قرآن و روشنگری دینی

سال ششم، شماره اول، پیاپی یازدهم، بهار و تابستان ۱۴۰۴ (۱۵۲-۱۳۳)
DOI: 10.30473/quran.2025.74349.1319

«مقاله پژوهشی»

تحلیل و ارزیابی شبهه دکتر سروش درباره نقش فاعلی و محوری پیامبر (ص) در فرآیند وحی و نقد آن از منظر علامه طباطبایی

محمد اکبری

استادیار، دانشگاه علوم و معارف قرآن کریم، قم، ایران.

نویسنده مسئول:
محمد اکبری
رایانامه:
mohammadakbrai2014@gmail.com

تاریخ دریافت: ۱۴۰۴/۰۲/۰۸
تاریخ پذیرش: ۱۴۰۴/۰۵/۲۱

استناد به این مقاله:
اکبری، محمد (۱۴۰۴). تحلیل و ارزیابی شبهه دکتر سروش درباره نقش فاعلی و محوری پیامبر (ص) در فرآیند وحی و نقد آن از منظر علامه طباطبایی. فصلنامه قرآن و روشنگری دینی، ۶(۱)، ۱۵۲-۱۳۳.
(DOI: 10.30473/quran.2025.74349.1319)

چکیده

مسأله وحی و نقش پیامبر اسلام (ص) در دریافت و ابلاغ آن، از مباحث بنیادین علوم قرآنی و کلام اسلامی است. دکتر عبدالکریم سروش با ارائه نظریه‌ای جدید، مدعی است که پیامبر (ص) در شکل‌گیری و پردازش وحی نقش فاعلی داشته و وحی را امری درون‌ذهنی و متأثر از تجربه نبوی می‌داند. این دیدگاه با مبانی وحیانی و تفسیری سنتی در تعارض است. در مقابل، علامه طباطبایی وحی را حقیقتی فرابشری و مستقل از ذهن پیامبر (ص) می‌داند که مستقیماً از سوی خداوند نازل شده است. روش تحقیق این مقاله، توصیفی-تحلیلی و تطبیقی است. ابتدا نظریه دکتر سروش بررسی شده، سپس مبانی قرآنی و تفسیری علامه طباطبایی تحلیل و در نهایت، این دو دیدگاه مقایسه شده‌اند. استناد به منابع تفسیری، روایی و تاریخی نشان می‌دهد که نظریه دکتر سروش از نظر مبانی قرآنی دچار اشکالات اساسی است. آیات متعددی همچون «إِنْ هُوَ إِلَّا وَحْی یوحَی» (نجم/ ۴) و «نَزَلَ بِهِ الرُّوحُ الْأَمِینُ» (شعراء/ ۱۹۳) صراحتاً وحی را کلام الهی و مستقل از ذهن پیامبر (ص) معرفی می‌کنند. نتایج تحقیق نشان می‌دهد که نظریه سنتی وحی که توسط علامه طباطبایی مطرح شده، از استحکام بیشتری برخوردار بوده و با مستندات قرآنی و تفسیری تطابق کامل دارد. در مقابل، دیدگاه دکتر سروش، که وحی را پدیده‌ای بشری میداند، نه تنها فاقد پشتوانه قرآنی است، بلکه با فهم تاریخی و سنت تفسیری مسلمانان نیز ناسازگار بوده و ازاین‌رو مردود است.

واژه‌های کلیدی

وحی، پیامبر اسلام، نظریه دکتر سروش، علامه طباطبایی، نقش فاعلی پیامبر.

Quran and Religious Enlightenment Open Access

Spring & Summer (2025) 6(1): 133-152
DOI: 10.30473/quran.2025.74349.1319

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Citing and Evaluating Abdolkarim Soroush's Doubt about the Prophet's (PBUH) Active and Central Role in the Process of Revelation and Its Critique from the Perspective of *Allamah Ṭabāṭabā'ī*

Mohammad Akbari

Assistant Professor, Qom University of Holy Quran Sciences and Education, Qom, Iran.

Correspondence
Mohammad Akbari
Email:
mohammadakbrai2014@gmail.com

Received: 28 Apr 2025
Accepted: 12 Aug 2025

How to cite
Akbari, A. (2025). Citing and Evaluating Abdolkarim Soroush's Doubt about the Prophet's (PBUH) Active and Central Role in the Process of Revelation and Its Critique from the Perspective of *Allamah Ṭabāṭabā'ī*. Quran and Religious Enlightenment, 6(1), 133-152. (DOI: 10.30473/quran.2025.74349.1319)

ABSTRACT

The issue of the nature of revelation and the position of the Prophet of Islam (PBUH) in the process of receiving and communicating it is one of the most important issues in the philosophy of religion and Islamic theology, which has always been a point of convergence for traditional and modern viewpoints. Abdolkarim Soroush, relying on hermeneutical principles, the psychology of religion, and religious empiricism, has proposed a theory that considers the Prophet not merely a passive recipient, but a central agent in the production of revelation. This viewpoint has significant consequences for understanding the nature of the Quran, the position of prophethood, and the concept of revelation. In contrast to this view, *Allamah Ṭabāṭabā'ī*, relying on transcendent philosophy, offers a theory based on which revelation is a trans-human reality, independent of the Prophet's mind, and its reception is of the type of presential knowledge and spiritual intuition. This article, using a descriptive-analytical method and a comparative approach, compares the epistemological and ontological foundations of these two viewpoints and attempts to critique Soroush's theory from the perspective of Islamic philosophy, especially the interpretive and theological views of *Allamah Ṭabāṭabā'ī*. In the process of analysis, the methodological differences between the two intellectual systems are first explained, and then the internal coherence of both theories is evaluated by examining Quranic, interpretive, and rational sources. The results of the research show that Soroush's view, due to its neglect of the ontological levels of revelation and its ambiguity in the relationship between human experience and divine speech, is not consistent with Quranic principles and the interpretive system of Islamic tradition. In contrast, *Allamah Ṭabāṭabā'ī*'s theory has greater conceptual coherence, the support of religious texts, and deeper philosophical grounding, and is able to provide an intra-religious and rational answer to the questions of religious modernity.

KEYWORDS

Revelation, Prophet of Islam (PBUH), Abdolkarim Soroush's Theory, Allamah Ṭabāṭabā'ī, The Prophet's Active Role, The Holy Quran.

Introduction

Throughout the history of Islamic thought, the subject of revelation and the manner of the Quran's descent has always been one of the central topics of theological and interpretive discussions. From the beginning of Islam until today, examining the nature of revelation and the Prophet of Islam's (PBUH) role in this process has been a sensitive and thought-provoking subject. In this regard, Abdolkarim Soroush's theory about the Prophet's (PBUH) active and central role in revelation has caused much re-evaluation and debate among contemporary scholars.

Abdolkarim Soroush, by presenting a new and different viewpoint from traditional approaches, emphasizes that the Prophet (PBUH) should be considered not only the absolute recipient of revelation but also an influential and facilitating agent in the process of its descent. This view has led to serious challenges in understanding old traditions and classical interpretive perceptions, and has raised fundamental questions about the interpretation of Quranic verses, the nature of revelation, and the Prophet's (PBUH) role. From the perspective of classical scholars and interpreters such as *Allamah Ṭabāṭabā'ī*, the Quran is emphasized from the perspective of divine speech and revelation as divine speech. In his interpretation, he introduces Quranic verses as an expression of the word of God and has emphasized that the descent of the Quran is from God, while the Prophet's (PBUH) role in this process is considered a facilitating intermediary, but not a changing or intervening agent in the content.

For this reason, Abdolkarim Soroush's theory about the Prophet's active role in revelation has led to a new and different perspective from the usual perceptions in the field of theology and interpretation. The main challenges raised in this area of critique and analysis of Abdolkarim Soroush's theory include two main axes: first, a re-reading of the nature of revelation in the Quran from the perspective of divine speech; second, an examination of the Prophet's (PBUH) role and position in the process of the descent of revelation. In previous works, such as numerous books on Quranic interpretation from a theological perspective, as well as research articles in the field of the philosophy of religion, the topic of revelation has been addressed as a transcendent and divine phenomenon. For example, in *Allamah Ṭabāṭabā'ī*'s interpretation, Quranic verses are emphasized as the manifestation of divine speech and a sign of the absolute descent of revelation from God.

Furthermore, philosophical research on revelation in contemporary works, such as those of Abdolkarim Soroush, shows a tendency to redefine the traditional concepts of revelation and the Prophet's position in it.

Therefore, one of the main questions of this research is how these two different approaches can be explained within a unified framework, and how the overlaps and contradictions in classical perceptions and Abdolkarim Soroush's new viewpoint can be analyzed. In this regard, research questions are raised, including the following: 'How can Abdolkarim Soroush's theory regarding the Prophet's active role in the descent of revelation be critiqued and examined from the perspective of *Allamah Ṭabāṭabā'ī*'s theological and philosophical foundations?' What Quranic evidence and verses in *Allamah Ṭabāṭabā'ī*'s works explicitly refer to the Quran being the word of God, and 'How can these verses be consistent or contradictory with Abdolkarim Soroush's view on the Prophet's (PBUH) role in the descent of revelation?'

The proposed solution to these challenges in this research is based on a comparative study and textual critique. First, by carefully reviewing Quranic verses and the evidence in *Allamah Ṭabāṭabā'ī*'s works, the traditional view on revelation as divine speech will be examined. Then, based on Abdolkarim Soroush's theoretical and philosophical principles, the Prophet's (PBUH) active role in the process of the descent of revelation will be analyzed and critiqued. On the other hand, the dimensions and concepts raised in contemporary sources and the research background in the field of revelation will be examined to clearly define the distinction of the current article from previous works.

One of the fundamental pillars of any scientific research is a critical review of the research background to correctly reveal the position of the article's scientific innovation. On the subject of this article, namely Abdolkarim Soroush's theory about the Prophet's (PBUH) active role in the process of revelation, various works have been written, each addressing this issue from a specific angle. However, a review of these sources shows that they often lack a comparative-methodological approach between Soroush's view and the Islamic philosophical tradition, especially *Allamah Ṭabāṭabā'ī*'s thought.

Among the foundational works, Soroush's books "The Expansion of Prophetic Experience," "The Parrot and the Bee," and "Muhammad, the Narrator of Prophetic Dreams," present the theoretical framework of his view on the humanity of revelation and the Prophet's active role in producing the religious text. These works are influenced by hermeneutic philosophy, the psychology of religion, and anthropological approaches to religion, and are often distant from the classical foundations of Islamic philosophy. In contrast, the critiques written on Soroush's view are mainly of three types: "Theological-narrative critiques, ethical or political critiques, and specific interpretive critiques." For example, in the book "The Quran, Divine Discourse" by Ali Nasiri, the divinity of the Quran as the word of God is comprehensively emphasized from a narrative and Quranic evidence perspective, and Soroush's view is rejected on this basis (Nasiri, 2011 AD/1390 SH). Also, in "Holy Revelation" by Mostafa Hosseini Tabataba'i, a sharp and sometimes reactionary critique of Soroush's statements is presented, which is more focused on the violation of traditional concepts than on methodological analysis (Hosseini Tabataba'i, 2018 AD/1398 SH).

Research has also been published in specialized journals such as "Theological Knowledge," "Contemporary Quranology," and "Research Miror," which have dealt with aspects of the issue of the Prophet's role in revelation in a scattered manner. These articles, although useful, are often limited to interpretive critique or are analyzed solely within the framework of Soroush's own theorizing, and there has been less effort for a systematic comparison with the principles of transcendent philosophy or *Allamah Ṭabāṭabā'ī*'s thought. On the other hand, regarding the explanation of the philosophy of revelation from *Allamah Ṭabāṭabā'ī*'s perspective, works such as "*al-Mīzān*" and Mostafa Karimi's research in the article "*al-Mīzān* and the Analysis of Revelation" have focused more on explaining the theoretical principles of Allamah than on using them to critique new theories. In other words, these sources have focused on interpreting Allameh's view and have generally not engaged in a direct confrontation with Soroush's view (Karimi, 2013 AD/1393 SH).

The current article has several distinguishing features compared to the background:

1. Unlike the narrative or emotional approach of some critics, this article critiques Soroush's theory with a comparative approach and by using the philosophical framework of transcendent philosophy;

2. Its main innovation lies in analyzing the issue from the perspective of "Paradigm and methodological difference" between Islamic tradition and religious modernity;

3. Unlike partial and reactionary critiques, the article attempts to challenge the internal coherence of Soroush's theory from the perspective of Islamic philosophy, not merely from a position of praising tradition.

Therefore, although a background exists regarding Soroush's theory and the interpretation of revelation, the research field still suffers from the lack of articles that evaluate modern views with Islamic epistemological and philosophical criteria, especially within the framework of transcendent philosophy. This article has tried to fill this gap and take a step towards strengthening the critical interaction between the system of Islamic philosophy and new readings of religion. This research, by using methods of textual and comparative critique and relying on philosophical and theological approaches, precisely examines and compares Abdolkarim Soroush's theory and *Allamah Ṭabāṭabā'ī*'s views on the nature of revelation and divine speech. Thus, the present research, while critiquing existing views, attempts to explain the dimensions and relationships of the concepts of revelation, the descent of the Quran, and the Prophet's (PBUH) role in this process by presenting a theoretical framework. This critical and comparative approach is a prominent feature of the present article that distinguishes it from other similar works. Finally, by emphasizing the need to reconsider traditional perceptions and adapt them to new findings, this research can pave the way for a deep and well-reasoned discussion on the nature of revelation and the Prophet's (PBUH) role in this divine phenomenon.

1. Methodological Foundations for Comparing Soroush's and *Allamah Ṭabāṭabā'ī*'s Views

Before entering into the substantive analysis of Abdolkarim Soroush's view and its critique from the perspective of *Allamah Ṭabāṭabā'ī*, it is necessary to address the fundamental methodological differences between these two intellectual currents. This is because the lack of a precise distinction between the epistemological frameworks of these two thinkers leads to a confusion of methodology with interpretive content, and a critique based on an incongruous paradigm is perceived by some critics as a "Return to the Past". This article, with full awareness of these differences, has been written not with the intention of reconstructing tradition, but in order to evaluate the coherence and explanatory power of each of these two approaches on the issue of revelation.

Soroush's view on revelation has its roots in the hermeneutic and phenomenological tradition of the West. Using the ideas of William James, Gadamer, and Dilthey, he considers revelation an inner and personal experience of the type of prophetic revelation, whose form and content are influenced by the Prophet's psyche, language, and historical personality (Soroush, 2008 AD/1387 SH: 188). This approach is immanent and human-centered and reduces the concept of revelation from the status of "Descent" to the level of "Experience."

In contrast, *Allamah Ṭabāṭabā'ī*, based on the Sadraean transcendent philosophy, considers revelation a trans-human, extra-mental, and transcendent matter that descends from the unseen world, and the Prophet is in the position

of a "Recipient" of presential knowledge and the recipient of the revelatory truth (Ṭabāṭabā'ī, 2009 AD/1388 SH: 18, 76); by distinguishing between presential and acquired knowledge, he emphasizes that the Prophet's perception of revelation is of the type of presential knowledge and immediate certainty in its divine truth. Therefore, the comparison of these two views is not a clash of two interpretations of one method, but a clash of two completely different epistemological systems: "One with phenomenological presuppositions, and the other with Islamic philosophical and Quranic foundations."

Now, the question may arise of how a modern explanation of revelation, 'Which has been formed in the context of Western epistemology, can be critiqued from a traditional interpretive perspective?' The answer is that the Islamic religious tradition, especially in the form of transcendent philosophy and late rational theology, is not merely a jurisprudential system or a narrative tradition, but itself has an independent and orderly philosophical-theological system that has the power to critique imported concepts and modern readings of religion. *Allamah Ṭabāṭabā'ī* is the representative of this rational current in the Islamic world. By using revelatory rationality and Quranic analysis, he provides a coherent and independent framework for explaining revelation. This theoretical capacity makes it possible to critique concepts such as the "Humanity of Revelation," "Historicity of the Quran," and the "Prophet's agency in revelation" not merely with a traditionalist defense, but with a rational-interpretive analysis.

One of the common criticisms of critiquing Soroush's view from a traditional perspective is a return to the past interpretive system and the inability to provide a new framework. This criticism is valid when the critique is based solely on imitating tradition. In contrast, the present article, by a precise re-reading of *Allamah Ṭabāṭabā'ī*'s epistemological system, seeks to reconstruct an alternative and independent theory against Soroush's modern paradigm. This is a theory that not only has the power to respond to new questions but also has internal coherence and the support of revelatory texts. In other words, a return to *Allamah Ṭabāṭabā'ī* is not a historically dated return to the past, but a use of the neglected capacities of Islamic rationality in confronting religious modernity. By proposing this comparative evaluation, the article examines the explanatory power of each of the two views and shows that the traditional theory, despite its historical antiquity, still has considerable dynamism in responding to modern doubts.

2. Abdolkarim Soroush's Theory Regarding the Prophet's Active Role in Revelation

In his analysis of revelation and how it is formed, Abdolkarim Soroush gives a fundamental position to the Prophet of Islam. He believes that the Prophet's outstanding and powerful personality was the main factor in this process and says about this: "The Holy Prophet had a comprehensive role; he was both the discoverer and the teacher, both the speaker and the listener, both the law-giver and the legislator. In this, God only played the role of sending the teacher, and other matters depended on the Prophet's personal experiences and reactions. He had the necessary readiness and equipment and knew well what to say and how to act. Of course, he was a human being with all human characteristics; sometimes he gave excellent lessons and sometimes he was influenced by unworthy students. Sometimes he was in ecstasy and sometimes he was bored. His

speech was sometimes simple and sometimes soared."

Soroush emphasizes elsewhere: "In my opinion, the Prophet had a fundamental role in the creation and production of the Quran. The metaphor of poetry can be effective in understanding this concept; the Prophet was like a poet who felt that a force beyond him had influenced his existence, but at the same time, or even more than that, he himself was the creator and producer of this discourse." (Soroush, 2008 AD/1387 SH: 26).

He considers revelation a human and earthly phenomenon and says: "To consider the Quran as the word of Muhammad is similar to considering it his miracle. Both are attributed to the Prophet and to God to the same extent, and emphasizing one does not mean denying the other. In the universe, everything that happens happens with God's knowledge, will, and permission, and no monotheist doubts this. However, just as we say that a cherry fruit belongs to a cherry tree, we should not imagine that to emphasize monotheism, we must say that God directly creates the cherry. We should not present the old Ash'ari perceptions in a new and sanctified guise, but rather express the discourse based on logic and precision. The Quran was the fruit of the Prophet's existential tree that came to fruition with God's permission." (Soroush, 2007 AD/1386 SH: 89)

He continues: "Muhammad was a book that God wrote, and when he read the book of his own existence, the Quran was formed and appeared as the word of God. God composed Muhammad, and Muhammad composed the Quran, and in the end, the Quran became the book of God; just as God created the bee, and the bee produced honey, and honey is considered a revelatory product." (Soroush, 2008 AD/1387 SH: 188)

In this view, the meaning of revelation originates from God, but its form originates from the Prophet. Just as the reed is from Muhammad but the breath is from God, and the water is from God but the jug is from the Prophet. God has placed the ocean of His existence in the small vessel of the personality of Muhammad ibn Abdullah, and for this reason, all phenomena related to him also take on the color and scent of Muhammad. Muhammad was an Arab, therefore, the Quran was also revealed in Arabic (Soroush, 2007 AD/1386 SH (a): 9).

Abdolkarim Soroush, in a conversation with Michel Hoebink, points to the difference between traditional and new views on revelation. He states that from a traditional perspective, revelation is free from any error. But today, a growing number of interpreters believe that revelation is free from error in purely religious matters, such as the attributes of God, life after death, and acts of worship, but in matters related to the material world and human society, the possibility of error is conceivable. Soroush considers revelation to be a matter without form and says that the Prophet is responsible for giving it form. He says about this: "Revelation in its essence is formless and indeterminate, and it is the Prophet who must give it form so that it becomes receivable by everyone. He, like a poet, conveys this inspiration to others in the language he masters, with the style he masters, and by using the images and knowledge he has." (Soroush, 2007 AD/1386 SH (a): 12)

Accordingly, since the Prophet was influenced by the culture of his time and, like any other human being, could make mistakes, revelation will not be free from error in the parts related to worldly and human issues. Soroush emphasizes this belief elsewhere and says: "The Prophet's main asset was his personality, and this

personality was both the place of appearance, the creative agent, and the recipient of religious and revelatory experiences. The expansion of his personality led to the development of the revelatory experience and vice versa, and for this reason, revelation was subordinate to the Prophet, not the Prophet to revelation. He was not under Gabriel's command; rather, it was Gabriel who was subordinate to the Prophet, and the descent of the angel happened by his will." (Soroush, 2006 AD/1385 SH: 13-14)

According to Soroush, the Quran is the very words of the Prophet and his creation, and the Prophet himself was the agent, originator, and recipient of religious and revelatory experiences. He believes: "The condition for accepting the descent of the Quran from God through Gabriel is to reduce the Prophet's position to a simple tool or intermediary; like a loudspeaker or a parrot that has no choice or will of its own. Is it not better to imagine the Prophet as a living and gushing spring and the originator of these sublime knowledges by emphasizing the inner experience of revelation?" (Soroush, 2008 AD/1387 SH: 189)

With a humanistic view of revelation, Soroush not only considers the Quran to be an earthly and human book, in which the Prophet, by virtue of being human, has benefited from revelation to the extent of his limited capacity, but he also considers the Quran to be the result of the Prophet's personality and inner experience, which is fallible, and consequently, revelation is also not free from error. Therefore, he considers the Quran and the Prophet to be earthly, human, and fallible.

3. A Critique of Abdolkarim Soroush's Theory from the Perspective of *Allamah Ṭabāṭabā'ī*

One of Abdolkarim Soroush's claims is that the Holy Quran is the word of the Prophet, and he has a central role in the production and creation of revelation. Abdolkarim Soroush not only makes such a statement himself but also claims that some interpreters, philosophers, and mystics agree with him and confirm his view. In contrast to this view, what Muslim scholars have stated is that the Holy Prophet does not have an active role in the nature of revelation; rather, he was the recipient of revelation and then had the duty of communicating and explaining it. To prove and validate that the Holy Prophet was not the creator and originator of revelation, it is possible to prove this issue not only through rational reasons, or in other words, extra-religious reasons, but also through the implications of Quranic verses.

He tries to prove his claim through various metaphors and examples and believes that the Holy Prophet (PBUH) is not merely a recipient, communicator, and explainer of revelation, but also has a role beyond these duties. For this claim, he uses the example of a gardener, a tree, and a fruit, meaning that in his opinion, God is the gardener, the Prophet is the tree, and the Quran is its fruit. However, the attribution of the fruit to the tree is a proximate cause, and the attribution of the fruit to the gardener is a mediate cause (Soroush, 2007 AD/1386 SH (a): 14).

Elsewhere, he uses the example of rainfall and says: "God is the beginning of all beginnings and is in the extension of the chain of natural causes, and every phenomenon happens by His will and planning. If this is the case, then why should a material and natural explanation of revelation and divine speech and the emphasis on the Prophet's role in it sever its

connection with God and make the concept of God speaking and revelation descending ineffective and meaningless?" (Soroush, 2008 AD/1387 SH: 168)

Another example is the relationship of honey with the bee and God. In his opinion, the Prophet is not like a loudspeaker or a repeating parrot that has no relevance or involvement in the process of revelation; rather, he is like a bee that has complete relevance and involvement in honey-making. Just as a bee feeds on the flowers and plants in its environment and produces healing honey from them.

According to Abdolkarim Soroush's view, the Prophet of Islam, by using his spiritual discoveries and personal knowledge, and in response to the diverse questions and needs of his audience, presented the Quran within the limited conditions and possibilities of his time and place. From his perspective, the Prophet is not only the recipient of revelation but also the main actor in its formation and realization. In other words, in this process, the Prophet is both the agent and the recipient, both the receiver and the conveyor, and plays multiple roles such as the law-giver, legislator, discoverer, and carrier of the divine message. In this view, God has the role of initiating and sending the revelation, and after that, the major part of the revelation process is organized with the Prophet's personality and experiences as the central point.... (Soroush, 2006 AD/1385 SH: 174)

By reflecting on the collection of analogies and analyses that Abdolkarim Soroush provides to justify his theory about the central role of the Prophet of Islam (PBUH) in the process of revelation, it can be concluded that this view is influenced by a kind of human-centered or, more precisely, "Humanistic" attitude towards the phenomenon of revelation. The meaning of humanism here is an approach in which human experience and consciousness are considered the focal point of understanding and interpreting phenomena, in such a way that even a trans-human phenomenon like revelation is explained within the framework of the Prophet's human capacities. By highlighting the role of the Prophet's individual personality, cultural characteristics, and historical mindset in the creation of the Quran, Abdolkarim Soroush essentially presents revelation as something originating from within the Prophet, not something independent that was revealed to him. Although this view seemingly still acknowledges the divine origin of revelation, it implicitly shifts the explanation of revelation toward interpreting it as a mental experience, capable of being formed within the Prophet's inner being, and based on his human perceptions and reactions. In contrast, *Allamah Ṭabāṭabā'ī*'s view, by emphasizing the Quran's "Divine Word" nature and the complete independence of revelation from the Prophet's mind, is based on a God-centered principle in which the Prophet's role is merely the recipient and communicator of revelation.

Therefore, the attribution of a humanistic perspective to Abdolkarim Soroush's theory is not meant as an accusation, but as an analytical description of his understanding of revelation. This perception is in fundamental conflict with the traditional and theological reading of revelation, which is emphasized by all Muslims, including *Allamah Ṭabāṭabā'ī*, and is subject to critique and rejection from the perspective of Quranic and interpretive principles.

3.1. The Quran's Explicit Statements about being the Word of God

There is much Quranic and narrative evidence that shows that revelation is the speech and word of God to His prophets. Before referring to this evidence, it should be said that the

discussion of divine speech is one of the oldest issues raised in the science of theology and heavenly religions. God speaking is considered an accepted and undeniable belief among the religious. Sadr al-Muta'allihin writes in this regard: "The followers of all heavenly laws agree on the Glorious God being a speaker, because they say God commanded such-and-such, forbade such-and-such, and informed about such-and-such an event. God's command and prohibition are types of speech." (Shirazi, 2001 AD/1380 SH: 244)

In the explanation of Chapter 11, it is stated that God is a speaker by consensus (Ḥillī, 2006 AD/1385 SH: 51). In many verses of the Quran, speaking is attributed to God (al-Nisā'/164; al-Baqarah/253; al-Shūrā/51). Two verses of the Quran explicitly refer to the Quran being the word of God:

"The stay-at-homes will say when you set out to take the spoils, 'Let us follow you.' They want to change the word of Allah." (al-Fatḥ/15) Based on this verse, the "Word of God" that they want to change is the promise that God made to the people of Hudaybiyyah that He would soon allocate the spoils of Khaybar to them after the conquest of Khaybar (Ṭabāṭabā'ī, 2009 AD/1388 SH: 18, 413).

"And if any one of the polytheists seeks your protection, then grant him protection so that he may hear the word of Allah; then deliver him to his place of safety. That is because they are a people who do not know." (al-Tawbah/6)

This verse deals with the ruling on giving protection to polytheists who seek it and says to give them protection so that they may hear the word of God. According to *Allamah Ṭabāṭabā'ī* in *al-Mīzān*, the meaning of "the word of God" (in this verse) is all Quranic verses (Ṭabāṭabā'ī, 2009 AD/1388 SH: 9, 193). A group of thinkers believe that in this verse, by using the pronoun, the Prophet is referred to three times (in the verbs *Ista'jarak*, *Fa'ajirh*, and *Ablighhu*). With all this emphasis on the Prophet as the addressee, is it logical that suddenly in the section "So that he may hear the word of Allah," the discussion shifts to the word of God? So if, as Abdolkarim Soroush claimed, the Quran is the word of the Prophet, why was it not said "So that he may hear your word"? Adding a "*Ka*" would have made the meaning clearer and the verse shorter and more concise (Nasiri, 2011 AD/1390 SH: 42). It is clear from these explanations that the Quran is a book whose divine origin and being the word of God are emphasized. Therefore, there is no reason left to consider the Quran as the word of the Prophet with a human origin.

From the perspective of Islamic philosophy, especially in Sadr al-Muta'allihin's transcendent philosophy, "Divine Speech," as an act of the Almighty, has levels that can be explained in the context of the hierarchical system of existence. In this view, God's speech is not a verbal or temporal matter but an act of the Necessary Being that has descended from the realm of divine knowledge to the level of expression and emanation. As Mulla Sadra explicitly states in *al-Mabda' wa al-Ma'ād*, divine speech is of the type of inner speech that is latent in the level of God's summary knowledge of things and, as a result of God's will, manifests as detailed and descended speech in the form of revelation (Shirazi, 2001 AD/1380 SH: 246). Therefore, attributing the Quran to God in terms of speech is not about verbal creation or linguistic composition but about the emanation of a reality that is the very knowledge and will of God.

On the other hand, in Islamic philosophy, the Necessary Being is a simple reality (*Basīṭ al-Ḥaqīqah*) and at the same time an independent

agent, so the issuance of speech from Him does not require composition or temporality, but happens through illumination and manifestation. Following this view, the Quranic revelation is an act of God's existential acts that the Prophet of Islam (PBUH), by benefiting from his abstract rational and spiritual powers, finds the ability to receive and bear. This understanding is in complete conflict with Soroush's view, which, by reducing revelation to human experience and the Prophet's inner perception, denies the existential and creative nature of divine speech. Consequently, from the perspective of Islamic philosophy, Abdolkarim Soroush's theory is in conflict with the principle of "Vertical Agency" and also with the principle of the "Simplicity of the Reality of God," and cannot provide an acceptable explanation for the Quran being the word of God.

In conclusion, it can be said that *Allamah Ṭabāṭabā'ī*, in his interpretation of the verses that point to the Quran being the "Word of God," Including "And if any one of the polytheists seeks your protection, then grant him protection so that he may hear the word of Allah" (al-Tawbah/6) and "They want to change the word of Allah," (al-Fatḥ/15) considers these expressions to refer to an independent, transcendent reality attributed to the divine essence, which the Prophet is only the intermediary for its perception and communication, not its agent. He explicitly states that the Quran as divine speech is of the type of God's actual knowledge that has been imparted to the Prophet in the form of words and meaning, commensurate with human capacity. Therefore, the attribution of the Quran to God is of the type of the relationship of a real agent to his act, not a metaphorical or figurative relationship. In contrast, Abdolkarim Soroush, relying on a humanistic approach, believes that the word of God is not the final expression, but rather the Quran is the speech of the Prophet who has formulated his religious experiences in a linguistic, literary, and human form. With examples such as the gardener and the fruit or the bee and the honey, he considers revelation to be the inherent product of the Prophet and not a discourse dependent on God. The clash of these two views becomes clear in the causal relationship between God and revelation: "Soroush considers the Prophet to be the main agent of the discourse, but *Allamah Ṭabāṭabā'ī* considers revelation to be solely a divine act that is illuminated on the soul of the Prophet. In this way, the Quran is the very word of God, not a reflection of the Prophet's historical personality."

3.2. Revelation as Divine Speech

In addition to the previous Quranic evidence, other verses of the Holy Quran also explicitly emphasize that revelation to the Prophet of Islam (PBUH) is a type of divine discourse. A discourse that, despite the Creator's grandeur and immateriality, occurs in accordance with His Lordly status and in proportion to the Prophet's existential capacity. For example, in verse 51 of Surah al-Shūrā, it is stated:

"And it is not for any human being that God should speak to him except by way of revelation or from behind a veil or by sending a messenger and revealing by His permission what He wills. Indeed, He is High and Wise."

This noble verse enumerates three ways for the realization of revelation and explicitly states that God's speaking to a human being is not possible through ways other than these three. Imam Ali (PBUH) in explaining this verse, considered revelation to be a matter of multiple appearances and varied manifestations: "Sometimes in the form of speech, sometimes in the form of an inner inspiration, sometimes in

truthful dreams, and sometimes in the form of the descent of readable verses, all of which ultimately find meaning under the title of the word of God." (Ahmadi, 2014 AD/1393 SH: 191).

Allamah Ṭabāṭabā'ī also makes this verse the basis of a precise philosophical analysis and states that divine discourse, unlike human discourse, does not require sound and language, nor is it dependent on time and matter. Rather, it is the manifestation of divine knowledge and will that is imparted to the soul of the Prophet through specific means. In his interpretation, he considers the phrase "Indeed, He is High and Wise" as the reason for the special method of God's discourse and explains that God, due to His inherent loftiness and infinite wisdom, has put aside direct human address and has chosen instead transcendent forms such as revelation, inspiration, and the sending of an angel (Ṭabāṭabā'ī, 2009 AD/1388 SH: 18, 75).

Allamah continues with a grammatical and philosophical precision, stating that the expression "Except by Way of Revelation" is a kind of connected, not a disconnected, exception. This means that revelation itself is an actual instance of divine discourse and, along with the other three types, indicates the forms of God's linguistic communication with human beings. In his view, this communication is not an ordinary conversation but an existential and intuitive act that unites with the Prophet's soul. This perception can be analyzed based on his philosophical principles regarding presential knowledge, the union of the knower and the known, and the immateriality of the Prophet's soul; where the Prophet is not a listener of sound, but a presential observer of the Lord's word.

To complete this meaning, *Allamah Ṭabāṭabā'ī* emphasizes under verse 11 of Surah Ṭāhā that at the first moment of receiving revelation, no cognitive doubt or rational argumentation arises for the Prophet. Rather, what happens is the direct and immediate intuition of the divine command. This is because if the Prophet's knowledge of revelation were the result of argumentation or rational premises, it would no longer be called "Revelation." Rather, this immediate certainty is the result of the Prophet's soul's connection to the unseen world (ibid: 14, 137).

Ṭabrisī also, in his commentary *Majma' al-Bayān*, relying on this same verse, confirms the three paths of revelation and considers its descent to be exclusively in non-material and divine forms. In his belief, any divine discourse, whether direct revelation, inspiration, or through an angel, have a single reality and a holy origin (Ṭabrisī, 2011 AD/1390 SH: 9, 11).

Finally, it must be said that *Allamah Ṭabāṭabā'ī*'s view here is not merely an interpretation but seeks to provide a philosophical explanation for the essence of revelation: "Revelation as a divine act, commensurate with a transcendent ontology, not a human experience or a mental production of the Prophet; and this difference is precisely the fundamental point of divergence between Allameh's theory and Abdolkarim Soroush's, who regards revelation as an internal phenomenon, structured within the context of the Prophet's personality and the culture of his time; while in Allameh's intellectual system, revelation is a light descending from the Presence of the Lord, and the Quran is the immediate manifestation of His transcendent word."

In Islamic philosophy, especially in the philosophical system of *Allamah Ṭabāṭabā'ī* which is based on the principles of transcendent philosophy, revelation is not an internal and personal experience, but a presential and intuitive matter that is realized as a result of the connection of the Prophet's soul to the active

intellect. In *Nihāyat al-Ḥikmah* and also in his commentary *al-Mīzān*, Allamah repeatedly points out that revelation is a type of existential connection between the true agent, which is God, and the Prophet's faculty of perception; in such a way that the Prophet, without the mediation of reasoning, witnesses the reality of revelation with his whole being. This view is based on the fundamental distinction between acquired knowledge and presential knowledge. Revelation is a level of a specific kind of presential knowledge that can only be realized in the Prophet's being and through his spiritual abstraction. This philosophical approach is in direct conflict with Abdolkarim Soroush's view based on the humanity of revelation and its subordination to the Prophet's personality.

Soroush, by appealing to models such as poetry, artistic inspiration, or literary metaphors, considers revelation a type of inner experience of the kind of human feeling and perception, which can, of course, have a divine origin, but in its formation and realization, the Prophet's personality and consciousness play a fundamental role. While in Islamic philosophy, a religious experience is legitimate when it is the result of the manifestation of God's action at the level of presential intuition and not merely a psychological effervescence or inner affections. From this perspective, the Prophet is not merely a conveyor of his own experience, but a bearer of a transcendent reality to which he has been connected through his abstraction and existential capacity. Therefore, the reduction of revelation to a human experience implies the denial of philosophical principles such as "The Abstraction of the Soul," "Connection to the Active Intellect," and "Presential Knowledge," and is clearly incompatible with Islamic philosophy.

Finally, it can be said: "*Allamah Ṭabāṭabā'ī*'s view on the verses of *al-An'ām* (50) and *Yūnus* (16) refers to a precise philosophical position in which the Holy Prophet (PBUH) is introduced not as the creator or author of the Quran, but as a complete follower of divine revelation. The Prophet's emphasis on the lack of knowledge of the unseen, not possessing divine treasures, and denying being an angel, refers to the meaning that the Quran is not an internal effervescence, but is imparted to his soul from a transcendent source. From Allameh's perspective, this subordination is not a moral humility, but the expression of an ontological reality: revelation is a divine act, and the Prophet is only its place of manifestation."

In contrast, Abdolkarim Soroush's theory reduces the Prophet's subordination to a conventional and linguistic justification and seeks to establish the Prophet in the position of the "True Agent of Revelation" through it. According to Soroush, although God is the "Remote Origin," the proximate and real agency belongs to the Prophet. For this reason, he uses expressions like "The Prophet is a poet" or "A Honeybee". This is while in Allameh's intellectual system, the Prophet is not the agent of revelation but the place of its descent, and this very distinction is the fundamental point of divergence between the two views. The Prophet's subordination confirms the Quran's belonging to God, while in Soroush's theory; this very subordination turns into a kind of literary self-interpretation.

3.3. The Prophet's Emphasis on the Quran's Revelatory Nature

In some verses of the Holy Quran, the Prophet of Islam (PBUH) explicitly emphasizes the revelatory nature of the Quran and denies any attribution of it to himself or his human powers. For example, in verse 50 of Surah *al-An'ām*, he says:

"Say, I do not tell you that I have the treasures of Allah or that I know the unseen, nor do I tell you that I am an angel. I only follow what is revealed to me."

In this verse, the Prophet denies three sacred statuses for himself: first, possessing divine treasures; second, knowledge of the unseen; and third, being an angel. According to *Allamah Ṭabāṭabā'ī*, these denials are not out of humility, but to draw a precise line between the "Agent of Revelation" and the "Recipient of Revelation". By stating that he only follows what is revealed to him, the Prophet in fact separates his existential nature from the source and creator of revelation and introduces himself in the position of "Bearer," not the "Maker," of the Quran. From the perspective of Islamic philosophy, and especially in transcendent philosophy, this statement of the Prophet has its roots in the principle of causality and the abstraction of the Prophet's soul. Revelation, in this epistemological system, is a matter emanating from the active intellect that is imparted to the Prophet's soul, and the Prophet, through his abstraction and special spiritual readiness, witnesses it. But this witnessing is not the Prophet's action, but the reflection of divine actuality in his existential vessel. So when the Prophet declares: "I only follow what is revealed to me," this is not a merely interpretive or moral position, but a philosophical confession to the objectivity of revelation with presential knowledge and an emphasis on the existential passivity of the Prophet in the face of divine emanation.

Furthermore, verse 16 of Surah *Yūnus* also confirms this truth:

"Say, If Allah had willed, I would not have recited it to you, nor would He have made it known to you. For I have remained among you for a lifetime before it. Do you not then reason?"

In this verse, the Prophet points to two fundamental points: first, that if the Quran was his own creation, he could have presented it in previous years as well; and second, that the descent of the Quran is subject to divine will and not the Prophet's desire or inner ability. *Allamah Ṭabāṭabā'ī*, in his interpretation of this verse, emphasizes that the structure of the sentence and its context indicate the absolute denial of the Prophet's agency in the creation of the Quran, because he is merely a messenger and carrier of the divine message, not its source. If, according to Abdolkarim Soroush's view, the Quran was the result of the Prophet's personal experience and inner effervescence, this volume of emphasis on non-agency, the denial of knowledge of the unseen, and having no choice in the descent of the verses would seem unjustified and even inconsistent with the main claim. But in light of Allameh's philosophical analysis, it becomes clear that these denials are not only incompatible with the status of prophethood but are a necessary part of it, because revelation is not a human production, but a manifestation of God's actual knowledge in the mirror of the Prophet's soul. Therefore, the Prophet's explicit statement of "Following Revelation" is a precise cognitive manifestation of the relationship between the servant and the Lord in the realm of revelation, a relationship that in Abdolkarim Soroush's theory is distorted in favor of a kind of self-sufficiency of the Prophet.

From the perspective of Islamic philosophy, especially in the system of transcendent philosophy, the Prophet's emphasis on the revelatory nature of the Quran is not just a verbal claim, but stems from the presential intuition of the reality of revelation in his holy

soul. In this view, the Prophet is a human being who has reached the level of complete abstraction and receives divine knowledge and truths immediately through an existential connection with the active intellect. Therefore, when the Prophet says: "I only follow what is revealed to me," this statement is not merely out of humility or moral teaching, but a reflection of the "Ontological" reality of receiving revelation as a divine act. This position is inconsistent with Soroush's view, which considers the Prophet the creator of revelation and the discourse as originating from within him, because if the Prophet was the creator of revelation, his emphasis on following divine revelation would, from a philosophical perspective, mean following himself, and such a logical circularity has been considered false by the great figures of philosophy. Therefore, in terms of the philosophy of the soul and the epistemology of revelation, the Prophet's emphasis on the revelatory nature of the Quran is not a sign of weakness and passivity, but a sign of the truth and intuition of a transcendent reality that has descended from God.

3.4. The Descent of the Quran from God

In some verses, God addresses all people and announces that the Quran has been revealed from their Lord. For example, in verse 174 of Surah *al-Nisā'*, God refers to the Quran as a proof and introduces it as having been revealed from Himself:

"O! Mankind, there has come to you a proof from your Lord, and We have sent down to you a clear light."

In this verse, *Allamah Ṭabāṭabā'ī* considers the word "Proof" to mean the Prophet of God and believes that this interpretation is supported by the fact that the sentence is located at the end of verses that state the truthfulness of the Prophet of God in his mission, and another support is that the Quran has been revealed from God Almighty.

In another verse, the descent of the Quran upon God's servant, i.e., the Prophet is mentioned, and the meaning of "What We have revealed" is the Quran, based on the context that its revelation has been specifically attributed to the Prophet of God:

"And what We revealed to Our servant on the Day of Discrimination, the day when the two groups met." (al-Anfāl/41)

"And We have sent down to you the Remembrance (the Quran) so that you may explain to the people what was sent down to them and so that they may reflect." (al-Naḥl/44)

In this verse, the descent of the Quran upon the Holy Prophet is first emphasized, and then his duty and the purpose of the Quran's descent, which is the explanation of the verses by the Prophet, are stated.

Based on the total points stated according to *Allamah Ṭabāṭabā'ī*'s opinion, it must be said that the Quran is a book that has been revealed from the Lord to all people, not from the Holy Prophet (PBUH) as Abdolkarim Soroush believes. Furthermore, in these verses, after stating the descent of the Quran from God, one of the Prophet's duties, which is the explanation of the Quran, is mentioned, meaning that the Prophet is merely the explainer and clarifier of the divine verses, not the producer and creator of revelation. It is also explicitly stated that God has specifically attributed the revelation of the Quran to His servant, the Prophet. So how can it be said that the Prophet brought the Quran from himself?

3.5. The Prophet's Special States during the Descent of the Quran

The following verses refer to the fact that the Holy Prophet (PBUH) was in a hurry and

rushed to receive revelation, which the Quran has forbidden him from doing.

"And do not rush with the Quran before its revelation has been completed to you, and say, My Lord, increase me in knowledge." (Ṭāhā/114)

"Do not move your tongue with it to hasten it. Indeed, upon Us is its collection and recitation. So when We have recited it, then follow its recitation. Then upon Us is its clarification." (al-Qīyāmah/16-19)

"We will make you recite, so you will not forget." (al-Aʿlā/6)

Regarding verse 114 of Surah *Ṭāhā*, it should be said that God explicitly and clearly tells His Prophet not to rush in reciting the Quran before the revelation is completed. The word "Revelation" in this verse and other verses means sending the message or reciting these very Quranic verses that have been revealed by God to the Prophet. This definition of revelation is exactly contrary to Abdolkarim Soroush's definition of revelation, who considers the Quran to be the word of the Prophet. In the verses of Surah *al-Qīyāmah*, three duties—the collection of the Quran, its recitation to the Prophet, and the explanation and clarification of its meanings—are the responsibility of God. In other words, the Prophet is warned not to rush in learning or conveying and communicating the verses of revelation before they descend, because God has promised not to let the revelation be forgotten.

Allamah Ṭabāṭabāʾī, regarding the second verse, believes that the phrase "Do not move your tongue with it" is addressed to the Prophet of God, and the two pronouns "It" refer to the Quran that was revealed to him. In the third verse, *Allamah Ṭabāṭabāʾī* also considers the meaning of *Iqraʾ* (recite) to be that God has said, "We give you (the Prophet) the power to recite the Quran correctly and well".

Therefore, given these points, when the collection of the Quran and its not being forgotten is the responsibility of God Almighty, it can no longer be claimed that the Prophet brought these words from himself. Because if, according to Abdolkarim Soroush's claim, the Quran emanated from the Prophet's soul and inner being, there would be no need for the Prophet to be so concerned about forgetting the verses of the Quran. In other words, in these verses, God explicitly says, "We will collect the verses, and you (the Prophet) do not worry about forgetting them," because we will reveal the verses to you again through the messenger of revelation. When the talk is about revelation and the descent of verses through this method, the claim of the verses emanating from the Prophet will definitely have no place. So it is clear that the Quran, contrary to Abdolkarim Soroush's theory of "Muhammad's Discourse," is divine speech, and its source is not the Prophet's soul or his experience, and when this is not the case, the claim of its historicity will also not be accepted.

In addition to the above, the Holy Prophet (PBUH) had neither read a book nor written a book before the descent of the Quran. This very fact means that the Quran is not the Prophet's words and he did not bring the words of the Quran from himself. In verse 48 of Surah *al-ʿAnkabūt*, it is mentioned that if the Prophet had written or read a book before the descent of the Quran, the misguided would have claimed that the Quran was the Prophet's words.

Allamah Ṭabāṭabāʾī, in explaining this verse, states that the meaning of the verse is: "Before the Quran was revealed to you, you were not in the habit of reading a text, and you also did not have the ability to write a book with your

hands. To put it simply, you had neither the skill of reading nor the mastery of writing, because you were illiterate and uneducated. If the situation had been otherwise, i.e., if you had been skilled in reading and writing, those who are constantly seeking to invalidate the truth would have found an excuse and would have doubted the validity of your call. But since you did not have the ability to read and write well, and people have known you with this characteristic and have associated with you for years, no doubt is left for them that this Quran is the word of God, and God has sent it down to you, not that it is the creation of your own mind. Nor is it the case that you have taken narratives or themes from ancient works and formed them in this way. As a result, those who seek to invalidate it cannot find a way to deny it on this pretext". Thus, Abdolkarim Soroush's claim that the Quran is not divine is rejected, because prophets who was illiterate and did not know how to read and write could not have brought a book like the Quran from himself.

From the perspective of Islamic philosophy, the Prophet's special states at the moments of receiving revelation, such as anxiety, haste, and reverence, confirm that revelation is an external and superhuman matter that is imparted to the Prophet's soul, not something arising from within and emanating from his personality. In transcendent philosophy, revelation is a kind of "Divine creative act" that is realized through the active intellect and in the light of the Prophet's spiritual abstraction. Such an emanation, although it occurs in proportion to the Prophet's existential capacity, because it originates from the world of command and the divine station, its consequence is a kind of anxiety or even passivity in the Prophet's physical and mental faculties. As Mulla Sadra explicitly states, in the face of divine grace, "The Prophet's soul reaches the state of annihilation and his existence becomes a complete mirror of God," (Shirazi, 2001 AD/1380 SH: 245) and this state of annihilation has effects and consequences on the soul and body that are manifested in verses like "Do not move your tongue with it" or "We will make you recite, so you will not forget". These states would not have a logical meaning if revelation was the product of the Prophet's own mind. Therefore, from a philosophical perspective, these reactions of the Prophet are an existential proof of the objectivity of revelation and its being immediate from God, not a sign of his personal creation or inner experience.

3.6. Phrases Indicating the Descent of the Quran from God

According to *Allamah Ṭabāṭabā'ī*, the verses that refer to the descent of the Muslims' heavenly book from God are evidence of the divine nature of the Quran's content. Based on the understanding that Allameh, by citing the verses of the Quran, provides of the nature of this book, the Quran in its essence had a unified, exalted, and transcendent reality beyond the reach of ordinary people. God brought this transcendent reality into a fragmented and detailed form and turned it into a readable and understandable text for human beings. According to Allameh, the fact that the detailing of the Quran is attributed to God and was revealed in a form that is readable and writable indicates that the current text of the Quran was sent down in this form by God. In narrations quoted in the book *al-Mīzān* from Imam Reza, he calls the Torah, the Gospel, and the Psalms the word of God. Therefore, Allameh, like most Quranic scholars and Muslim theologians, considers revelation to be the word of God and believes that denying God's speaking to human beings means denying revelation and is incompatible with the principles and foundations of heavenly religions.

3.7. The Theory of Prophetic Dreams and Its Critique from the Perspective of *Allamah Ṭabāṭabā'ī*

In one of his newest theories, titled "Prophetic Dreams," Abdolkarim Soroush provides a new formulation of the nature of revelation and the Prophet's role in it. He believes that revelation was in fact a collection of the Prophet of Islam's (PBUH) truthful dreams, which the Prophet, after witnessing them, was responsible for interpreting and literarily reconstructing. In this theory, the Quran is no longer the direct word of God, but the form of the "Prophet's interpretation" of dreams that had a divine origin. According to Soroush: "The Prophet saw dreams, holy dreams, and then he interpreted them and his interpretation became the Quran." (Soroush, 2006 AD/1385 SH: 160) He compares these dreams to the dream of Prophet Yusuf and writes: "Just as Yusuf sees realities in his dream in symbols and metaphors, the Prophet of Islam also speaks of reality with the language of a dream." (Soroush, 2006 AD/1385 SH: 161) As a result, in this view, the Prophet is no longer a conveyor of the word of God in the traditional sense, but the linguistic agent and the internal interpreter of revelation. Soroush thus elevates the Prophet's role from a "Medium of revelation" to a "Creator of the interpreted revelation" and considers this theory a natural development of his previous theories about the Prophet's agency.

From the perspective of *Allamah Ṭabāṭabā'ī*, such a view of revelation is in clear conflict with the basis of Quranic revelation and the principles of Islamic philosophy. In his commentary *al-Mīzān*, especially under the opening verses of Surah *al-Najm*, by citing the verse "By the star when it descends, your companion has not strayed, nor has he erred, nor does he speak from whim. It is only a revelation revealed," (al-Najm/1-4) he states that the Quran is not the Prophet's discourse, but the very revelation that was issued from the divine station and was imparted to the Prophet's heart (Ṭabāṭabā'ī, 2009 AD/1388 SH: 19, 11). According to Allamah, revelation is an intuitive and presential reality that the Prophet's soul understands immediately and with certainty, not that he reconstructs it with his mental interpretation (ibid: 14, 137).

From the perspective of transcendent philosophy, a dream, as an imaginal perception, is at a lower level than presential knowledge and rational intuition, and cannot be the vessel for receiving legislative revelation that descends from the active intellect. As Mulla Sadra states in *al-Asfār al-Arba'ah*, revelation descends from the "World of Intellect" and is above the level of imagination, not the product of the Prophet's dreams (Sadr al-Din Shirazi, 1981: 6, 124). Consequently, contrary to Soroush's theory which places the Prophet in the position of an interpreter of religious dreams, *Allamah Ṭabāṭabā'ī* holds that the Prophet is the bearer of a reality descended from the divine station, which is received with presential knowledge and complete certainty, and therefore no room for human interpretation, exegesis, or re-creation remains. The theory of prophetic dreams, by reducing revelation to the level of imagination, weakens the Prophet's cognitive authority and the originality of the Quran as the word of God, and has no place in Allameh's rational and revelatory system.

Conclusion

The critique and evaluation of Abdolkarim Soroush's theory regarding the Holy Prophet's (PBUH) active role in the process of revelation showed that this view is not compatible with

the authentic principles of revelation, interpretation, and also the rational and philosophical principles in Islamic thought. Soroush's theory, by presenting a human-centered understanding of revelation, sought to redefine the Quran as a product of the Prophet's inner experience, and thereby changed the Prophet's role from a passive recipient to an active creator and processor of revelation. But as interpretive analyses, including *Allamah Ṭabāṭabā'ī*'s views, clearly show, the Holy Quran considers itself the word of God. A discourse that has been directly revealed by God and the Prophet is only in the position of receiving, explaining, and communicating it.

In the philosophical dimension, Abdolkarim Soroush's theory also has a clear conflict with the ontological and epistemological foundations of Islam, especially transcendent philosophy. From the perspective of Mulla Sadra and his followers like *Allamah Ṭabāṭabā'ī*, revelation is not a psychological or passive process, but a divine existential act that is realized through manifestation and illumination on the Prophet's soul. Divine speech in this view originates from the level of presential and intuitive knowledge, not the product of mental analysis or literary creativity. The Prophet, through the abstraction of his soul and an existential connection to the active intellect, receives revelatory truths intuitively, not that he creates them like a poet or an artist. Consequently, Soroush's theory, due to its humanistic interpretation of revelation, its reduction to human experience, and its disregard for the philosophical and theological foundations of Islam, cannot provide an acceptable explanation of the nature of revelation in the Islamic intellectual system.

Based on this, *Allamah Ṭabāṭabā'ī*'s view, which considers revelation to be a divine, superhuman, and infallible matter, has a much higher degree of theoretical coherence and solidity, with its strong Quranic, narrative, philosophical, and rational support, and can answer the cognitive challenges surrounding the nature of revelation and the Prophet's role in its process.

References

Ahmadi, R. (2014 AD/1393 SH). *Phenomenon of Revelation from the Viewpoint of Allamah Ṭabāṭabā'ī*. Qom: Al-Mustafa International Center for Translation and Publication.

Ashrafi, A. R. (2008 AD/1387 SH). "The Divine nature of the Quranic Text from the Perspective of Allamah Ṭabāṭabā'ī and Its Role in Tafsir al-Mīzān." *Recognize the Quran.*

Ḥillī, H. (2006 AD/1385 SH). *Bāb Hādi ʻAshar*. Commentary by Fāḍil ibn ʻAbdullāh. Qom: Dar al-Fikr.

Hosseini Tabataba'i, M. (2019 AD/1398 SH). *Waḥy Qudsī (A Critique of Abdolkarim Soroush's Discourse)*. N.p.: Ehsan Publishing.

https://www.islahweb.org/fa.

Kargozaran Newspaper.

Karimi, M. (2013 AD/1393 SH). "al-Mīzān and the Analysis of Revelation."

Nasiri, A. (2011 AD/1390 SH). *The Quran, Divine Discourse*. Tehran: Wahy va Kherad.

Shirazi, S. (1981 AD). *al-Asfār al-Arbaʻah*. Beirut: Dar Ihya' al-Turath al-'Arabi.

Shirazi, S. A. (2001 AD/1380 SH). *al-Mabda' wa al-Maʻād*. (S. J. Ashtiani. Ed). Qom: Islamic Propaganda Office.

Soroush, A. (2007 AD/1386 SH (a)). *Bashar and Basheer: A Response by Abdolkarim Soroush to Ayatollah Jafar Sobhani*. *Religion and Thought*, official website of the Da'wat wa Islah group. Retrieved from

Soroush, A. (2007 AD/1386 SH ©). Muhammad Word, Iʻjāz of Muhammad.

Soroush, A. (2008 AD/1387 SH). "Abdolkarim Soroush's Theory on Quranic Revelation, Abdolkarim Soroush's response." *Journal of Islamic Theology, Imam Sadiq Research and Educational Institute*. No. 65.

Soroush, A. (2008 AD/1387 SH). "Parrot and Bee." *Reflection of Thought Publication Journal*. No. 98, pp. 171-192.

Ṭabāṭabā'ī, M. H. (2009 AD/1388 SH). *Tafsīr al-Mīzān*. (S. M. B. Mousavi Hamedani. Trans). Qom: Islamic Publications Office.

Ṭabrisī, F. (2010 AD/1390 SH). *Tafsir Majma' al-Bayān*. (M. Bistuni. Ed). Qom: Bayan-e Javan.

Theological Knowledge. Vol. 5, no. 1.

Yousefi Ashkevari, H. (2007 AD/1386 SH). "Quran as the Word of God." *Ayeen Journal*. No. 11 and 12.