

**Title:** The Virtuous Son of the Rational: A Traditionalist's Response to the *Falāsifa's* dismissal of Revelation.

**Author:** Nahyan Fancy, PhD Candidate, History and Philosophy of Science, University of Notre Dame

**Abstract:** Ibn Sīnā had laid down a theory of prophecy and revelation that sharply conflicted with traditionalist notions of revelation. In rationalizing the necessity of prophets and their inability to convey literal truths for fear of misleading the ignorant masses, Ibn Sīnā practically implied that revelation was superfluous for the intellectual elite who have a higher and better grasp of reality through the power of reason. Ibn Ṭufayl solidified this argument in narrative form by suggesting that an individual, Ḥayy ibn Yaqzān, may autodidactically arrive at reality purely through reason. Moreover, in the last part of the treatise, Ibn Ṭufayl shows that the truths that Ḥayy acquires rationally are already present in an imperfect form in revelation. Far from seeing this as an attempt to reconcile reason and revelation, traditionalists were apt to view it as a devastating attack on their fundamental principles. The increasing antagonism against the *falāsifa* from the eleventh to the thirteenth centuries was a direct result of their perceived attacks against the rationality of traditional sources.

Ibn al-Nafīs took on the task of defending the traditionalists and attacking the *falāsifa's* belief in the superiority of reason over revelation. He specifically targeted the principle of autodidacticism in Ibn Ṭufayl's text to show that reason itself needs revelation while revelation in turn conforms to reason. He also tackled the issue of anthropomorphism and bodily resurrection to show how reason and revelation should work together to lead humans towards the ultimate truth on these issues. Apart from revealing the complex nature of these problems, his text sheds light on the heavy interaction between the *falāsifa*, *mutakallimūn* and the traditionalists during this period. Although many aspects of *falsafa* made their way into traditionalist doctrine, this study shows that the traditionalists were still able to maintain a distinct identity because of their fundamental disagreement with the *falāsifa* over the purpose and usefulness of revelation.