Wisdom and Philosophy in the Bahá'í Faith: On the Divine Horizon of Ḥikmat and the Boundaries of Speculative Reason

By Iman Motlagh Arani

Abstract

This article examines the emergence of a distinct philosophical paradigm within the Bahá'í Faith, one that reconfigures the nature, purpose, and authority of philosophy itself. Rather than framing philosophy as an autonomous rational enterprise or as subordinate to dogmatic theology, the Bahá'í Writings present a prophetic ontology in which wisdom (ḥikmat) is both divinely sourced and civilizational in purpose. Through a genealogical engagement with classical, Islamic, and modern philosophical traditions, the article analyzes how the Bahá'í Revelation both affirms and transforms philosophical categories such as being (wujūd), causality, knowledge, and interpretation. Central to this transformation is the Manifestation of God, not merely as a religious figure but as the ontological fulcrum of truth, whose utterance reorders the hierarchy of knowledge from Revelation to reason, from action to understanding. The article also introduces a new typology of philosophers, distinguishes legitimate from false uses of reason, and explores the structural function of interpretation within a post-metaphysical covenantal order. Ultimately, the Bahá'í model challenges secular and theological dichotomies by proposing a unity of thought and Revelation that is dialogical, ethically oriented, and historically responsive—a metaphysical vision of philosophy not as speculation, but as world-shaping praxis.

Introduction: The Question of a Bahá'í Philosophy

Is there such a thing as a Bahá'í philosophy? At first glance, the question may seem contradictory, or at least ambiguous. Philosophy has often been understood as the autonomous exercise of reason—an enterprise whose very legitimacy rests on its independence from religious dogma or revealed authority. To posit a "Bahá'í philosophy" thus appears to confront two powerful critiques simultaneously: from rationalists who reject the mingling of Revelation and Reason, and from religionists who see philosophy as a source of skepticism, relativism, or secular dilution. And yet, the Bahá'í Writings explicitly affirm the value of reason, uphold the unity of science and religion, and identify *ḥikmat* (wisdom) as a cardinal virtue. The question, then, is not whether philosophy can be reconciled with Revelation, but rather: what new philosophical configuration emerges when Revelation itself defines the horizon of thought?

To explore this question, we must begin with the meaning and origin of philosophy. The term *philosophy*, from the Greek *philosophia*, denotes the "love of wisdom." But the seemingly simple etymology conceals a long and fractured history. In classical antiquity, philosophy was not merely a theoretical enterprise. For Plato, it was the soul's ascent toward intelligible realities and moral purification through dialectical reflection. For Aristotle, it was the systematic investigation of first principles and the nature of being. Yet even these founding figures stood in

the midst of older traditions—pre-Socratic fragments, Pythagorean theologies, Eleatic paradoxes. As Derrida reminds us, the beginning of philosophy is itself a metaphysical illusion. There is no absolute point of departure. "The beginning and the end," he writes, "are traces and traces of traces."

Indeed, philosophy has never been wholly separate from religion. In its earliest forms, philosophical inquiry was often inseparable from myth, prophecy, and divine cosmology. The very founders of Greek philosophy—Thales, Pythagoras, Heraclitus—were shaped by theological, cosmological, and esoteric traditions. Bahá'u'lláh affirms this integration of sacred and rational knowledge when He writes: "The sages aforetime acquired their knowledge from the Prophets, inasmuch as the latter were the Exponents of divine philosophy and the Revealers of heavenly mysteries." He further notes that "Empedocles, who distinguished himself in philosophy, was a contemporary of David, while Pythagoras lived in the days of Solomon… and acquired Wisdom from the treasury of prophethood." The fundamental insights of philosophy, in this light, did not emerge in isolation from religion, but were "emanated from the Prophets."

The myth of autonomous reason as the true origin of philosophy finds its strongest articulation in Enlightenment rationalism. Here, reason is elevated above all else, and philosophy is purified of theological influence. From this perspective, philosophy's task is to critique, not confirm, religious claims. As Gilson notes, such a view leads inevitably to the conclusion that a "Christian philosophy" is absurd, since reason and Revelation must be categorically separated.

But Gilson challenges this dichotomy. In his view, Christian philosophy is not a contradiction but a new mode of philosophizing—one in which reason is illuminated by faith, and Revelation does not abolish but transforms philosophical inquiry. This perspective is most clearly embodied in the thought of St. Thomas Aquinas, who, while drawing deeply from Aristotle, reorients his metaphysics around the doctrine of creation *ex nihilo*, a concept rooted not in reason alone but in the revealed truths of the Bible. Theology, in this account, is not merely content for philosophy but an "indispensable auxiliary to reason."

The concept of *Ego sum qui sum* ("I am that I am"), revealed in Exodus, becomes the cornerstone of a new understanding of Being itself. It is this biblical insight, Gilson argues, that gives rise to the "existential notion of being" that marks a fundamental transformation in metaphysics. Likewise, the Augustinian motto *nisi credideritis, non intelligetis*—"unless you believe, you shall not understand"—suggests that faith is not the enemy of reason, but its precondition. The philosophical tradition shaped by Christian Revelation does not negate reason; it expands it.

This historical pattern extends beyond the Middle Ages. Even modern philosophers who sought to distance themselves from theology—Descartes, Pascal, Malebranche, Leibniz, Kant, Hegel—remained deeply indebted to religious concepts and theological frameworks. Descartes's cogito, his proofs for God, and his doctrine of occasionalism are all unintelligible without reference to

the Christian metaphysical tradition. Malebranche's occasionalism and Pascal's turn from rationalism to Christian mysticism testify to a continued intertwining of faith and thought. Leibniz's pre-established harmony and doctrine of the Necessary Being echo theological principles from Aquinas and Avicenna. Kant, often regarded as the architect of modern philosophical autonomy, nonetheless affirmed that he had to "deny knowledge in order to make room for faith." When read in conjunction with the *Critique of Practical Reason*, the *Critique of Pure Reason* reveals not the expulsion of theology, but its reconfiguration—placing moral law, freedom, and God at the heart of reason's practical vocation. Hegel, too, developed his dialectic of Spirit in ways that retained deep affinities with theological patterns of history and eschatology.

What these examples reveal is that philosophy has never been truly autonomous. Its concepts, categories, and problems are historically and structurally entangled with religious thought. The "death of metaphysics," lamented by Gilson, occurs precisely when philosophy attempts to sever these ties. The recovery of philosophy, he argues, depends on a return to its theological roots—not to subordinate reason, but to restore its capacity for truth.

The Bahá'í perspective continues and completes this restoration. It affirms the necessity of reason while grounding it in the Revelation of the Manifestation of God. As Bahá'u'lláh declares, "The beginning of wisdom and the origin thereof is to acknowledge whatsoever God hath clearly set forth." Reason without Revelation is blind; Revelation without reason is mute. Their union is not a compromise but a fulfillment.

In the sections that follow, we will trace how this union unfolds in the lives of intellectual converts to the Bahá'í Faith; we will articulate a working definition of Bahá'í philosophy; and we will explore the structures of reason, Revelation, and interpretation in Bahá'í thought. Our aim is not to imitate Christian or Islamic models, but to ask whether Bahá'í philosophy marks the emergence of a new paradigm: one in which the love of wisdom is reborn as a covenantal responsibility—a responsibility to think, to act, and to understand within the horizon of divine truth.

2: Why Thinkers Become Bahá'ís – Intellectual Conversions and Admiration

The possibility of a Bahá'í philosophy is not a speculative idea invented by later commentators. It is, rather, a historical phenomenon with identifiable figures—philosophers, theologians, scientists, and poets—who encountered the Bahá'í teachings and found in them not only spiritual truth but also philosophical depth. The emergence of the Bahá'í Faith was not met solely with emotional or religious allegiance, but with a profound recognition that its principles, concepts, and cosmology offered new ways of thinking about ontology, epistemology, ethics, and civilization. In short, many of its earliest and most articulate proponents were thinkers who either converted to the Bahá'í Faith or were intellectually transformed by it.

Among the Western intellectuals are such figures as **Auguste Forel**, the Swiss neuroanatomist, psychologist, and moral philosopher who, after a lifetime of scientific work and ethical reflection, embraced the Bahá'í Faith in 1921. Forel found in the Bahá'í teachings a unified vision that harmonized the empirical rigor of science with the moral demands of spiritual life. He praised its rational ethical system, its call for universal peace, and its foundational affirmation of the oneness of humanity as principles long sought in his humanist and scientific work. Similarly, **Dr. J.E. Esslemont**, a Scottish physician and author of *Bahá'u'lláh and the New Era*, described the Faith as a "spiritual revolution" rooted in reason and divine law. Later thinkers such as **William S. Hatcher**, a mathematician and logician trained in analytic philosophy, devoted much of his scholarly output to formalizing Bahá'í teachings using symbolic logic and axiomatic reasoning. His book *Logic and Logos* is a direct attempt to construct a philosophical theology based on Bahá'í epistemology. Figures like **H.M. Balyuzi**, **John Esslemont**, **George Townshend**, and **Udo Schaefer** further exemplify this pattern: intellectuals who were drawn to the Faith not in spite of their rational training, but because they found its truths resonant with their highest intellectual ideals.

In addition to Western converts, some of the most important **Persian and Islamic thinkers** of the 19th and 20th centuries embraced or developed Bahá'í philosophical thought from within the Islamic intellectual tradition. These figures are foundational to any serious understanding of Bahá'í philosophy. **Mírzá Muḥammad Qá'iní (Nabíl-i-Akbar)** was one of the most erudite scholars of his generation—a mujtahid, philosopher, and theologian who had studied under Ḥajj Mullā Hādī Sabzavārī, the preeminent exponent of post-Sadrian metaphysics. Bahá'u'lláh Himself described Nabíl-i-Akbar as "the most erudite of the divines" and affirmed that he had subordinated his formidable philosophical acumen to the Revelation.

Mírzá Abu'l-Faḍl-i-Gulpáygání, perhaps the most celebrated Bahá'í scholar of modern times, was a polymath proficient in Islamic jurisprudence, Qur'anic exegesis, classical Arabic and Persian literature, logic, theology, and comparative religion. His works, such as *Burhán-i-Lámiʿ* and *Fara'id*, defend the Bahá'í Revelation using rational, philosophical, and hermeneutic methods that blend classical Islamic scholarship with universalist Bahá'í reasoning. He taught at al-Azhar University, wrote extensively in Arabic, and was recognized for his intellectual integrity and methodical argumentation.

Mírzá Asadu'lláh Fádil Mázandaráni authored monumental historical and doctrinal works, most notably *Zuhúru'l-Ḥaqq*, which blends historiography, theology, and interpretive insight. His writings reflect a deep engagement with Islamic philosophy and mystical thought, yet they are entirely oriented around the implications of Bahá'u'lláh's Revelation. Likewise, **'Abdu'l-Ḥamíd Ishráq-Khávarí**, compiler of *Raḥíq-i-Makhtúm* and *Qámús-i-Íqán*, synthesized vast textual traditions, drawing on kalām, tafsīr, and mysticism to clarify Bahá'í doctrines through an encyclopedic, philosophical lens.

Finally, **Dr. ʿAlī-Murād Dāvūdī**, a leading professor of Islamic philosophy at Tehran University and head of its department of philosophy, stood as a singular figure in modern Iranian intellectual history. Deeply trained in Avicennan and Sadrian traditions, Dāvūdī wrote extensively on metaphysics, epistemology, and ethics. His Bahá'í writings explore topics such as being (wujūd), unity (tawḥīd), the station of the Manifestation, and the nature of divine law. He

saw in Bahá'í Revelation the realization of the metaphysical unity sought by centuries of Islamic philosophers. His disappearance and presumed martyrdom in the wake of the 1979 Iranian Revolution marked the tragic silencing of one of the Bahá'í world's most sophisticated philosophical voices.

These Persian Bahá'í scholars did not merely adapt inherited categories; they reconceptualized them in light of Revelation. Their philosophical activity was not apologetic, but **constructive**—grounding a new metaphysics, ethics, and theology based on Bahá'í teachings, while maintaining fidelity to reasoned inquiry and classical method. In their works, **reason is not abolished but sanctified**, and **philosophy becomes an act of spiritual discernment**. Their lives are the strongest refutation of the idea that Bahá'í thought is too abstract, too scriptural, or too theological to be philosophical. It is precisely in these thinkers that Bahá'í philosophy proves its vitality.

What unites all these figures—East and West—is not a uniform method or school, but an encounter: an encounter with a Revelation that challenged and elevated their intellectual commitments. In their lives, we see that Bahá'í philosophy is not merely possible; it is already in motion. It unfolds in the crossing of traditions, the transformation of rational categories, and the spiritualization of intellectual life. It does not negate philosophy's past, but offers a new future: one in which the love of wisdom is reborn within the light of divine unity.

3. The Philosophical Horizon of the Bahá'í Writings

To speak of a Bahá'í philosophy is not merely to ask whether philosophical questions are present in the Bahá'í Faith, but to ask whether the very structure of Bahá'í Revelation engenders a philosophical activity of a new kind. The answer must begin with the content of the Bahá'í sacred texts themselves. The writings of Bahá'u'lláh and 'Abdu'l-Bahá do not merely include occasional references to philosophers or abstract metaphysical themes. They constitute, when read as a totality, a sustained and comprehensive engagement with the foundational questions of philosophy: ontology, epistemology, cosmology, ethics, anthropology, political order, aesthetics, and the philosophy of language and interpretation. To read them philosophically is not to impose a foreign framework, but to recognize their inherent philosophical architecture.

Philosophy, traditionally defined as the love of wisdom, in the Bahá'í Writings appears not as an autonomous speculation but as a response to the divine impulse embedded within creation. Bahá'u'lláh repeatedly affirms that "the essence and the fundamentals of philosophy have emanated from the Prophets," grounding wisdom (*ḥikmat*) in Revelation itself. What follows from this is a redefinition of philosophy—not as the abstract construction of human reason isolated from divine aid, but as the unfolding of reason within the orbit of divine illumination. This structure is neither Augustinian nor Thomistic. It neither fully integrates philosophy into theology, nor insists on their separation. Instead, it constitutes a new dispensation of wisdom, one in which philosophy becomes the reflective face of Revelation, and Revelation the animating soul of philosophy.

This vision is not a rhetorical embellishment. It is embodied in the immense corpus of Bahá'u'lláh and 'Abdu'l-Bahá, whose writings together amount to a comprehensive system of metaphysical, ethical, and civilizational discourse. The writings of Bahá'u'lláh—such as the *Kitáb-i-Íqán*, *Lawḥ-i-Ḥikmat*, *Lawḥ-i-Basīṭ al-Ḥaqīqah*, *Lawḥ-i-Maqṣūd*, *Hidden Words*, *Seven Valleys*, *Four Valleys*, and the *Súiriy-i-Haykal*—engage directly with metaphysical concepts such as being, essence, causality, the unknowable God, the divine Will, emanation, manifestation, creation, nature, and the purpose of existence. In these works, He articulates a cosmology in which God is utterly transcendent, His Essence (*dhāt*) beyond all knowing, and yet His attributes reflected in the entire cosmos through the Manifestations of God. The reality of being (*vojūd*) is continually presented as an act—the bestowal of existence by God—rather than a static essence (*ḥaqīqat* or *dhāt*). This view undercuts the metaphysics of substance in favor of a metaphysics of manifestation (*ẓuhūr*) and relation.

In *Lawḥ-i-Ḥikmat*, Bahá'u'lláh affirms the dignity of the philosophers and sages of the past—naming Socrates, Empedocles, Pythagoras—and yet insists that their wisdom was drawn from the treasury of the Prophets. This repositions the philosophical tradition not as the source of ultimate truth but as the echo of divine insight. In the *Kitáb-i-Íqán*, Bahá'u'lláh elaborates a profound hermeneutics, distinguishing between the outer form and inner meaning of sacred texts, and calling for a mode of reading that is detached from literalism, guided by spiritual purity, and attuned to the symbolic nature of Revelation. This is not merely a theological admonition; it is a metaphilosophical claim about the nature of meaning, truth, and interpretation.

The *Seven Valleys* and *Four Valleys* develop a mystical epistemology, presenting stages of knowledge, love, and unity as existential transformations rather than logical deductions. The structure of the journey is neither merely Sufi nor Neoplatonic, but reframed in a Bahá'í metaphysical anthropology in which the soul's purpose is to reflect divine attributes through stages of search, love, knowledge, unity, contentment, wonder, and true poverty. The epistemology implied here is performative and spiritual: knowledge is acquired not solely by syllogism but by the soul's transfiguration.

In texts such as *Lawḥ-i-Maqṣūd* and *Lawḥ-i-Madīnat al-Tawḥīd*, Bahá'u'lláh sets forth ethical and ontological principles that ground unity not merely as a moral imperative but as the ontological structure of reality. Unity (*tawḥīd*) is not only the singularity of God, but the inner coherence of all being. It is the metaphysical principle that binds cosmology, ethics, and social order. In this sense, philosophy is no longer an abstraction; it is civilization-building. Every metaphysical concept in these texts is inseparable from its ethical and historical implications.

'Abdu'l-Bahá's writings deepen and systematize these insights. In *Some Answered Questions*, He addresses questions of metaphysics, anthropology, logic, psychology, political theory, evolution, and the nature of science. He distinguishes between the essence and the attributes of God, affirms the eternity of creation, and argues that nature is the expression of divine Will. His discussions of the soul, mind, and spirit distinguish faculties and levels of existence with a

precision that maps closely to classical philosophical debates, yet always redirected through the lens of Revelation. In His addresses at the Metaphysical Club and the Hotel Plaza, He explicitly affirms the unity of religion and science, defining true philosophy as that which is animated by spiritual insight.

His other works—such as *Treatise on Politics*, *Secret of Divine Civilization*, *Risāla-yi-Madanīyyih*, *Tafsīr du'ā'-yi ṣaḥar*, and various tablets—offer philosophical reflections on political order, civilization, law, ethics, causality, and eschatology. He reaffirms the rational basis of belief, redefines causality in light of divine purpose, and offers a model of civilization that is both metaphysical and developmental. Philosophy, for 'Abdu'l-Bahá, is never separate from the renewal of society.

From these texts emerges a unified philosophical framework that is both metaphysical and prophetic. The concept of the Manifestation of God serves as the central axis around which all philosophical themes revolve. It is through the Manifestation that humanity comes to know the unknowable God, to reflect divine attributes, to acquire true knowledge, and to build just societies. In contrast to Thomistic or Augustinian models, Bahá'í philosophy does not seek to merge philosophy into theology, nor to grant reason an independent dominion. Rather, it introduces a new metaphysical paradigm rooted in *Mazhar* (manifestation)—a principle more dynamic than essence, more relational than being, and more unifying than causality.

In this paradigm, the unknowable Divine Essence (*dhāt*) is not reduced to abstract concepts or rational inference, but acknowledged through its manifestations—the *kalimāt* (Words) of God that structure existence, history, and meaning. These *kalimāt* are not mere utterances but ontological events, bridging the infinite and the finite, the eternal and the temporal. Revelation is not a static deposit of dogma but a dynamic process of unveiling. Metaphysics is no longer the study of fixed substances, but of living relations, divine signs, and civilizational purpose.

This view critiques inherited metaphysical systems—Greek ontology's emphasis on presence and substance, Augustinian theology's fixation on exemplarism, and Enlightenment rationalism's detachment from divine *telos*—not by discarding their insights, but by transcending their limitations. It affirms the legacy of Plato and Aristotle, yet insists that true philosophy must be animated by the spirit of the age. The Bahá'í paradigm is not philosophy as speculation, but philosophy as transformation—an ethics of becoming, a metaphysics of manifestation, and a civilization-building wisdom rooted in *ḥikmat*.

Thus, Bahá'í philosophy is not a theology in disguise, nor a diluted rationalism. It is a post-metaphysical unity of reason and Revelation—grounded in the radical unknowability of God, the ontological function of the Manifestation, the symbolic nature of language, and the teleological unfolding of unity in diversity. The Bahá'í philosopher, therefore, is not one who "explains" the Faith, but one who thinks within its horizon—who, moved by love of wisdom, seeks to know in order to serve, and understands in order to act. As such, Bahá'í philosophy is not a contradiction but the redefinition of philosophy itself.

4: The Typology of Philosophers in Bahá'í Thought: Revelation, Reason, and the Ethics of True Knowledge

What emerges from the Bahá'í Writings is a multi-layered typology of philosophers, sages, and men of knowledge, grounded in a metaphysical and ethical framework wholly distinct from inherited Greek and scholastic paradigms. This typology is not merely historical or classificatory; it is ontological and eschatological. It reflects the degrees of access to divine reality, the ethical purification of the soul, and the proper ordering of knowledge in relation to Revelation. At the summit of this hierarchy stand the Manifestations of God, but the typology also includes Prophets (Nabīs), Imams (A'immah), the Guardian and 'Abdu'l-Bahá, righteous scholars, mystic knowers, and errant philosophers—each evaluated according to their relation to divine light.

At the highest level are the Manifestations of God, who are not philosophers in the classical sense, but divine educators whose knowledge is innate, infallible, and immediate. Bahá'u'lláh writes: "The sages aforetime acquired their knowledge from the Prophets, inasmuch as the latter were the Exponents of divine philosophy and the Revealers of heavenly mysteries" (*Lawḥ-i-Ḥikmat*, as cited in *The Centrality of Philosophy and Wisdom in the Bahá'í Faith*, Source 282). Their utterances are described as "the crystal, living waters," while all other knowledge is but "the dregs." Unlike human philosophers who acquire knowledge discursively, the Manifestations are direct emanations of divine will, endowed with inherent infallibility. Their metaphysical station is the metaphysics of *ẓuhūr*—manifestation—as the bridge between the unknowable *dhāt* (Essence) and the world of *vojūd* (existence).

Immediately beneath them stand the Prophets (Nabīs) and the Imams (A'immah), figures who are not originators of new dispensations but are divinely inspired and protected from error in their interpretive and spiritual authority. They possess what theologians term "endowed infallibility." In the Bahá'í Faith, this role is uniquely fulfilled by 'Abdu'l-Bahá and the Guardian of the Cause. Though not Manifestations themselves, they are described as "the Center of the Covenant" and "the infallible Interpreter of the Word." Their station affirms the continuity of divine guidance through time and the legitimacy of authoritative, non-speculative interpretation.

Descending further in the hierarchy, we encounter the category of *true sages* and *righteous men of learning*. These are individuals whose knowledge is sanctified by spiritual purity and detachment from selfish ambition. As Bahá'u'lláh declares: "Righteous men of learning... are, in the sight of Him Who is the Desire of the world, stars of the heaven of true knowledge" (*Lawḥ-i-Dunyá*, Source 273). These individuals are fountains of wisdom not because of academic credentials but because of their moral alignment with divine purposes. Their knowledge is transformative, not speculative; ethical, not merely intellectual.

Complementing this category are the *mystic knowers* and *seekers*—those who have traversed the *Seven Valleys* or *Four Valleys*, who attain knowledge not through syllogism but through the purification of the heart. As Bahá'u'lláh writes: "Knowledge is a light which God casteth into the heart of whomsoever He willeth" (*Chihár-Vádí*, Source 16). Their epistemology is performative:

to know is to become, and true understanding arises from inward transfiguration. These mystics do not reject reason, but surpass it through spiritual unveiling (*kashf*) and proximity to the Source.

In stark contrast, the Writings critique various types of false or vain philosophers. First among them are *materialists*, who restrict knowledge to sensory data and deny the soul's spiritual reality. 'Abdu'l-Bahá, in *Some Answered Questions*, laments: "Certain philosophers of America and Europe are content to gradually approach the animal world and so to go backward." He critiques their belief that man is simply a species of animal with no immortal soul. In *Tablets of the Divine Plan*, he adds: "No matter how much man gains wealth... he will not become as independent as a cow." This metaphor highlights the futility of materialistic ambition without spiritual purpose.

Next are those who possess knowledge divorced from humility—what Bahá'u'lláh calls "satanic knowledge." These are the philosophers whose pride, self-love, and addiction to disputation blind them to divine light. "Knowledge is the most grievous veil between man and his Creator," He warns (*Kitáb-i-Íqán*, Source 124). Such scholars may be prolific in logic or metaphysics, but their knowledge is sterile, a reflection of "vain and obscure thoughts." Their hearts, unpurified, become obstacles to the truth they claim to seek.

The Writings also critique *religious leaders and scholars* who oppose the Manifestation due to self-interest or dogmatic rigidity. These figures, though outwardly learned, become "the wolves in shepherd's clothing" (*Lawḥ-i-Ibn-i-Dhib*, Source 298), leading people astray with their literalism and veiled ambition. Bahá'u'lláh states that "by their sanction and authority, every Prophet of God hath drunk from the chalice of sacrifice" (*Kitáb-i-Íqán*, Source 98).

Bahá'í metaphysics, therefore, does not begin with being as presence (*ousia*), nor with being as act (*esse*), but with *ẓuhūr*—manifestation—as the dynamic interface between divine unknowability (*dhāt*) and cosmic reality (*vojūd*). The hierarchy of knowledge flows from the Essence, to the Manifestation, to the infallible Interpreter, to the righteous knower, to the mystic seeker. The true philosopher is not one who claims autonomous reason, but one who aligns knowledge with the ethical telos of transformation—what the Writings call *ḥikmat*. As Bahá'u'lláh states, "The beginning of wisdom and the origin thereof is to acknowledge whatsoever God hath clearly set forth."

Bahá'í philosophy, then, redefines the very meaning of philosophy. It does not seek to isolate reason from Revelation, nor subordinate philosophy to theology. It critiques classical ontologies of substance, existentialisms of despair, and logicisms of abstraction, while honoring their historical contributions. In its place, it offers a post-metaphysical, prophetic ontology: one rooted in *manifestation*, guided by unity-in-diversity, and oriented toward the civilizational renewal of the world.

To think philosophically in the Bahá'í sense is not to speculate endlessly on first principles, but to respond to the Revelation with ethical and intellectual integrity. The Bahá'í philosopher does not speak *about* Revelation but *from within* it—transformed by its light, and committed to manifesting its truth in action.

5. Hermeneutics, Interpretation, and the Limits of Understanding in the Bahá'í Faith

5.1. Genealogy, Language, and the Crisis of Meaning

Nietzsche's *On the Genealogy of Morality* shattered the illusion that moral or metaphysical concepts possess an essential, unchanging core. For Nietzsche, concepts such as "truth," "good," and "spirit" are not fixed reference points but historical artifacts—expressions of power relations, psychological reversals, and cultural transformations. Interpretation is not a neutral act of unveiling meaning, but a will to power: a re-inscription of forces through language. In his genealogical method, Nietzsche traces moral values not to divine command or rational deduction, but to instincts, resentment, and socio-political stratagems. The 'origin' is therefore always already a site of violence, and etymology becomes an archaeological excavation of buried conflicts.

This insight calls into question any claim to a pristine beginning, including the idea of "pure reason" or "revealed truth." Nietzsche's suspicion reverberates through post-structuralist thought, with Derrida's différance continuing the assault on origin and stability. If words are the sediment of conflicting historical intentions, can any theological or philosophical discourse remain immune? Can we still speak of 'wisdom' or 'divine knowledge' without falling into the traps of conceptual idolatry?

A genealogical analysis of key terms further complicates our task. The Arabic term ḥikmat (wisdom/philosophy) originally connoted 'judicious action' or 'putting something in its proper place,' eventually acquiring metaphysical weight through its assimilation into Aristotelian and Neoplatonic thought in Islamic philosophy. Ta'wīl, meaning 'to return to the origin,' once denoted hermeneutic interpretation in search of an inner truth, yet it became associated with arbitrary esotericism and doctrinal deviation. Tafsīr, from the root *f-s-r*, implies clarification or exposition, typically employed for exegesis of Qur'anic text. Sharīʿa, meaning 'path to water,' initially referred to divine law but gradually became a symbol of codified legalism. Dīn, often translated as 'religion,' stems from notions of judgment, debt, and reciprocal submission. The Greek *logos* began as 'speech' or 'account' and eventually evolved into the cosmic reason in Stoic and Christian metaphysics. Nomos, or 'law,' originally referred to custom or distribution, and ʿaql, reason, derives from the verb ʿaqala, 'to bind'—suggesting that reason is a restraining, ordering force. Each of these terms has undergone conceptual distortions across historical shifts, theological disputes, and political regimes.

However, the Bahá'í Writings offer a radical alternative to the genealogical suspicion. While acknowledging the instability of human language and the inadequacy of metaphor, Bahá'u'lláh

and the Báb speak of words not as ideological residues but as theophanic events. Language, in this vision, is not a prison of deferred meaning, but a vessel of divine effulgence. “Every word is endowed with a spirit,” Bahá’u’lláh affirms, and its impact depends on purity of heart and intention. The revealed Word is not merely signification but ontological actualization: it calls realities into being. Divine Names are not contingent labels; they are metaphysical forces with creative efficacy.

In this contrast, the Bahá’í perspective reframes the question: genealogy may show the degradation of meanings over time, but Revelation inaugurates a new linguistic beginning. While Nietzsche teaches us to deconstruct the origin, Bahá’u’lláh offers a restored Origin—a renewal of language that purifies the “choice Wine” and liberates the Word from its historical entanglements. In this light, one may still trace etymologies and remain cautious of inherited categories, yet without surrendering to relativism. For although all human interpretation is situated and partial, divine Revelation is the irruption of a language not of this world, though spoken through it. The challenge is not to escape history, but to recognize when the Word breaks history open and reconfigures it from within.

If Nietzsche’s genealogical method seeks to unearth the contingent power formations hidden beneath seemingly eternal truths, then Foucault’s archaeological and genealogical projects deepen this suspicion by demonstrating how *discursive formations*—institutionalized regimes of knowledge and authority—constitute what can be said, known, and interpreted at any given historical moment. In this light, authority over interpretation is not a neutral transmission of meaning but a historically and theologically constituted function. The act of interpretation becomes itself a political act: an intervention into the space where power and meaning meet.

From this perspective, the Bahá’í Faith’s structure of interpretive authority may be seen not as a diffuse field of interpretation open to democratic negotiation, but rather as an explicitly bounded transmission of *ta’wīl*—authorized, infallible exposition—restricted to a divinely designated lineage. In the genealogy of the Bahá’í Dispensation, authority over meaning has not simply emerged through historical convention or institutional power, but is asserted to descend directly from the ontological Will of Revelation. As Bahá’u’lláh declares in the *Kitáb-i-Aqdas*:

"When the ocean of My presence hath ebbed and the Book of My Revelation is ended, turn your faces toward Him Whom God hath purposed, Who hath branched from this Ancient Root." (*Kitáb-i-Aqdas*, par. 121)

This passage—reaffirmed in *Kitáb-i-‘Ahd*, the Book of the Covenant—makes the line of succession clear: interpretation is not to be diffused across the community, but concentrated in the being of ‘Abdu’l-Bahá, "He Whom God hath purposed," whose ontological function is to explicate the Word with divine authority. This authority is not merely institutional but is expressed as metaphysical: ‘Abdu’l-Bahá is not just a chosen successor but a being ontologically *branched* from the Primal Revelation.

The same principle continues in the Will and Testament of ‘Abdu’l-Bahá:

"After the disappearance of this wronged one, it is incumbent upon... all... to turn unto the Branch from the two Lote-Trees... Shoghi Effendi... He is the Expounder of the verses of God." (*Will and Testament of ‘Abdu’l-Bahá*)

Here, Shoghi Effendi is named not only the Guardian of the Cause but explicitly “the Expounder of the verses of God.” Interpretation, in this schema, is not a historical evolution of hermeneutic engagement but a continuation of divine infallibility under human stewardship. This breaks with both Nietzsche’s and Foucault’s views of interpretive authority as emergent, contingent, and power-laden: in the Bahá’í view, interpretive authority is *given*, not *constructed*—a delegation of divine omniscience to human agency through Revelation.

And yet, we arrive at a critical genealogical rupture: after Shoghi Effendi, the line of Guardians ends—no further appointed Guardian exists. The interpretive authority is no longer embodied in a living person but is transmitted through a textual corpus. The writings of Bahá’u’lláh, ‘Abdu’l-Bahá, and Shoghi Effendi form a sealed canon. The interpretive function—if it remains—must now be negotiated in the absence of an infallible interpreter.

Here, Nietzsche and Foucault re-emerge: what happens when authority dissolves into text? The interpretive vacuum opens a field of contestation. Even when the canon is complete, its meanings are not. Every engagement with the text is already situated—historically, linguistically, ideologically. And if, as Foucault argues, knowledge is constructed through historically contingent rules of formation, then every act of understanding now must be situated within *discursive limitations*—no longer under a single Sovereign Interpreter, but within the diverse community of readers. The Bahá’í paradigm finds itself faced with the paradox of authoritative Revelation and interpretive multiplicity.

One cannot ignore the Derridean problem: does the withdrawal of the Author open the infinite play of signification? Can the meanings of Bahá’í texts—however divinely revealed—be frozen in time when interpretation is inevitable? To read is already to interpret. Every act of understanding is marked by différance. As Nietzsche would say, “there are no facts, only interpretations”—but here, in the Bahá’í system, there *were* facts: the interpretations of the Guardian, the voice of ‘Abdu’l-Bahá, the Speech of the Manifestation. What now remains are *traces*.

Indeed, even these authoritative interpretations are themselves texts, subject to temporality, language, and understanding. Every new generation must engage them anew, not merely preserve them. This invites a shift: from authority as vertical power to understanding as horizontal dialogue. And here, perhaps, the Bahá’í community may lean toward a Gadamerian horizon—toward dialogue between readers, between text and community, between past and present.

But such dialogue requires more than pluralism—it requires fidelity. A fidelity not only to the textual signifiers, but to the ontological referents they signify: the Manifestation, the Covenant, the divine order. This is not relativism, but *hermeneutic accountability*. The Bahá'í writings do not sanction esoteric readings that distort the "outward sense" (*ẓāhir*), nor private gnosis that would displace the authority of the Manifestation. As Bahá'u'lláh warns, those who "claim an inner meaning" contrary to the apparent Word "have been and will be hypocrites and liars."

Nevertheless, the act of understanding cannot be silenced. The dialectic of speech and meaning continues. Even if interpretation is not publicly *authorized*, it is existentially *unavoidable*. And thus, in the absence of the Guardian, the Bahá'í community must live in what we might call a post-hermeneutic vigilance: not engaging in formal ta'wīl, but seeking understanding in a spirit of humility, coherence, and reverence.

5.2. Dialogue, Revelation, and the Possibility of Understanding

The absence of an interpretive authority after Shoghi Effendi does not merely represent an institutional discontinuity; it poses a deeper epistemological and hermeneutic crisis for the Bahá'í community. If, as Derrida insists, all meaning is deferred (différance), and if, as Gadamer argues, understanding is always historically situated and prejudiced (Vorurteil), how can the Bahá'í community continue to understand and act upon its sacred texts in the absence of a divinely authorized explainer? Does interpretation collapse into relativism, or is there a sacred structure that persists beyond the institutional voice of authority?

To approach this question, one must first revisit Gadamer's notion of the "fusion of horizons" (Horizontverschmelzung), in which the horizon of the interpreter and the horizon of the text must enter into dialogue. In Gadamer's view, tradition is not a burden to be overcome but a medium through which understanding takes place. The text speaks, not because it possesses an immutable meaning, but because the interpreter brings their own historically shaped understanding into a dynamic encounter with it. This does not mean that interpretation is arbitrary. Rather, the interpreter is called to *listen*, to allow the text to question them, to be transformed in the dialogue.

Gadamer's hermeneutics thus affirms the dignity of the reader while preserving the authority of the text. In this light, the Bahá'í paradigm may be seen not as a collapse of meaning after the Guardian, but as a shift: from authoritative explication to dialogical responsibility. The Bahá'ís are now called to engage the sacred Writings, and their authorized interpretations, through the "consultative" process that governs the functioning of the Universal House of Justice and the community at large. Understanding, therefore, becomes a communal act of reading and response.

Derrida's contribution to this discussion is more radical. In deconstruction, there is no transcendental signified; meaning is always already postponed, caught in the play of signs. But Derrida also insists that this infinite deferral does not lead to nihilism. Rather, it grounds an ethics of responsibility: the reader must respond to the text without ever mastering it. There is no final interpretation, only the trace of meanings, the excess that escapes systematization. Applied to Bahá'í hermeneutics, this implies that while the Guardian provided an authoritative

interpretive frame, the discontinuity of that authority does not nullify interpretation. Instead, it calls forth an interpretive humility—a willingness to read without claiming mastery.

From this perspective, the Bahá'í model after Shoghi Effendi may be seen as structurally open to dialogical and differential understanding. There is no individual interpreter, but a textual constellation that includes the Writings of Bahá'u'lláh, the interpretive voice of 'Abdu'l-Bahá and the Guardian, and the consultative authority of the Universal House of Justice. Interpretation thus becomes a layered activity: textual fidelity is upheld by anchoring oneself in the explicit statements of the authoritative figures, while the ongoing application of principles is conducted through collective consultation.

But this collective consultation does not resolve the ontological instability of meaning; it merely governs its expression. Therefore, Bahá'í hermeneutics must confront a paradox: the Writings claim clarity and sufficiency, yet understanding them continues to be an act of interpretation conditioned by history, culture, language, and intention. The claim that "the seal of choice wine has been broken" suggests an eschatological unveiling—a moment where interpretation is no longer hidden but clear. Yet even the wine, once poured, must be tasted, and every tongue will taste differently.

In this sense, Bahá'í hermeneutics cannot escape the hermeneutic circle. It must acknowledge that the clarity of the Writings does not eliminate the contingency of the reader. But it proposes that this contingency be met not by solitary judgment, but by the covenantal structure of consultation, deference to authoritative texts, and a moral commitment to unity.

This tension mirrors Gadamer’s insight that understanding is not method but encounter. To read Bah’í texts is not to decode a manual; it is to enter a sacred conversation. Derrida would call this a responsibility to the Other—to the trace of the divine that speaks through language but is never fully captured by it.

Thus, the crisis of interpretation is not a crisis of relativism, but of ethical maturity. In the absence of a living interpreter, the Bahá'í community must become interpreters: not in the authoritative sense, but as co-respondents to the divine Word. The death of the interpreter may then be, paradoxically, the birth of dialogical responsibility. As the Guardian once wrote, philosophy need not begin and end in words. Nor should hermeneutics. It must end in transformation.

5.3. Covenant, Complexity, and the Ethos of Unified Interpretation

The challenge of interpretation within the Bahá'í Faith, particularly in the post-Guardianship era, brings into view the dialectical relationship between unity and complexity. The Bahá'í Covenant, unlike creedal systems that rely on theological assent to fixed dogma, is rooted in the principle of organic continuity and evolving understanding. It does not dissolve the need for interpretation; rather, it demands that interpretation be conducted in the spirit of covenantal fidelity—not to any one personal authority after the Guardian, but to the collective corpus of authoritative texts and the institutions that guard their integrity. This covenantal hermeneutics resists the twin dangers of dogmatism and relativism.

The principle of interpretation in the Bahá'í context thus centers not merely on textual exegesis (tafsīr) but on a covenantal ethos of integrative coherence. Any act of understanding must strive to do justice to the whole of Revelation, not to a curated fragment chosen to justify a preconceived position. In this respect, Bahá'í hermeneutics implicitly affirms a principle akin to what Derrida called "justice as that which is undeconstructible": an orientation toward the totality of the revealed Word, not as a closed totality, but as a demand of infinite responsibility.

To interpret a single verse about, for example, the role of women, the Universal House of Justice, or the nature of the soul, is not to isolate that verse, but to draw into its horizon every other verse, commentary, and authorized interpretation that touches on it. This task presumes a hermeneutics of complexity: to avoid simplistic readings, to detect tensions and harmonies across time, and to recognize the historical context in which utterances were made—their immediate audience, exigency, and temporality. This does not relativize the truth of the Revelation, but rather guards its universal claim by discerning which utterances were context-specific and which were meant as perennial.

Here, the philosophical tension between historical criticism and textual fidelity becomes a central concern. In contrast to a naive historicism that would reduce meaning entirely to context, the Bahá'í approach affirms the possibility of timeless truth articulated through time-bound expressions. The faithful interpreter must thus learn to distinguish the transient from the essential, the time-bound from the eternal. This distinction cannot be made arbitrarily; it must be grounded in the totality of the Writings and the guidance of the Covenant.

This approach aligns with the Gadamerian view of interpretation as a "fusion of horizons"—not the subordination of one meaning to another, but the dialogical transformation of both interpreter and interpreted. But unlike Gadamer, who sees the text as open to perpetual reinterpretation in conversation with tradition, the Bahá'í model insists that the foundational Revelation of Bahá'u'lláh represents the final and complete divine grammar for this dispensation. Thus, interpretation must remain loyal to its telos: the full disclosure of the Manifestation's intention, as unveiled across all authoritative texts.

The Bahá'í Writings themselves demand this multi-dimensional interpretive ethic. For example, the Kitáb-i-Aqdas offers concise imperatives, but it is only through its intertextual web—the Tablets of Bahá'u'lláh, the authoritative explanations of 'Abdu'l-Bahá, the interpretations of the Guardian, and the elucidations of the Universal House of Justice—that a fuller understanding of any one principle emerges. This cumulative structure forms a matrix of meaning, not a free-for-all of interpretive creativity.

Thus, complexity in the Bahá'í paradigm is not chaos, but an ordered interrelation of meanings grounded in Revelation. The interpreter must be faithful not only to the text, but to its embeddedness in history, language, and the chain of authorized explanation. As Bahá'u'lláh writes, "The essence of understanding is that one should not contradict the Text, nor advance a meaning contrary to what hath been made manifest."

Such a hermeneutics demands both humility and total intellectual engagement. It guards against selective quoting, against reducing Bahá'u'lláh’s Revelation to moral platitudes or personal

preferences. In accordance with ʿAbdu'l-Bahá's explicit directive, "if two souls dispute and contend over a divine question… both are in error" (*Will and Testament* 15). The wisdom of this decree is that unity must never be compromised in the search for meaning. Dialogue in the Bahá'í paradigm is not a contest of interpretations, but a sacred process of consultation animated by reverence, love, and mutual silence when divergence arises. When no consensus is reached, it is enjoined that one "should ask the Expounder for the truth of the situation," thereby preserving both the dignity of the Revelation and the harmony of the community. Interpretation, in this light, is not the invention of new meaning, but the conscientious reception of insight through the disciplined synthesis of the Sacred Writings under the shadow of unity. The Covenant, therefore, is not merely institutional; it is an epistemological safeguard. It affirms that understanding must proceed within the bounds of authorized guidance, and that all interpretation is an act of fidelity—to the Word, to the community, and to the divine Will that transcends all individual reasoning.

5.4 The Dialogical Nature of Understanding and Unity

The Bahá'í writings frame the act of understanding not as a solitary encounter with fixed meanings, but as a deeply dialogical, consultative, and spiritual undertaking. At its heart, the pursuit of interpretation is inseparable from the moral imperative of unity, both epistemologically and socially. This perspective offers an alternative to hermeneutic paradigms that emphasize fragmentation, suspicion, or infinite deferral. Instead, it places language, meaning, and truth within the relational dynamics of divine purpose, human humility, and mutual consultation.

Bahá'u'lláh writes, "Be united in counsel, be one in thought. Let each morn be better than its eve and each morrow richer than its yesterday. Man's merit lieth in service and virtue and not in the pageantry of wealth and riches" (Tablets of Bahá'u'lláh 138). This imperative to unity is not merely ethical but epistemic: the realization of truth is conditioned by the quality of interaction among human minds, the consultation of diverse perspectives, and the purging of speech from "idle fancies and worldly desires." As Bahá'u'lláh further states, "Take heed that your words be purged from idle fancies and worldly desires and your deeds be cleansed from craftiness and suspicion" (Tablets 138).

This dialogical imperative finds institutional expression in the concept of consultation (*mashvarat*), which is not a method of voting or debate, but a sacred act that generates insight through sincere participation. The Universal House of Justice underscores that consultation "is the lamp of guidance which leadeth the way, and is the bestower of understanding" (*Consultation: A Compilation* 6). Understanding, in this view, emerges not from individual mastery of text, but from the collaborative effort to approach truth through humility, reverence, and shared search.

Consultation functions as the epistemological foundation of peace itself. In the Most Holy Book (*Kitáb-i-Aqdas*), Bahá'u'lláh commands the rulers of the world to gather and "take counsel together" in order to lay the foundations of the world's "Great Peace." He writes: "Should any king take up arms against another, all should unitedly arise and prevent him. If this be done, the nations of the world will no longer require any armaments" (*Tablets* 165). The imagery here is

not just political but philosophical: unity in action must be preceded by unity in counsel. Justice, understanding, and enduring peace are generated through cooperative deliberation.

From a hermeneutic standpoint, this reveals a unique integration of epistemology, ethics, and social order. Understanding is not isolated cognition but participatory transformation. One does not merely interpret the text but is shaped by it, in community with others. The act of interpretation thus becomes a vehicle for collective growth.

Bahá'u'lláh's own vision of human development points toward this ideal: "Every thing must needs have an origin and every building a builder. Verily, the Word of God is the Cause which hath preceded the contingent world... yet is being renewed and regenerated at all times" (*Tablets* 141). Revelation is not static. The text is always becoming, always being reinterpreted in new contexts. But such re-interpretation must be faithful to the foundational purpose: "to promote the unity of the human race, and to foster the spirit of love and fellowship amongst men" (*Gleanings* 215).

Unity in hermeneutics thus echoes unity in ontology. The same Word of God that orders the cosmos calls humanity to order its understanding through dialogue. This does not mean erasing differences or enforcing uniformity, but rather approaching interpretive diversity with the consciousness that we are bound by a higher moral horizon. It means that every act of reading must be tempered by the responsibility to seek justice, preserve unity, and "manifest My wisdom... to banish ignorance from the earth" (Tablets 138).

Therefore, the Bahá'í paradigm of understanding is both eschatological and ethical. It is eschatological because it views interpretive maturity as a sign of the "coming of age" of humanity. Shoghi Effendi connects this to the emergence of a new world order, in which "the unification of the whole of mankind" will stimulate "the intellectual, the moral and spiritual life of the entire human race" (*World Order of Bahá'u'lláh* 163). And it is ethical because it requires the virtues of humility, trust, sincerity, and consultation to make any knowledge possible.

In this sense, Bahá'í hermeneutics transcends the dichotomy between the solitary reader and the authoritative interpreter. It replaces both with a model of dialogical unity—a covenantal epistemology rooted in Revelation, animated by community, and sustained through consultation. Here, understanding is not the private property of the scholar, nor the dictate of the ruler, but the fruit of hearts turned in collective sincerity toward the Word and Will of God.

Philosophy, Interpretation, and the Limits of Reason in the Bahá'í Faith

The Bahá'í Faith articulates a nuanced position on philosophy and reason, affirming the value of sound intellectual inquiry while establishing strict boundaries around metaphysical speculation and interpretive authority. This position stems not from anti-intellectualism, but from a theological epistemology grounded in divine Revelation as the ultimate arbiter of truth. Reason, in this view, is a noble faculty, divinely bestowed and essential for human progress, but one that must operate in harmony with Revelation, rather than in defiance or isolation from it.

A core theme in the Bahá'í writings is the distinction between philosophy that leads to truth and mere intellectual exercise that leads nowhere. Bahá'u'lláh categorically rejects "academic pursuits that begin and end in words alone," stating, "Such academic pursuits as begin and end in words alone have never been and will never be of any worth. The majority of Persia's learned doctors devote all their lives to the study of a philosophy the ultimate yield of which is nothing but words" (*Tablets of Bahá'u'lláh* 169). This criticism is not a wholesale rejection of philosophy, but a warning against metaphysical hairsplitting and barren dialectics that yield no actionable insight or moral transformation. As Shoghi Effendi clarified in a letter written on his behalf, "Philosophy, as you will study it and later teach it, is certainly not one of the sciences that begins and ends in words. Fruitless excursions into metaphysical hair-splittings is meant, not a sound branch of learning like philosophy" (*Messages from the Universal House of Justice*).

The proper aim of philosophy, according to Bahá'í thought, is aligned with the pursuit of truth, justice, and moral refinement. Bahá'u'lláh emphasizes that "the purpose of knowledge is the recognition of the Truth. Whoso is veiled from this by even the subtlest of veils is among the dead" (*Epistle to the Son of the Wolf* 23). Knowledge divorced from spiritual recognition becomes an illusion of understanding. Thus, one who "encompassed all the sciences of the earth yet paused at the Word 'Yea'" would, in the sight of God, "be unworthy of mention and counted among the most ignorant of people" (23).

This epistemological orientation supports the Bahá'í principle of the harmony of religion and reason. As 'Abdu'l-Bahá explains, "Religion must conform to science and reason; otherwise, it is superstition. God has created man in order that he may perceive the verity of existence and endowed him with mind or reason to discover truth" (*Promulgation of Universal Peace* 63). Reason, therefore, is essential and honored, but its scope is limited: it cannot, on its own, penetrate the full reality of divine mysteries without the aid of Revelation. As 'Abdu'l-Bahá continues, "The greatest philosophers without this Spirit are powerless, their souls lifeless, their hearts dead! Unless the Holy Spirit breathes into their souls, they can do no good work" (*Some Answered Questions* 226).

In this light, the Bahá'í Faith offers a redefinition of what constitutes a true philosopher or wise person (ḥakīm). A ḥakīm is not merely one who reasons well or is versed in dialectics but one who marries insight with action, reason with submission, and speech with transformative power. "A true philosopher would never deny God nor His evidences, rather would he acknowledge His glory and overpowering majesty which overshadow all created things" (*Tablets of Bahá'u'lláh* 169). Furthermore, "The beginning of Wisdom and the origin thereof is to acknowledge whatsoever God hath clearly set forth, for through its potency the foundation of statesmanship... hath been firmly established" (169).

Interpretation (ta'wīl), when divorced from the apparent text and undertaken by unauthorized individuals, is explicitly prohibited in Bahá'í teachings. Bahá'u'lláh writes, "Whoso interpreteth what hath been sent down from the heaven of Revelation, and altereth its evident meaning, verily he is of them that have perverted the Most Exalted Word of God" (*Kitáb-i-Aqdas* verse 105). Interpretation, if it alters the evident sense or imposes a hidden meaning that contradicts the outward word, is viewed as both heretical and destructive. As 'Abdu'l-Bahá warns, "Bahá'ís neither consider themselves among those firmly grounded in knowledge who can engage in interpretation (ta'wīl), nor do they believe that anyone other than God has the right to interpret (ta'wīl)" (*Makátīb-i-'Abdu'l-Bahá*, vol. 1, 317).

In contrast, explanation (tafsīr) is permitted when it remains in accord with the manifest text and does not claim access to an esoteric layer that supersedes the literal command. Bahá'u'lláh asserts, "The people of Bahá are souls who consider anything contrary to the apparent command of God to be false. The inner and the inner of the inner revolve around this outward" (*Lawḥ-i-Burhān*).

This disciplined hermeneutics mirrors the Faith's broader commitment to spiritual clarity and ethical transformation. "The head of wisdom is the fear of God," Bahá'u'lláh proclaims, affirming that reverence for divine law is the foundation of true understanding. This fear "prevents humanity from that which causes humiliation and degradation... and assists him in that which causes elevation and sublimity" (*Tablets of Bahá'u'lláh* 169). Thus, philosophy in the Bahá'í sense is inseparable from piety, and wisdom cannot be abstracted from justice, consultation, and compassion—the "two luminaries" that illumine its heaven (169).

Ultimately, the Bahá'í model of reason and interpretation affirms that philosophy, when guided by Revelation and animated by virtue, becomes a creative force for civilization-building. Detached from divine purpose, it devolves into the "chilling of spirits" and the "idle imaginings" of a speech without fruit. The Bahá'í philosopher is thus a new figure—a lover of wisdom who recognizes its Source, a practitioner of truth who honors its Form, and an interpreter who speaks only when illuminated by the light of the Manifest Word.

Conclusion

This article has sought to answer a deceptively simple question: is there such a thing as a Bahá'í philosophy? Not in the sense of a system imposed from outside, but as a mode of thought native to the Revelation itself—one in which reason, wisdom, and spiritual insight coalesce. We began by showing that philosophy and wisdom (*ḥikmat*) are not marginal to the Bahá'í Faith, but central to its structure, purpose, and metaphysical vision. Drawing on a wide range of thinkers—Muslim, Christian, and Bahá'í—we explored how philosophical inquiry can emerge within Revelation without reducing itself to theology or losing its reflective autonomy.

Section 2 affirmed that Bahá'í thought has inspired and attracted philosophers, scholars, and scientists from both East and West. The lives of intellectual believers—from Mírzá Abu'l-Faḍl to Auguste Forel, from Nabil-i-Akbar to Ali-Murad Davudi—demonstrate that Bahá'í philosophy is not an abstract theory but a lived intellectual and spiritual horizon. Section 3 then traced the deep philosophical content within the writings of Bahá'u'lláh and 'Abdu'l-Bahá, showing how themes such as ontology, epistemology, metaphysics, and ethics are radically reconfigured within a prophetic metaphysics grounded in *ẓuhūr* (manifestation), the unknowability of the Divine Essence (*dhāt*), and the centrality of the Word (*kalimah*) as both ontological bridge and hermeneutical key.

In Section 4, we explored the relationship between philosophy and theology, situating Bahá'í metaphysics in continuity and contrast with figures such as Aquinas, Augustine, and Avicenna. We argued that Bahá'u'lláh does not offer a theology of *esse* (pure being), but a metaphysics of *ẓuhūr*—a dynamic, non-totalizing model that affirms hierarchy, causality, and cyclical history without collapsing into either classical ontology or fideistic submission. Philosophy is not subordinated to dogma, nor does it function in abstraction; rather, it is reborn in the act of Revelation, becoming a mode of world-building guided by ethical transformation.

Section 5, finally, addressed the interpretive foundations of Bahá'í thought. Here we saw that hermeneutics—understood as the search for meaning through Revelation—is central to Bahá'í philosophy. Unlike theological traditions that privilege either rigid exegesis (*tafsīr*) or esoteric symbolism (*taʾwīl*), the Bahá'í Writings affirm a mode of interpretation that is both disciplined and open, rooted in the coherence of the Revelation as a whole and guided by authorized interpreters: 'Abdu'l-Bahá and the Guardian. Drawing from both Western hermeneutics (Gadamer, Ricoeur) and Islamic traditions of meaning, Bahá'í hermeneutics insists on three principles: the centrality of the Manifestation, the unity of meaning and practice, and the humility of the interpreter. Interpretation, in this model, is not the assertion of personal authority, but a covenantal responsibility to understand truth within the bounds of revealed guidance.

Together, these five sections articulate the lineaments of a Bahá'í philosophy: not a school, but a paradigm; not a synthesis of the past, but the emergence of a new structure of thought. It is a philosophy in which metaphysics is inseparable from ethics, where knowledge is a function of purity, and where interpretation is never detached from action. In contrast to postmodern skepticism or religious literalism, Bahá'í thought offers a vision of philosophy as both intellectually rigorous and spiritually anchored—a vision grounded in the Manifestation of God, animated by the love of wisdom, and committed to the transformation of self and society.

Works Cited

'Abdu'l-Bahá. (n.d.). *Commentary on the Hidden Treasure (Tafsír-i-Kuntu Kanzan Makhfíyyan)*. [PDF].

'Abdu'l-Bahá. (n.d.). *Some Answered Questions*. [PDF].

'Abdu'l-Bahá. (n.d.). *Selections from the Writings of 'Abdu'l-Bahá*. [PDF].

'Abdu'l-Bahá. (n.d.). *Tablet to August Forel (Lawh-i-Duktúr Forel)*. *The Bahá'í World*, 15, 37–43. [PDF].

'Abdu'l-Bahá. (n.d.). *Tablets of the Divine Plan*. [PDF].

'Abdu'l-Bahá. (n.d.). *The Tablet of the Universe (Lawh-i-Aflakiyyih)*. [PDF].

'Abdu'l-Bahá. (n.d.). *Treatise on Leadership (Risálíyih Síyásíyih)*. [PDF].

'Abdu'l-Bahá. (n.d.). *Will and Testament of 'Abdu'l-Bahá (Alváḥ-i-Vaṣáyá)*. [PDF].

Aristotle. *Metaphysics*. Translated by W. D. Ross, in *The Complete Works of Aristotle*, edited by Jonathan Barnes, Princeton University Press, 1984.

Bahá'u'lláh. (n.d.). *Chihár-Vádí (Four Valleys)*. [PDF].

Bahá'u'lláh. (n.d.). *Haft-Vádí (Seven Valleys)*. [PDF].

Bahá'u'lláh. (n.d.). *Kitáb-i-Íqán (The Book of Certitude)*. [PDF].

Bahá'u'lláh. (n.d.). *Lawḥ-i-Basít al-Ḥaqíqah (Tablet of the Uncompounded Reality)*. [PDF].

Bahá'u'lláh. (n.d.). *Lawḥ-i-Burhán (Tablet of the Proof)*. In *Tablets of Bahá'u'lláh* (pp. 203–216). [PDF].

Bahá'u'lláh. (n.d.). *Lawḥ-i-Dunyá (Tablet of the World)*. In *Tablets of Bahá'u'lláh* (pp. 81–97). [PDF].

Bahá'u'lláh. (n.d.). *Lawḥ-i-Ḥikmat (Tablet of Wisdom)*. In *Tablets of Bahá'u'lláh* (pp. 135–152). [PDF].

Bahá'u'lláh. (n.d.). *Lawḥ-i-Ibn-i-Dhib (Epistle to the Son of the Wolf)*. [PDF].

Bahá'u'lláh. (n.d.). *Lawḥ-i-Maqṣúd (Tablet of Maqṣúd)*. In *Tablets of Bahá'u'lláh* (pp. 159–178). [PDF].

Derrida, Jacques. *Writing and Difference*. Translated by Alan Bass, University of Chicago Press, 1978.

Gilson, E. (1939). *Reason and Revelation in the Middle Ages*. Charles Scribner's Sons.

Gilson, E. (1940). *The Spirit of Mediaeval Philosophy* (A. H. C. Downes, Trans.). Charles Scribner's Sons. (Original work published 1938)

Gilson, E. (1965). *The Philosophy of St. Bonaventure* (D. I. Trethowan & F. J. Sheed, Trans.). St. Anthony Guild Press.

Gilson, E. (1984). *From Aristotle to Darwin and Back Again: A Journey in Final Causality, Species, and Evolution* (J. Lyon, Trans.). University of Notre Dame Press. (Original work published 1971)

Gilson, E. (1993). *Christian Philosophy: An Introduction* (A. Maurer, Trans.). Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies.

Heidegger, Martin. *Introduction to Metaphysics*. Translated by Gregory Fried and Richard Polt, Yale University Press, 1959.

Kant, Immanuel. *Critique of Pure Reason*. Translated by Paul Guyer and Allen W. Wood, Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Plato. *Republic*. Translated by Paul Shorey, in *The Collected Dialogues of Plato*, edited by Edith Hamilton and Huntington Cairns, Princeton University Press, 1968.

Nasr, Seyyed Hossein. *Three Muslim Sages: Avicenna, Suhrawardī, Ibn 'Arabī*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1964.