



Fayḍ Kāshānī's Hidden Words as a Sufi Text: A Brief Discussion*

*

In writing this introduction, I have adapted a previous published article of mine: 'Revealing Revisions: Fayḍ al-Kāshānī's four versions of al-Kalimāt al-maknūnah,' Iranian Studies 47:2 (2014), pp. 241-262.

Cyrus Ali Zargar

associate professor of religion at Augustana
College in Rock Island.
Cyrus.Zargar@ucfedu

Abstract

The Safavid-era Persian Shiite cleric and sage Dayd Kashani was both a disciple and a son-in-law of the Shiite philosopher Mulla Sadra Shirazi. Fayd Kashani who was an accomplished scholar made an expert in various branches of Islamic scholarship. His inclination toward what was then known as sufism turned to be in the realm of mysticism proper, plus his keen interest in adopting an intellectual approach to the Holy Quran and hadith sources. A pivotal book of his has been al-Kalimat al-Maknunah (Hidden Words) that has received several expositions, editions, and translations.

Keywords: Fayd Kashani, Safavid era, mysticism, intellectual approach, Shiism, Iran.



Arguably the most celebrated Safavid crossover text—incorporating elements of Mullā Ṣadrā’s philosophy, Shiite narrations, and Sufi writings—is *Kalimāt Maknūnah min ‘ulūm ahl al-ḥikmah wa-l-ma‘rifah wa aqwālihim*, which can be translated as ‘Hidden Words from the Sciences of the People of Wisdom and Intimate Knowledge of God and from Their Sayings.’ Its author is the Safavid-era scholar Muḥammad b. Murtaḍā b. Maḥmūd, widely known as Mullā Muḥsin Fayḍ al-Kāshānī (d. 1090 AH/1679). Born to a scholarly family, Fayḍ benefited from his father’s private library and his maternal uncle’s instruction before he sought training in the religious sciences of his day in Isfahan, Mecca, Qum, and Shiraz, settling back in his hometown Kashan after serving as the Friday Prayer leader in Isfahan under the rule of Shāh ‘Abbās II.⁽¹⁾ Fayḍ’s place in Shiite intellectual history was largely secured on account of his massive hadith commentary, *al-Wāfi*, which was the standard comprehensive source used in the study of hadith for almost two centuries

before being replaced by the *Wasā'il al-shī'ah* of al-Ḥurr al-‘Āmilī (d. 1099 AH/ 1688).⁽²⁾ Yet, apart from hadiths, Fayḍ left his mark on every major religious branch of knowledge, composing over one hundred titles on topics as varied as Quranic exegesis, jurisprudence, ethics, Sufi cosmology, theology, and philosophy, as well as a substantial collection of poems.⁽³⁾ He had the distinction of being the most eminent student and son-in-law of Twelver Shiites' most eminent philosopher and one of the most important philosophers in the history of Islam, Muhammad b. Ibrāhīm al-Shīrāzī, known as Mullā Ṣadrā (d. 1045 AH/ 1635-6).

The text, *Kalimāt makhnūnah*, tends to arouse interest. This is because, while grounded in Shiite hadith, it is Fayḍ's most explicitly 'Sufi' work. Indeed, while one cannot doubt Fayḍ's Sufi proclivities, the text might hint at a much closer affiliation with Sufism rather than a mere academic or literary interest, especially when seen in the light of other elements of Fayḍ's life: His practice of spiritual exercises under Mullā Ṣadrā's guidance in order to realize spiritual realities, his sympathy with the cosmology of the foremost Sufi theorist Muḥyi al-Dīn ibn al-‘Arabī, his advocacy of music, his use of sources by mainstays of Sufi reading lists, such as Abū Ḥāmid al-Ghazālī, Mawlānā Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī, and ‘Abd al-Raḥmān Jāmī, coupled with his rumoured appointment as *khalīfah* within the Nūrbakhshīyyah Order.⁽⁴⁾ On the other hand, the vociferous protests against assertions of Fayḍ's association with *ṭarīqah*-style Sufism—most notably made by his student Sayyid Ni‘matallāh Jazā'irī (d. 1112 AH/ 1700-1)—have successfully placed Fayḍ's legacy within the context of an innocuous Shiite mysticism mostly safe from the controversies of Sufism (*taṣawwuf*).⁽⁵⁾

Applying the term 'Sufi' to Fayḍ's *al-Kalimāt al-makhnūnah* is fraught with historical complications, as Todd Lawson has shown, mainly because Fayḍ's book is both distinctively Shiite and fixed within the cosmological framework of Mullā Ṣadrā.⁽⁶⁾ On the

other hand, claims that the author, hence his work, had absolutely no association with something called ‘Sufism’ seem simplistic at best.⁽⁷⁾ This is especially true because the idea of an authentic Shiite mysticism, distinct from Sufism, was only beginning to develop in Fayḍ’s lifetime, as it can be deduced from both the recent work of ‘Aṭā Anzalī on the Safavid origins of a concept Shiite *‘irfān*, and Fayḍ’s own writings.⁽⁸⁾ Indeed, it is only toward the end of his own life, with revisions he makes to this text, that Fayḍ might be said to refashion his relationship with Sufism.

Fayḍ’s distinction—early on in his career, near the time when he wrote *al-Kalimāt al-maknūnah*—seems to have been not between Sufism and *‘irfān*, but between ‘true Sufism’ and ‘false Sufism.’⁽⁹⁾ Thus, accusations against those inclined to practices associated with Sufism formed a set of questions to which Fayḍ responded sometime after 1052/1642-3 in his *Muḥākamah bayn al-mutaṣawwifah wa ghayrihim*. Fayḍ defends this Sufi-associated group (whom he calls the ‘ascetics,’ *zuhhād*, and ‘worshippers,’ *‘ubbād*) and divorces them from those whom he describes as false claimants to Sufism. In this treatise, Fayḍ tries to set up a balanced, ethical approach to resolving the tension between the scholars (*‘ulamā’*) and the ascetics. Concerning the false claimants to Sufism, Fayḍ does condemn their loud *dhikr*, their adding words to the *tahlīl* (the declaration ‘There does not exist any deity save God’), and their use of poetry and inappropriate suggestions about Sufi cosmology, statements that ‘everything is one,’ which ‘they do not understand’ but have ‘heard from others and adopted in blind imitation, while it is completely unknown to them what others meant by it.’⁽¹⁰⁾ The problem, clearly, is not Sufism, but feigning claimants to Sufism. To take issue with false Sufis is a very Sufi stance, since at least the time when ‘Ali b. Aḥmad al-Būshanjī (d. 348 AH/ 959-60) famously declared Sufism to have become ‘a name without a reality, but it used to be a reality without a name.’⁽¹¹⁾

Also in the earlier stage of his career, around the year 1060 AH/ 1650 when he composed *al-Kalimāt al-tarīfah*, Fayḍ repudiates *pretenders* to Sufism, although notably, again, not Sufis themselves.⁽¹²⁾ In this treatise, Fayḍ Kāshānī criticizes those who call themselves ‘shaykh’ or ‘dervish,’ haughtily thinking they have grasped enough from Sufism (*al-taṣawwuf*) and God-becoming (*al-ta’alluh*) to achieve whatever they wish simply through their attention or supplication, vying in arrogance with other such shaykhs. Fayḍ blames them for their practice of a forty-day retreat (*khalwah*) in a dark room, for their avoiding meat and sleep. He also criticizes those ‘called the people of *dhikr* and Sufism,’ who mix poetry and *ghinā’* (forbidden music), make moaning and braying sounds, dance, clap, remember God too loudly, and generally replace normative (*sunnah*) practices with heresies.⁽¹³⁾ While he takes issue with distinctively Sufi practices, he does seem to retain the idea that there can be a mystical tradition devoid of such practices, aligned with the normative words and deeds of the Prophet Muḥammad and his family, and yet enriched by the visionary insights of bygone Sufi masters. Only in hindsight can we call that tradition ‘*irfān*. It is quite likely that Fayḍ would have called it ‘true Sufism,’ even though his focus—in *al-Kalimāt al-maknūnah*—is on the word *ma’rifah*, a word meaning ‘intimate knowledge’ of God, in reference to the end-goal of Sufi exercises and contemplation.

Is ma’rifah Kāshānī’s term for ‘irfān?’

Important changes to the world of Shiite scholarship were occurring in Fayḍ’s lifetime. There was an increasing concern with measuring the fruits of study and contemplation against the hadiths left by the family and descendants of the Prophet Muḥammad. The decline of Sufi orders in the Safavid Iran meant

that Sufism was increasingly becoming associated with antinomian and idiosyncratic expressions of religion, such as wandering dervishes, as Anzali shows.⁽¹⁴⁾ Eventually, this depiction of Sufism led to the creation of a term to describe legitimate expressions of Twelver Shiite mysticism, as well as the study of Sufi texts and concepts within a Shiite context, *'irfān*. Although the major shift in language happens after Fayḍ's lifetime, one might argue that there is some degree of care in *al-Kalimāt al-maknūnah*. His focus on the word *ma'rifah* instead of *taṣawwuf* might indicate such caution, but it might also be simply a more accurate description of the book's epistemological aims; the book introduces key doctrinal and cosmological observations as elucidated by those who have known God intimately. The word *ma'rifah*, along with *ḥikmah* (wisdom), indicates the branches of knowledge that constitute *al-Kalimāt al-maknūnah*'s subject matter. Like his teacher, Mullā Ṣadrā, Kāshānī uses both terms extensively, though sometimes interchangeably: Both appear together in Ṣadrā's writings to describe the heritage of the philosophers (*al-ḥukamā'*) and Sufis (*al-ṣūfiyyah*, here in a positive sense) who taught their followers to acquire knowledge by purifying their souls.⁽¹⁵⁾ In this description, *al-ḥikmah* is emphasized; it emerges as the sum 'wisdom' of these two types of knowledge. Sometimes Ṣadrā and Kāshānī use the two terms separately. In such cases, the first term, i.e., *ḥikmah* refers to the culmination of rational and inspired sciences. The second one, i.e., *ma'rifah* refers to the direct knowledge of God and His creation belonging to Sufis who did not necessarily engage in philosophical arguments and proofs. Such *ma'rifah* is knowledge resulting from spiritual striving, *kashf* (the unveiling of unseen matters), and *shuhūd* (the witnessing of that which has been unveiled), the fruits of a Sufism devoid of the negative connotations Mullā Ṣadrā reviews in *Kasr al-aṣnām al-jāhilīyyah* and Fayḍ reviews in *al-Kalimāt al-ṭarīfah*. In that treatise, Fayḍ describes *ma'rifah* as a science (*'ilm al-ma'rifah*), and, from the

context of his description, it clearly involves witnessing spiritual realities by means of the heart.⁽¹⁶⁾ Fayḍ often refers to the source of the truths he presents in *al-Kalimāt al-Maknūnah* as the ‘People of *ma‘rifah*.’ He also begins that book—and includes in its title—the phrase the ‘People of *ḥikmah* and *ma‘rifah*.’⁽¹⁷⁾ It seems possible that, by focusing on the *result* of Sufi discipline and contemplation, namely intimate knowledge (or *ma‘rifah*) of God, Kāshānī and his teacher were often able to avoid the more controversial term *taṣawwuf*, even if they did not yet take recourse to the term *‘irfān*.⁽¹⁸⁾

Fayḍ’s Intellectual Progression

Fortunately for those interested in uncovering the historical context of Fayḍ’s intellectual and mystical orientations, Fayḍ left more than merely this one version of *al-Kalimāt al-maknūnah*. He returned to the text throughout his life, revealing thereby changes in his thought (about Sufism, true mystical knowledge, and the role of hadith) and changes in the context that surrounded his writings. In what follows, it will be considered that *al-Kalimāt al-maknūnah* consists of not only as a single work, but as a work that came to exist as four related works.⁽¹⁹⁾ One might even think of *al-Kalimāt al-maknūnah* as a source-work from which are derived multiple texts, which have been given various titles. In exploring the relationship between these four works and the progression of changes made, especially those changes made at the end of Kāshānī’s life, two observations will be made. First, it is clear that Kāshānī composed works with two audiences in mind, those able to comprehend mystical realities in contrast to those less able to do so, as Todd Lawson has argued.⁽²⁰⁾ Second, and more debatably, it emerges from Fayḍ Kāshānī’s changes that, toward the end of his life, Kāshānī’s increasing concern with the *akhbār*

(hadith reports) had a noticeable effect on his presentation of Sufi cosmology and philosophy.

Fayḍ never clearly rejected or turned away from the study of Sufi cosmology or philosophy. Rather, an examination of Fayḍ's *al-Kalimāt al-maknūnah*, along with three other renditions of this treatise, will reveal his more emphatic presentation of Sufi cosmology and philosophy as branches of knowledge or scholarship derived from and supported by the *akhbār*. To state things more clearly, Fayḍ never rejected the science of Sufism but rather rejected Sufi masters as the source of that science, discerning increased urgency in establishing the *akhbār* as that source. Fayḍ's viewpoint is an argument that Imāmī spirituality not only contains all that is worthwhile in Sufism but is its ultimate source. This helps us understand Fayḍ's efforts, especially his later efforts, to write such mystical treatises not *merely* as an attempt to defend Sufi and philosophical concepts, but also as the subtlest line of offense against Sufism; instead of rejecting the Sufi sciences, Fayḍ was claiming them for Twelver Shi'ism.

It is possible that Fayḍ's later stance toward Sufism was part of a larger anti-Sufi climate in the seventeenth-century Safavid Iran, one that resulted from a complex web of social, economic, and courtly changes that brought clerics to fear the emergence of reverence for Sufis, dervishes, and the messianic Abū Muslim. ⁽²¹⁾ Indeed, the climate among the 'ulamā' and even eventually the court became markedly less tolerant toward Sufism during Fayḍ's lifetime. ⁽²²⁾ Still, Kāshānī's changes reflect his later, more heightened concern with the supremacy of the Islamic scripture. This sentiment was part of a broader, alluring 'hadith revival' occurring in the Shiite world, one that made the non-scriptural seem less authoritative as a source of knowledge, one that resulted in some of the most well-known later compilations of Hadith, including Fayḍ's. This was so much the case that even Mullā Ṣadrā's own son, Ibrāhīm (d. 1071 AH/ 1660-1), rejected

the study of Sufi and philosophical texts in favor of the study of hadith and jurisprudence, gaining the approval of Yūsuf al-Bahrānī (d. 1186 AH/ 1772), an Akhbārī and vehement critic of Mullā Ṣadrā.⁽²³⁾ In some ways, Fayḍ's own later scriptural orientation should not be a surprise, for—as has been mentioned by Leonard Lewisohn and Rasul Ja'fariyān—it is verified by Fayḍ's own later autobiographical writings.⁽²⁴⁾ Moreover, Fayḍ was a Hadith scholar and an Akhbārī, a designation in Shiite scholarship that Robert Gleave justifiably translates as 'scripturalist.'⁽²⁵⁾ Fayḍ, as an Akhbārī, distrusted the methods of those who advocated personal juristic reasoning or *ijtihād*, but he also believed that the keys to all the religious sciences abided in the recorded sayings and deeds of the Prophet Muhammad and the imams from his bloodline.⁽²⁶⁾



Notes

1. ‘Alī Khāliqī, *Andīshah-yi sīyāsī-i Fayḍ-i Kāshānī* (Qum, 1387 Sh 2009), pp. 13-4.
2. Rasūl Ja‘farīyān, *Şafawīyyah dar ‘arşah-yi dīn, farhang, wa sīyāsāt* (Qum, 1379 Sh 2001), p. 2: 538. Germane to the subsequent discussion, al-‘Āmilī claimed that ‘an inclination toward the Sufi path is obvious’ in Fayḍ’s hadith collection. See Sayyid Hāshim Āqājarī, *Muqaddimah-ī bar munāsibāt-i dīn wa dawlat dar Īrān-i ‘aşr-i Şafawī* (Tehran, 1389 Sh 2011), p. 378.
3. Estimates of the total number of his works vary. His student Sayyid Ni‘matallāh Jazā’irī claimed that they exceeded two hundred. Fayḍ, however, wrote three indices of his works, an early one (in 1067 AH) that lists 41 works, as well as two later ones (in 1089 and 1090 AH). The 1089 index lists 115 works, while the 1090 index lists 100, categorizing all

- of his writings into groups of five according to subject matter. The organization of this last index relates to the text at hand because Fayḍ will do the same with the ‘words’ or chapters that make up his ‘hidden words’ in a later revision of *al-Kalimāt al-maknūnah* written in 1088 AH, grouping the words into sections of five. Also, one version of this text leaves the number of chapters or ‘words’ at 41, as will be discussed. See Muḥsin Nājī-Naṣrābādī, *Kitābshināsī-yi Fayḏ-i Kāshānī* (Tehran, 1387 Sh/ 2008-9), pp. 46-8.
4. See William C. Chittick, ‘Muḥsin-i Fayḏ-i Kāshānī,’ *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd ed. (1993), 7: 475-6.
 5. See Hamid Algar, ‘Fayḏ-e Kāshānī, Mollā Mohsen Mohammad,’ *Encyclopaedia Iranica* (1999), 9: 452-4. For a biography of Jazā’irī, see Mīrzā Muḥammad ‘Alī Mudarris, *Rayḥānat al-Adab fī tarājim al-ma’rūfīn bi-l-kunyah wa-l-laqab* (Tehran, 1374 Sh 1996), pp. 3: 113-5. Jazā’irī’s defence of Fayḏ occurs in the portion devoted to Fayḏ’s biography (4: 369-379), specifically, pp. 4: 370-1.
 6. See Todd Lawson, ‘The Hidden Words of Fayḏ Kāshānī,’ *Actes du 4e Colloque de la Societas Iranologica Europaea*, Paris, Septembre 1999 in *Cahiers de Studia Islamica*, ed. M. Szuppe et al. (Leuven, 2002) 2: 427-447, here, pp. 429-31.
 7. Cases of easy dismissal of Fayḏ’s Sufism are many. As an example, consider a recent otherwise excellent book on Fayḏ’s political thought by ‘Alī Khāliqī in which he responds to condemnations of Fayḏ by prominent scholars for his Sufi inclinations by remarking that ‘Fayḏ’s *irfān* and esotericism should not be mistaken for Sufism’ (17-8). See *Andīshah-yi sīyāsī-i Fayḏ-i Kāshānī* (Qum, 1387 Sh 2009), pp. 17-8.
 8. See ‘Aṭā Anzālī, *‘Mysticism’ in Iran: The Safavid Roots of a Modern Concept* (Columbia, South Carolina: University of South Carolina Press, forthcoming). I wish to thank Profes-

9. Rasūl Ja‘farīyān might be alluding to the inseparability of Shiite mysticism and Sufism at that time when he states that defending Fayḍ against charges of Sufism was a difficult matter because the ‘blending of Sufism with ‘*irfān* prevented claimants to true ‘*irfān* from readily protecting themselves from the attacks of their detractors.’ See *Şafawīyyah dar ‘arşah-yi dīn, farhang, wa sīyāsāt*, p. 2: 537.
10. See Kāshānī, ‘Risālah-yi muḥākama bayn al-mutaşawwifa wa ghayrihim,’ ed. Muḥammad-Taqī Dānishpajhūh, *Nashriyyah-yi Danishkadih-yi Adabīyyāt-i Tabrīz*, 2: 9 [Tabriz] (1336 Sh / 1957), pp. 113-134, here 125. Dānishpajhūh discusses the date of composition on p. 114. See also Kathryn Babayan, *Mystics, Monarchs, and Messiahs* (Cambridge, MA, 2002), p. 448.
11. See Ahmet T. Karamustafa, *Sufism: The Formative Period* (Berkeley, CA, 2007), p. 100.
12. For the date of composition, see Muḥsin Nājī-Naşrābādī, *Kitābshināsī-yi Fayḏ-i Kāshānī*, p. 237.
13. Kāshānī, *Safīnat al-najāh wa-l-kalimāt al-ṭarīfah*, ed. Sayyid ‘Alī Jabbār Gulbāghī (Tehran, 2008-9), p. 216. This quotation comes from *al-Kalimāt al-ṭarīfah*; all subsequent citations of this text will cite it as *al-Kalimāt al-ṭarīfah*.
14. See Anzali, ‘Mysticism’ in Iran: The Safavid Roots of a Modern Concept.
15. See Şadrā, *Kasr al-aşnām al-jāhilīyyah*, ed. Muḥsin Jahāngīrī (Tehran, 2002-3), 53-5.
16. Kāshānī, *Safīnat al-najāh wa-l-kalimāt al-ṭarīfah*, ed. Sayyid ‘Alī Jabbār Gulbāghī (Tehran, 2008-9), 218. This quotation comes from *al-Kalimāt al-ṭarīfah*; all subsequent citations of this text will cite it as *al-Kalimāt al-ṭarīfah*.
17. Kāshānī, *al-Kalimāt al-maknūna*, ed. ‘Alī-Rizā Aşgharī

- (Tehran, 2008-9), author's introduction, 23. All subsequent references to this text will use this edition, despite my having consulted another recent edition, published one year earlier: *Kalimāt-i maknūnah*, ed. Sādiq Hasanzadah (Qum, 2007-8). Aṣgharī's edition is the basis for that used in the Arabic portion of this book.
18. See Henry Corbin's discussion of the terms *tasawwuf* and 'irfān in his *En Islam iranien: Aspects spirituels et philosophiques* (Paris, 1972), 4:22. Fayḍ does refer to the *ahl-i 'irfān* in his *dīwān*, but the substitution of 'irfān for *ma'rifah* is for reasons of prosody; see Kāshānī, *Kulliyāt-i Fayz-i Kāshānī*, ed. Mustafā Fayzī-Kāshānī (Tehran, 2002), 2: 715, ghazal, no. 255.
 19. In using the word 'work,' here I refer to the work-text-artifact triad as described by M.J. Driscoll in 'The Words on the Page: Thoughts on Philology, Old and New,' *Creating the Medieval Saga: Versions, Variability and Editorial Interpretations of Old Norse Saga Literature*, ed. Judy Quinn and Emily Lethbridge (Odense, 2010), pp. 87-104, here pp. 93-5. The *work* refers to an idealized conception of an instance of authorship; the *text* is a version of that work that might exist in multiple copies; and the *artifact* is an actual (usually physical) copy of that text. I thank my colleague Christopher M. Jones at Augustana College for bringing this article to my attention.
 20. Lawson justifiably categorizes Kāshānī's works into two categories, 'works for the majority of Shiites and works aimed at an elite cognoscenti.' See 'The Hidden Words of Fayḍ Kāshānī,' p. 434.
 21. See Andrew J. Newman, 'Clerical Perceptions of Sufi Practices in Late Seventeenth-Century Persia,' *The Heritage of Sufism*, ed. Leonard Lewisohn and David Morgan (Oxford, 1999), 3: 135-164.

22. As Sajjad Rizvi discusses, the reigns of Shah ‘Abbās I (r. 996-1038 AH/ 1588-1629) and Shah ‘Abbās II (r. 1052-77 AH/ 1642-66) showed tolerance for non-*ṭarīqah*, non-Sunnī, non-musical, and non-antinomian Sufism. Later, however, a spirituality advocating the potential supremacy of an individual—whether the spiritual master, his trainees, or his readers—was shunned in favour of deference to the spiritual supremacy of the absent imam, as well as the temporal authority of that imam’s two representatives, the shah and the jurists. See Rizvi, ‘A Sufi Theology Fit for a Shī‘ī King: The Gawhar-i Murād of ‘Abd al-Razzāq Lāhījī,’ *Sufism and Theology*, ed. Ayman Shihadeh (Edinburgh, 2007), 83-98, here 85-5.
23. Sajjad H. Rizvi, “Mullā Ṣadrā Shīrāzī: His Life and Works and the Sources for Safavid Philosophy”, *Journal of Semitic Studies*, Supplement 18 (2007), 22.
24. See Lewisohn’s ‘Sufism and the School of Isfahān,’ *The Heritage of Sufism*, ed. Leonard Lewisohn and David Morgan (Oxford, 1999), 3: 63-134, here 123-130. Rasūl Ja‘farīyān discusses this (and the anti-Sufi climate coinciding with Fayḍ’s later life) in his ‘Fayḍ wa tasawwuf,’ *Fayḍnāmah*, ed. Muḥsin Nājī-Naṣrābādī and Sayyid Abū al-Qāsim Naqībī (Tehran, 2008-9), 221-244. This is a reprint edition of the source mentioned by Lewisohn, a chapter of Ja‘farīyān’s *Dīn wa sīyāsāt dar dawrah-yi Ṣafawī* (Qum, 1991-2), 271-295.
25. See Robert Gleave, “Scripturalist Islam: The History and Doctrines of the Akhbārī Shī‘ī School”, in *Islamic Philosophy, Theology and Science: Texts and Studies*, ed. H. Daiber, vol. 72 (Leiden, 2007).
26. For this translation of the term *ijtihād*, see Robert Gleave, “Inevitable Doubt: Two Theories of Shī‘ī Jurisprudence”, in *Studies in Islamic Law and Society*, ed. Ruud Peters and

Bernard Weiss, vol. 12 (Leiden/Boston/Köln, 2000), 260, as well as 4-6. The Akhbārī movement's defining principle was a rejection of the *ijtihād* espoused by Uṣūlīs and an emphasis on interpreting according to the text of the *akhbār*. For Fayḍ, this rejection of *ijtihād* seems to have been somewhat more nuanced than many of his Akhbārī colleagues. Fayḍ primarily took issue with *uṣūl al-fiqh*, the science serving as the theoretical groundwork of *ijtihād*, and the preference given to it by Uṣūlīs over and above the *akhbār*, yet Fayḍ – exceptional among Akhbārīs – was not opposed to some degree of interpretation in deriving laws from the narrations, nor did he bind himself to the most apparent meaning of a narration, as is evidenced in his body of work. See Ghulāmḥusayn Dīnānī's interview with Muḥammad Rizā Irshād, "Sawār bar safīnah-yi nijāt-i ḥikmat wa falsafah", in *Fayḍnāmah*, ed. Muḥsin Nājī Naṣrābādī and Sayyid Abū al-Qāsim Naqībī (Tehran, 2008-9), 198-9.