

name like 'Ukayl. The harbour is said to have belonged to the pre-Islamic Katabān [q.v.], then to the so-called Gebanites and finally to the Ḥimyārites. Its name is also connected with Mahra b. Ḥaydān b. 'Amr b. al-Ḥāf, the ancestor of the Mahra [q.v.].

The cape was acquired from the local sultan by the French admiral Mahé La Bourdonnais in 1734. Napoleon Bonaparte wished to garrison the cape, a proposal which was also suggested by the French government to Muḥammad 'Alī Paṣha [q.v.]. When the latter was preparing to put the plan into force in 1838, he encountered the resolute opposition of the British, who occupied Aden in 1839 and established a coaling station on Mayyūn (Perīm) in 1857. The cape was bought from the local sultan 'Alī Tabat by a Marseilles firm, and turned over to the Société de Bāb al-Mandab in 1871. In 1884 the harbour was occupied by the Turks, who fortified the cape, notwithstanding continuous but fruitless attempts by the French to enforce their claims. Al-Shaykh Sa'id was bombarded by the British in 1914, but the Turks held out, being supported in 1915 by troops sent by the Zaydī Imām Yahyā b. al-Manṣūr. The Turks even bombarded Mayyūn and temporarily closed the Straits of Bāb al-Mandab.

Bibliography: H. von Maltzan, *Reise nach Südarabien*, Braunschweig 1873, 384-5; A. Sprenger, *Die alte Geographie Arabiens*, Amsterdam 1966, 67, 77; M. Hartmann, *Der Islamische Orient*, Leipzig 1909, ii, 153, 417-18, 469; W. Schmidt, *Das südwestliche Arabien. Angewandte Geographie*, Frankfurt a.M. 1913, iv, part 8, 78-9; F. Stuhlmann, *Der Kampf um Arabien zwischen der Türkei und England. Hamburgische Forschungen*, Brunswick 1916, 113-20; G.W. Bury, *Arabia Infelix or the Turks in Yemen*, London 1915, 17, 27, map opp. p. 20; A. Grohmann, *Südarabien als Wirtschaftsgebiet*, 2 vols., Vienna 1922-33, i, 168, 185; British Admiralty, *A handbook of Arabia*, London 1920, 174.

(A. GROHMANN-[E. VAN DONZEL])

SHAYKH AL-ṬĀ'IFA (see AL-ṬŪṢĪ, MUḤAMMAD B. AL-HASANĪ).

AL-SHAYKH AL-YŪNĀNĪ, the disguise of one of the participants in the transmission of authoritative Neoplatonic thought to Islam based upon a translation of large portions of books IV-VI of the *Enneads* of Plotinus. Fragments with this designation have been recovered without, however, allowing a reconstruction of the form and extent of his work. It is also debatable whether al-Shaykh al-Yūnānī was substituting for the name of a given philosopher and even might have belonged to the entire lost Arabic Plotinus source. The wide range of meaning of *shaykh* [q.v.] permits a choice between "Greek Teacher" and "Greek Old Man"; occasional Greek references to some Neoplatonists as *gerōn*, among them Porphyry (see Kutsch), might perhaps tip the scales in favour of "Old Man", whether Porphyry's role in the Arabic Plotinus reflects historical links [see FURFŪRIYŪS] or not (see Zimmermann). In addition to the fragments from the *Enneads*, al-Shaykh al-Yūnānī is credited with a brief treatise on topics of Neoplatonic philosophy. In this case, as well as in other references, there can hardly be any doubt that he was understood to be one and same person, even where he is brought into contact with ancient philosophers or, rather mysteriously, is described as a pupil of Diogenes (see *Sūwān al-ḥikma*, ed. D.M. Dunlop, 56-7, 58-61). The manifold problems connected with this figure cannot be separated from the entire complicated and fateful history of the Arabic Plotinus, for which see UṬŪLŪDIYĀ.

Bibliography: F. Rosenthal, *al-Ṣayḥ al-Yūnānī and the Arabic Plotinus source*, in *Orientalia*, N.S. xxi (1952), xxii (1953), xxiv (1955), repr. in idem, *Greek philosophy in the Arab world*, Variorum, Aldershot 1990, no. III; complete tr. by G. Lewis, in vol. ii of the ed. of the *Enneads* by F. Henry and H.-R. Schwyzer, Paris-Brussels 1959, see pp. xxxii-xxxiv of the preface; 'Abd al-Rahmān Badawī, *Plotinus apud Arabes*, Cairo 1955, 184-98; W. Kutsch, *Ein arabisches Bruchstück aus Porphyrios (?) Peri psychēs und die Frage des Verfassers der "Theologie des Aristoteles"*, in *MFOB*, xxxi (1954), 265-86; F.W. Zimmermann, *The origins of the so-called Theology of Aristotle*, in J. Kraye, W.F. Ryan, and C.B. Schmitt (eds.), *Pseudo-Aristotle in the Middle Ages*, London 1986, 110-240.

(F. ROSENTHAL)

SHAYKHIYYA, an important school of speculative theology within Twelver Shī'ism, influential mainly in Persia and 'Irāk since the early 19th century. Although at times its leaders have been excommunicated and its doctrines condemned as heretical, Shaykhism (also known as the *Kashfiyya*) has accommodated itself fairly successfully with the majority Uṣūlī establishment and is generally regarded as a school (*madhhab*) rather than a sect (*firka*). Bābism [see BĀB, BĀBĪS] began in the 1840s as a radical development of *Shaykhī* heterodoxy.

1. Early history.

The origins of *Shaykhism* are to be found in a highly original attempt to effect a synthesis between (1) the theosophical Shī'ism of Mullā Ṣadrā Shīrāzī [q.v.] and the School of Iṣfāhān, (2) the waning *Akhbārī* tendency, and (3) what Amanat calls a "diffuse gnosticism", influenced by crypto-Ismā'īlī and related ideas. Later *Shaykhī* doctrine owes much to a wish to play down the school's own distinctiveness and effect a compromise with the Uṣūlī establishment.

The school's originator, *Shaykh* Ahmad al-Aḥsā'ī (1166-1241/1753-1826 [q.v.]), is still reckoned one of the leading Shī'ī 'ulamā' of the early *Kādjār* period, and a thinker of considerable force. His early life in al-Aḥsā', a backwater with few provisions for religious learning, was unpropitious for one with ambitions to scholarship; but by the time of his arrival in the Shī'ī shrine colleges of 'Irāk in the early 1790s, he already possessed a prodigious knowledge, not only of *fiqh* and *kalām*, but of the theosophical texts that were to form the basis of a wide-ranging critique in later years.

More importantly, he had experienced numerous dreams and visions, chiefly of the Imāms, allowing him to claim privileged understanding of the *Qur'ān* and Traditions. This claim to intuitive knowledge sets al-Aḥsā'ī apart from the representatives of the two main currents of Shī'ī thinking then contending for dominance: the Uṣūlīs, with their emphasis on *idjtiḥād* through reasoning, and the *Akhbārīs* [see *AKHBĀRIYYA* in Suppl.], who stressed a literal adherence to the texts themselves, without recourse to *idjtiḥād*.

Having acquired licences from several eminent *muḍj-tahids*, in 1221/1806 al-Aḥsā'ī travelled to Persia. Here he remained for almost twenty years, patronised by Faṭḥ 'Alī Shāh [q.v.] and a succession of *Kādjār* notables. He lived mainly in Yazd (1806-14) and Kirmānshāh (1814-21), where he enjoyed the patronage of Muḥammad 'Alī Mirzā and wrote some of his most important books, including the *Sharḥ al-ziyāra al-ḡāmi'a al-kabīra* (his *magnum opus*) and commentaries on the *Risāla al-ilmīyya* of Muḥsin Fayḍ al-Kāshānī and the *Arḥḥīyya* and *Mashā'ir* of Mullā Ṣadrā.

In 1822 in Kazwīn, al-Aḥsā'ī first encountered a

charge of apostasy, and in the last four years of his life, spent largely in Karbalā', he became the object of a campaign of vilification. He died on his way to Mecca on 21 Dhu 'l-Ḳa'da 1241/27 June 1826, aged seventy-three.

Al-Aḥsā'ī was succeeded in Karbalā' by a younger Persian disciple, Sayyid Kāzim Raṣṡṡī (d. 1259/1844; birth dates range from 1198/1784 to 1214/1799-1800 [q.v.]), like his mentor the product of a non-clerical family. Raṣṡṡī remained in Karbalā' until his death and, despite repeated denials that he had established a new *madhhab* within Islam and insistence that he was no more than an expounder and defender of the views of al-Aḥsā'ī, became an effective focus for the allegiance of a small but influential grouping of 'ulamā' and laymen. A school had effectively been created: on Raṣṡṡī's death, his followers split into radically different factions. This division, which has recently been studied in some detail by Amanat, Bayat, and MacEoin, is of wide significance, since it encapsulates some of the most important tensions in Ḳādjār Shī'ism.

The two most extreme divisions to emerge after 1844 were Bābism, which rapidly outgrew its Shaykhī origins to proclaim a new revelation and a new *Shari'a*, and a conservative branch based in Tabriz. This latter group included leading 'ulamā', merchants, government officials, and notables; after a period of wholesale separation from the religious mainstream, it merged with it and lost its character as a distinct school.

The successive claims of Sayyid 'Alī Muḥammad Shīrāzī, the Bāb [q.v.], were a logical development of several strains in Shaykhī thinking, most importantly the emphasis on intuitive knowledge and the concept of a single individual, the Perfect Shī'ī or *bāb*, who could act as an infallible guide to the Imām. Both al-Aḥsā'ī and Raṣṡṡī seem to have been regarded (and to have regarded themselves) in this light; the latter divided the dispensation of Islam into two distinct periods: a cycle of outward observances (which came to an end after twelve centuries) and one of inner truth (which began with the appearance of al-Aḥsā'ī).

2. Kirmānī Shaykhism.

The Bāb's chief rival for the allegiance of the school was Ḥādjī Muḥammad Karīm Khān Kirmānī (1225-88/1810-70), the eldest son of Ibrāhīm Khān Zahr al-Dawla, the governor of Kirmān and Balūcīstān (1803-24) and one of al-Aḥsā'ī's leading patrons in Persia. A member of the ruling Ḳādjār family by birth and marriage, Karīm Khān rose as a religious leader in the Kirmān region was both strengthened and complicated by his position as the senior member of the powerful Ibrāhīmī clan and his control of its financial resources. The history of Kirmānī Shaykhism is closely linked both to the fortunes of the Ibrāhīmī family and wider political developments.

A prolific writer and would-be polymath, Karīm Khān sought to reconcile Shaykhī teaching with Uṣūlī orthodoxy, insisting that the school agreed in all its main principles (*uṣūl*) with traditional Shī'ī doctrine, while differing only in practice (*furū'*). The clear heterodoxy of the Bāb and his followers was both an impetus to this policy and an aid in furthering it. Hence his ambivalence over the doctrine of the Fourth Support (*al-rukn al-rābi'*), with which he became particularly associated. In a novel reworking of the traditional five bases of religion (divine unity, prophethood, resurrection, divine justice, and the imamate), Kirmānī reduced them to three (knowledge of God, prophethood, and *imāma*) and added a fourth pillar, knowledge of the friends and enemies of the Imams. In its original formulation, this doctrine leaned towards

recognition of a single, divinely-appointed mediator between the Imām and the faithful (identified with al-Aḥsā'ī, Raṣṡṡī, and, it would seem, Kirmānī himself). Later, however, almost certainly as a reaction to the Bāb's advancement of similar claims, this was modified to a more general advocacy of the 'ulamā' and other holy figures as representatives of the Imām. In many respects, this debate prefigures that around Khumaynī's concept of *wilāyat al-fakīh* and whether its application should be to a single individual or a collective body of *mudjtahids*.

Kirmānī's most significant break with the doctrine of an inspired guide came, however, with his appointment of his own son, Muḥammad Khān (1263-1324/1846-1906) and the creation of a spiritual dynasty similar to those found in Ṣūfism. Leadership of the school was passed down through a series of Ibrāhīmī khāns (generally known by the title Sarkār Akā): Ḥādjī Zayn al-'Ābidīn Khān (1276-1360/1859-1942), Abu 'l-Kāsim Khān (1314-89/1896-1969), and 'Abd al-Riḍā Khān (d. 1979). This period saw mounting conservatism, particularly with regard to social reform and acceptance of Western ideas. Bayat speaks of intellectual stagnation in a situation where original Shaykhī doctrine was taught privately while public profession was made of orthodoxy (Bayat, 181).

During the leadership of Ḥādjī Muḥammad Khān, tension between Shaykhīs and their opponents, known as Bālāsari, erupted into violence on several occasions, culminating in virtual civil war in 1905 (MacEoin, *Bālāsari*). Identification of the Shaykhīs with Ḳādjār interests, and Muḥammad Khān's own hard-line royalist stance, encouraged a widening of the issues to a point where the original dispute was eclipsed by growing agitation for a constitution.

Following the assassination of 'Abd al-Riḍā Khān in the aftermath of the Iranian revolution of 1979, the headquarters of the school was moved to Baṣra in 'Irāq, where leadership passed to Ḥādjī Sayyid 'Alī Mūsawī.

At its height in the last century, Shaykhism was an influential school with converts in all the main Persian cities, 'Irāq, India, and eastern Arabia. In Persia, the membership included high-ranking government officials and even Muẓaffar al-Dīn Shāh [q.v.]: in this respect, it appears to have been an acceptable alternative to Ṣūfism, following the collapse of the Nī'matullāhī revival of the early 19th century.

3. Doctrine.

In broad terms, Shaykhī doctrine differs very little from that of orthodox Twelver Shī'ism, and is generally little further from it than the views of the theological thinkers: if anything, al-Aḥsā'ī and Raṣṡṡī made greater efforts than Ṣadrā and his followers to remain part of the official religious system. Despite an obvious debt to Ibn al-'Arabī and the Shī'ī theorists, al-Aḥsā'ī disagreed with them on several important issues, in particular the doctrine of the oneness of existence (*wahdat al-wuḍūd*). Since God remains ontologically separate from and inaccessible to creation, al-Aḥsā'ī emphasised the role of the prophets and imāms as intermediaries between the divine and human worlds. Within this context, he regarded the imāms as the four causes of creation: active (they are the locations of the divine will); material (all things have been created from the rays of their lights); formal (God created the forms of all creatures from the lights of their forms); and final (God created all things for their sake).

It was this view that led to one of the earliest arguments against al-Aḥsā'ī, namely, that he held the

imāms to be creators instead of God. Although he denied this criticism in its extreme form, and argued that his views were based on well-known traditions, there is no doubt that the imāms and their role as manifestations of the divinity played a central role in his theology. Belief in the necessity for the continuing presence of an imām combined with al-Aḥsā'ī's own conviction of the possibility of visionary contact and inspiration to produce a central doctrinal focus on intermediacy in each generation.

This itself led to the view that religious truth has developed through the ages, mankind being likened to a growing child in need of progressively stronger diets. Alongside the idea of an age of inner truth succeeding one of outward observance, Shaykhī teaching proposed that humanity had either come of age or was about to do so—a doctrine which had its strongest impact on Bābism and its successor, Bahā'ism [q.v.].

Raṣṭī's belief that a new age of spirituality had started with al-Aḥsā'ī seems to have given rise to speculation within the school as to the possibility of the advent of the Twelfth Imām's imminent advent, but how extensive such chiliastic expectation really was it is very hard to establish. The Kirmānī Shaykhīs naturally play down all suggestions of messianism, while modern Bahā'īs exaggerate its role on the basis of oral statements. In their writings, both al-Aḥsā'ī and Raṣṭī adopt a conventional attitude to the question of the Imām's return. Nevertheless, the fact that Raṣṭī's death was immediately followed by a frantic outburst of millenarianism suggests that, at the very least, talk of living gates to the Imām had excited speculation that the Mahdī himself might soon make his appearance.

In their lifetimes, however, orthodox criticism of al-Aḥsā'ī and Raṣṭī found a particular focus in the former's teaching on the eschatology of the individual. In several works—notably the *Sharḥ al-ziyāra*—he developed an original doctrine of resurrection based on a complex system of physical and spiritual bodies (for details, see MacEoin, *Cosmology*, Corbin, *Terre céleste*, 146-74). According to this scheme, man possesses four bodies: two *djasad* and two *djism*. For the orthodox, the crucial problem with this system, which involves resurrection in an interworld known as Hūrkalāyā, was its denial of a return for the first *djasad*, the fleshy body of terrestrial elements. Although the Shaykhī doctrine does not entirely spiritualise the process of resurrection, it tended to be interpreted in that way by the school's opponents.

4. Literature.

The corpus of written materials produced by the school's leadership is enormous, although very little has been penned by adherents. A great deal still exists only in manuscript form, although the Shaykhī community of Kirmān has made microfilm copies of all the originals in its own library. Their Sa'adat Press has published reliable editions of works by all the *shaykhs*, amounting to several hundred volumes, and plans to issue more. A full bibliography of Shaykhī writing from al-Aḥsā'ī to Abu 'l-Kāsim Khān may be found in the latter's *Fihrist*, to which Momen's *The works of Shaykh Ahmad al-Aḥsā'ī* is useful addition.

Bibliography: Shaykh Ahmad b. Zayn al-Dīn al-Aḥsā'ī, *Djawāmi' al-kalim*, 2 vols., Tabriz 1273/1856-7, 1276/1860 (94 treatises); idem, *Sharḥ al-ziyāra al-djāmi'a al-kabira*, new ed., 4 vols., Kirmān 1355-6 Sh./1976-7; Sayyid Kāzīm Raṣṭī, *Dalil al-mutahayyirīn*, n.p. 1276/1859-60; Shaykh 'Abd Allāh Aḥsā'ī, *Sharḥ-i ḥālāt-i Shaykh Ahmad al-Aḥsā'ī*, Bombay 1309/1892-3 (the main biographical source); H. 'A.

Mahfūz (ed.), *Sirat Shaykh Ahmad al-Aḥsā'ī*, Baghdad 1376/1957 (autobiographical accounts); H. Corbin, *Terre céleste et corps de résurrection de l'Iran Mazdeén à l'Iran Shi'ite*, Paris 1960, Eng. tr. *Spiritual body and celestial earth: from Mazdean Iran to Shi'ite Iran*, Princeton 1977 (contains translations from works by several Shaykhī leaders); idem, *L'école shaykhie en théologie shi'ite*, in *Annuaire de l'École Pratique des Hautes Etudes, Section des Sciences Religieuses* (1960-1); Hādīdj Muhammad Karīm Khān Kirmānī, *Irshād al-awāmm; G. Scarcia, Kerman 1905: La "guerra tra Seiji e Bālāsari"*, in *AIUON*, N.S., xiii (1963), 195-238; M. Muddarrisi Cahārdīhī, *Shaykhigari, Bābigari*, Tehran 1352 Sh./1972; Abu 'l-Kāsim b. Zayn al-'Ābidīn Khān Kirmānī, *Fihrist-i kutub-i Shaykh Ahmad Aḥsā'ī wa sā'ir mashāyikh-i 'izām*, Kirmān 1977 (comprehensive biobibliographical information); D. MacEoin, *From Shaykhism to Babism: a study in charismatic renewal in Shi'ī Islam*, Ph.D. diss. Cambridge University 1979; idem, *Elr*, art. *Aḥsā'ī*, *Shaikh Ahmad b. Zayn-al-Din*; idem, *Elr*, art. *Bālāsari*; idem, *Elr*, art. *Cosmology in Shaykhism*; V. Rafati, *The development of Shaykhī thought in Shi'ī Islam*, Ph.D. diss. UCLA 1979; Mangol Bayat, *Mysticism and dissent: socioreligious thought in Qajar Iran*, Syracuse 1982, chs. 2, 3 and *passim*; Abbas Amanat, *Resurrection and renewal: the making of the Babi movement in Iran, 1844-1850*, Ithaca & London 1989, chs. 1, 6; M. Momen, *The works of Shaykh Ahmad al-Aḥsā'ī: a bibliography*, Baha'ī Studies Bulletin Monograph no. 1 [1992]. (D. MacEoin).

SHAYKHŪ, LUWĪS, conventionally L. CHEIKHO, with the correct name Rizk Allāh b. Yūsuf b. 'Abd al-Masīh b. Ya'kūb (1859-1927), Jesuit scholar and polygraph. He was the author of many works on Arabic language and literature, especially, Christian Arabic, and founder of the journal *al-Mashriq*. Originally from upper Mesopotamia, he spent most of his life in Beirut.

Born at Mārdīn [q.v.], now in Turkey, he came to Beirut at the age of nine for secondary education. He entered the Jesuit order in 1874, studied for four years in France, and on his return to Lebanon, taught in the Jesuit secondary school in Beirut where he began publication of his *Madjāni al-adab*. After further studies at the Université de Saint-Joseph, in England, Austria and Paris, where he became familiar with libraries there and with current orientalist scholarship, he returned in 1894 to Beirut and stayed there substantially until his death, devoting himself to work on Arabic language and literature and to editing *al-Mashriq*, founded by him in 1898.

A catalogue of his impressive literary output, virtually exhaustive, has been given by C. Hechaïmé, his successor as editor of *al-Mashriq*, in his *Bibliographie analytique du Père Louis Cheikho, avec introd. et index*, Beirut 1979, which also includes (161-78) everything which had until then appeared on Shaykhū, during his lifetime and afterwards, and in both the Arab world and that of Orientalist scholarship.

Of his 2,750 writings, the greater part of which—though not the most important—appeared in *al-Mashriq*, some 979 titles are devoted to Christianity and its writings, not directly concerned with Arabic studies. But his major works included his anthology of Arabic literature, the *Madjāni al-adab fi ḥadā'iq al-'Arab*, Beirut 1882-3, 6 vols.; his *Sharḥ* on it, 3 vols.; and its *Fahāris*. The whole work had a great success, with many editions. He edited, from manuscript, the Arabic version of *Kalīla wa-Dimna* [q.v.] (1905), the *diwāns* of Abu 'l-'Atāhiyya (1886, 1887), of al-Khansā', and above all, of the *Ḥamāsa* of al-Buḥturī (1910). In the