



Research Paper

A Philosophical Analysis of Mohammad Javad Khorasani's Method in Critiquing Hafez's Mystical Worldview

Amir Hossein Mansouri Nouri^{*1} , Mohammad Javad Rastgoo² , Ainollah Khademi³ , Seyed Mohsen Hosseini⁴ 

¹ PhD graduate in Kalam and Philosophy from Shahid Rajaei Teacher Training University

² Level 3 seminary student at Marvi Seminary

³ Professor at Shahid Rajaei Teacher Training University

⁴ PhD graduate in Islamic Philosophy and Kalam from Shahid Rajaei Teacher Training University

***Corresponding Author:** Amir Hossein Mansouri Nouri
Address: Shahid Rajaei Teacher Training University

Email: amirhoseindoa@gmail.com
Tel: 02133919115


[10.22080/JEPR.2025.28739.1265](https://doi.org/10.22080/JEPR.2025.28739.1265)

Received:
March 4, 2025

Accepted:
June 15, 2025
Available online:
June 26, 2025

Keywords:
Hafez, Khorasani, Worldview,
Insight, Action, Tendency

Abstract

The present article aims to answer the main question: “What is the philosophical analysis of Khorasani’s method in critiquing Hafez’s mystical worldview?” For this purpose, the study employs reliable sources and library research methods to analyze and critique Khorasani’s approaches in evaluating Hafez’s ideas. The findings indicate that Khorasani’s critiques have the following shortcomings: (1) Lack of validation of mystical revelations: Khorasani, without rational or religious evaluation, rejects all mystical revelations, including those of Hafez. (2) One-sided approach: He examines Hafez’s poetry only from a specific perspective and neglects the analysis of its multilayered meanings. (3) Absence of historical references: His critiques do not refer to credible historical sources and lack scholarly accuracy. (4) Superficial interpretation: He focuses on the apparent meanings of the poems and disregards their inner and profound meanings. (5) Contradictory behavior: In some cases, Khorasani’s interpretations of Hafez’s poetry conflict with the actual content of Hafez’s works or even with his other critiques. (6) Ignoring the multidimensional nature of Hafez’s poetry: While Hafez employs symbolic and polysemous language, Khorasani fails to consider these aspects. (7) Neglect of figurative meanings: His analyses usually focus on the literal meaning and miss the symbolic and allusive dimensions of Hafez’s poetry. Ultimately, due to these shortcomings, Khorasani’s critiques are insufficient and unsubstantiated for refuting Hafez’s ideas.



Extended Abstract

1. Introduction

The present article is shaped by the quest to answer the central research question: “What is the philosophical analysis of Khorasani’s method in critiquing Hafez’s mystical worldview?” To address this inquiry, the study adopts a qualitative approach, making extensive use of credible sources and traditional library research methods. The focus is placed on a detailed analysis and critique of Mohammad Javad Khorasani’s approaches in assessing the philosophical and mystical ideas embedded in the poetry of Hafez.

Khorasani’s critiques, while aiming to provide a rational evaluation of Hafez’s worldview, reveal significant shortcomings upon closer philosophical scrutiny. First, Khorasani rejects all mystical revelations, including those of Hafez, without adequate consideration for rational or religious methods of examination and validation. His assessment lacks the necessary procedures for verifying mystical experiences, which constitutes a fundamental methodological flaw.

Second, Khorasani’s readings of Hafez’s poetry are markedly one-sided. He approaches the verses primarily from a single philosophical or ideological perspective, neglecting the multifaceted and multi-layered meanings that are characteristic of Hafez’s oeuvre. Such an approach fails to account for the rich complexity and ambiguity intrinsic to mystical poetry.

Third, Khorasani’s critiques are weakened by the lack of reference to credible historical sources. The absence of well-established historical and textual evidence diminishes the intellectual rigor of his arguments and undermines the academic value of his conclusions.

Fourth, his interpretations are often superficial, with a dominant emphasis on the literal and apparent meanings of the poems. This approach overlooks the deeper, mystical, and sometimes esoteric meanings embedded within Hafez’s verses, which are crucial for a comprehensive understanding of the poet’s worldview.

Fifth, there is evidence of inconsistency in Khorasani’s interpretive strategies. In some cases, his readings of Hafez’s work are at odds with the widely acknowledged content of Hafez’s poetry or even with Khorasani’s own previous critical positions, indicating a lack of internal coherence in his critique.

Sixth, Khorasani fails to recognize the multidimensional and symbolic nature of Hafez’s language. Hafez’s ability to express complex ideas through polysemic and metaphorical language demands a nuanced and context-sensitive analysis—one that is noticeably absent in Khorasani’s method.

Seventh, and finally, Khorasani’s critiques are mostly focused on surface meanings and ignore the use of symbolism, allusion, and allegory, which are among the defining features of Hafez’s poetry. By overlooking these dimensions, he misses essential aspects of Hafez’s philosophical and mystical discourse.

In conclusion, this extended examination demonstrates that Khorasani’s philosophical and methodological approach in critiquing Hafez’s mystical worldview contains numerous deficiencies. As a result, his criticisms are neither sufficiently reasoned nor robust enough to convincingly refute the foundations of Hafez’s mystical thought. The findings underscore the necessity of a more comprehensive, nuanced, and historically grounded analytical approach in the study and critique of mystical worldviews within Persian literary tradition.

2. Method

In this study, reliable sources were utilized and library research methods were employed to analyze and critique Khorasani’s approaches in evaluating the philosophical and mystical ideas of Hafez. The research was conducted through a descriptive-analytical method, relying on a thorough review of written documents, books, and credible academic articles related to both Khorasani and Hafez. By systematically collecting, categorizing, and interpreting the relevant data, the study examines the strengths and weaknesses of Khorasani’s critical methodology and assesses its validity and adequacy in the context of Hafez’s mystical



worldview. The findings are presented based on careful textual analysis and logical assessment of Khorasani's arguments.

3. Conclusion

After analyzing Khorasani's views and criticisms regarding Hafez's mystical worldview, the following results have been obtained across different sections:

1. Khorasani's belief concerning Hafez and his assertion that the mystical revelations and experiences (kashf and shuhud) attained by Hafez and other mystics are satanic is not correct. This is because the mystics themselves do not consider every revelation as valid proof; instead, each mystical experience is measured against criteria such as reason and religious law (shari'a). If it conforms to those standards, it is accepted; otherwise, it is set aside. Moreover, mystics regard these revelations as authoritative only for themselves and not universally binding.
2. Approaching Hafez's poetry from a one-sided perspective is not justified. Just as there are hadiths that criticize poetry, there are also narrations that praise it. It is therefore necessary to reconcile both sets of narrations. This reconciliation suggests that the critical narrations pertain to poetry that undermines the real teachings of Islam, whereas poetry that expresses authentic religious knowledge is praised by the Ahl al-Bayt (peace be upon them).
3. Many of Khorasani's objections lack historical substantiation. Thus, for a scholarly critique of a worldview, it is essential to take historical documents into account. Given that accurate historical documents regarding Hafez's life and times are scarce and his poetry possesses multiple layers of meaning,

this point should be considered—something that Khorasani has neglected.

4. A review of Khorasani's criticisms of Hafez clearly shows that most of his objections are based on literalism. If we were to apply this literalist method to Quranic verses and hadiths, it would often result in blasphemous interpretations, such as literal readings of verses attributing a "hand" to God Almighty.
5. Khorasani's inconsistent conduct in dealing with Hafez's poetry is itself subject to criticism.
6. Neglecting the figurative meaning of poems is one of the most important criticisms directed at Khorasani. Poets often employ literary devices and imagery to communicate the deep dimensions of their worldview more effectively and precisely. Overlooking such literary techniques leads to erroneous and unfair critiques. Additionally, considering the likelihood that Hafez may have been a Shi'a, it is more appropriate to interpret verses that appear outwardly contrary to Islamic law in their figurative sense.

In light of the above, it can be concluded that Khorasani's criticisms are not sufficient to refute Hafez's mystical worldview and do not constitute a scholarly critique. While Khorasani's position deserves respect, it must be acknowledged that such criticisms are, for the most part, rooted in dogmatism rather than objective scholarship.

Funding

There is no funding support.

Authors' contribution

This paper was written by Amir Hossein Mansouri Nouri and all

the responsibility for this article rests with him.



Conflict of interest

The author declares no conflict of interests.