

The method of understanding and explaining hadiths in the two rationalistic and transmitivistic commentary of Kāfi by Mullā Ṣadrā and Majlisī

Mohammad Mahdi Farrahi

PhD. of Quran and Hadith Sciences, Farabi Campus, University of Tehran. Qom: Iran;

Mohammadfarrahi2011@gmail.com

Received: 10/17/2021

Accepted: 11/01/2022

Introduction

Hadith is one of the important sources for understanding and knowing about different aspects of Islam. Hadith, like many other texts, needs explanation and interpretation, that's why scholars have been explaining it for a long time. Each of the hadith commentators has explained the hadiths with a special approach. Among these, we can mention two approaches, philosophical rationalism and transmitivism. In the Safavid era, some hadith commentators used these two approaches to explain hadiths. To better understand the effects of these two approaches in the method of understanding and explaining traditions, it is necessary to study them.

Materials and Methods

In this study, we use a comparative method to study the commentaries of two influential thinkers of the Safavid era, namely Mullā Ṣadrā and Muhammad Bāqir Majlesī, who are respectively a rationalist philosopher and a transmitivistic scholar, on the book Kāfi.

Results and Discussion

The result of this study shows that although there is no significant difference between Mullā Ṣadrā and Majlisī in explaining the meaning of words, in some cases, Mullā Ṣadrā's logical and philosophical view has been influential in his explanation of words. In morphological topics Even though Mullā Ṣadrā has paid attention more than Majlisī in some cases, but in cases where the discussion led to a difference in meaning, Majlisī has paid more attention to those matters than Mullā Ṣadrā. This difference between Mullā Ṣadrā and Majlisī is due to their attitude in explaining hadiths; Explaining that Mullā Ṣadrā often explains traditions with one aspect and does not tend to mention different aspects, but unlike him, Majlisī is very attentive in mentioning different aspects. In the topics of syntax Even though Mullā Ṣadrā pays attention to these topics, the Majlisī's attention to these topics is more than his. Perhaps one of the reasons for Majlisī's greater attention to these topics is his attention to different aspects of meaning in tradition, because as we have said, Majlisī is interested in mentioning different aspects of meaning in traditions, and different aspects of syntax sometimes lead to different aspects of meaning in tradition. In some cases, when Majlisī discussed syntax and Mullā Ṣadrā did

not discuss syntax, or on the contrary, Mullā Ṣadrā discussed syntax but Majlisī did not discuss it. It is possible that there is a reason for taste. Another reason why Majlisī paid more attention to the discussion of syntax than Mullā Ṣadrā could be that Mullā Ṣadrā was more interested in explaining the content of the tradition and did not consider the discussion of syntax very important to him. Another possible reason is that Majlisī, influenced by some other interpretations of Kāfī, raised some syntactical debates and his attention to some syntactical debates is a result of this. Another point worth noting is that the source of tradition is not particularly important for Mullā Ṣadrā, but it is important for Majlisī. It seems that Mullā Ṣadrā's rationalism and mysticism and Majlisī's transmitivism have been influential in giving importance to the source of the traditions they cite, and it is as if for Mullā Ṣadrā that there is a reasonable aspect of the tradition in his opinion is enough for him to cite it, but for Majlisī, who is a transmitter, the source of the tradition is important and he was more careful in narrating the traditions. The reason for this state of tradition of Mullā Ṣadrā may be attributed to this tolerance in quoting from various sources, and the other is his lack of mastery over Shia traditions. Another point worth noting is that Mullā Ṣadrā used a lot of other works, with or without citing; But there is no trace of his benefiting from the explanations and margins that were written before him on Kāfī. Unlike Mullā Ṣadrā, Majlisī used a lot of other Kāfī commentaries in his explanation of Kāfī principles, and his reliance on them is surprisingly high. Also, it can be said that Mullā Ṣadrā quotes other people's words along the path of his own thought system, but Majlisī does not follow a particular coherent thought system, and sometimes quoting other people's words is centered for him. Majlisī is cautious and mentions various aspects in explaining hadiths, but unlike him, Mullā Ṣadrā explains the hadiths with a decisive statement and usually explains the traditions with only one aspect, and even if from others, what with reference and even if he quotes without reference, it is usually based on one aspect in the way of explaining the tradition.

Conclusion

Mullā Ṣadrā is from philosophy and mysticism and has used them in his commentary, but Majlisī does not have an optimistic view of philosophers and opposes them. However, Majlisī has quoted and used some sayings of philosophers in his description. Majlisī also disagrees with the Sufis, however, he also quotes from them. Investigations show that Majlisī was not against the principle of mysticism, but he was against some deviations. Another point is that although Majlisī did not oppose the principle of mysticism, but contrary to Mullā Ṣadrā's description of the principles of Kāfī, the talk of discovery, intuition and mysticism and their defense is not prominent in "Mir'āt al-'uqūl".

Keywords: Philosophical Rationalism, Transmitivism, Commentary of Uṣūl of al-Kāfī, Mir'āt al-'uqūl.