

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Analysis of the Jurisprudential Approach of the Sheikhism School of Karim Khaniyyah Kerman in Comparison with the Akhbari School

Iman. Zeajaldi¹, Nader Mokhtari. Afrakati^{2*}, Abdolreza Mohammad. Hosseinzadeh³, Abdul Mahdi. Arabshahi Moghadam⁴

¹ PhD student, Department of Jurisprudence and Fundamentals of Islamic Law, Faculty of Theology, University of Sistan and Baluchestan, Zahedan, Iran

² Assistant Professor, Department of Jurisprudence and Fundamentals of Islamic Law, Faculty of Theology, University of Sistan and Baluchestan, Zahedan, Iran

³ Associate Professor, Department of Theology, Faculty of Law and Theology, Shahid Bahonar University, Kerman, Iran

⁴ Assistant Professor, Department of Fiqh and Fundamentals of Islamic Law, Faculty of Theology, Law and Islamic Studies, University of Sistan and Baluchestan, Zahedan, Iran

Received: 2024-07-11

Revised: 2024-09-19

Accepted: 2024-09-26

Published: 2024-10-01

EDITOR:

Sandeep Kotwal^{id}

Knowledge Management Division, National Health Systems Resource Centre, Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, New Delhi, India. Email: sandkotwal@gmail.com

REVIEWER 1:

Kaushalya Koralage^{id}

Assistant Lecturer in Sociology at University of Colombo, Colombo, Sri Lanka. Email: koralage@iouc.cmb.ac.lk

REVIEWER 2:

Vanessa Indama^{id}

Public Administration Department, Basilan State College, Isabela City, Basilan, Philippines. Email: vanesindama@gmail.com

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The opening sentence establishes the foundation of the Akhbari school by mentioning Mirza Muhammad Amin Isfahani. However, it would benefit from a brief contextual background of the historical and intellectual climate of the early 11th century AH to better situate Isfahani's contributions within the broader Shia jurisprudential discourse.

The distinction between the two meanings of "Akhbari" is crucial. It is recommended to provide a clearer delineation or possibly introduce subheadings to separate these definitions, ensuring readers can easily follow the nuanced usage throughout the paper.

The introduction of the Sheikhism school associated with Ahmad ibn Zayn al-Din al-Ahsa'i is well-placed. However, elaborating on the specific theological and philosophical divergences that set Sheikhism apart from both Akhbari and Usuli schools would strengthen the comparative framework of the paper.

The paper references several primary sources, such as works by Kermani. Ensuring that direct quotes from these sources are accurately translated and contextually analyzed would enhance the reliability and depth of the analysis.

The explanation of the "methods of correcting reports" within Sheikhism is pivotal. Strengthening this argument with counterpoints from Usuli perspectives would provide a more balanced and critical analysis.

The section on the "Tasdid" theory is comprehensive. However, integrating scholarly critiques or alternative interpretations of this theory from both Akhbari and Usuli scholars would present a more nuanced view and anticipate potential counterarguments.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The citation style appears inconsistent (e.g., "Bahraani, 1984, 2003"). It would enhance the manuscript's professionalism to adopt a standardized citation format, such as APA or Chicago, and apply it uniformly across all references.

When introducing Shaykh Yusuf Bahrani as a well-known Akhbari scholar, consider adding more information about his specific contributions to Akhbari thought to underscore his significance beyond his reference to al-Kulayni.

The transition from Akhbari dominance to Usuli resurgence is mentioned briefly. Expanding this section with more detailed analysis of the socio-political factors that facilitated this shift would provide a deeper understanding of the dynamics between the two schools.

The introduction mentions a gap in scholarly work regarding Sheikhism's unique jurisprudential views. Including a more comprehensive literature review section that critically examines existing studies and explicitly highlights this gap would reinforce the paper's contribution to the field.

The assertion that both Akhbari and Shaykhi schools reject reason as an independent source is well-articulated. Including specific examples of legal rulings where this rejection is evident would solidify the argument and demonstrate practical implications.

This section effectively contrasts Akhbari and Shaykhi positions. To enhance clarity, consider structuring the arguments into subpoints or bullet lists to distinctly highlight the similarities and differences between the two schools.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

2. Revised

Editor's decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.