab states that "The path of servitude and the journey towards God have been set out in detail in the *Ṣaḥīfa-yi ḥaramayn* (sic.)."

[985] Shirazi, *al-Ṣaḥīfa bayna 'l-ḥaramayn*, pp. 46-8.

[986] Ibid., pp. 55-8; 64-6.

[987] Ibid., pp. 84-96.

[988] Ibid., pp. 96-101.

[989] Ibid., pp. 101-22.

[990] Ibid., pp. 66-84.

[991] Nicolas, *Séyyèd Ali Mohammed dit le Bâb*, p. 213; Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq,* p. 288.

[992] *Aᶜẓam al-kutub*: see Māzandarānī, *Asrar al-āthār*, vol. 4, p. 44.

[993] Ibid.

[994] Nicolas, *Séyyèd Ali Mohammed, dit le Bâb*, p. 60.

[995] Ibid.

[996] Māzandarānī, *Asrar al-āthār*, vol. 4, p. 45; cf. Shirazi, *Risāla furūᶜ al-ᶜAdliyya*, pp. 7, 9.

[997] Zarandī, *Dawn-Breakers*, p. 142.

[998] Translation in Nicolas, *Séyyèd Ali Mohammed, dit le Bâb*, pp. 214-8.

[999] Zarandī, *Dawn-Breakers*, p. 143.

[1000] Ibid., p. 144. In a letter to Khurāsānī written at the same time, the Bab instructs him to chant the *adhān* and to teach in the mosque "where the verses were sent down from your Lord"; this was the Shamshīrgarān Mosque near the Bab's home, and not the Masjid-i Naw, as Zarandī states (see letter quoted in Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, p. 149; Hamadānī, *Tārīkh-i-Jadīd*, pp. 200, 201). According to Fayḍī, however, the book was given, not to Khurāsānī, but to the Bab's uncle, Ḥājī Mīrzā Sayyid ᶜAlī (Fayḍī, *Ḥaḍrat-Nuqṭa-yi ūlā*, p. 153.

[1001] Balyuzi, *The Bab*, pp. 76-8.

[1002] Fayḍī, *Ḥaḍrat-Nuqṭa-yi ūlā*, pp. 53-4; ᶜAbd al-Ḥamīd Ishrāq Khāvarī, *Muḥāḍirāt* (Tehran: Muᵓassasa-yi Millī-yi Maṭbūᶜāt-i Amrī, 126 B. [1963]), vol. 2, pp. 785-6.

[1003] Compare the *adhān* formula used by the Ḥurūfīs and described in the *Istiwā-nāma* of ᶜAlī al-Aᶜlā (see Bausani, "Ḥurūfiyya," p. 601).

[1004] On the Bab's use of the *hayākil* for men and *dawāᵓir* for women, see Browne, *Materials*, p. 216; Māzandarānī, *Asrar al-āthār*, vol. 3, pp. 46-7, vol. 4, pp. 115-20. For a fuller discussion, see Denis MacEoin, "Nineteenth-Century Babi Talismans", *Studia Iranica* 14:1 (1985), pp.77-98

[1005] The figure "273" here is a reference to the words "*ᶜAlī Muḥammad bāb Allāh*."

[1006] The Bab is now known to have been about one week's journey from Shiraz at Kunār-takhta, on 24 Jumādā II 1261/30 June 1845 (see Balyuzi, *The Bab*, p. 105.

[1007] Shirazi, "Risāla furū' al-'Adlīyya," pp. 3-4.

[1008] Ibid., p. 5.

[1009] Ibid., p. 7; cf. p. 10.

[1010] Ibid., p. 13.

[1011] Ibid., p. 14.

[1012] Ibid., p. 16.

[1013] Ibid., pp. 20-31. This hierarchy is based on a tradition related by Jābir ibn Ḥayyān (d. 803); for an early Babi interpretation, see al-Qatīl ibn al-Karbalāᵓī, "Risāla," in Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq,* p. 528; see al-Ahsaᵓi, *Sharḥ al-ziyāra*, vol. 1, pp. 8-1, 60, and (on *maᶜrifa* of the first four stations), pp. 26-7.

[1014] Shirazi, Risāla furūᶜ al-ᶜAdliyya," pp. 20, 22.

[1015] Ibid., p. 24.

[1016] Ibid., p. 31.

[1017] Ibid., pp. 32-3.

[1018] Ibid., p. 33.

[1019] Ibid., p. 34.

[1020] Ibid., p. 41.

[1021] On Dārābī, probably the most active Babi *dāᶜī* of this period and leader of the Babi risings in Yazd and Nayrīz, see Bāmdād, *Rijāl*, vol. 4, pp. 433-8;

Muḥammad-ᶜAlī Fayḍī, *Nayrīz-i Mushkbīz*. (Tehran: Muᵓassasa-yi Millī-yi Maṭbūᶜāt-i Amrī, 129 B. [1972]), pp. 7-75; Muḥammad Shafīᶜ Rawᶜānī-Nayrīzī, *Lamaᶜāt al-anwār* (Tehran: [s.n.], 130 B. [1973]), vol. 1, pp. 40-54.

[1022] Zarandī, *Dawn-Breakers*, pp. 174-6.

[1023] Notes to Iᶜtiḍād al-Salṭana, *Fitna-yi Bab*, p. 160.

[1024] Al-Baghdādī, Risāla amriyya," p. 112.

[1025] Shirazi, Tafsīr *Sūrat al-kawthar*, f. 28a.

[1026] Ibid., f. 5a.

[1027] Ibid.

[1028] Ibid., ff. 6a-6b, 19a.

[1029] Ibid., f. 11b; cf. ff. 24a., 25a.

[1030] See ibid., ff. 7b, 15a, 17b.

[1031] Ibid., f. 99b.

[1032] For the Shaykh's view, see al-Ahsaᵓi, *Sharḥ al-ziyāra*, vol. 1, pp. 25-6, 64.

[1033] A list of these works, with notes of the manuscripts in which they occur may be found in MacEoin, "Revised Survey," pp. 92-101.*

[1034] Kirmānī, *Izhāq al-bāṭil*, p. 107, cf. p. 10, where Rashti is referred to as *ṣāḥib al-rukn al-rābiᶜ*.

[1035] Ibid., p. 106; cf. p. 175.

[1036] Apart from those works specifically cited, we have also referred to Kirmānī, *Hidāyat al-ṭālibīn*, pp. 168-77. Kirmānī also discusses this topic in other works, notably the manuscript "Ilzām al-nawāṣib."

[1037] Muḥammad Karīm Khān Kirmānī, *Risāla-yi sī faṣl* (Kirman: Chāpkhāna-yi Saᶜādat 1368 [1949]), p. 22. On this basis, Kirmānī discusses resurrection after divine justice in the section on *tawḥīd* in *al-Fiṭra al-salīma*, vol. 1, pp. 223ff, 292ff.

[1038] On this basis Kirmānī discusses resurrection after prophethood in *Irshād al-ᶜawāmm,* vol. 1, pp. 110ff; vol. 2, pp. 7 ff.

[1039] Kirmānī, *Risāla-yi sī faṣl,* p. 23.

[1040] On there being no *taqlīd* in *ḍurūrīyāt* or *uṣūl*, see Āl Kāshif al-Ghiṭāᵓ, *Aṣl al-Shīᶜa wa uṣūluhā*, p. 107.

[1041] Kirmānī, *Risāla-yi sī faṣl*, p. 23.

[1042] Ibid., p. 24.

[1043] Muḥammad Karīm Khān Kirmānī, "Risāla dar javāb-i Mullā Ḥusayn ᶜAlī Tawīsargāni," in *Majmaᶜ al-rasāᵓil*, vol. 15, (Kirman: Maṭbaᶜat al-Saᶜādat, 1972), p. 146 ; idem, *al-Fiṭrah al-salīma*, vol. 3, p. 190; cf. idem, "Risālah dar rafᶜ-i baᵓḍ-i shubahāt," in *Majmaᶜ al-rasāᵓil*, vol. 15, pp. 198-9.

[1044] Idem, "Javāb-i Tawīsargāni," p. 147 ; cf. idem, *Rukn-i rābiᶜ* (Kirman: Chāpkhāna-yi Saᶜādat, [19--]), p. 9.

[1045] Idem, "Javāb-i Tawīsargāni," p. 147.

[1046] Idem, *Rukn-i rābiᶜ*, p. 21; idem, *al-Fiṭra al-salīma*, vol. 3, pp. 185, 190.

[1047] Idem, "Risāla dar javāb-i yik nafar Iṣfahānī," in *Majmaᶜ al-rasāᵓil*, vol. 15, (Kirman: Maṭbaᶜat al-Saᶜādat, 1972), p. 81.

[1048] Idem, *Risāla-yi sī faṣl*, p. 31.

[1049] Idem, "Javāb-i yik nafar Iṣfahānī," pp. 79-80.

[1050] Idem, *Risāla-yi sī faṣl*, p. 31.

[1051] Idem, *Risāla-yi chahār faṣl* (Kirman: [s.n.], 1324 Sh [1946]), pp. 1, 3.

[1052] Idem, "Risāla dar rafᶜ-i baᵓḍ-i shubahāt," pp. 199-201.

[1053] Idem, "Javāb-i yik nafar Iṣfahānī," p. 82.

[1054] Shirazi, "Risāla-fi 'l-sulūk," manuscript in INBA 6006.C, p. 73; cf. a *risāla* by an unidentified Babi in INBA 6003C, p. 384.

[1055] Shirazi, *Tafsīr Sūrat al-baqara*, ff. 5a-5b.

[1056] Idem, *Tafsīr Sūrat al-kawthar*, f. 36a. On the "hidden support", cf. letter to Muḥammad Shah in idem, *Muntakhabāt-i āyāt*, p. 14.

[1057] Idem, *Tafsīr Sūrat al-kawthar*, f. 36b; cf. f. 68a.

[1058] Ibid. Compare the dialectical argument back to the Imāms used by Ḥasan-i Sabbāḥ (d. 1124), described by Hodgson, *The Order of Assassins*, p. 54.

[1059] Shirazi, *Tafsīr Sūrat al-kawthar*, f. 37a.

[1060] Qurrat al-ᶜAyn, "Risāla," in possession of an Azalī Babi in Tehran, pp. 3-4.

[1061] Ibid., p. 6.

[1062] Ibid. For a discussion of the *insān al-kāmil* concept in a Babi context see Hermann Roemer, *Die Babi-Beha'i: Die jüngste Mohammedanische Sekte* (Potsdam: [s.n.], 1912), pp. 12-13.

[1063] Qurrat al-ᶜAyn, "Risāla," in possession of an Azalī Babi in Tehran, pp. 6-7, 8.

[1064] Ibid, p. 8. References to Qurᵓan 34:18 in similar contexts are extremely common in Shaykhi and Babi literature of this period , see for example Kirmānī, *Risāla-yi tīr i shihāb*,, pp. 179-81.

[1065] Qurrat al-ᶜAyn, "Risāla," in possession of an Azalī Babi in Tehran, p. 10.

[1066] Ibid., p. 12.

[1067] Ibid., p. 14.

[1068] Ibid.

[1069] Ibid., p. 18.

[1070] Sayyid Yaḥyā Dārābī quoted in Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, p. 474.

[1071] Shirazi, *Tafsīr Sūrat al-kawthar*, f. 94b.

[1072] Ibid. For the last phrase, see Qurʾan 5:19.

[1073] Idem, *Qayyūm al-asmāʾ*, f. 106a.

[1074] Shirazi, Tafsīr Sūrat al-kawthar, ff. 65b, 66a, 66b ff. By contrast, later Bahaʾi doctrine regards the four *abwāb* as imposters and, indeed, maintains that the twelfth Imām was never born at all (Bahā'u'llāh, in Ishraq Khavari, ed., *Māʾida-yi āsmanī*, vol. 4, pp. 91, 141. Cf., however, idem *

[1075] Shirazi, "Qayyūm al-asmā," f. 41a.

[1076] *Risāla* by an unidentified Babi in INBA 6006.C, p. 8.

[1077] *Risāla* by an unidentified Babi in INBA 6003.C, pp. 400, 401-2.

[1078] *Risāla* by an unidentified Babi in INBA 6006.C, pp. 8-9.

[1079] Qurrat al-ᶜAyn, *Risāla* in Gulpāyagānī, *Kashf al-Ghiṭāʾ* p. 18; idem, letter to Mullā Jawād Vilyānī in Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq* by, p. 488.

[1080] Qatīl ibn al-Karbalāʾī, *Risala,* in Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq,* p. 504.

[1081] Kāshānī, *Nuqṭat al-Kāf*, p. 100.

[1082] Shirazi, letter to Mīrzā Ḥasan Khurāsānī, in INBA 6003.C, p. 321; idem, *Qayyūm al-asmāʾ,* f. 139a.

[1083] Ibid, f. 64b

[1084] Qurrat al-ᶜAyn, *Risāla*, in Gulpāyagānī, *Kashf al-Ghiṭāʾ,* p. 2.

[1085] Ibid., p. 3.

[1086] Ibid.

[1087] Ibid.

[1088] Ibid., p. 4; cf. Shirazi, *Tafsīr Sūrat al-kawthar*, f. 109b, where Muḥammad and the Imāms are described as "one person."

[1089] Qurrat al-ᶜAyn, *Risāla*, in Gulpāyagānī, *Kashf al-Ghiṭāʾ,* p. 5.

[1090] Ibid., pp. 5-6.

[1091] Ibid., p. 6; on the *ḥadīth* quoted here, see chapter 1 above, note 27.

[1092] Ibid., p. 7

[1093] Ibid., pp. 8-11.

[1094] Ibid., pp. 11-13.

[1095] Ibid., p. 13.

[1096] Ibid., p. 2.

[1097] Ibid.

[1098] Ibid., p. 14.

[1099] Zunūzī, *Risāla* quoted in Māzandarānī*, Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, pp. 31, 32.

[1100] Māzandarānī*, Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, p. 314.

[1101] Shirazi, *Qayyūm al-asmāʾ,* f. 46b.

[1102] Ibid.

[1103] Ibid., f. 69b.

[1104] Ibid., f. 50b.

[1105] Ibid., f. 31a.

[1106] Ibid., f. 36a.

[1107] Ibid., f. 96a.

[1108] Qurrat al-ᶜAyn, *Risāla*, in Gulpāyagānī, *Kashf al-Ghiṭāʾ,* p. 14.

[1109] Ibid., p. 15.

[1110] Shirazi, *Dalāʾil-i sabᶜa*, p. 29; cf. idem, quoted in Māzandarānī, *Asrār al-āthār*, vol. 5, p. 369.

[1111] See idem, *Tafsīr Sūrat al-kawthar*, f. 66a.

[1112] Idem, *Qayyūm al-asmāʾ*, f. 76a.

[1113] Ibid., f. 166a.

[1114] Ibid., f. 3a.

[1115] Ibid., ff. 19a, 69b. On the Imāms as the gate of God, see Kirmānī, *al-Kitāb al-mubīn,* vol. 1, pp. 227-31; Muḥammad Khān Kirmānī, *Yanābīᶜ al-ḥikma* (Kirman: Maṭbaᶜat al-Saᶜāda, 1353-56 [1963-66]), vol. 1, pp. 437-55.

[1116] Shirazi, *Qayyūm al-asmāʾ,* f. 103b.

[1117] Ibid., f. 73b.

[1118] Ibid., ff 103b, 143 b. On Ismaili identification of the Imām with God, see Abū Isḥāq Ibrāhīm Qūhistānī, *Haft Bab, or, Seven Chapters*, translated and edited by W. Ivanow (Bombay: Ismaili Society, 1959), pp. 37-8.

[1119] Shirazi, *Qayyūm al-asmāʾ,* f. 73b.

[1120] Ibid., f. 76b.

[1121] Ibid., f. 89a.

[1122] Ibid., f. 109a.

[1123] Prayer in INBA 6004.C, p. 188.

[1124] Idem, *Ṣaḥīfa-yi ʿadliyya*, p. 13; cf. p. 7.

[1125] Ibid., p. 7; cf. p. 11.

[1126] Idem, "Tafsīr Sūrat al-kawthar," f. 7b.

[1127] Ibid., f. 15a.

[1128] Ibid., f. 4b.

[1129] Ibid., f. 7b.

Chapter Six

[1130] Al-Qatīl ibn al-Karbalāʾī, *Risāla*, in Māzandarānī*, Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, p. 511.

[1131] Ibid.; Zarandī, *Dawn-Breakers*, pp. 92, 94; Shirazi, *Qayyūm al-asmāʾ*, ff. 198a, 199a, 200a. If these later passages represent the original instruction, my conjectured dating for the latter part of this work would be rendered problematic.

[1132] Zarandī, *Dawn-Breakers*, p. 94; Gulpāyagani, *Kashf al-ghiṭāʾ*, p. 72; Gulpāyagani, quoted in Balyuzi, *The Bab*, pp. 37-8; al-Qatīl ibn al-Karbalāʾī, *Risāla*, in Māzandarānī*, Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq,* p. 511.

[1133] Zarandī, *Dawn-Breakers*, p. 94; Muḥammad Karīm Khān Kirmānī, *Risāla dar radd-i Bab-i murtād*, 2nd ed. (Kirman: [s.n.], 1384 [1964]), p. 18; Qurrat al-ᶜAyn, *Risāla*, in Gulpāyagānī, *Kashf al-ghiṭāʾ*, p. 20.

[1134] Māzandarānī*, Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq,* pp. 41.

[1135] Ibid., pp. 56, 58.

[1136] Samandar, *Tārīkh-i Samandar*, p. 351.

[1137] Sipihr, *Nāsikh al-Tavārīkh*, vol. 3, p. 235; Zarandī, *Dawn-Breakers*, p. 86. The Bab wrote several further letters to Muḥammad Shah, from Bushehr, Kulayn, and the prison in Mākū. For texts of some of these, see CUL Browne F. 28, item 7; Shirazi, *Muntakhabāt-i āyāt*, pp. 5-8, 9-13, 13-18.

[1138] Zarandī, *Dawn-Breakers*, pp. 23-6, 267.

[1139] Al-Qatīl ibn al-Karbalāʾī, *Risāla*, in Māzandarānī*, Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq,* p. 511.

[1140] Ibid.

[1141] Ibid., p. 512.

[1142] Ibid.

[1143] Shirazi, quoted in Māzandarānī*, Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, pp. 279-80.

[1144] In a letter to his uncle, Sayyid ᶜAlī, the Bab, speaking of the return to earth of Muḥammad and the Imāms in the persons of the *ḥurūf al-ḥayy*, states that the first to return was Muḥammad and that he was the first messenger of the Qāʾim (i.e., Bushrūʾī – see Shirazi, *Bayān-i fārsī* 1:2, p. 6; 1:3, p. 8); the second to return was ᶜAlī, and he took the message of the Bab to Ḥājī Mīrzā Sayyid ᶜAlī (his uncle) in Bushehr (i.e., Basṭāmī – see Mīrzā Ḥusayn ᶜAlī Nūrī, Bahāʾ Allāh, *Lawḥ-i Naṣīr*, in *Majmūᶜa-yi alvāḥ-i*

mubāraka, ed. Muḥyī 'l-Dīn Ṣabrī (Cairo: Saᶜdat Press, 1920), pp. 190-1: idem, letter quoted in Māzandarānī*, Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, pp. 223-4. Zarandī states that Basṭāmī was the first to leave Shīrāz (*The Dawn-Breakers*, pp. 87-90).

[1145] Evidence for this date may be found in Rawlinson to Sir Stratford Canning (8 January 1845): "About three months ago, an inferior priest of Shiraz appeared in Kerbela, bearing a copy of the Koran, which he stated to have been delivered to him, by the forerunner of the Imām Mehdi, to be exhibited in token of approaching advent" (in Rawlinson to Sir Justin Sheil, 16 January 1845, FO 248/114). Later reports from Rawlinson confirm that the reference is to Mullā ᶜAlī.

[1146] Tanakābūnī, *Qiṣaṣ*, p. 196; Zarandī, *Dawn-Breakers*, pp. 90-1; Baghdādī, *Risāla amrīyya*, p. 106; Māzandarānī*, Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, pp. 106.

[1147] Māzandarānī*, Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, p. 187.

[1148] Ibid., p. 186.

[1149] Ibid., p. 187. The Bab himself notes that he sent the *Ṣaḥīfa al-makhzūna* with the *Qayyūm al-asmāᵓ* (see *Qayyūm al-asmāᵓ*, f. 67b).

[1150] Samandar, *Tārīkh-i Samandar*, p. 347; cf Nuri, *Lawḥ-i-Naṣīr*, in *Majmūᶜa*, pp. 190-1. Māzandarānī quotes part of a second letter from the Bab to al-Najafi, written after the latter's rejection of his claims (*Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, p. 107).

[1151] Zarandī, *Dawn-Breakers*, pp. 90-1.

[1152] Samandar, *Tārīkh-i Samandar*, p. 347. On the extensive us of *mubahāla* as a form of confrontation between Babis and their opponents before 1848, see Denis MacEoin, "The Babi Concept of Holy War", *Religion*, 12 (1982): pp. 109-10.

[1153] Rawlinson to Canning, 8 January 1845 (FO 248/114).

[1154] Baghdādī, *Risāla amriyya*, p. 106. This source indicates that Basṭāmī spent about three months in prison in Baghdad before his trial there; since

the trial took place on 13 January 1845, he must have been transferred to Baghdad about the middle of October.

[1155] Ibid., pp. 106-7; Tanakābūnī, *Qiṣaṣ*, pp. 196-7; Wardī, *Lamaḥāt*, pp. 138-40. A full account of Basṭāmī's arrest and trial is given by Moojan Momen, "The Trial of Mullā ʿAlī Basṭāmī: A Combined Sunnī-Shīʿī *Fatwā* against the Bāb", *Iran* 20 (1982), 113-43, available online at: www.northill.demon.co.uk/
relstud/mullaali.htm. See also, Balyuzi in *The Bab*, pp. 61-8; Moojan Momen, *The Babi and Bahaʾi Religions, 1844-1944: Some Contemporary Western Accounts* (Oxford: George Ronald, 1981), pp. 83-90. The court of inquiry was attended by both Shiʿi and Sunni ulama, under the presidency of Najīb Pāshā; ʿAlī Wardī states that "this was the first gathering of its kind in the Ottoman period, since it was not then customary for the ulama of both parties to meet together in a single gathering for a trial," *Lamahāt*, p. 138.

On Basṭāmī's final end, see Denis MacEoin, "The Fate of Mulla ʿAlī Basṭāmī", *Baha'i Studies Bulletin*, 2:1 (1983), p.77).

[1156] Balyuzi, *The Bab*, pp. 66-7.

[1157] Momen, *The Babi and Bahaʾi Religions*, p. 89.

[1158] Baghdādī, *Risāla amriyya*, pp. 105-6. Muḥammad Shibl was the father of Muḥammad Muṣṭafā.

[1159] Al-Qatīl ibn al-Karbalāʾī, *Risāla*, in Māzandarānī*, Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq,* p. 512.

[1160] Ibid., p. 514.

[1161] Ibid., p. 515.

[1162] Ibid.

[1163] Ibid.

[1164] Rawlinson to Canning, 8 January 1845 (FO 248/114).

[1165] Rawlinson to Sheil, 16 January 1845 (FO 248/114).

[1166] The Bab left Shīrāz on 26 Shaʿbān 1260/10 September 1844 (Shirazi, *Khuṭba fī Jidda,* p. 332).

[1167] Zarandī, *Dawn-Breakers*, pp. 63, 96, 158; Kirmānī, *Izhāq al-bāṭil*, p. 15. On the various prophecies relating to the appearance of the Qāʾim in Mecca and Kūfa, and other events associated with his advent, see Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad al-Shaykh al-Mufīd, *Kitāb al-irshād*, ed. Sayyid Kāẓim al-Mūsawī al-Miyāmawī (Tehran: [s.n.], 1337 [1957]), pp. 336-45; Majlisī, *Biḥār al-anwār*, vol. 53, pp. 1-144; anon, untitled *risāla* in *Nivishtijāt wa āthār-i aṣḥāb-i awwaliyya-yi amr-i aʿlā,* vol. 80, INBA, pp. 1-196; al-Ahsaʾi, *Ḥayāt al-nafs*, pp. 91-134; Shirazi, *Tafsīr Sūrat al-kawthar*, ff. 37b-40b, 77b-88b.

[1168] Māzandarānī*, Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, p. 235.

[1169] Shirazi, quoted in ibid.

[1170] A convert of Bushrūʾī, fought at Shaykh Ṭabarsī, killed in Tehran in 1852 (see ibid., p. 169; Malik Khusravī, *Tārīkh-i Shuhadāʾ*, vol. 2, pp. 78-9, vol. 3, pp. 313-4).

[1171] Shirazi, quoted in INBA 6003.C, pp. 320.

[1172] Māzandarānī, *Tārikh-i-zuhūru'l-haqq*, pp. 121, 235. For a detailed account of the Bab's changing views on holy war, see MacEoin, "Babi Concept of Holy War", pp. 93-129.

[1173] Shirazi, *Qayyūm al-asmāʾ*, f. 176b.

[1174] Kirmānī, *Izhāq al-bāṭil*, pp. 15, 111; Kirmānī, *Risāla-yi tīr i shihāb*, in *Majmaʿ al-rasāʾil-i fārsī*, vol. 1, p. 197.

[1175] Rawlinson to Canning, 22 January 1845 (FO 195/237).

[1176] al-Qatīl ibn al-Karbalāʾī, *Risāla*, in Māzandarānī*, Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq,* p. 514.

[1177] Wardī, *Lamaḥāt*, pp. 109-10.

[1178] Kirmānī, *Risāla-yi tīr i shihāb*, p. 197; cf. idem, *Izhāq al-bāṭil*, p. 111.

[1179] Idem, *Risāla-yi tīr i shihāb*, p. 198; cf. idem, *Izhāq al-bāṭil*, p. 111.

[1180] Idem, *Izhāq al-bāṭil*, p. 110.

[1181] Rawlinson to Sheil, 28 February 1845 (FO 248/114).

[1182] Kirmānī, *Izhāq al-bāṭil*, pp. 95, 127-44, 164-76; idem, *Risāla dar radd-i Bab-i murtād*, pp. 29-30; idem, *Risāla-yi tīr i shihāb*, pp. 195, 210, 241.

[1183] Shirazi, *Khuṭba fī Jidda*, pp. 332-3.

[1184] Zarandī, *Dawn-Breakers*, p. 158. Sayyid Javād met the Bab at Masqat and returned with him to Bushehr; he was then permitted to go to the *ᶜatabāt* by way of Basra and must certainly be the person who carried word there of the Bab's arrival and the change in his plans (see Māzandarānī*, Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq,* p. 100).

[1185] Al-Qatīl ibn al-Karbalāᵓī, *Risāla*, in Māzandarānī*, Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq,* p. 503.

[1186] See Zarandī, *Dawn-Breakers*, p. 158. Parallels can, of course, be made with other millenarian cults for whom the non-fulfillment of prophetic expectations acts as reinforcement for belief (see the classsic sociological study by Leon Festinger, *When prophecy fails: A social and psychological study of a modern group that predicted the destruction of the world*, New York, 1964.

[1187] See al-Qatīl ibn al-Karbalāᵓī, *Risāla*, in Māzandarānī*, Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq,* p. 512.

[1188] Shirazi, *Kitāb al-fihrist*, ms in INBA 4011C, p. 63; INBA 6003.C, p. 286.

[1189] Shirazi to Sayyid Aḥmad Yazdī, in INBA 4012C, p. 96.

[1190] ᶜAbbās Effendi, Abd al-Bahāᵓ, *Tadhkirat al-wafaᵓ fi tarjumati ḥayāti qudamāᵓi 'l-aḥibbāᵓ* (Haifa: ᶜAbbāsiyya Press, 1342 [1924]), pp. 262-70.

[1191] Zarandī, *Dawn-Breakers*, p. 271.

[1192] Māzandarānī*, Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq,* p. 38.

[1193] Ibid.

[1194] Ibid., p. 244.

[1195] Ibid., p. 383; Samandar, *Tārīkh-i Samandar*, pp. 135-6, 173.

[1196] Māzandarānī*, Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq,* p. 104/b.

[1197] Shirazi, prayer quoted in ibid., p. 271.

[1198] Al-Qatīl ibn al-Karbalāʾī, *Risāla*, in Māzandarānī*, Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq,* p. 519.

[1199] Māzandarānī*, Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq,* p. 271; Shirazi, *al-Ṣaḥīfa bayna 'l-ḥaramayn*, pp. 14-15.

[1200] Zarandī, *Dawn-Breakers*, pp. 134-7.

[1201] Ms. collection in INBA 5006C.

[1202] Shaykh Sulṭan al-Karbalāʾī to Babis in Iran, quoted in Māzandarānī*, Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq,* pp. 245-9.

[1203] Shirazi, in INBA 6003C, pp. 295-8, 305-18. Evidence that these prayers were written before 15 Jumādā II 1261/21 June 1845 is to be found in the fact that they are mentioned in the Bab's *Kitāb al-fihrist*, completed on that date (see *Kitāb al-fihrist*, p. 69).

[1204] Baghdādī, *Risāla amrīyya*, p. 108.

[1205] Wardī, *Lamaḥāt*, p. 152. Most other sources give 1817, but Dr. al-Wardī's information is taken from Ḥājj Shaykh ʿAbbūd al-Ṣāliḥī, a descendant of her father, who has assured the present writer that it is based on family records.

[1206] Ibid., p. 153.

[1207] Samandar, *Tārīkh-i Samandar*, pp. 344-5.

[1208] Tanakābūnī, *Qiṣaṣ*, p. 185.

[1209] Ibid., p. 128.

[1210] Ibid. For details of others, see Muḥammad Ḥasan Khān, Iʿtimād al-Salṭana, *Khayrāt-i Ḥisān* (Tehran: [s.n.], 1886). See also Robert and Elizabeth Fernea, "Variations in Religious Observance among Islamic Women," in *Scholars, Saints and Ṣūfīs: Religious Institutions in the Middle East since 1500*, edited by Nikki R. Keddie (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972), pp. 385-401.

[1211] Ḥājj Mullā ʿAlī Vāʾiẓ Tabrizī Khiyābānī, *Ulamāʾ-i muʿāṣirīn*, pp. 311-25.

[1212] Others include Shams-i-Jahān Bigum, a grand-daughter of Fatḥ ʿAlī Shāh; Khurshīd Bigum, a cousin of Ḥājj Mullā Muḥammad Bāqir Shaftī; and Bigum Kūchik, a maternal aunt of Ḥājī Mīrzā Jānī Kāshānī.

[1213] ʿAbbas Effendi, *Tadhkirat al-wafāʾ*, p. 292; Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, p. 312.

[1214] Samandar, *Tārīkh-i Samandar*, p. 334.

[1215] Ibid., pp. 344-5.

[1216] Wardī, *Lamaḥāt*, p. 153.

[1217] ʿAbbās Effendi, *Tadhkirat al-wafāʾ*, p. 295.

[1218] Kāshāni, *Nuqṭat al-Kāf*, p. 140.

[1219] Samandar, *Tārīkh-i Samandar*, p. 346.

[1220] Shirazi to Ḥājī Mīrzā Ḥasan Khurāsānī, in INBA 6003C, p. 320.

[1221] This circle included three of the *ḥurūf al-ḥayy*: Mullā Muḥammad Bāqir Tabrizī, Mullā Muḥammad-ᶜAlī Qazvīnī, and Mullā Muḥammad Hādī Qazvīnī, as well as Shaykh Ṣāliḥ Karīmī (see Malik Khusravī, *Tārīkh-i shuhadāᵓ*, vol. 3, pp. 77-81); Āqā Sayyid Aḥmad Yazdī (see Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, p. 459); Shaykh Sulṭān al-Karbalāᵓī (see ibid., pp. 244-5); Mullā Ibrāhīm Maḥallātī (see ibid. pp. 389-90); Sayyid ᶜAbd al-Hādī Qazvīnī (see Samandar, *Tārīkh-i Samandar*, pp; 135-7, 173); Saʻīd al-Jabbāwī (see Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, p. 261); and Hājī Muḥammad al-Karādī (see ibid, pp. 261-2).

[1222] Mullā Aḥmad ibn Ismāᶜīl Khurāsānī quoted in Wardī, *Lamaḥāt*, p. 160.

[1223] On the role of the younger generation in paradigm shifts, see Thomas Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, 3rd. Ed., Chicago, 1996.

[1224] See ibid., p. 161

[1225] Hājī Muḥammad Muᶜīn al-Salṭana, "Sharh-i ḥāl-i Ṭāhira Qurrat al-ᶜAyn," appended to *Tarīkh-i Muᶜīn al-Salṭana*, p. 3.

[1226] Wardī, *Lamaḥāt*, p. 156.

[1227] Al-Qatīl ibn al-Karbalāᵓī, *Risāla*, in Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq,* p. 510.

[1228] Zarandī, *Dawn-Breakers*, p. 137.

[1229] Wardī, *Lamaḥāt*, p. 169.

[1230] Ibid., p. 156.

[1231] Shaykh Sulṭān al-Karbalāᵓī, letter in Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq,* pp. 256.

[1232] Wardī, *Lamaḥāt*, p. 169.

[1233] See Zarandī, *Dawn-Breakers*, pp. 100-1; Mīrzā Ḥusayn Hamadānī, *Tārīkh-I jadīd,* p. 200-1; Kirmānī and Kirmānī, *Hasht bihisht*, p. 286 n. 1.

There is contradictory evidence which suggests that Khurāsānī traveled to Kirman in the summer of 1845, after his expulsion from Shīrāz in June (Zarandī, *Dawn-Breakers*, pp. 183-7). The present reconstruction would seem, however, to avoid most inconsistencies.

[1234] Kirmānī, *Risāla dar radd-i Bab*, pp. 27-8; see also p. 58

[1235] Ibid., p. 28. See also Nicolas, *Séyyèd Ali Mohammed, dit le Bâb*, pp. 228-9.

[1236] Kirmānī, *Risāla dar radd-i Bab*, p. 27.

[1237] Idem, *al-Shihāb al-thāqib fī rajm al-nawāsib*, pp. 25-7.

[1238] Idem, *Risāla dar radd-i Bab*, p. 58.

[1239] See ibid., pp. 44, 47-55.

[1240] Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, p. 312. Bahāʾ Allāh states that Kirmānī wrote an attack every year, (Nūrī, *Alwāḥ-i mubāraka-yi ḥaḍrat-i Bahāʾ Allāh* [facs. ed.] ([New Delhi?: s.n.], 1310 [1892]), p. 16.

[1241] Kirmānī, *Risāla-yi sī faṣl*, pp. 34-5

[1242] Idem, *Risāla-yi tīr i shihāb*, p. 211; cf. p. 241; cf. also idem, *Izhāq al-bāṭil*, pp. 82, 95, 107

[1243] Ibid, p. 92.

[1244] See Shirazi, *Bayān-i fārsī*, 2:5, pp. 27-8; 2:10, p. 46; 2:16, p. 65; 2:17, p. 67; idem, quoted in Ishrāq Khāvarī, *Qāmūs-i Īqān*, vol. 1, p. 42; Edward Granville Browne, "The Babis of Persia. II," p. 910.

[1245] Al-Qatīl ibn al-Karbalāʾī, *Risāla*, in Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq,* p. 517, 519.

[1246] Zarandī, *Dawn-Breakers*, p. 40.

[1247] Mīrzā Muḥammad ᶜAlī Zunūzī, quoted in Māzandarānī*, Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, p. 35. For other references to Kirmani in later Babi and Bahaᵓi works, see Nūrī, *Kitāb-i-Iqān* (Cairo: Faraju'llāh Zakī, 1934), pp. 142-8; idem, *al-Kitāb al-aqdas*, Bombay (Mumbai)?, n.d., pp. 56-59 (trans. as *The Kitāb-i-Aqdas* (sic)*: the Most Holy Book* (Haifa: Bahaᵓi World Centre, 1992), pp. 78, 242 (The "land of Kāf and Rāᵓ" refers to Kirman); Shoghi Effendi, in *Maʿida-yi Āsmānī*, ed. ᶜAbd al-Ḥamīd Ishrāq Khāvarī (Tehran: Muᵓassasa-yi Millī-yi Maṭbūᶜāt-i Amrī, 128-129 B. [1971-1973]), vol. 6, pp. 59, 64, 79; Ishrāq Khāvarī, *Qāmūs-i Īqān,* vol. 1, pp. 40-50, vol. 2, pp. 665-70. The concept of an opponent (*ḍadd*) of each prophet is also a feature of Ismaili doctrine (see Naṣīr al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad Ṭūsī, *The Rawḍat al-taslīm: Commonly called Tasawwurat*, edited by and translated W. Ivanow (Leiden: E. J. Brill, for the Ismaili Society, 1950), pp. 151).

[1248] Only the work of the latter seems to have survived; it is the *risāla* referred to frequently in these pages.

[1249] Shaykh Sulṭān Karbalāᵓī, "Maktūb," pp. 256-7.

[1250] Qazvīnī, *Tārīkh*, p. 474; Zarandī, *Dawn-Breakers*, p. 159 (where Mullā Javād is incorrectly called "Baraghānī").

[1251] Zarandī, *Dawn-Breakers*, p. 161.

[1252] Ibid., pp. 161-2.

[1253] Al-Qatīl ibn al-Karbalāᵓī, *Risāla*, in Māzandarānī*, Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq,* pp. 520, 527.

[1254] Kirmānī, *Al-Shihāb al-thāqib*, p. 2.

[1255] Māzandarānī*, Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, p. 388.

[1256] Shirazi, quoted in ibid., p. 280.

[1257] Zarandī, *Dawn-Breakers*, p. 162; on the terms "Jibt" and "Tāghūt", see Qurᵓan 4:51.

[1258] Shirazi, prayer quoted in Māzandarānī*, Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, p. 275.

[1259] Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, p. 388; al-Qatīl ibn al-Karbalāʾī, *Risāla*, in ibid, p. 520; Qazvīnī, *Tārīkh*, p. 473; and see generally prayers of the Bab quoted in Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, pp. 269-70, 273-4, 274.

[1260] Shirazi, *Tafsīr Sūrat al-kawthar*, f. 3a-3b.

[1261] Shirazi, quoted in Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, pp. 484-501; cf. Hamadānī, *Tārīkh-i-Jadīd*, p. 283.

[1262] Qurrat al-ᶜAyn to Vilyānī, in Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, p. 485.

[1263] Ibid., p. 489; cf. Shirazi, *Risāla furūᶜ al-ᶜAdliyya*, p. 3.

[1264] Qurrat al-ᶜAyn to Vilyānī, in Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, p. 491-2.

[1265] Ibid., p. 492.

[1266] Ibid., p. 493.

[1267] Ibid., p. 495.

[1268] Ibid., p. 499; cf. pp. 121, 388.

[1269] See Samandar, *Tārīkh-i Samandar*, p. 347; Shirazi, *al-Ṣaḥīfa bayna 'l-ḥaramayn*, pp. 14-15; idem, prayer quoted in Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, p. 271; idem, letter, in ibid, p. 274; idem, letter dated 7 Dhū 'l-Ḥijja 1262/ 26 November 1846, in Āvāra, *Kawākib*, pp. 105-6; idem, letter to Muḥammad Shah, in *Muntakhabāt*, p. 11; Qurrat al-ᶜAyn, letter in Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*. p; 352; ᶜAbbās Effendi, *Tadhkirat al-wafāʾ*, p. 29; Baghdādī, *Risāla amrīyya*, pp. 110, 113.

[1270] Shirazi, letter quoted in Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, p. 274.

[1271] See Hodgson, *The Order of Assassins*, pp. 51-60, 126-31.

[1272] Qurrat al-ᶜAyn, *Risāla*, in Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, p. 488.

[1273] Ibid, p. 493.

[1274] Ibid., p. 490.

[1275] Ibid.

[1276] Ibid., p. 488, 495.

[1277] Ibid., p. 491.

[1278] Shirazi, *Risāla furūᶜ al-ᶜAdlīyya*, pp. 3-4; Māzandarānī, *Asrār al-āthār*, vol. 4, pp. 247-8.

[1279] Zarandī, *Dawn-Breakers*, p. 267.

[1280] Ibid., p. 465; Rawḥanī-Nayrīzī, *Lamaᶜāt*, vol. 1, pp. 46, 50.

[1281] Zarandī, *Dawn-Breakers*, p. 539.

[1282] Samandar, *Tārīkh-i Samandar*, p. 351.

[1283] Shirazi, in Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, pp. 331, 331-2, 332-3, 333-4.

[1284] On Mullā Aḥmad see ibid., p. 157-60.

[1285] Al-Karbalāᵓī, *Risāla* in Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, pp. 245-6.

[1286] Mullā Aḥmad Khurāsānī, *Risāla*, in Wardi, *Lamaḥāt*, p. 160.

[1287] Ibid., p. 161.

[1288] Ibid.

[1289] Wardī, *Lamaḥāt*, p. 159.

[1290] Shirazi, *Qayyūm al-asmāᵓ*, f. 56a.

[1291] Wardī, *Lamaḥāt*, p. 159. Presumably Qurrat al-ᶜAyn based this belief on the quasi-Docetic notion that the Imams are supernatural beings who could not actually suffer bodily harm, even if they showed it outwardly.

[1292] Shirazi, letter to Qurrat al-ᶜAyn, in Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, p. 333; idem, *Qayyūm al-asmāᵓ*, f. 104b.

[1293] See letters quoted in al-Karbalāᵓī, *Risāla* in Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq,* p. 247; see also note 1273 above.

[1294] Ibid., pp. 248-50.

[1295] Ibid., p. 252.

[1296] Ibid.

[1297] Shoghi Effendi, *God Passes By* (Wilmette: Bahaᵓi Publishing Committee, 1944), p. 32; Zarandī, *Dawn-Breakers*, p. 295.

[1298] On the orthodoxy of this view in Babi doctrine, Shirazi, *Qayyūm al-asmāᵓ,* f. 103a.

[1299] The original passage may be found in chapter one of the *Furūᶜ al-ᶜAdliyya* (INBA 5010.C, there numbered "chapter seven", p. 94; also the Persian translation there numbered "chapter thirteen", p. 130); it reads: "And among the purified substances in certain verses are those things which have fallen beneath the gaze of the Family of God; even though none of the ulama have mentioned this, nevertheless, the decision rests with him whom God hath caused to witness the creation of the heavens and the earth."

[1300] Kāshānī, *Nuqtat al-Kāf*, pp. 140-1.

[1301] Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, p. 314.

[1302] ᶜAbbās Effendi, *Makātīb-i ᶜAbd al-Bahāᵓ* (Cairo: Maṭbaᶜa Kurdistān al-ᶜIlmiyya, 1330 [1910-21]), vol. 2, p. 255. We can observe an interesting extension of this "charismatic field" (as defined by Berger) in Babism, with the later role of Mullā Ḥusayn Bushrūᵓī and Mullā Muḥammad ᶜAlī Bārfurūshī as the "Qāᵓim-i Khurāsānī" and "Qāᵓim-i Jīlānī" respectively, contemporaneous with the Bab's own claim to *qāᵓimīyya* (see Sayyid Muḥammad Hādī Zavāraᵓī, *Waqāyiᶜ-i mīmiyya* (CUL, Browne Or. MS. F. 28, item 1), pp. 1, 3, 54, 70; idem, *Majlis-i shahādat-i ḥaḍrat-i awwal man*

āmana, Qāʾim-i Khurāsānī (CUL, Browne Or. MS. F. 28, item 2), passim; Luṭf ʿAlī Mīrzā Shīrāzī, *Tārikh-i Vaqāyiʿ-i Mazāndarān* (CUL, Browne Or. MS. F. 28, item 3; available in facsimile in University of Michigan British Manuscript Project 749(4), #3. East Lansing, Mi.: H-Bahai, 2001 at http://www.h-net.org/~bahai/arabic/vol5/lutfali/lutfali.htm.), p. 71 ; Kāshānī, *Nuqṭat al-Kāf*, pp. 152, 154, 181, 199, 202.

[1303] See Qurrat al-ʿAyn letters, quoted in Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, pp. 360, 361, 362.

[1304] Khurāsānī, *Risāla*, in al-Wardi, *Lamaḥāt,* p. 161.

[1305] Shirazi, quoted in Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, pp. 332.

[1306] Ibid., p. 333.

[1307] Mullā Aḥmad continued to play an active, if not very prominent, role in the promulgation of Babism (see Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, pp. 159-60). He was, it seems, arrested for a time as late as 1876, and appears to have died a natural death in 1886. (see ʿ Ishrāq Khāvarī, *Taqvīm*, pp. 93, 106.

[1308] See, in particular her letter printed as an appendix to Gulpāyagānī, *Kashf al-ghiṭāʾ*.

[1309] See ibid, p. 4.

[1310] *Risāla*, in al-Wardī, *Lamaḥāt,* p. 161.

[1311] Kāshānī, *Nuqṭat al-Kāf*, p. 141.

[1312] Qurrat al-ʿAyn letter, quoted in Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, p. 348.

[1313] Shirazi, *Qayyūm al-asmāʾ*, f. 185b.

[1314] Idem, *Dalāʾil-i Sabʿa,* p. 29.

[1315] Idem, *Risāla furūʿ al-ʻAdliyya*, pp. 5-6.

[1316] See account by Ḥājī Mīrzā Ṣādiq Muᶜallim in Balyuzi, *The Bab*, pp. 97-8.

[1317] Shirazi, *Tafsīr Sūrat al-kawthar*, f. 28a.

[1318] Ibid., f. 7b.

[1319] Ibid., f. 11a.

[1320] Letter quoted in Māzandarānī*, Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, p. 344.

[1321] Letter in INBA 7009.C, p. 133.

[1322] Shirazi, *Tafsīr Sūrat al-kawthar*, f. 4b.

[1323] Shirazi, *Qayyūm al-asmāᵓ*, f. 185b.

[1324] A relative of Shaykh Ḥasan Zunūzī and himself an *ᶜālim*, he was executed with the Bab in Tabriz in 1850 (see Māzandarānī*, Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, pp. 27-31.)

[1325] On the important role played by talismans in Babism, see Denis MacEoin, "Nineteenth-Century Babi Talismans", *Studia Iranica* 14:1 (1985), pp.77-98. The article includes several reproductions of *hayākil and dawāᵓir*.

[1326] Mīrzā Muḥammad ᶜAlī Zunūzī, quoted in Māzandarānī*, Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, pp. 31-2.

[1327] Rashīd al-Dīn Faḍl Allāh Hamadānī, *Jāmiᶜ al-tawārikh: qiṣmat-i Ismāᶜīlīyān va Fāṭimīyān va Nizārīyān va Duᶜāyān va Rāfiqān* ed. Muḥammad Taqī Dānish-pizhū, Muḥammad Mudarrisī Zanjānī (Tehran: Bungāh-i Tarjuma va Nashr-i Kitāb, 1338 [1959]), p. 98; Hodgson, *The Order of Assassins*, p. 118.

[1328] Nuqabāᵓī, *Qurrat al-ᶜAyn*, p. 6; on the use of colored inks, see Shirazi, *Qayyūm al-asmāᵓ*, ff. 67a, 162b, 192b; Qurrat al-ᶜAyn, *Risāla*, in Māzandarānī*, Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, p. 345. On the "color motif" in heterodox Iranian movements, see Biancarmia Scarcia Amoretti, "Sects and Heresies,"

in *The Cambridge History of Iran*, vol. 4, *The Period from the Arab Invasion to the Seljuqs*, ed. R. N. Frye (London: Cambridge University Press, 1975), pp. 513-14; Edward Granville Browne, *A Literary History of Persia* (London: T. F. Unwin, 1902), vol. 1, pp. 311-2.

[1329] Qurrat al-ᶜAyn, *Risala* in Gulpāygānī, *Kashf al-ghiṭāᵓ*, pp. 3-4.

[1330] Samandar, *Tārīkh-i Samandar*, p. 349.

[1331] Nuqabā'ī, *Qurrat al-ᶜAyn*, pp. 6-7.

[1332] Zunūzī, quoted in Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, p. 35.

[1333] Shaykh Abū 'l-Thanāᵓ Maḥmūd ibn ᶜAbd Allāh al-Ālūsī, *Rūḥ al-maᶜānī fī tafsīr al-Qurᵓān al-ᶜaẓīm wa 'l-sabᶜ al-mathāni*, quoted in al-Wardī, *Lamaḥāt*, p. 169; cf. Gulpāyagānī, *Kashf al-ghiṭāᵓ*, p. 95.

[1334] Letter quoted in Māzandarānī, *Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, p. 349.

[1335] The verb should, of course, be feminine.

[1336] Ibid.

[1337] The *ḥudūd* are laws for the punishment of "crimes against God" such as adultery, apostasy, theft, or inebriation. Other crimes are dealt with by *taᶜzīr* punishments, wihch are at the discretion of the *qāḍī*.

[1338] See, for example Hodgson, *The Order of Assassins*, pp. 148-9; Bernard Lewis, *The Assassins: A Radical Sect in Islam* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1967), pp. 71-5.

[1339] Hamadānī, *Jāmiᶜ al-tawārikh*, p. 164.

[1340] Quhistani, *Haft Bab*, p. 42.

[1341] ᶜAlāᵓ al-Dīn ᶜAtā Malik Juwaynī, *The Tārīkh-i-Jahan-gusha of ᶜAlaᵓu 'd-Din ᶜAta Malik-i-Juwayni*, ed. Mirza Muḥammad ibn ᶜAbdu'l-Wahhab-i-Qazwini (Leyden: E. J. Brill; London: Luzac, 1912-37), vol. 3, pp. 237-8, trans. as *The History of the World-Conqueror*, trans. John Andrew Boyle

(Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1958), vol. 2, pp. 695-6. See also Ṭūsī, *Rawḍat al-taslīm*, pp. 172-3.

[1342] See Hodgson, *The Order of Assassins*, pp. 151-3. Nāṣir-i Khusraw Qubādhiyānī notes that "he [the Qāʾim] shall first foster the *sharī'a*, then he shall stand in his own station and make manifest the truth" (Nāsir-i Khusraw, *Kitāb-vajh-i dīn* (Berlin: Kaviani, 1343 [1925]), p. 166).

[1343] On the value of the gnostic motif in Shaykhi and Babi doctrine, see Peter L. Berger, "From Sect to Church: A Sociological Interpretation of the Baha'i Movement"; and Peter Smith, "Motif Research: Peter Berger and the Baha'i Faith," pp. 210-34.

[1344] On the relationship of the arcs of descent and ascent to the periods of *nubuwwa* and *wilāya*, see Corbin, *En Islam iranien*, vol. 1, pp. 209, 211, 273.

[1345] The analogy here is with the cycle of the solar year and the twelve lunar months.

[1346] Rashti, *Sharḥ al-qaṣīda* ([Tabriz?: s.n.], 1269 [1853]), quoted in Abū 'l-Faḍl Gulpāyagānī, *Kitāb al-farāʾid* (Cairo: Matbaʿa Hindiyya, 1315 [1897]).

[1347] *Risāla*, in INBA 6003.C, pp. 380-416; this reference, p. 407; cf. pp. 399, 413, 415.

[1348] Ibid., p. 399.

[1349] Ibid., p. 403.

[1350] On the Bab's own use of this title, see Shirazi, *Qayyūm al-asmāʾ*, f. 36a.

[1351] *Risāla*, in INBA 6003.C, p. 408. Kirmānī also makes use of a developed form of this analogy (Kirmānī, *Risāla-yi tīr i shihāb*, pp. 167-77). For the use of a similar analogy in an Ismaili context, see al-Ṭūsī, *Rawḍāt al-taslīm*, pp. 152-3. One might with profit compare Hegel's use of much the same idea in relation to the evolutionary development of the spirit in history (see *Lectures on the Philosophy of World History*, translated by H. B. Nisbet (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975), pp. 129-31.

[1352] *Risāla*, in Māzandarānī*, Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, p. 513.

[1353] See Qurrat al-ᶜAyn, autograph *risāla* ms. in possession of Azalī Babi in Tehran, pp. 19, 22-3 (Photocopy in the author's possession).

[1354] Ibid., pp. 11-12.

[1355] Letter quoted in Māzandarānī*, Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, p. 280. There is an echo here of the recurrent theory of three historical ages, as found in Joachim of Floris (1135-1202) and others, For examples, see Norman Cohen, *The Pursuit of the Millenium: Revolutionary Millenarians and Mystical Anarchists in the Middle Ages*, rev. ed. (London: Maurice Temple Smith, 1970).

[1356] Kirmānī, *Risāla-yi tīr i shihāb*, pp. 178-81.

[1357] Ibid., p. 175.

[1358] Samandar states only "the birthday of the Bab" (1 Muḥarram). I have supplied the year from the fact that he subsequently mentions that this event led to her being sent to Baghdad.

[1359] Samandar, *Tārīkh-i Samandar*, pp. 346-7; cf. p. 78. See also Nūrī, quoted in Ishrāq Khāvarī, *Māᵓida,* vol. 8, pp. 186-7.

[1360] Mullā Aḥmad ibn Ismāᶜīl Khurāsānī *risāla,* quoted in al-Wardī, *Lamaḥāt*, pp. 161-2; ᶜAbbās Effendi, *Tadhkirat al-wafāᵓ*, pp. 271-2, 296-7; Qurrat al-ᶜAyn, *Risāla*, in Māzandarānī*, Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, pp. 350, 354-5.

[1361] ᶜAbbās Effendi, *Tadhkirat al-wafāᵓ*, pp. 296-7.

[1362] *Risāla*, quoted in al-Wardī, *Lamaḥāt*, p. 162. On the abolition of *taqiyya* on the appearance of the Qāᵓim, see al-Qummī, *A Shi'ite Creed*, p. 111.

[1363] *Risāla*, quoted in al-Wardī, *Lamaḥāt*, p. 162.

[1364] Qurrat al-ᶜAyn, *Risāla*, in Māzandarānī*, Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, p. 344.

[1365] Ibid.

[1366] Ibid.

[1367] Ibid., p. 345.

[1368] Ibid., p. 346.

[1369] Ibid.

[1370] Ibid.

[1371] Ibid., p. 350.

[1372] See Zarandī, *Dawn-Breakers*, pp. 292-8 (and note the reference to explicit antinomianism on p. 298); Māzandarānī*, Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, pp. 109-12; Joseph Arthur, comte de Gobineau, *Les Religions et les Philosophies dans l'Asie Centrale*, 10th ed. (Paris: Gallimard, 1957), pp. 165-9; Nicolas, *Séyyèd Ali Mohammed, dit le Bâb*, chapter 4.

[1373] Māzandarānī*, Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, pp. 69-72, 164-6.

[1374] See for example al-Baghdādī, *Risāla amrīyya*, pp. 109-110; Samandar, *Tārīkh-i Samandar*, p. 80; Zarandī, *Dawn-Breakers*, pp. 297, 461; Māzandarānī*, Ẓuhūr al-ḥaqq*, p. 58.

[1375] As late as 1307/1890, Hamadānī was obliged, in his *Kitāb al-ijtināb*, to refute the claim that "the Babi sect is accounted as belonging to the Shaykhi school" (p. 144).

[1376] Shirazi, *Tafsīr Sūrat al-kawthar*, f. 6b.

[1377] Ibid., f. 11B.

[1378] Ibid., f. 24a.

[1379] Ibid., f. 25a.

[1380] Kirmānī, *Risāla dar radd-i Bāb*, p. 45.

[1381] Ibid., p. 46.

[1382] Ibid.

[1383] This *ziyārartnāma* may be found in CUL Browne F. 20 ff. 85b-87b.

[1384] The widening of the Bab's appeal and the decrease in the numerical importance of Shaykhis within the Babi movement is noted by Moojan Momen in "The Social Basis of the Babi Upheavals in Iran (1848-1853): A Preliminary Analysis," *International Journal of Middle East Studies* (Cambridge) vol. 15 (1983), pp. 157-83.

[1385] I use "sect" advisedly: early Baha'ism is simply an offshoot of Babism for some time; later, in various phases, it seeks to take on the quality of an independent religion, though its current status is closer to that of a New Religious Movement, as defined by modern sociologists of religion.

[1386] This latter point is discussed in Ann K. S. Lambton, "A Reconsideration of the Position of the Marjaᶜ al-Taqlīd and the Religious Institution," *Studia Islamica* (Paris) vol. 20 (1964), pp. 115-35.