

«مقاله پژوهشی»

"تحلیل معنایی واژه راسخون در آیه ۷ آل عمران براساس مکتب بن و دیدگاه استرآبادی" با تأکید بر واژه‌های مترادف و متقابل

زهرا آقابراری^۱، سید محمد رضوی^{۲*}، مهدی مهدی عباسی^۳

چکیده

اختلاف در مخاطب قرآن، در بین اندیشمندان اسلامی سبب شده است دیدگاه‌های گوناگونی ارائه شود. در این میان شرف‌الدین استرآبادی دیدگاه ویژه‌ای دارد و آن اینکه تأویل آیات متشابه تنها مخصوص معصومین (ع) است و از آنجا که وی تأویل را اعم از ظاهر و باطن می‌داند، نظر وی آن است که مخاطب آیات متشابه چه از نظر معنای ظاهری و چه باطنی معصومین هستند. با توجه به اختلافات موجود، برای قضاوت مناسب بین این دیدگاه‌ها، این مقاله در صدد بررسی معنای راسخون بر اساس روش مکتب بن می‌باشد؛ که آیا معنای مد نظر شرف‌الدین اثبات می‌شود؟ یا خیر؟ از این رو با بررسی انجام‌شده مشخص شد، معنای راسخون در آیه، گروهی ویژه و متمایز از مردم هستند که علم به تأویل آیات را داشته ولی مصداق آن روشن نمی‌شود چرا که متن، توانائی تعیین مصداق آن را ندارد. از این رو بر اساس بافت فرامتنی و بر مبنای دیدگاه شرف‌الدین به صورت کلی اثبات می‌شود که راسخون گروهی ویژه و متمایز هستند که مصداق آن معصومین می‌باشند.

واژه‌های کلیدی

راسخون، تأویل، شرف‌الدین، مکتب بن، استرآبادی.

۱. دانشجوی دکتری دانشگاه آزاد اسلامی، تهران مرکز، ایران.
۲. استادیار دانشگاه آزاد اسلامی، تهران مرکز، ایران.
۳. استادیار دانشگاه آزاد اسلامی، تهران مرکز، تهران، ایران.

نویسنده مسئول:

سید محمد رضوی

رایانامه: dsmrazavi@yahoo.com

تاریخ دریافت: ۱۴۰۳/۰۲/۰۱

تاریخ پذیرش: ۱۴۰۳/۰۵/۰۲

استناد به این مقاله:

آقابراری، زهرا؛ رضوی، سید محمد و مهدی‌عباسی، مهدی (۱۴۰۳). "تحلیل معنایی واژه راسخون در آیه ۷ آل عمران براساس مکتب بن و دیدگاه استرآبادی" با تأکید بر واژه‌های مترادف و متقابل. فصلنامه قرآن و روشنگری دینی، (۱)، ۱۲۵-۱۴۲. (DOI:10.30473/quran.2024.70102.1258)



ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Analysis of the Semantic Meaning of the Word "Rāsikhūn" in Verse 7 of Surah Āli ‘Imrān Based on the Bun School and the Perspective of Istarābādī, Emphasizing Synonymous and Antonymous Terms

Zahra Aghabarari¹, Sayyid Mohammad Razavi^{2*}, Mahdi Mahdi Abbasi³

1. Ph. D. Student of Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Center. Iran.
2. Assistant Professor, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran.
3. Assistant Professor, Islamic Azad University, Tehran Center, Tehran, Iran.

Correspondence:
Sayyid Mohammad Razavi
Email: dsmrazavi@yahoo.com

Received: 20Apr 2024
Accepted: 24July 2024

How to cite
Aghabarari, Z., Razavi, S.M. & MahdiAbbasi, M. (2024). Analysis of the Semantic Meaning of the Word "Rāsikhūn" in Verse 7 of Surah Āli ‘Imrān Based on the Bun School and the Perspective of Istarābādī, Emphasizing Synonymous and Antonymous Terms. Quran and Religious Enlightenment, 5(1), 125-142.
(DOI:[10.30473/quran.2024.70102.1258](https://doi.org/10.30473/quran.2024.70102.1258))

ABSTRACT

The disagreement regarding the audience of the Quran among Islamic scholars has led to various interpretations. Among them, Sharaf al-Dīn Istarābādī has a distinctive viewpoint, asserting that the interpretation of ambiguous verses is exclusively meant for the impeccable Imams (AS). Since he considers interpretation to encompass both the apparent and the inner meanings, his opinion is that the audience of the ambiguous (Mutashābih) verses—both in terms of their apparent meaning and inner meaning—are the impeccable Imams. Given the existing differences, this article aims to appropriately judge between these viewpoints by examining the meaning of "Rāsikhūn" based on the "Bun" methodology. The question arises: Is Sharaf al-Dīn's intended meaning validated or not? The investigation has shown that the meaning of "Rāsikhūn" in this verse refers to a special and distinct group of people who possess knowledge of the interpretation of verses, yet the identity of this group remains unclear, as the text does not have the ability to specify its identity. Accordingly, based on the extra-textual context and the perspective of Sharaf al-Dīn, it can generally be established that "Rāsikhūn" are a special and distinct group, specifically the impeccable Imams (AS).

KEY WORDS

Rāsikhūn, Interpretation (*Ta'wīl*), Established, Complete, *Sharaf al-Dīn Istarābādī*.



Introduction

Sharaf al-Dīn Istarābādī, in his discussion of verse 7 of Surah *Āli 'Imrān* concerning the interpretation of "*Rāsikhūn*," regards it as exclusive to the Ahl al-Bayt (AS) (Istarābādī, 1988 AD/1409 AH: 106). Although his book outlines the virtues of the Ahl al-Bayt, one might argue that his interpretation merely highlights their merits rather than addressing other individuals. However, given the significance he attributes to interpretation, this justification is not acceptable, as he considers interpretation to encompass both the inner and apparent meanings (Hosseini, Akbari, Oftadeh, 2019 AD/1399 SH: 61). In this case, the apparent meaning of the verse also limits "*Rāsikhūn*" to the Ahl al-Bayt (AS). Conversely, some commentators do not consider "*Rāsikhūn*" to be knowledgeable about the interpretation of ambiguous verses (Ṭabāṭabā'ī, 1995 AD/1374 SH: 3, 42), and some do not restrict this term to the Ahl al-Bayt (Zamakhsharī, 1986 AD/1407 AH: 1, 338; Tha'ālābī, 1993 AD/1414 AH: 1, 10). Thus, there exists a difference of opinion among commentators regarding the meaning of this verse.

This perspective on the verse leads to disagreements among the Imamiyyah scholars regarding the authenticity of the verses of the Quran. This raises the question of whether one can act solely based on the meanings of the verses of the Quran without authorization from the Ahl al-Bayt (AS). Three viewpoints exist:

1) The consensus of the *Uṣūlī* scholars and the *Akhbārī* scholars, such as *Muḥammad Bāqir Majlisī* (1983: 86, 139) and *Sayyid Ni'matullāh Jazāyirī* (n.d.: 43), who affirm the absolute authenticity of all verses of the Quran.

2) *Mullā Muḥsin Fayḍ Kāshānī* believes that some complete Shia scholars can grasp the

meaning of certain ambiguous verses (1919 AD/1349 AH: 49).

3) A group denies the authenticity of the Quran regarding theoretical rulings, considering both principles and branches as inclusive. Notable figures in this regard include *Muḥammad Amīn Istarābādī* (2005 AD/1426 AH: 353), *Husayn Karakī* (1976 AD/1396 AH: 192), *Shaykh Ḥurr 'Āmilī* (n.d.: 186), *Muhammad Taqī Majlisī* (Beheshti, 2011 AD/1390 SH: 210), *Fāḍil Tūnī* (1991 AD/1412 AH: 136), and *Shaykh Yūsuf Baḥrānī* (n.d.: 1, 27). Some outright reject the authenticity of all verses, asserting that referring to the Quran is conditional upon having authorization from the Ahl al-Bayt (AS), including figures like *'Abdullāh ibn Ṣāliḥ Samāhījī* (1988 AD/1409 AH: 2, 203), *Sayyid Mīrzā Jazāyirī* (Baḥrānī, n.d.: 1: 27), and *Sayyid Ṣadr al-Dīn Qummī* (Murtaḍā Anṣārī, 1998 AD/1419 AH: 1, 151).

Sharaf al-Dīn's interpretation of Verse 7 of Surah *Āli 'Imrān* will lead to the conclusion that individuals other than the Ahl al-Bayt (AS) lack the ability to understand ambiguous verses, making it impossible for non-Ahl al-Bayt individuals to rely on the apparent meanings of these verses. This viewpoint represents a new distinction that confines the interpretation of ambiguous verses to the infallibles. Since *Istarābādī* considers interpretation to encompass both apparent and hidden meanings, he effectively asserts that in ambiguous cases, one should only refer to the texts of the impeccable Imams.

Given this disagreement and its implications in the discussion of the authenticity of referencing the verses of the Quran, which essentially involves the authenticity of the Quran as a source of religious deduction, the importance of examining this viewpoint becomes evident. However, the analysis of

Istarābādī's perspective concerning his interpretation of Verse 7 of Surah *Āli 'Imrān* has shown that it is pertinent to analyze his viewpoint using modern semiotic methods to assess the feasibility of his intended meaning in light of semiotic methodologies. Thus, this paper will explore the semantic network of "Rāsikhūn" in the disputed verse based on the methodology of the *Bun School* to determine to what extent his interpretation of the verse is reliable according to modern interpretive methods. This is because, according to the methodology of the *Bun School*, the meanings of the employed styles in the text are derived from the semantic network, which aids in establishing how the text conveys the intended meaning.

1. Semantics

Semantics is a new approach to researching the meaning of the Quran, and since it is an emerging method in the field of Quranic sciences and interpretation, it has received less attention. However, among Orientalists like Izutsu (Sharifi, 2013 AD/1392 SH: 86) and some Islamic researchers, this method is utilized. Consequently, a group of researchers has adopted their methodologies from semantics in the style of Izutsu in academic centers. Therefore, it has become known as a new method among interpreters and researchers in Quranic sciences. Among the structural semantic methods based on the descriptive paradigm of "Soresu," ethnosemantics can be mentioned; this method explores semantic domains and textual studies (Izutsu, 1999 AD/1378 SH: 295-298).

2. The Terminology of Rāsikhūn

The term "Rāsikhūn" is a commonality between Hebrew and Arabic, appearing in Hebrew as

"רשקה; *Raskh*" meaning "To be full" (Safai Takhte Fooladi, 2015 AD/1394 SH: 63). *Allamah Muṣṭafawī* states regarding the meaning of this root: "The common meaning of this material is complete and absolute stability and establishment, such that it is fully and purposefully established in its place and can exert its utmost power within it, and this establishment permeates to the highest degree." (1981 AD/1360 SH: 4, 119) *Ibn Fāris* refers to the meaning of stability in an absolute sense, stating: "This root has a single meaning: Permanence and durability, and the verb *Raskh* also means to become permanent, with its active participle meaning lasting." (Ibn Fāris, 1979: 2, 395)

Between these two viewpoints, which one determines the situational meaning of "Rāsikh," especially since neither linguist has provided evidence for their claims? *Abūhilāl 'Askarī* discusses the difference between "Rāsikhūn" and "Stability," stating that their relationship is one of generality (*'Umūm*) and specificity (*Khuṣūṣ*); because *Rusūkh* is the perfection of stability. He cites a reference from Arabic literature to support his claim: "Rāsikh is the perfection of what is stable, and the witness to this claim is that in Arabic, something that is established on the ground is called *Thābit*, while something that has a strong connection to the ground is not called *Rāsikh*. Similarly, a wall is not called *Rāsikh*, as a mountain is more stable than a wall." ('Askarī, 2021 AD/1400 SH: 296) Accordingly, *Allamah Muṣṭafawī's* viewpoint is more precise than that of *Ibn Fāris*; thus, the situational meaning of this term according to lexical dictionaries is absolute stability.

However, *Ibn Fāris*, in another of his works, provides a usage of this term that is inconsistent with the stated meaning, suggesting that this meaning is likely a metaphorical usage. This is

when he states that "*Rasakha*" can mean to flow, as when it is said "*Rasakh al-Ghadīr*," meaning "when its water recedes, it flows out." (Ibn Fāris, 1986: 377) In this case, this usage must be considered metaphorical in his view.

Zabīdī explains the meaning of this root: "*Rasakha al-Shay'u Yarsakhu Rusūkhan*," meaning "To become firm," where "*Rasakha*" in its general sense means "To be firmly established in its place." Therefore, he interprets "*al-Rāsikhu fil 'Ilm*" as "The one who has entered it with a firm entrance," referring to someone in whom knowledge has been firmly instilled. He considers "*Jabalun Rāsikh*" to mean "A firmly established mountain." He defines "Every stable person" as "*Rāsikh*." In the usages he mentions, he also describes the intensive form of this root: "*Arsakhahū Irsākhan*," meaning "He made it stable," and he uses it transitively. He likens this meaning to "Like a substance that becomes established in a book." (1986 AD/1407 AH: 4, 271)

Based on the analysis conducted among lexical dictionaries, it has been determined that this word has a single linguistic root, which is complete stability and establishment, related to the concept of fullness in Hebrew. This is because fullness denotes completion, and complete stability is also a form of spiritual or material completion. Thus, the relationship of the meaning of fullness in Hebrew with its Arabic counterpart has a relationship of generality and specificity from one aspect, meaning that a type of completion, fullness, can be either established or unestablished. Full and stable fullness is synonymous with "*Rāsikh*," while the Hebrew meaning is broader than the Arabic one, making the Arabic meaning more specific than the Hebrew (Safai Takhte Fooladi, 2015 AD/1394 SH: 63).

In another usage, "*Rāsikh*" has been cited to mean "To flow." Therefore, according to lexical

dictionaries, two semantic fields can be considered for the word "*Rasakha*": one semantic field where "*Rasakha*" means complete stability and another where "*Rasakha*" means to flow. The second meaning seems to relate to the shared root meaning of "Fullness," as "To flow" can be seen as a branch of "Fullness" in that water or any other liquid flows out when it exceeds the capacity of its container and fills it. Thus, the relationship between these two meanings can be seen as a cause and effect relationship; fullness causes flowing. Therefore, in accordance with linguistic traditions, these two meanings are metaphorical in nature, but from a semantic perspective, both meanings have been used for the word "*Rāsikh*," forming two semantic fields that are somewhat related. The meaning of flowing is a result of fullness, and fullness is a type of completeness.

3. Usage in Pre-Islamic Culture

The use of this word in pre-Islamic Arabic poetry is identifiable in only one instance based on the existing poems, specifically in the poetry of a poet from the tribe of *Hudhalī*:

Thus, the female wild cow stood on a hill due to the [fear of] flowing mud.

In this poem, based on the prevailing atmosphere of the text, the present tense verb "*Yarsakhna*" from the root "*Rasakha*" has been used, which, contrary to the meaning presented by lexical dictionaries, signifies "To flow" — understood as one of the metaphorical meanings of this root. It appears that the dictionaries' interpretation of the root of this word may be incorrect. Although the usage of a word does not imply its definition, considering that the only example of its usage in pre-Islamic poetry conveys the meaning of "Flowing" and in light of the shared meaning with the Hebrew word that translates to "Full," it seems that the

primary meaning of this word has been "To flow" in a full and encompassing manner (Safai Takhte Fooladi, 2015 AD/1394 SH: 63). This is because, given the atmosphere of the aforementioned poem, which describes the flow of a flood and its nature, it can be understood that the intended meaning of "Flowing" in the mentioned poem refers to the flowing of mud with maximum intensity and power (Jawālīqī, n.d.: 282).

4. Semantic Fields

In linguistics, a "Field Theory" is a set of vocabulary words that are grouped together based on semantic relations, pointing to a specific subject. This term is also used in anthropology, semiotics, and technical interpretation, and in Arabic, it is referred to as "*al-Ḥaql al-Mu'jamī*." (Rahnama, 2023 AD/1402 AH: 64) In its definition, it is stated: "The place of a word in the system of linguistic relations connects it to other words in the linguistic vocabulary." (Ullmann, 1973: 31) Therefore, from the perspective of theorists, the semantic field expresses the types of relationships within each lexical domain. These relationships in any lexical area include: "Synonymy, Hyponymy, Antonymy, and Incompatibility." (Graeme, 2009: 262-292)

4.1. Synonymous Words

Synonymy is self-evident in some languages, and in many cases, it is a normal occurrence in language (Fakhr Rāzī, 1997 AD/1418 AH: 1, 256), with various factors contributing to its creation and expansion. In the Bun School, since a word gains meaning within the context of discourse, absolute synonymy is conceivable; however, in most cases, relative synonymy among words is prevalent. This is because changes in vocabulary within a similar

context in this approach are motivated by various reasons, one of which is a preference for variety in speech. In this case, two words can be considered synonymous. Nevertheless, to derive semantic fields using this method, it is necessary to identify synonymous words and the type of synonymy they exhibit in order to ascertain the semantic field of the word in question.

4.1.1. Rasawa

Another word synonymous with "*Rāsikh*" is "*Rasawa*," which has a different meaning. "*Rasawa*" refers to something whose stability is due to its greatness; at the same time, this stability can be either complete or incomplete. Therefore, in cases of the first type, meaning stability regarding the weight, it overlaps with the meaning of "*Rāsikh*."

"*Rasawa*" is only used for something that possesses weight, such as a mountain or anything of substantial size; for instance, it can be said: "The Mountain *Rās*." However, it is not said: "The wall *Rās*." In the Quran, it is mentioned, "It moves and comes to a standstill in the name of God," where a ship is compared to a mountain because of its greatness, and the term "*Rās*" is used for it. Thus, "*Rasawa*" indicates stability along with greatness, weight, and height. Its usage in other contexts is metaphorical and based on comparison and the proximity of its meaning to greatness, similar to the Arabic expression that says: "A large camel has settled on the ground." (Askarī, 2021 AD/1400 SH: 296)

Considering that the meaning of "*Rasawa*" is stability accompanied by greatness and that the meaning of "*Rāsikh*" is complete stability, the meanings of these two are somewhat oppositional. This is because the meaning of the phrase "*Jabalun Rās*" is a large, stable

mountain, whereas "*Jabalun Rāsikh*" refers to a mountain with unyielding stability. In the meaning of "*Rāsikh*," greatness is not implied; it could very well be a small mountain, yet its stability could be unbreakable. Similarly, it could be large. Therefore, in meaning, these two are categorically distinct, meaning that words carrying the meaning of stability have two types: One type signifies complete, unyielding stability that does not imply greatness, and another type signifies the stability of a large object that does not indicate unyieldingness.

Consequently, these two share the meaning of stability, but in terms of greatness and unyieldingness, the stability is in contrast, and they possess relative synonymy. However, in the case of "*Rās*" and "*Rāsikh*," there is a specific generality and specificity, because "*Rās*" indicates stability with greatness, which may be unyielding or may be yieldable. In contrast, "*Rāsikh*" expresses unyielding and complete stability, which may apply to either a large object or a small one.

4.1.2. *Wathuqa*

Among the synonymous words with "*Rasakha*," meaning stable and firm, the word "*Wathīq*," which means solid and steadfast, can be mentioned (Farāhīdī, 1989 AD/1410 AH: 202). *Fayyūmī* (d. 770 AH) refers to this word by stating: "*Wathuqa*," pertains to objects, and its root is *Withāqah*, meaning strong and stable; thus, *Wathīq* refers to something that is fixed and firm." (n.d.: 647) "*Wathīq*" is considered synonymous with something that is stable and robust, referring to something that is fixed and whose stability is strong, making it unshakeable. However, does this word encompass the idea of unyieldingness, which is synonymous with complete stability? No! This word expresses strong stability but does not

denote unyielding stability. Therefore, in terms of meaning, these two have a dual relationship. Since both signify stability, they are considered synonymous; however, since one indicates stability with firmness while the other denotes unyielding stability, they stand in contrast. Thus, the synonymy between these two is relative.

Nevertheless, a stable and robust object can be complete and unyielding, or it can be complete but not unyielding. The examples of "*Wathīq*" and "*Rāsikh*" have a one aspect general-specific relationship, as some matters are completely stable and robust, while others may not be.

4.1.3. *Waṭīd*

Regarding the meaning of "*Waṭada*," it is stated: "To establish something by pounding it down until it becomes firm." (Ibn Fāris, 1979: 121) From this meaning, *Ibn Durayd* (d. 321 AH) uses "*Binā'u Wathīq*," which means a stable structure (1987: 2, 660). *Ṣāhib ibn 'Ubbād* also interprets "*Wathīq*" as meaning to make firm (n.d.: 230). However, *Ibn Manẓūr* considers this root to mean "*Wāṭada al-Shay'*"; he made it stable and he made it heavy." (1993 AD/1414 AH: 461) in its transitive sense, which does not align with the meaning of "*Rāsikh*." However, this word in contemporary dictionaries means a stable state that is free from any weakness, "*Lā Ya'tarīhi Du'f*," and continues to explain it as "Meaning a *Rāsikh* that has no deviation." (Ma'lūf: 1, 1539) In this context, this meaning is more specific than "*Rāsikh*," indicating that the meaning has evolved, and its contemporary meaning is synonymous with "*Rāsikh*." However, "*Rāsikh*" is more general than "*Waṭīd*" in this sense because "*Rāsikh*" indicates an unchanging stability, while "*Waṭīd*" conveys an unchanging stability that is free from any weakness. Yet,

this distinction may not be relevant in the current discussion.

4.1.4. Qa's

Ibn Fāris considers the root "*Qa's*" to mean "Stability and Strength." (1979: 5, 109) From this meaning, the usage of "*Izzatu Qa'sā'*," which means "Permanent Nobility," is derived. Its use is also observed for animals, as in "*Wa Taqa' asat al-Dābbatu*," meaning "The animal became firm and did not move." (Ibn Manẓūr: 6, 177) Based on this understanding, "qas'" is spiritually related to "rasikh" in terms of stability, but differs in terms of strength. "Rasikh" refers to the utmost stability, whereas "*Qa's*" expresses strength of stability. Therefore, the synonyms of these two are relative, and using them interchangeably in a traditional method is a kind of metonymy. However, from the perspective of the Bun School, these two have a broader synonymy, and if used in a similar style and yield a similar meaning, they will be synonymous; but if they present different meanings, that is, one signifies unwavering stability and the other signifies stability with strength, then in this case, these two represent different meanings. If both are used in different styles, the outcome of both styles is a shared meaning of stability, and the opposing meanings are set aside.

4.1.5. Araz

The author *Ṣāhib ibn 'Ubbād* expresses three meanings for "*Araza Ya'rizu Urūzan*": "It became constricted, gathered, and stabilized." (n.d.: 9, 77) *Zabīdī* interprets this word as "Stabilized gathering" (n.d.: 15, 8). Based on this, the relationship between this word and "*Rāsikh*" is one of relative synonymy, where both share a general meaning of stability. However, the meaning of "*Araza*" does not

achieve perfection, but rather signifies stability with density (Jawharī, 1986 AD/1407 AH: 3, 863).

4.1.6. Summary

The analysis shows that among Arabic vocabulary, it is difficult to find a direct equivalent for "*Rāsikh*." The only term that is more specific in contemporary meaning and suggests a more limited interpretation aligning with "*Rāsikh*" is "*Waṭīd*." Thus, this word possesses a unique semantic inclusiveness in synonymy that other Arabic words do not convey, and that meaning is stability in its utmost perfection.

4.2. Opposite Terms

The opposite terms derived from the root "*Rasakha*" are examined in this section, and it will be determined what type of opposition exists among these words.

Here's the translation to English:

4.2.1. Rakhawa

The root "*Rakhawa*" means "Softness and lightness of reason." (Ibn Fāris, 1979: 2, 501) From this root, there is the usage of "*Arkhatil Nāqatu*," which is said when the middle of a quadruped's back becomes weak (Jawharī, 1986 AD/1407 AH: 6, 2354). *Ibn Sīdah* considers it applicable to anything: "*al-Rikhwu* refers to the softness and weakness of anything." (Ibn Sīdah: 5, 295) If its meaning is softness, it means softness as opposed to roughness; if its meaning is weakness, it indicates being unstable in comparison to the steadfastness (*Thābit*) of an object. In this case, this word stands in opposition to any form of stability, whether it is complete like "*Rāsikh*" or of other types.

4.2.2. Hashsh

The root "*Hashsh*" in three letters means "Weakness and Instability," (Ibn Fāris, 1979: 6, 9) and its usage for anything has been noted by Ibn Manẓūr (1993 AD/1414 AH: 2, 685). Therefore, the word "*Hashsh*" has a broader opposite meaning, as it is generally opposed to stability and is in contrast to all forms of stability, including "*Rusūkh*."

4.2.3. Fasadat

Another opposing term to "*Rāsikh*" is "*Fasād*," which is used for all things, as in "*Fasada al-Shay'*," meaning "It becomes invalid, destroyed, or changed." (Zabīdī, n.d.: 8, 496) Change, in this context, signifies a lack of permanence and stability. Therefore, this word is also used in contrast to "*Rāsikh*," but its opposition is between existence and non-existence. Some matters, such as non-material entities, are unchangeable and thus do not fall into the opposition between stability and corruption.

4.2.4. Istihālah

Rāghib interprets the original meaning of the root "*al-Hawli*" as "The change of a thing and its separation from other things." (1412: 266) In the meaning of "*Istahāla*," it is noted to mean "To change," (Zamakhsharī, 1979: 1, 224) and its usage has also been noted for anything that is movable and changes (Zabīdī, n.d.: 28, 368). Thus, this word too stands in contrast to the general meaning of stability.

4.2.5. Summary

By examining the words opposed to "*Rāsikh*," it can be concluded that in the Arabic language, there is no direct equivalent for the word "*Rāsikh*." All opposing words are generally in contrast with "*Rāsikh*," meaning that "*Rāsikh*" indicates complete permanence, while these words imply changeability and weakness,

standing in opposition to the meaning of permanence. Therefore, their opposition encompasses both "*Rāsikh*" and non-"*Rāsikh*" words.

5. Textual Studies

In the third step of the semantics of "*Rāsikhūn*" within the Qur'anic context, textual studies and analyses of verses and roles are addressed. Now, with regard to the information presented in the previous two steps, a semantic analysis of this word in the Qur'an will be conducted to approach the meaning and relation of "*Rāsikhūn*" in the verse.

5.1. Syntagmatic Relation

Syntagmatic relation refers to the relationship between linguistic elements and other linguistic elements. This relationship is such that, through the juxtaposition of these factors, a specific meaning emerges. This alignment refers to the "Syntagmatic Relation" of the positioning of the signifiers relative to each other. Words in a language influence each other through the sequences they establish, affecting the semantic fields of other words, thereby broadening, narrowing, or differentiating them. This influence is typically bidirectional, with each word affecting the other. In other words, the criterion for syntagmatic relation is the possibility of combining signifiers based on grammatical or semantic compatibility (Sojoodī, 1991 AD/1370 SH: 51), through which a meaning can be understood that is crystallized by the governing rules of a language. Therefore, the axis determining meaning in syntagmatic relation relationships is the impact of words on each other, which leads to words carrying either an enhanced or diminished semantic weight (Safavi, 2011 AD/1390 SH: 197).

Ṣāhib ibn 'Ubbād (died 385 AH) considers "*Rāsikhūn*" to have a metaphorical meaning:

"The *Rāsikhūn* in the Qur'an are the scholars, those who read and teach the Qur'an," (n.d.: 4, 260) though the basis of this meaning is not clear linguistically. *Fayyūmī* in "*Miṣbāḥ*" also refers to its meaning as metaphorical: "For the active participle *Rāsikh*, one can cite the term: "A firm step in knowledge" which means superiority and abundance in knowledge," (n.d.: 226) where the basis of this meaning is also not evident linguistically. Similarly, *Ibn 'Arabī* regards the "*Rāsikhūn*" as guardians who are absorbed in knowledge: "They are the knowledgeable who study," (Ibn Manẓūr, 1993 AD/1414 AH: 3, 18) which is also similar to the previous two meanings.

Khālīd ibn Janbah interprets "*Rāsikhū fil 'Ilm*" as the opposite of "*Ba'īd fil 'Ilm*," which is derived from the context of the continuation of the verse (Ibn Manẓūr, 1993 AD/1414 AH: 3, 18). In the continuation of the verse, it states that the *Rāsikhūn* in knowledge regard the ambiguous verses as coming from God and believe in them. Thus, it seems that their unquestioning acceptance stems from their distance from knowledge, which, of course, is inconsistent with the apparent meaning of "*Rāsikh*" and the verse. This meaning is metaphorical due to the relationship of opposition, implying that "*Rāsikh*" in its original sense means "Fixed" and that "*Rāsikhūn fil 'Ilm*," based on its original meaning, should mean "Those firmly established in knowledge." Being distant from knowledge contrasts with this meaning, which necessitates a clarifying context; however, the mentioned context does not convey the intended meaning, as this unquestioning acceptance could indeed stem from certainty acquired through knowledge. Therefore, the mentioned context cannot exclude the intended meaning.

Zabīdī (...-1145 AH) considers the style of "*al-Rāsikhūna fil 'Ilm*" (the firmly rooted in

knowledge) to be figurative (*Zabīdī*, n.d.: 4, 271). This is because the meaning of "*Rāsikh*" (rooted) signifies permanence, and he interprets it in the verse as implying being included. Thus, the original meaning has changed compared to non-original meaning, since here, stability in knowledge has been likened to being included in knowledge, which means "The one firmly established in knowledge is like the one entering knowledge." Then, the thing being compared is expressed through the term of comparison, which can be considered a type of guarantee since the meaning of entering has been used with another active participle. However, it is unclear what evidence *Zabīdī* relied on to derive this meaning for "*Rāsikh*" in the verse, unless it is said that he based it on the collocation of the word "*Rāsikh*" with the preposition "*Fī*," which is a preposition specific to capacity, considering knowledge as the container and "*Rāsikh*" as the contained (*Maẓrūf*). This is because stability in knowledge cannot be conceived in itself; rather, stability in acquiring knowledge, etc., is what it means, unless the knowledge in the verse is taken to mean certainty, in which case stability in certainty is fully meaningful. Therefore, it should be examined whether "knowledge" in the verse means certainty or refers to knowledge in general.

Accordingly, *Rāghib* states regarding the meaning of "*Rāsikh*": "The firmly rooted in knowledge is someone upon whom no doubt arises, and the reason for this meaning is that Allah has described them thus in Surah *al-Hujurat*." (1991 AD/1412 AH: 352) It seems that this meaning is taken from the continuation of the verse "They say: "We have believed in it; all of it is from our Lord" in conjunction with the opening of the verse, such that the firmly rooted ones in knowledge consider the ambiguous

verses, which cause division, to be from Allah, and these verses do not instigate doubt within them. Therefore, since they are firmly rooted, according to the rule: "The description implies a cause," they do not doubt in this faith. Thus, being firmly rooted is a cause that prevents doubt from forming within them. However, what are they firmly rooted in that prevents doubt from arising within them? Two possibilities exist:

1) *Rāsikh* in Knowledge

In this case, it signifies complete stability in knowledge, though its meaning is somewhat ambiguous because knowledge is the object of stability, which cannot be stable without an addition. It must be associated with something to clarify its meaning. In this context, knowledge can be associated with several matters: stability in "Acquiring knowledge," stability in the "Permanence of knowledge," stability in "Retaining knowledge," or stability in the "Container of knowledge." Among these potential meanings, options one through three do not yield an explicit interpretation from the text, but the last option, stability in the container of knowledge, aligns with the preposition "Fī," which symbolizes capacity, and this preposition can serve as evidence for this meaning. In this case, the container of knowledge is the heart (attributed to Imam Ṣādiq (AS), 2020 AD/1400 SH: 16), and the meaning of *Rāsikh* in the verse would refer to those who have complete stability in their hearts and their hearts do not deviate. This interpretation is consistent with the contrast to the first group mentioned in the verse, which states: "In their hearts is deviation," indicating that their hearts were led astray, and it can support this meaning.

2) *Rāsikh* in Certainty

If the firmly rooted ones in knowledge mean the firmly rooted ones in certainty, then the definite article "al" before "Knowledge" (*al-ʿIlm*) cannot refer to a specific agreement since

it has no prior usage in the Surah. However, "al" here is generic, meaning that certainty, in its common sense, does not apply to individuals like humans, and certainty as an addition (like *Zayd* or *ʿUmar*) is also personal, and the firmly rooted cannot be attributed to the certainty of *Zayd* and *ʿUmar*. The generic term defines the essence, meaning it indicates the essence of certainty. In this case, *Rāsikhān* are established in the essence of certainty. Thus, it is the essence of certainty that acts as the cause of their hearts not deviating. However, this meaning lacks textual evidence, and the literal meaning does not apply here, as according to the methodology of the Bun semantic school, the root words lack a non-original meaning; thus, the linguistic context in this methodology does not support the mentioned meaning.

However, Allamah *Muṣṭafawī*, regarding the meaning of knowledge in light of this understanding in his interpretation of the verse, states, "This means that *Rāsikhūn* are those who possess ability in knowledge, and their knowledge is at a level of substantial and established certainty in a manner that it has penetrated into the realm of knowledge and has become enduring." (Muṣṭafawī, 1981 AD/1360 SH: 4, 119)

In this verse, Allamah considers knowledge to mean certainty in contrast to other stages of perception such as doubt and suspicion, which counts as the literal meaning of the word. Therefore, establishment in certainty is intended. However, this meaning does not align with "*Tamakkanū fil ʿIlm*," as Allamah himself states, because knowledge here means knowledge in the academic sense. He goes on to say that they "Are established in certainty," which makes it clear that knowledge and certainty should be used in opposition to one another because being established in certainty is meaningless; certainty is not a matter of choice that can be a matter of

one's establishment. Rather, it is an involuntary mental state, while being established in knowledge is possible and is a voluntary act. Thus, the phrase "*Tamakkanū fil 'Ilm*" means having the ability in knowledge, and hence there is a contradiction in Allamah's words, as the phrase "*Tamakkanū fil 'Ilm*" is in conflict with the sense of certainty attributed to knowledge.

However, based on the contrast between the *Rāsikhān* ones and those who have "*Fī Qulūbihim Zayghun*" (deviation in their hearts); the meaning of knowledge can also be determined since these two are opposed to each other. The term "*Fī Qulūbihim Zayghun*" implies the existence of deviation from steadfastness and stability in the heart (Rāghib, 1991 AD/1412 AH: 387). Hence, *Rāsikhān* are those for whom certainty is firmly established in their hearts, and there is no possibility of deviation or change in it.

In the continuation of the verse, "*Wa mā Ya'lamu Ta'wīlahū*," (and none knows its interpretation) this contrast is contradictory because knowledge in this context corresponds to knowledge in the phrase "*Wa al-Rāsikhūna fil 'Ilm*," (and the firmly rooted in knowledge) and undoubtedly in this context, knowledge is meant in the sense of academic knowledge, not in the sense of certainty. Since there must be a connection between these two, the meaning of knowledge here should be assumed as knowledge, and it should be considered a type of knowledge. This can indeed be reconciled with the rhetorical figures concerning both phrases. Therefore, *Abū Hilāl 'Askarī* interprets the phrase "*Wa al-Rāsikhūna fil 'Ilm*" as meaning the "Firmly established in knowledge," stating, "God has said in the Quran: "The firmly rooted in knowledge," meaning those who are stable in knowledge." ('Askarī, 2020 AD/1400 SH: 296)

However, regarding the connection between "*Wa al-Rāsikhūna fil 'Ilm*" and "*Wa mā*

Ya'lamu Ta'wīlahū" through exception, there is a challenge. If the conjunction "Wa" in "*Wa al-Rāsikhūn*" is considered as an *Musta'nifa*, then this construction will not be an exception (*Mustathnā*), and the meaning of the verse would be: "The firmly rooted in knowledge say: We believe in it, for all of the Quran, both the ambiguous and the definitive, is from God." However, for the "Wa" in the verse to be considered as a continuation, there needs to be evidence for this, as it could also be seen as a conjunction. In this case, the meaning of the verse would be: "No one knows the interpretation of the ambiguous verses except God and the firmly rooted in knowledge. They say: All of the Quran, both the ambiguous and the definitive, is from God." In the first scenario, the meaning of the verse is clear, but in the second meaning, the challenge regarding what knowledge is—whether it is certainty or the defined concept of knowledge—can once again be raised.

Allamah *Ṭabāṭabā'ī* considers the conjunction "Wa" (and) to be an instance of *Istīnāf* for several reasons. He first states: "How is it possible that the Holy Quran be revealed to the blessed heart of the Prophet (PBUH), who is one of the firmly rooted in knowledge, indeed the best among them, and he does not understand its ambiguous verses and says, "Whether I understand or not, I believe in all of it because it is all from God." (Ṭabāṭabā'ī, 1995 AD/1374 SH: 3, 42) In critique of this argument, it should be noted that the text of the verse does not imply that the firmly rooted in knowledge do not understand the ambiguous verses and yet believe in them without understanding. On the contrary, they know the interpretation of the ambiguous verses and based on their knowledge, they have faith in it; indeed, from a rational perspective, faith without knowledge is ignorant and reprehensible faith.

The second reason is that the "Method of the Quran in describing the community of Islam or the group among whom the Messenger of God is present, has been such that it first mentions the Prophet in a specific manner regarding his nobility, and then states the rest separately, which has not happened in this verse... Therefore, if the meaning of the sentence is that the firmly rooted in knowledge know the interpretation of the Quran, considering that the Prophet is undoubtedly one of them, it would have been appropriate to say, as we mentioned before: "And none knows its interpretation except God and His Messenger and the firmly rooted in knowledge." (Jawadi Amoli, 1990 AD/1379 SH: 13, 181-182) There is another issue in this statement, which is that it was said the meaning of "*Rāsikhūn*" (the firmly rooted) is to be completely established; complete stability can only be considered in the context of a complete human being, because how can an incomplete human be fully stable? Thus, it is the complete human who is firmly established in knowledge, which means that other individuals do not fall within the category of firmly rooted and therefore do not need to be mentioned in the context of the verse.

The third reason is that the context of the verse seeks to categorize people regarding the Book of God into two groups: One being the sick-hearted who pursue the ambiguous verses and the other being the believers who, when encountering ambiguous verses, say: "We believe in all of the Quran because all of it is from our Lord." (Ṭabāṭabā'ī, 1995 AD/1374 SH: 3, 42) Therefore, the context is not aimed at associating the firmly rooted with God. In response, it has been mentioned that the context of the verse can be reconciled with the aforementioned division, and it can be asserted that the verse examines the two groups, and the firmly rooted can also be associated with God,

because the division of people in the verse is not a logical division where a third category cannot be envisioned. Rather, in contrast to the hearts of the deviant, the hearts of the firmly rooted exist. The claim that a third type of heart does not exist, so that people can be divided into two categories, is contrary to the narratives. The third type of hearts, which are the general believers, is described as, "And a heart in which there is a black dot, and good and evil contend within it," (Kulaynī, 1986 AD/1407 AH: 2, 423) and the verse does not mention this category.

Jawadi Amoli, in explaining Allamah's claim, states: "If the (and) is copulative and conjunctive, then the word *Ammā* in "*Fa ammā Alladhīna fī Qulūbihim Zayghun*" is for detailing the two groups, the sick at heart and those with sound hearts. One side has been mentioned, while the other side is not mentioned. However, if the *Wa* was to be *Isṭīnāf*, *Wa* in the "*Wa al-Rāsikhūn*" is placed opposite the first group and completes the sentence, encompassing both details; Thus, according to this, the literary structure requires that "*Wa al-Rāsikhūna*" stands opposite "*Fa ammā Alladhīna fī Qulūbihim Zayghun*" as its second wing." (Jawadi Amoli, 2000 AD/1379 SH: 13, 181-182)

In response, one could argue that there is no literary objection to this discussion; because if *Wa* is conjunctive, it can be interpreted as taking *Fa ammā* in an implied form, and its omission is more eloquent since it avoids redundancy. Allamah Jawadi, in rebuttal to this criticism, asserts: "In the matter of omitting or not omitting, if we can understand the speech without omission and implication, it is preferable." (ibid.) However, based on the Bun semantics school, there is no pre-constructed rule that can be applied to language, and in general, prescriptive semantics—meaning the use of presumptive principles in interpreting meaning—is not permissible. Therefore,

according to the method of this approach, this response is incorrect. Furthermore, the implication of *Ammā* in light of "*Wa al-Rāsikhūn*" present in the verse is on par with the absence of that implication, with no preference for one over the other. If the verse intended to meaningfully categorize "*Wa al-Rāsikhūn*" as merely a division, it would have used a detailing tool such as *Wa Ammā* instead of *Wa*. Yet, the conjunction of *al-Rāsikhūn* with *Wa* is more compatible with being conjunctive than merely categorizing individuals, because the semantic scope of *Wa* includes both conjunction and *Istīnāf*. In its semantic scope, the detailing intended does not exist, which requires a special adjacency on this subject, unless it is said that *Ammā* serves as an indicator for this issue, which itself is a point of contention, and resorting to it is redundant.

Furthermore, if the (and) were to be considered as a continuative conjunction, according to the apparent meaning of the verse, no one knows the interpretation of the Qur'an except for God, and even the impeccable Imams, who are the divine guides, would be unable to understand the interpretations of the Qur'an. However, the impeccable Imams (PBUH) are knowledgeable about the interpretations of divine verses based on external evidence (Jawadi Amoli, 2000 AD/1379 SH: 13, 181-182). Allamah *Ṭabāṭabā'ī* responds that the restriction in the verse is considered additional. In this case, only those with deviated hearts are excluded from knowledge of interpretation, and the impeccable Imams are not part of this discussion.

However, the existing issue is that God's knowledge of interpretation is inherent, and this knowledge cannot be shared with anyone because God's knowledge is identical to His essence. Therefore, to assume the restriction is additional means there is a shared partnership

with God in His inherent knowledge, which even the impeccable Imams do not possess inherently. Thus, the restriction within the verse is indeed true. If the (and) in the verse is assumed to be conjunctive, then the firmly rooted can be considered to possess the knowledge of interpretation, but they have that knowledge incidentally, meaning their understanding of interpretation is a result of God's grace upon them, due to their lack of heart deviation.

Another point is that it becomes clear that the semantic scope of the firmly rooted implies complete stability, and that this stability exists within the realm of knowledge, meaning their hearts are in no way deviated. This level of stability in faith is not conceivable for all individuals in the community of believers, as it is stated in the Qur'an that believers must attain true faith (al-Nisā'/136). Even Prophet Ibrahim (AS) did not possess such established faith until he reached the level of absolute certainty (al-Baqarah/260), and the assurance and stability of heart that is firmly rooted were not conceivable for him at that stage. Nevertheless, it cannot be said that the firmly rooted have the ordinary members of society in mind, as those who are firmly rooted possess attributes that set them apart from the general populace. The feature of the firmly rooted, which is an unwavering faith, raises the question of where this attribute originates. The answer is provided within the verse itself, as they have access to the knowledge of interpretation, and this knowledge of the ambiguous verses is what has established and solidified their faith.

However, it should be noted that the understanding that both the ambiguous (*Mutashābih*) and the clear (*Muḥkam*) verses belong to God is not exclusive to the firmly rooted; rather, those with pure intellect are also partners in this matter. In other words, contrary

to the beliefs of *Ṭabāṭabā'ī* and Jawadi Amoli, the people in the verse are divided into three categories: One group has deviated hearts, another has complete stability in their hearts, and the third consists of those with pure intellect. Although they may not possess the same heart stability as the firmly rooted, as the verse indicates with certainty, they do not have knowledge of the interpretations of the ambiguous verses. However, they acknowledge through their intellect the truth that both the clear and ambiguous verses were revealed to the Prophet (PBUH), which aligns with the beginning of the verse.

The coexistence of "*Ibtighā'a Ta'wīlih*" (to seek its interpretation) and "*Wa mā Ya'lamu Ta'wīlah ilā Allāh*" (and no one knows its interpretation except Allah) conveys the idea that seeking the interpretation of the Qur'anic verses is blameworthy. This description pertains to the individuals with deviated hearts mentioned in the verse, who are condemned. Why is following the ambiguous verses blameworthy? Because it serves two objectives: 1) Seeking sedition, and 2) Seeking the interpretation of the verse. Thus, it becomes clear that seeking the interpretation of the verse is blameworthy in itself. Why is it blameworthy? Because knowledge of the interpretations of the verses is solely with God, according to the phrase "*Wa mā Ya'lamu Ta'wīlah ilā Allāh*," and therefore, seeking the interpretation of the verse out of ignorance is unwise and blameworthy.

In contrast to this group are the firmly rooted, who do not seek interpretation; rather, knowledge of interpretation has been entrusted to them. Therefore, even according to Allameh *Ṭabāṭabā'ī*'s premise, the *Wa* should indeed be a conjunction, because the characteristic of individuals with deviated hearts is their pursuit of interpretation. The opposing group includes two

categories: One is the knowledgeable regarding interpretation, and the other is those who are not seeking interpretation. The first group consists of the firmly rooted, while the third group refers to those with pure intellect who benefit from the knowledge of the firmly rooted. If the *Wa* in the verse were to be considered as continuative, the verse would not indicate anyone having knowledge of interpretation besides God. Thus, no one would have knowledge of interpretation, leading to the conclusion that the ambiguous verses provide a basis for the first group to cause sedition, which contradicts God's guidance expressed in "*Ihdina al-Ṣirāṭal Mustaqīm*." (guide us to the straight path)

Considering what has been said, it becomes evident from the syntagmatic relation that the *Wa* in the verse serves as a conjunction, and based on this syntagmatic relation, the firmly rooted share in God's knowledge of the interpretation of ambiguous verses, which is affirmed at the textual level.

5.2. Paradigmatic Relation

This level of language use stems from the question of why one sign is chosen among similar signs in linguistic selection and what difference this choice makes in the meaning of linguistic propositions. In other words, the relationship of paradigmatic essentially refers to the connection that exists among elements that are selected in place of one another and create a new discourse at the same linguistic level. De Saussure refers to this as "Associative Relation," while Jakobson refers to it as "Paradigmatic," considering it to arise from the commonalities among words in the mind, which leads to the establishment of a network of various relations in human consciousness (De Saussure, 2013 AD/1392 SH: 177).

In the Qur'an, there is only one verse that has a contextual similarity to the verse in question. In

the preceding verses of the discussed verse, it speaks about the faith of the People of the Book in Jesus before their death and their testimony about this group: "There is none among the People of the Book but must believe in him before his death, and on the Day of Resurrection, he will be a witness against them." (al-Nisā'/159) Continuing this discussion about Jesus' testimony against the People of the Book, God mentions two groups of Jews; one group of Jews whom God deems deserving of the prohibition of good things: "We have made unlawful for them good things that were lawful for them." (al-Nisā'/160) He cites several reasons for this:

1. Due to their wrongdoing (ibid.);
2. Due to taking away from many people (ibid.);
3. Taking usury, which is forbidden (al-Nisā'/161);
4. Consuming wealth unlawfully (ibid.).

God then considers them unbelievers due to these actions and warns them of painful punishment: "We have prepared for the disbelievers among them a painful punishment." (ibid.) In contrast to the first group of Jews, God introduces three other groups:

1. The firmly rooted in knowledge among the Jews (al-Nisā'/162);
2. The believers among the Jews who believed in the Prophet (PBUH) and the previous prophets and are established in prayer and zakat (ibid);
3. The believers among the Jews who believe in God and the Day of Resurrection (ibid.).

To these three groups, contrary to the first group of Jews, God promises a great reward (ibid.). The reason for this reward can also be inferred from the contrasting context; they are considered a group that does not follow the practices of the first group, and due to the

descriptions mentioned for them, they are worthy of a great reward in the hereafter.

It is clear that these three are all Jews because the context of the discourse is about them, and furthermore, at the beginning of the verse, the firmly rooted ones from among the Jews are identified through the reference "*Minhum*" (from them), so there is no need to repeat that the other groups are also from the Jews due to the implication of this pronoun. However, these three groups are different from each other because different qualities are attributed to them. The first group consists of those who are firmly rooted in knowledge, the second group consists of believers in the Prophet of Islam and previous prophets who uphold prayer and zakat, and the third group consists of Jews who have not believed in the Prophet, either because they were not present during his time or because they were present but did not believe, even though they do believe in God and the Day of Judgment and do not perform the actions of the first group.

However, the question that arises here is: Who are the firmly rooted in knowledge among the Jews? According to verse 7 of Surah *Āli 'Imrān*, this group comprises those whose hearts are steadfast and not susceptible to deviation. This characteristic, as mentioned previously, is exclusive to a specific group that has reached the level of the perfect human being; otherwise, it is not possible to have complete stability in the heart. They must go through the stages that Abraham went through to attain a steadfast heart (al-An'ām/76). This characteristic may be specific to the prophets and successors of the Children of Israel, and its exact application to us is not clear; however, based on the context of the verse, it is evident that they have a quality that distinguishes them from the other two groups.

In any case, this verse does not provide any specific characteristic for the firmly rooted in knowledge apart from the meaning of heart stability, but it does indicate that the firmly rooted in knowledge have a special difference from other groups, as God has mentioned them distinctively. Yet, their characteristics are left unstated, and even interpretive narrations have not elaborated on them. Meanwhile, in the verse in question, there are many narrations indicating that the infallibles are the firmly rooted in knowledge (Kulaynī, 1986 AD/1407 AH: 1, 414). Therefore, based on this intertwined data, it can be inferred that the firmly rooted have a special characteristic that does not exist among other people, which is complete stability in the heart. This may result in two anticipated states: Either due to knowledge of the ambiguous verses or regarding a factor other than that. In the first case, the view of *Istarābādī* is affirmed, which holds that the understanding of ambiguous verses is solely in the hands of the impeccable Imams. In the second case, if the impeccable Imams are also deprived of knowledge of the ambiguous verses and believe only based on their faith in God, it contradicts the divine verses that define the role of the prophets and successors as guides (al-Raʿd/7), as guidance cannot coexist with ignorance of the revelation. Essentially, how can someone claim to guide through divine revelation while being unaware of its meaning?

Conclusion

Considering that the semantic field of "*Rāsikhūn*" encompasses the meaning of "Complete Stability" based on the examination conducted, and that its reference in the verse is expressed in the form of a container, it became clear that "*Rāsikhān* in knowledge" are, in fact, those firmly rooted in the realization of knowledge, meaning they are the steadfast in

heart. The verse mentions three groups: One group with deviated hearts, one group with complete stability in their hearts, and a third group comprising those with pure intellect. Therefore, to clarify the implication of the verse regarding the firmly rooted, the verse was examined based on this semantic field, indicating that the groups of those firmly rooted in knowledge, who are actually the firmly rooted in heart, belong to the second group.

The group of those firmly rooted in knowledge, who possess a sound heart, connects to God through the contextual relationships present in the textual school of Bun regarding the discussion and ability to interpret ambiguous verses. This does not mean that the ability to interpret is limited solely to God. On the other hand, it excludes other humans from the circle of interpreters of ambiguous verses, thus confirming the meaning from the verse that only a specific group among humans possesses the knowledge of interpretation. This view aligns with the perspective of *Sharaf al-Dīn Istarābādī* regarding the issue of scholars being able to interpret in this exegetical manner. However, the contextual relationship in the verse does not specifically determine the exemplars of those firmly rooted in knowledge as being infallible individuals. Yet, in the discussion of succession and using the interconnected data, these exemplars can be identified. Consequently, the examination clarified that based on the semantics of Bun, the interpretation that *Sharaf al-Dīn Istarābādī* provides for the verse is supported, and the views of those who consider interpretation to be available to the general public or restricted only to God are not consistent with the context of the verse.

Sources

Holy Quran

Al-Maydānī, A. (n.d.). *Majma' al-Amthāl*. Beirut: Dar al-Ma'rifah.

Anṣārī, M. (1998 AD/1419 AH). *Farā'id al-Uṣūl*. Qom: Islamic Thought Assembly.

Attributed to Imam Ṣādiq (AS). (1979 AD/1400 AH). *Miṣbāḥ al-Sharī'a*. Beirut: Al-A'lami Publishing Foundation.

Bahrānī, Y. (n.d.). *Hadā'iq al-Nāzira*. Qom: Islamic Publishing Foundation.

Beheshti, I. (2011 AD/1390 SH). *Akhhārīyya*. Qom: Scientific-Cultural Dar al-Hekmat Institution.

Fāḍil Tūnī, A. (1991 AD/1412 AH). *al-Wāfiyah fī Uṣūl al-Fiqh*. Qom: Islamic Thought Assembly.

Fakhr Rāzī, M. (1997 AD/1418 AH). *al-Maḥṣūl*. Beirut: Al-Maktabah al-Risalah.

Farāhīdī, Kh. (1989 AD/1410 AH). *al-'Ayn*. Qom: Hegrat Publications.

Fayḍ Kāshānī, M. (1969 AD/1349 SH). *al-Uṣūl al-Aṣīlah*. Tehran: University Printing Organization.

Fayyūmī, A. (n.d.). *Miṣbāḥ al-Munīr*. Iran: Dar al-Razi Publications.

Graeme, H. (2009). "Ontology and the Lexicon." *Handbook on ontologies*. Springer. Berlin: Heidelberg.

Ḥurr 'Āmilī, M. (2002 AD/1423 AH). *al-Fawā'id al-Ṭūsīyyah*. N.p.: Al-Mahallati Library.

Ḥusaynī, Z; Akbari, Z; Oftadeh, F. (2019 AD/1399 SH). "Examination of the Nature of Interpretation, Foundations, and Typology of Interpretative Narrations in the Book *Ta'wīl al-Āyāt al-Zāhira*." *Journal of Quranic Interpretations Research*. Vol. 2, no. 4.

Ibn Durayd, M. (1987). *Jamhara al-Lughah*. Beirut: Dar Al-Ilm for Malayin.

Ibn Fāris, A. (1979). *Maqāyīs al-Lughah*. Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-Ilmiyya.

Ibn Fāris, A. (1986). *Mujmal al-Lughah*. Beirut: Al-Maktaba al-Risala.

Ibn Ḥaddād, S. (1975). *Kitab al-Af'āl*. Cairo: Dar Al-Sha'ab for Press, Printing, and Publishing.

Ibn Manzūr, M. (1993 AD/1414 AH). *Lisān al-'Arab*. Beirut: Dar Sader.

Istarābādī, M. (2005 AD/1426 AH). *Fawā'id al-Madīna al-Tābi'a li Jāmi'at al-Mudarrisīn*. Qom: Islamic Publishing Foundation.

Istarābādī, Sh. (1988 AD/1409 AH). *Ta'wīl al-Āyāt al-Zāhira fī Faḍā'il al-'Itrah al-Ṭāhira*. Qom: Islamic Publishing Foundation.

Izutsu, T. (1999 AD/1378 SH). *Concept of Faith in Islamic Discourse* (Poursina, Z. Trans). Tehran: Soroush.

Jawālīqī, A. (n.d.). *Sharḥ Adab al-Kātib*. Beirut: Dar al-Kitab al-Arabi.

Jawharī, I. (1986 AD/1407 AH). *al-Ṣiḥāḥ*. Beirut: Dar al-Ilm for Malayin.

Jazā'irī, A. (1988 AD/1409 AH). *al-Ijāza al-Kabīra*. Qom: Mar'ashi Najafi.

Jazāyirī, N. (n.d.). *Manba' al-Ḥayāt wa Ḥujjīyyat Qawl al-Mujtahid min al-Amwāt*. Beirut: Al-A'lami Publishing Foundation.

Karakī, H. (2017 AD/1396 SH). *Hidāyat al-Abrār ilā Ṭarīq al-A'imma al-Aṭhār*. N.p.: N.n.

Kulaynī, M. (1986 AD/1407 AH). *al-Kāfi*. Tehran: Dar al-Kutub al-Islamiyyah.

Majlisī, M. (1983). *Bihār al-Anwār*. Qom: Sources of Shia Hadith.

Ma'lūf, L. (2009). *al-Munjid fī al-Lughah al-'Arabīyyah al-Mu'āṣirah*. Beirut: Catholic Press.

Muṣṭafawī, H. (1981 AD/1360 SH). *Investigation into the Words of the Holy Quran*. Tehran: Translation and Publishing Bureau.

Rāghib Iṣfahānī, A. (1991 AD/1412 AH). *al-Mufradāt fī Gharīb al-Quran*. Damascus and Beirut: Dar al-Qalam, al-Dar al-Shamiyya.

Rahnama. (2022 AD/1402 AH). *Doctoral Thesis: Semantics of the Word 'Itmīnān' Based on Ibn's School*. Isfahan: Kharasgan University.

Safa'i Takht-e Fooladi, M. (2015 AD/1394 SH). *Samian Vocabulary in the Quran*. Isfahan: Author.

Safavi, K. (2015 AD/1394 SH). *Applied Semantics*. Tehran: Hamshahri Publishing.

Ṣāhib ibn 'Ubbād. (n.d.). *al-Muḥkam wa Muḥīt al-A'zam*. Beirut: Dar al-Fikr.

Sharifi. (2013 AD/1392 SH). "Critique and Review of Opinions in the Field of Quranic Semantics of Izutsu." *Journal of Contemporary Wisdom*. Vol. 4, no. 3.

Ṭabāṭabā'ī, M. (1995 AD/1374 SH). *Tafsir al-Mizān fī Tafsir al-Quran*. (Hamadani, M. Trans). Qom: The Society of Teachers in Qom Islamic Seminary, Islamic Publishing Office.

Tha'ālabī, A. (1993 AD/1414 AH). *Fiqh al-Lughah*. Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-Ilmiyya.

Ullmann, S. (1973). *Meaning and Style*. Uk: Blackwell.

Zabīdī, M. (n.d.). *Tāj al-'Arūs*. Beirut: Dar al-Fikr.

Zamakhsharī, M. (1979). *Asās al-Balāghah*. Beirut: Dar al-Sader.

Zamakhsharī, M. (1986 AD/1407 AH). *al-Kashshāf*. Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-Ilmiyya.