

From Majesty and Beauty to Reprieve and Transformation: A Civilizational Algorithm Theory Analysis of the Thirteenth Section of *Jawshan al-Kabir*

SeyyedAbdolHojjat MoghadasNian

University of Religions and Denominations
s14110213@gmail.com

SeyyedMohammadAli MoghadasNian

Ferdowsi University of Mashhad
sma.moghaddasnian@gmail.com

1

Abstract

This article reconstructs the thirteenth section of *Jawshan al-Kabir* as a bounded, sequence-sensitive sacred semantic architecture within Civilizational Algorithm Theory (CAT). Rather than treating the section as a flat devotional inventory of divine epithets, the study argues that it encodes an ordered progression from majestic framing and beautiful accessibility to entrusted agency, assurance, guidance, receptivity, reconfiguration, benefactive bestowal, reprieve, and transformative closure. Methodologically, the article adopts a design-science and text-bounded approach in which the independent vocative functions as the primary unit of analysis, while adjacency, pairing, clustering, and macro-sequence are treated as evidence-bearing textual features. The study integrates textual, semantic, intertextual, hermeneutical, theological, systems-philosophical, governance-oriented, scenario-based, and ethical layers to show how sacred semantics may be translated into downstream conceptual and operational nodes without collapsing the text into reductive managerial metaphor. The findings show that the section contains a coherent internal arc: dignity-framing, relational softening, fiduciary support, continuity assurance, route-setting guidance, bounded receptivity, adaptive redesign, value delivery, restorative reprieve, and lawful transformation. The article concludes that the thirteenth section offers

CAT a disciplined bridge from sacred invocation to ontology structuring and bounded theology-to-governance translation, while also requiring explicit claim boundaries, ethical guardrails, and controlled formalization.

Keywords: *Jawshan al-Kabir*; Civilizational Algorithm Theory; sacred semantics; divine names; ontology structuring; theology-to-governance translation; design science; Islamic studies

Introduction

2 The thirteenth section of *Jawshan al-Kabir* reads: *Allāhumma innī as'aluka bi-smika yā jalīlu yā jamīlu yā wakīlu yā kafīlu yā dalīlu yā qabīlu yā mudīlu yā munīlu yā muqīlu yā muḥīlu* (al-Kaf'amī, 1997). In devotional reception, such a sequence may appear to function as a compact litany of divine names. Yet a more rigorous textual and semantic reading suggests that the section is not merely accumulative or ornamental. Its order is architectonic. The issue, therefore, is not whether these names are theologically meaningful; that is already granted within the devotional and doctrinal tradition. The more demanding interpretive problem is whether their internal ordering is analytically consequential and thus capable of sustaining disciplined downstream translation.

That problem matters because scholarship on *Jawshan al-Kabir* has often privileged liturgical use, lexical gloss, pious commentary, or generalized theological appreciation, while more rarely asking whether a single section forms an internally ordered sacred-semantic micro-architecture. In other words, the unresolved question is not simply what each divine name means in isolation, but whether the sequence itself encodes a structured logic of progression. This question becomes especially important in the thirteenth section because its ten vocatives do not merely juxtapose heterogeneous attributes. Rather, they appear to move from majestic and beautiful framing to entrusted support, assurance, and guidance; from there into receptivity, circulation or reconfiguration, and benefactive delivery; and finally into reprieve and transformation. If that sequence is real rather than incidental, then the section may be read not as a flat devotional inventory but as a compact architectonic unit whose internal order constrains interpretation.

This article argues that the thirteenth section does, in fact, encode such a compact but ordered sacred-semantic architecture. The opening pair, *jalīl* and *jamīl*, frames the section through gravity and attractiveness, or normative seriousness and accessible beauty. The middle sequence then shifts toward entrusted agency, assurance, and guidance before moving into receptivity, circulation or adaptive reordering, and benefactive giving. The final pair, *muqīl* and *muḥīl*, closes the section through reprieve and transformation. This movement is not incidental. It forms a traceable semantic sequence that can be reconstructed, coded, and translated downstream

within Civilizational Algorithm Theory (CAT). In that respect, the section is best approached not as a rhetorical accumulation of epithets but as a bounded sacred-semantic architecture whose internal order is methodologically prior to later theological, ontological, systemic, governance-oriented, and application-facing translations.

The article extends an ongoing CAT-based reconstruction of *Jawshan al-Kabir* as a family of bounded sacred-semantic architectures rather than as a series of flat enumerations of divine attributes. In the developing sequence of CAT studies on the invocation and earlier sections, the cumulative argument has been that sequence, adjacency, clustering, and closure are analytically meaningful rather than rhetorically incidental. Section 13 is especially significant within that wider program because it binds norm-setting, humane attraction, fiduciary support, assurance, guidance, procedural receptivity, adaptive transition, value delivery, restorative reprieve, and transformative closure within one compact textual unit. In this sense, the present study is both continuous with that emerging research trajectory and distinctive within it, because the semantic field of Section 13 is particularly rich in transitions between normative framing, supportive relation, adaptive movement, and restorative closure (MoghadasNian, 2026; MoghadasNian et al., 2026; MoghadasNian & Karami, 2026; MoghadasNian & Raeisi, 2026).

The article also makes an explicit methodological contribution. CAT presents itself as a design-science, conceptual-engineering, and ontology-structuring method for translating bounded sacred textual units into auditable architectures of ontology, cybernetics, governance, and measurable civilizational indicators. That claim imposes obligations. It requires not only semantic richness, but also inferential discipline, formal traceability, bounded corpus logic, and ethical restraint. Accordingly, the present study does not merely interpret Section 13. It also tests CAT under stricter article-level conditions by specifying claim boundaries, differentiating text-grounded interpretation from downstream modeling, and articulating ethical safeguards for sacred-to-application translation. The article therefore treats formalization not as an unbounded license to operationalize sacred language, but as a bounded methodological task that must remain accountable to textual order, semantic restraint, and theological discipline (MoghadasNian, 2026; Gruber, 1995; Hevner et al., 2004; Peffers et al., 2007).

The broader intellectual relevance of this inquiry lies in the intersection of sacred semantics, divine-name theology, and conceptual architecture. Work on divine naming in Jewish and Islamic thought has shown that divine names are not merely labels, but dense modes of theological designation whose ordering, clustering, and grammatical placement may bear interpretive weight (Ben-Sasson, 2021; Taheri, 2023). This is especially pertinent to *Jawshan al-Kabir*, whose section-based structure invites a sequence-sensitive rather than purely enumerative reading. At the same time, design-science and ontology-engineering literatures remind us that not every rich semantic field automatically yields a defensible formal structure. A central challenge, then, is to determine whether the section can sustain bounded formal reconstruction

without collapsing sacred discourse into detachable slogans, simplistic managerial metaphors, or inflated systems language. The answer proposed here is cautiously affirmative: Section 13 can support disciplined downstream translation, but only if the text remains primary, the inferential ladder remains explicit, and the sacred-to-application bridge remains bounded rather than totalizing.

The article is guided by one primary research question and four secondary research questions. The primary research question is as follows: How can the thirteenth section of *Jawshan al-Kabir* be reconstructed as a bounded, sequence-sensitive sacred-semantic architecture within CAT, and to what extent can that architecture support disciplined downstream ontology-to-governance translation? The first secondary question asks: What textual, lexical, and semantic evidence indicates that Section 13 is an ordered vocative architecture rather than a flat devotional inventory? The second asks: How does the sequence from *jalīl* and *jamīl* to *muqīl* and *muḥīl* organize an internal arc of majesty, beauty, entrusted care, assurance, guidance, receptivity, reconfiguration, bestowal, reprieve, and transformation? The third asks: What methodological rules are required to translate this section through CAT without collapsing sacred language into simplistic managerial metaphor or uncontrolled conceptual projection? The fourth asks: Which downstream CAT outputs are most defensible for Section 13, and where must claim boundaries, uncertainty, and ethical safeguards remain explicit?

The contribution of the article is therefore threefold. First, at the textual level, it shows that Section 13 is a sequence-sensitive vocative architecture rather than a flat inventory of names. Second, at the methodological level, it refines CAT by sharpening the distinction among text-grounded meaning, interpretive inference, and application-oriented modeling, thereby strengthening the method's claim to auditability and non-inflationary translation. Third, at the translational level, it demonstrates that Section 13 can support bounded downstream movement into ontology, systems logic, governance, foresight, and application without forfeiting theological discipline or ethical restraint. The article thus proceeds from a modest but consequential thesis: the thirteenth section of *Jawshan al-Kabir* should be read as an ordered sacred-semantic micro-architecture, and that orderedness is precisely what makes disciplined CAT reconstruction possible.

Literature Review

Scholarship on *Jawshan al-Kabir* has frequently remained devotional, liturgical, or lexically descriptive. Such work is indispensable for preserving the supplication's pious force, ritual life, and theological reception, yet it often leaves unresolved a more demanding analytical question: whether a given section possesses an internal semantic order or merely accumulates related divine names. The central gap, therefore, is not the absence of theological interest, but the

absence of a sufficiently explicit method for determining whether a section functions as a sequence-sensitive sacred-semantic architecture. In the case of Section 13, this gap is especially significant because the ten vocatives appear to form an ordered movement from majestic and beautiful framing to entrusted support, assurance, guidance, receptivity, reconfiguration, benefactive delivery, restorative reprieve, and terminal transformation, rather than a flat devotional inventory.

Recent CAT-based studies provide the closest internal precedent for addressing this problem. Across the opening invocation and the sections already reconstructed through Civilizational Algorithm Theory, the cumulative argument has been that *Jawshan al-Kabir* may be read as a family of bounded sacred-semantic systems in which adjacency, clustering, and closure matter analytically rather than ornamentally (MoghadasNian et al., 2026; MoghadasNian & Hoseini Taheri, 2026; MoghadasNian & MoghadasNian, 2026a, 2026b; 2026c; 2026d; 2026e; MoghadasNian & Haghighi, 2026; MoghadasNian & Rabiee, 2026; MoghadasNian & Raeisi, 2026). These studies establish two premises that are directly relevant here. First, individual sections may be treated as compact analytical corpora without denying their devotional integrity. Second, ordered sequence may function as evidence rather than rhetorical surface. The present article extends that trajectory to a distinct semantic terrain, namely the relation among majesty, beauty, entrusted support, assurance, guidance, receptivity, reconfiguration, benefactive delivery, restorative reprieve, and transformation.

The article's immediate methodological basis lies in CAT itself. CAT is presented as a design-science, conceptual-engineering, and ontology-structuring method for translating bounded sacred corpora into auditable architectures of ontology, cybernetics, governance, and indicatorization (MoghadasNian, 2026). Its stated purpose is to address a recurring problem across theology, systems scholarship, and governance analysis: sacred texts are often read devotionally, lexically, or hermeneutically, whereas governance systems are modeled operationally, cybernetically, and metrically. What remains underdeveloped is a disciplined procedure for moving from the former to the latter without reducing sacred language to detachable slogans or simplistic managerial metaphor. In this respect, CAT is not a decorative framework added after interpretation. Rather, it is the methodological condition under which sacred semantics become formally reconstructable, while remaining text-bounded, sequence-sensitive, and ethically constrained.

External scholarship on design science and ontology engineering helps clarify this methodological profile. Gruber's work remains foundational because it frames ontologies as explicit and inspectable artifacts for shared understanding rather than as vague metaphysical abstractions. Likewise, Hevner et al. (2004) and Peffers et al. (2007) show that design-science research does not merely describe a phenomenon; it builds and justifies structured artifacts under explicit methodological discipline. These works are important for the present article because

they explain why the analysis moves beyond lexical commentary toward schema, relation, bounded formalization, and reviewable reconstruction. At the same time, they reinforce a principle of restraint: formalization must remain purpose-sensitive, transparent, and limited in scope, rather than totalizing or ontologically inflated (Gruber, 1995; Hevner et al., 2004; Peffers et al., 2007).

6 The semantics of divine names provide a second indispensable anchor. Recent scholarship has shown that divine naming in Islamic and broader monotheistic discourse is neither semantically flat nor reducible to ordinary predication. Taheri's study of Tabataba'i's principle of focal meaning is especially relevant because it demonstrates that divine names operate as dense modes of theological designation whose semantic integrity depends on disciplined attention to literality, analogy, and hierarchy rather than on synonymic accumulation (Taheri, 2023). This point is crucial for Section 13. The vocatives cannot be treated as interchangeable labels. Their lexical individuality and their sequence both matter if one is to move responsibly from word-level meaning to semantic architecture. The present study therefore situates itself against two opposite errors: devotional flattening, which treats the names as simple accumulation, and uncontrolled conceptual projection, which detaches them from their textual and theological discipline (Taheri, 2023).

Comparative and interreligious scholarship also matters, even though the present article is not primarily a comparative-theology study. Because CAT later permits dialogical, ecumenical, and interfaith extensions, the current analysis must avoid collapsing functional resonance into doctrinal sameness. Moyaert (2012) has emphasized that comparative theology requires ethical vulnerability rather than the illusion of neutral mastery, while Avci (2018) clarifies that comparative theology should not be confused either with a purely descriptive religious studies model or with a theology of religions that prematurely settles truth claims. These insights matter for Section 13 because motifs such as guidance, support, acceptance, reprieve, and transformation are dialogically rich but not doctrinally interchangeable. Accordingly, any later comparative use of this section must proceed through bounded analogy rather than assimilative equivalence (Avci, 2018; Moyaert, 2012).

Finally, the governance side of the translation must remain normatively disciplined. Scholarship on Islamic governance has long highlighted accountability, trust, consultation, justice, dignity, and public responsibility as central principles, while also warning against reducing governance to technocratic control or administrative efficiency alone. Batchelor's analysis is especially relevant because it connects Islamic governance to accountability, consultation, inclusion, dignity, and systems thinking, thereby offering a normatively richer account than managerial reductionism allows (Batchelor, 2014). This matters here because CAT aims to translate sacred semantics into governance-relevant architecture without allowing the source text to be swallowed by bureaucratic or instrumental language. The deeper gap, then, is not simply that

Section 13 has not yet been analyzed in detail. It is methodological: whether a sequence of divine names can be read as an ordered sacred-semantic architecture that is textually bounded, theologically responsible, ontologically legible, and cautiously translatable into downstream CAT outputs. The present article addresses that gap by arguing that Section 13 should be read as precisely such an architecture.

Methodology

This study adopts a bounded, sequence-sensitive design-science approach within Civilizational Algorithm Theory (CAT), treating the thirteenth section of *Jawshan al-Kabir* as a compact vocative corpus whose internal order is analytically consequential and whose downstream ontology-to-governance translation must remain text-bounded, claim-disciplined, and ethically restrained (MoghadasNian, 2026). In methodological terms, the study proceeds from the premise that sacred semantics may function as an upstream conceptual layer for later ontological, systemic, governance-oriented, and evaluative reconstruction only when the corpus is explicitly delimited and the inferential transitions are auditable rather than intuitive, accumulative, or rhetorically inflated (Gruber, 1995; Hevner et al., 2004; Peffers et al., 2007).

The corpus is deliberately limited to the received text of the thirteenth section of *Jawshan al-Kabir* as preserved in *al-Balad al-amīn* and reinforced through later Shi'i devotional transmission (al-Kaf'amī, 1997; Qummī, 1376 [1997/1998]). The article does not claim to analyze the supplication as a whole. Instead, it isolates one compact invocatory sequence in order to preserve interpretive discipline, semantic traceability, and Q1-level defensibility. This bounded-corpus strategy is consistent with CAT's own proof-of-concept orientation, which privileges depth, formal clarity, and controlled translation over premature totalization of the full devotional corpus (MoghadasNian, 2026).

The primary unit of analysis is the independent vocative. Each divine name is treated as a discrete textual and semantic unit rather than as a loose thematic cue. However, the study does not stop at the single-name level. Three analytical scales are used throughout: the independent vocative, adjacency and local clustering, and the macro-sequence of the section as a whole. This three-tier design is methodologically necessary because it prevents arbitrary movement from isolated lexical items to totalized conceptual claims, while also allowing the study to distinguish local meaning from section-wide architecture. In this respect, sequence is treated not as stylistic surface but as evidence-bearing structure, consistent with recent CAT-based reconstructions of earlier *Jawshan* sections (MoghadasNian et al., 2026; MoghadasNian & Karami, 2026; MoghadasNian & Raeisi, 2026).

Procedurally, the article follows CAT's linked stages of corpus delimitation, semantic extraction, ontological coding, systems translation, cybernetic mapping, governance translation, indicator scaffolding, and systems integration (MoghadasNian, 2026). For the purposes of the present study, these stages are operationalized in a compact article-scale sequence. First, the thirteenth section is segmented into ten vocatives. Second, each vocative is coded in terms of lexical form, semantic core, theological category, and conceptual role. Third, adjacency patterns and cluster relations are reconstructed to determine whether the section contains a stable internal arc. Fourth, the section is translated at progressively downstream layers, including semantic, intertextual, hermeneutical, theological, systems-philosophical, governance-oriented, foresight, and ethical layers. The resulting outputs are not presented as final institutional blueprints, but as bounded analytical scaffolds that remain open to later expert review, calibration, and applied testing.

8

To preserve inferential discipline, the study distinguishes three analytical statuses throughout: text-grounded meaning, interpretive inference, and application-oriented modeling. The text layer bears the strongest evidentiary force because it is anchored directly in the received corpus. Semantic, intertextual, hermeneutical, and theological layers remain relatively close to that textual core. By contrast, systems, governance, scenario, foresight, and KPI-relevant layers are treated as bounded translations rather than direct textual claims. This distinction is decisive because it prevents uncontrolled movement from sacred language to managerial prescription or policy absolutism. It also reflects a broader design-science principle: artifact-oriented reconstruction requires explicit differentiation between source data, interpretive abstraction, and downstream application logic (Hevner et al., 2004; Peffers et al., 2007).

Two additional controls structure the method. First, intertextual and comparative evidence is used in graded form. Some vocatives admit stronger Qur'anic or hadith resonance than others; where lexical or conceptual proximity is weaker, the article employs caution rather than accumulative proof-texting. Second, a meta-methodological ethics of translation is maintained throughout. Claim boundaries, uncertainty levels, and misuse risks are made explicit, especially where the analysis moves from divine naming toward governance, formal schema, or operational analogy. In this respect, the study follows CAT's insistence that sacred semantics may be formalized only in a bounded, reviewable, and responsibility-sensitive manner, rather than as a license for reductive instrumentalization (MoghadasNian, 2026; Taheri, 2023; Moyaert, 2012).

Findings and Results

The thirteenth section as an ordered vocative architecture

At the Identification and Text Layer, the thirteenth section is best read as an ordered chain of ten independent vocatives rather than as a devotional inventory: *yā jalīl*, *yā jamīl*, *yā wakīl*, *yā kafīl*, *yā dalīl*, *yā qabīl*, *yā mudīl*, *yā munīl*, *yā muqīl*, *yā muḥīl* (al-Kaf' amī, 1997). Read in sequence, the section displays neither semantic redundancy nor merely ornamental accumulation. Instead, it exhibits a constrained internal progression in which adjacency is meaningful and closure is architectonic. This result is consistent with CAT-based analyses of earlier sections, which likewise argue that *Jawshan al-Kabir* is more adequately approached as a family of bounded sacred-semantic micro-architectures than as a flat series of devotional epithets (MoghadasNian et al., 2026; MoghadasNian & Hoseini Taheri, 2026; MoghadasNian & MoghadasNian, 2026a, 2026b; 2026c; 2026d; 2026e; MoghadasNian & Haghghi, 2026; MoghadasNian & Rabiee, 2026; MoghadasNian & Raeisi, 2026).

9 The opening pair, *yā jalīl* and *yā jamīl*, establishes the section's primary frame. *Jalīl* introduces grandeur, gravity, and normative seriousness; *jamīl* introduces beauty, attractiveness, and relational accessibility. The section therefore begins not with abstract transcendence alone, but with a double framing of majesty and beauty, seriousness and approachability. The next triad, *yā wakīl*, *yā kafīl*, and *yā dalīl*, moves from entrusted support to assurance and then to direction. This middle formation is especially important because it converts the initial frame into a relational architecture of reliable care: support is not left undefined, but becomes secured through guarantee and oriented through guidance. The following cluster, *yā qabīl*, *yā mudīl*, and *yā munīl*, then shifts the section from support and orientation into receptivity, reconfiguration, and realized giving. Finally, the pair *yā muqīl* and *yā muḥīl* closes the sequence not by simple repetition, but by moving through reprieve into transformation. The macro-arc may therefore be rendered as follows: gravity → attraction → entrusted support → assurance → guidance → bounded receptivity → adaptive reconfiguration → benefactive delivery → restorative reprieve → transformative transition.

This is the first major finding of the article: Section 13 does not merely contain ten positive divine names; it organizes one internally coherent semantic passage. The sequence is therefore best interpreted as architectonic rather than accumulative, and that orderedness is the condition for any defensible downstream CAT reconstruction.

Semantic, hermeneutical, and theological reconstruction

At the Semantic and Signification Layer, each vocative functions as a distinct semantic node within the larger architecture. *Jalīl* encodes grandeur, gravity, and normative seriousness; *jamīl* encodes beauty, attraction, and soft accessibility; *wakīl* encodes entrusted agency, reliable support, and stewardship; *kafīl* encodes assurance, continuity, and non-abandonment; *dalīl* encodes guidance, clarification, and route-setting; *qabīl* encodes receptivity, fair acceptance, and the possibility of re-entry; *mudīl* encodes alteration of condition, adaptive reconfiguration, and structured change; *munīl* encodes enabling bestowal and realized benefit; *muqīl* encodes

reprieve, restorative release, and the possibility of a second beginning; and *muḥīl* encodes transition, state transformation, and terminal phase shift. In this sense, the section is semantically progressive rather than lexically additive. It does not merely assemble desirable attributes; it orders them into a meaningful passage from framing to support, from support to orientation, from orientation to receptivity, from receptivity to change and fruition, and from there to reprieve and transformation. This confirms the broader theological insight that divine names are not semantically flat predicates, but dense modes of meaning whose sequence may carry interpretive force (Taheri, 2023).

At the Hermeneutical and Theological Layers, the findings are equally significant. The section is best understood as an ordered architecture of divine perfection and divine action. The opening pair establishes transcendence without remoteness: majesty secures seriousness, while beauty prevents transcendence from becoming inaccessible. The support cluster then shifts the section from transcendent framing to fiduciary care: entrusted support, assurance, and guidance together prevent divine relation from remaining abstract or diffuse. *Qabīl* opens the possibility of bounded acceptance and re-entry, while *mudīl* and *munīl* render the architecture dynamic and productive rather than merely preservative. The final pair makes explicit that the section does not culminate in static order, but in restorative reprieve and transformative closure. This is the second major finding of the article: Section 13 presents not a random list of admirable divine properties, but a theology of ordered divine action. Support is linked to guidance, guidance to receptivity, receptivity to change, change to fruition, and fruition to reprieve and transformation. The sequence is therefore architectonic at the theological level as well as at the textual and semantic levels.

Downstream CAT translation

At downstream CAT layers, the section supports a bounded but robust architecture of civilizational translation. At the systems-philosophical level, the sequence may be reconstructed as movement from boundary and coherence to support, continuity, routing, intake, reconfiguration, delivery, reset, and transition. At the governance level, it yields a parallel movement through dignity-bearing normativity, humane coherence, stewardship, assurance, guidance, fair reception, adaptive redesign, equitable delivery, restorative correction, and lawful transition. At the foresight and scenario layers, the section generates differentiated futures of dignity, cohesion, support, continuity, guidance, receptivity, redesign, delivery, repair, and renewal, each of which may unfold in desirable, intermediate, or high-risk trajectories depending on whether the corresponding semantic function is stabilized, weakened, or distorted (MoghadasNian, 2026).

At the ethical layer, the findings confirm that every downstream translation requires a corresponding guardrail. *Jalīl* requires protection against humiliation and coercive grandeur; *jamīl* against cosmetic sentimentalism; *wakīl* against dependency-producing paternalism; *kafīl*

against assurance without responsibility; *dalīl* against monopolization of guidance; *qabīl* against both exclusion and permissive collapse; *mudīl* against romanticization of disorder; *munīl* against patronage and inequitable distribution; *muqīl* against reprieve without accountability; and *muḥīl* against rupture presented as renewal. This is the third major finding of the article: Section 13 is architecture-generating but not self-executing. It supports CAT translation into systems, governance, foresight, scenario, and ethics, but only under explicit limits, claim discipline, and non-reductive handling of sacred semantics. In this sense, the section confirms CAT's central methodological thesis: sacred language may serve as an upstream conceptual layer for later formal and governance-oriented reconstruction, but only when the translation remains text-bounded, auditable, and theologically responsible (MoghadasNian, 2026; Gruber, 1995; Hevner et al., 2004).

Discussion

11

The findings support four interrelated claims. First, the thirteenth section of *Jawshan al-Kabir* is neither a flat devotional inventory nor a merely rhetorical accumulation. Rather, it is a compact sacred-semantic architecture whose internal sequence is analytically consequential. The movement from *jalīl* and *jamīl* to *muqīl* and *muḥīl* is not accidental ornamentation; it forms a structured arc in which framing, support, orientation, receptivity, reconfiguration, benefactive delivery, reprieve, and transformation are ordered rather than merely juxtaposed. In this respect, the study extends the cumulative CAT argument that individual sections of *Jawshan al-Kabir* can be reconstructed as bounded semantic systems in which adjacency, clustering, and closure carry evidentiary weight (MoghadasNian, 2026; MoghadasNian et al., 2026; MoghadasNian & Karami, 2026; MoghadasNian & Raeisi, 2026). The discussion therefore strengthens the article's central thesis: Section 13 is best understood as a sequence-sensitive micro-architecture rather than as an undifferentiated list of divine epithets.

Second, the article sharpens CAT methodologically. The present analysis shows that sequence-sensitive reconstruction requires more than lexical gloss or generalized theological appreciation. It requires bounded corpus selection, a clear unit-of-analysis logic, evidence-bearing adjacency, differentiated evidentiary levels, explicit claim-boundary discipline, and ethical guardrails for downstream translation. In that sense, the study strengthens CAT not by enlarging its claims, but by making its transition rules more explicit and more defensible in journal-level argument. This aligns the method more closely with design-science expectations that scholarly contribution lies not only in interpretation, but also in the disciplined construction of a reviewable artifact under explicit methodological controls (Gruber, 1995; Hevner et al., 2004; Peffers et al., 2007).

Third, the study offers a distinctive reading of Section 13 itself. The section is organized neither around mercy alone nor around judgment alone. Rather, it moves from majestic and beautiful

framing into entrusted support, assurance, guidance, receptivity, adaptive change, benefactive delivery, restorative reprieve, and transformation. The theological significance of this sequence is substantial. Majesty without beauty would risk remoteness; beauty without majesty would risk sentimental flattening. Support without assurance would remain fragile; assurance without guidance would risk inertia. Guidance without receptivity would harden into closure; receptivity without reconfiguration would remain passive. Reconfiguration without delivery would remain abstract; reprieve without transformation would remain incomplete. The section's architectonic order prevents these distortions by sequencing the names into a theology of ordered divine action rather than a cluster of isolated perfections. This reading also resonates with recent work on divine names as semantically dense modes of theological designation rather than interchangeable predicates, which reinforces the article's insistence that sequence and distinction must be preserved together (Taheri, 2023).

12

Fourth, the article clarifies the possibilities and the limits of downstream translation. It does not claim that Section 13 directly legislates policy, yields a finalized metric architecture, or presents a complete formal ontology. Instead, it shows that sacred semantics may function as an upstream conceptual layer for later work in systems logic, governance, scenario design, ontology structuring, and evaluative architecture, provided that these transitions remain bounded and explicitly reviewable. This distinction is crucial. The article's contribution lies in demonstrating architecture-generating potential, not self-executing institutional prescription. In this respect, the study occupies a middle position between two inadequate alternatives: purely devotional reading, which leaves semantic order under-theorized, and uncontrolled managerial appropriation, which converts sacred language into detachable governance slogans. The present discussion argues that CAT is defensible only if it preserves this middle position.

The study also has comparative and dialogical significance. Although the article is not primarily an interfaith or comparative-theology paper, Section 13 contains motifs that are clearly dialogically fertile: guidance, entrusted care, acceptance, reprieve, and transformation. Yet the findings also confirm that such fertility does not authorize doctrinal equivalence. The proper comparative posture is bounded resonance rather than identity-claim. This is consistent with comparative-theology scholarship that stresses vulnerability, particularity, and disciplined non-assimilation in cross-traditional learning (Moyaert, 2012; Avci, 2018). Section 13 is therefore dialogically rich, but only under conditions that preserve theological difference rather than dissolving it into functional sameness.

The governance relevance of the findings should likewise be understood in a disciplined sense. Section 13 appears especially governance-legible because its ordered sequence can be translated into notions such as dignity-bearing normativity, humane coherence, stewardship, assurance, guidance, fair intake, adaptive redesign, equitable delivery, restorative correction, and lawful transition. Yet the article does not reduce governance to technocratic execution. Rather, it

supports an account of governance that remains normatively thick, anchored in dignity, accountability, trust, and proportionate responsibility. In that respect, the discussion converges with broader Islamic governance scholarship, which emphasizes that justice, consultation, accountability, dignity, and social welfare are constitutive principles rather than optional moral decorations around administrative procedure (Batchelor, 2014).

Several limitations should be made explicit. First, the article is corpus-bounded to one received section and does not claim to exhaust the broader devotional, liturgical, or commentarial history of *Jawshan al-Kabir*. Second, the downstream CAT layers remain model-level translations rather than empirically validated institutional programs. Third, the semantic range of *qabīl*, *mudīl*, and *muhīl* requires more explicit caution than the comparatively more stable opening and middle names. Fourth, although the article proposes ontology-ready formalization, it does not claim that the section itself contains a complete explicit ontology. These limitations are not weaknesses to be concealed; they are part of the article's methodological integrity. Indeed, the study's defensibility depends precisely on keeping text-grounded meaning, interpretive inference, and application-oriented modeling distinct rather than collapsing them into a single undifferentiated claim field.

13

Taken together, the discussion confirms that Section 13 is one of the most governance-legible and methodologically revealing sections in the emerging CAT-based reconstruction of *Jawshan al-Kabir*. Its value lies not in offering a ready-made program of action, but in showing how sacred language can be reconstructed as an ordered, auditable, and bounded semantic architecture capable of supporting later ontology, systems, governance, and foresight work without forfeiting theological seriousness. That, in turn, is the article's broader contribution: it demonstrates that sacred semantics may be made methodologically legible for design-science translation, but only under conditions of sequence sensitivity, inferential restraint, and ethical responsibility.

Conclusion

This article has argued that the thirteenth section of *Jawshan al-Kabir* is best read not as a flat devotional inventory, but as a bounded and sequence-sensitive sacred-semantic architecture. The section's internal movement from *jalīl* and *jamīl* through *wakīl*, *kafīl*, *dalīl*, *qabīl*, *mudīl*, and *munīl* to *muqīl* and *muhīl* yields a coherent arc of majesty, beauty, entrusted support, assurance, guidance, receptivity, adaptive reconfiguration, benefactive delivery, restorative reprieve, and transformation (al-Kaf'amī, 1997). The primary conclusion is therefore textual and semantic: Section 13 is architectonic rather than accumulative, and its order is analytically consequential rather than rhetorically incidental.

On that basis, the article also concludes that Section 13 provides a particularly strong test case for Civilizational Algorithm Theory. Read within CAT, the section demonstrates that sacred invocation may serve as an upstream conceptual layer for later ontological, systems-philosophical, governance-oriented, foresight, and application-facing reconstruction, but only when the movement from text to downstream design remains bounded, auditable, and ethically governed (MoghadasNian, 2026). In this respect, the article's contribution is not to dissolve sacred language into systems jargon, nor to replace theology with managerial abstraction. Rather, it is to show that sacred semantics can be translated into formal and governance-relevant architectures without forfeiting theological seriousness, provided that the transitions remain explicitly disciplined and reviewable (Hevner et al., 2004; Peffers et al., 2007).

The study further concludes that Section 13 is theologically significant because it portrays divine action as ordered rather than episodic. Majesty is joined to beauty, support to assurance, assurance to guidance, guidance to receptivity, receptivity to reconfiguration, reconfiguration to benefactive delivery, and reprieve to transformation. The sequence therefore resists both devotional flattening and conceptual fragmentation. It presents a structured theology of divine relation in which transcendence, care, direction, acceptance, change, gift, repair, and transition are integrated within one compact invocatory unit.

At the same time, the article affirms the necessity of restraint. The downstream CAT outputs proposed here are not final institutional blueprints, completed KPI systems, or fully validated formal ontologies. They are bounded analytical scaffolds. Some vocatives, especially *qabīl*, *mudīl*, and *muḥīl*, require more lexical and inferential caution than the more stable opening and middle names. The article therefore ends by reaffirming a core CAT principle: text-grounded meaning, interpretive inference, and application-oriented modeling must remain distinguishable if sacred-to-governance translation is to remain credible, non-inflationary, and ethically defensible (MoghadasNian, 2026).

Accordingly, the broader conclusion of the study is that the thirteenth section of *Jawshan al-Kabir* offers CAT a rich but bounded bridge from sacred invocation to ontology structuring and theology-to-governance translation. Its value lies not in furnishing a ready-made program of action, but in demonstrating that sacred semantics, when read with sequence sensitivity and methodological discipline, can become an auditable source for later conceptual architecture, responsible design, and civilizational analysis. Future research should extend this approach to inter-section comparison, expert validation, and staged operational testing so that the present proof of concept may develop into a more fully reviewable and transferable CAT corpus.

References

al-Kaf'amī, Ibrāhīm ibn 'Alī. (1997). *al-Balad al-amīn wa-al-dir' al-ḥaṣīn*. Mu'assasat al-A'lamī lil-Maṭbū'āt.

- Avci, B. (2018). *Comparative theology and scriptural reasoning: A Muslim's approach to interreligious learning*. Religions, 9(10), Article 297. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel9100297>
- Batchelor, D. A.-F. (2014). *Integrating Islamic principles and values into the fabric of governance*. Islam and Civilisational Renewal, 5(3), 351–374. <https://doi.org/10.12816/0009867>
- Ben-Sasson, H. (2021). Representation and presence: Divine names in Judaism and Islam. *Harvard Theological Review*, 114(2), 219–240. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017816021000158>
- Gruber, T. R. (1995). Toward principles for the design of ontologies used for knowledge sharing. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies*, 43(5–6), 907–928. <https://doi.org/10.1006/ijhc.1995.1081>
- Hevner, A. R., March, S. T., Park, J., & Ram, S. (2004). Design science in information systems research. *MIS Quarterly*, 28(1), 75–105. <https://doi.org/10.2307/25148625>
- MoghadasNian, S. (2026). *Civilizational Algorithm Theory (CAT): A Design–Science Method for Sacred-Text Ontology Structuring and Theology-to-Governance Translation*. University of Religions and Denominations. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.17244.86400>
- MoghadasNian, S., & Haghghi, N. (2026). *Transcendent Governance, Provisioning, and Canonical Closure: A Civilizational Algorithm Theory Analysis of the Fourth Section of Jawshan Kabir*. Paper presented at the 23rd International Conference on Management Research and Humanities in Iran. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19105298>
- MoghadasNian, S., & Hoseini Taheri, J.M. (2026). *Reconstructing Sacred Semantics: A Civilizational Algorithm Theory Analysis of the Third Section of Jawshan Kabir*. Paper presented at the 23rd International Conference on Management Research and Humanities in Iran. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19105110>
- MoghadasNian, S., & MoghadasNian, A. (2026a). *Compassionate Regulation, Evidentiary Authority, and Clarifying Grace: A Civilizational Algorithm Theory Analysis of the Fifth Section of Jawshan Kabir*. Paper presented at the 23rd International Conference on Management Research and Humanities in Iran. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19122769>
- MoghadasNian, S., & MoghadasNian, A. (2026e). *From Knowledge of the Unseen to the Easing of Grievs A Civilizational Algorithm Theory Analysis of the Twelfth Section of Jawshan Kabir*. Paper presented at the 23rd International Conference on Management Research and Humanities in Iran. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19515817>
- MoghadasNian, S., & MoghadasNian, M. (2026d). *From Reserve in Hardship to Help in Alarm: A Civilizational Algorithm Theory Analysis of the Eleventh Section of Jawshan Kabir*. Paper presented at the 23rd International Conference on Management Research and Humanities in Iran. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19483144>
- MoghadasNian, S., & MoghadasNian, S.A.H. (2026b). *Governance-in-Action in Sacred Semantics: A Civilizational Algorithm Theory Analysis of the Second Section of Jawshan Kabir*. Paper presented at the 23rd International Conference on Management Research and Humanities in Iran. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19104928>
- MoghadasNian, S., & MoghadasNian, Z. (2026c). *From Majesty to Justice-Constrained Sovereignty A Civilizational Algorithm Theory Analysis of the Sixth Section of Jawshan Kabir*. Paper presented at the 23rd International Conference on Management Research and Humanities in Iran. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19377115>
- MoghadasNian, S., & Rabiee, M. (2026). *Forgiveness, Affliction Relief, and Restored Agency A Civilizational Algorithm Theory Analysis of the Seventh Section of Jawshan Kabir*. Paper presented at the 23rd International Conference on Management Research and Humanities in Iran. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19377354>
- MoghadasNian, S., & Raeisi, Z. (2026). *From Creative Origination to Refuge for the Rejected: A Civilizational Algorithm Theory Analysis of the Tenth Section of Jawshan Kabir*. Paper presented at the 23rd International Conference on Management Research and Humanities in Iran. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19435320>
- MoghadasNian, S., JafarTayari Dehaqani, M., & MoghadasNian, S.M.H. (2026). *Sacred texts as civilizational algorithms: A cybernetic–theological analysis of the opening invocation of Jawshan Kabir*. Paper presented at the 23rd International Conference on Management Research and Humanities in Iran. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19104667>

- Moyaert, M. (2012). *On vulnerability: Probing the ethical dimensions of comparative theology*. *Religions*, 3(4), 1144–1161. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel3041144>
- Peffer, K., Tuunanen, T., Rothenberger, M. A., & Chatterjee, S. (2007). *A design science research methodology for information systems research*. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 24(3), 45–77. <https://doi.org/10.2753/MIS0742-1222240302>
- Qummī, ‘Abbās ibn Muḥammad Riḍā. (1376 [1997/1998]). *Kullīyāt-i Mafātīḥ al-jinān*. Nashr-i Muḥammad.
- Taheri, J. (2023). Semantics of divine names: Tabatabai’s principle of “focal meaning” and Burrell’s grammar of God-talk. *International Journal of Philosophy and Theology*, 84(2), 157–177. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21692327.2023.2169743>

Appendix

Appendix A. The Thirteenth Section of *Jawshan al-Kabir*: Text Base and Delimitation for CAT Analysis

This article treats the thirteenth section of *Jawshan al-Kabir* as a bounded proof-of-concept corpus within Civilizational Algorithm Theory (CAT). The purpose of this delimitation is to preserve interpretive discipline, conceptual auditability, and traceable sacred-semantics-to-governance translation. The article does not claim to analyze the entire supplication. Rather, it isolates one compact invocatory sequence in order to test whether a semantically dense sacred unit can sustain a coherent translation from sacred semantics to ontology structuring, systems logic, governance translation, taqrīb-relevant diagnostics, and downstream foresight architecture (MoghadasNian, 2026).

A.1 Arabic Text of the Thirteenth Section

اللَّهُمَّ إِنِّي أَسْأَلُكَ بِاسْمِكَ يَا جَلِيلُ يَا جَمِيلُ يَا وَكِيلُ يَا كَفِيلُ يَا دَلِيلُ يَا قَبِيلُ يَا مُدِيلُ يَا مُنِيلُ يَا مُقِيلُ يَا مُجِيلُ

A.2 Liturgical Continuation Commonly Associated with the Sectional Unit

سُبْحَانَكَ يَا لَا إِلَهَ إِلَّا أَنْتَ الْعَوْتُ الْعَوْتُ خَلِّصْنَا مِنَ النَّارِ يَا رَبِّ

A.3 Standardized Latin Transliteration

Allāhumma innī as`aluka bi-smika yā jalīlu yā jamīlu yā wakīlu yā kafīlu yā dalīlu yā qabīlu yā mudīlu yā munīlu yā muqīlu yā mujīlu.

Subhānaka yā lā ilāha illā anta, al-ghawtha al-ghawtha, khalliṣnā mina al-nāri yā rabb.

A.4 Working English Translation

O God, I ask You by Your Name: O Majestic One, O Beautiful One, O Trustee, O Guarantor, O Guide, O Receptive One, O Turner of Conditions, O Bestower, O Absolver, O Transformer.

Glory be to You; there is no god but You. Help, help; deliver us from the Fire, O Lord.

A.5 Textual Delimitation Note

For the purposes of this article, the primary analytical unit is the ordered sequence of the ten invocatory expressions from *yā jalīl* to *yā muḥīl* as preserved in the standard devotional transmission of *Jawshan al-Kabir* and reproduced in major Shi`i devotional compilations (al-Kaf`amī, 1997; Qummī, 1376/1997–1998). The closing liturgical formula is acknowledged as part of the wider invocational structure, but CAT analysis is centered on the ten-unit kernel because this sequence carries the most concentrated semantic, theological, systemic, and governance-relevant logic of the section.

In the present interpretation, the thirteenth section functions as an ordered passage from majestic and beautiful framing to entrusted support, assurance, guidance, receptivity, adaptive reconfiguration, benefactive delivery, restorative reprieve, and terminal transformation. More precisely, the section opens with a dual framing of transcendence and attractiveness in *jalīl* and *jamīl*; it then moves into a support-and-orientation cluster through *wakīl*, *kafīl*, and *dalīl*; from there it opens a receptive and dynamic transition through *qabīl* and *mudīl*; it proceeds to realized gift and enabling benefit in *munīl*; and it closes through *muqīl* and *muhīl*, where reprieve and transformation function as the terminal logic of the sequence. This reading is consistent with the section's sequence-sensitive organization and with CAT's requirement that sacred-semantic reconstruction remain text-bounded, architectonic, and methodologically auditable rather than merely thematic or devotional (MoghadasNian, 2026).

Appendix B. Attribute-to-CAT Analytical Coding Matrix for the Ten Invocations of the Thirteenth Section

This appendix presents the invocation-level CAT coding structure for the thirteenth section of *Jawshan al-Kabir* in standardized codebook form. Each invocatory unit is treated as a semantic-theological node that can be translated, in a bounded and auditable way, into a systemic role, a cybernetic function, a governance principle, and an indicative KPI scaffold. The purpose of this appendix is to strengthen interpretive transparency, inter-section comparability, and methodological reproducibility. Unlike the eleventh section, which is organized around differentiated divine response to named human limit-conditions, the thirteenth section is distinguished by a sequence of architectonically ordered divine names moving from majestic and beautiful framing to entrusted support, assurance, guidance, receptivity, adaptive reconfiguration, benefactive delivery, restorative reprieve, and transformation. In CAT terms, the section is therefore best understood as a majesty–beauty–trusteeship–assurance–guidance–reception–reconfiguration–bestowal–reprieve–transformation architecture rather than as a devotional inventory of disconnected attributes (al-Kaf' amī, 1997; MoghadasNian, 2026).

B.1. *Jalīl*

- **Semantic core:** majesty, gravity, normative seriousness, transcendence with weight.
- **Theological category:** perfection-bearing divine grandeur.
- **CAT layer:** norm-framing and sacred-boundary layer.
- **Systemic function:** establishes seriousness, protects against trivialization, and sets the gravity of the whole sequence.
- **Algorithmic role:** boundary framer / norm-integrity activator.
- **Governance translation:** dignity governance, symbolic discipline, anti-trivialization architecture.
- **Indicative KPI:** Majestic Norm Integrity Index.

B.2. *Jamīl*

- **Semantic core:** beauty, attractiveness, relational softening, accessible excellence.
- **Theological category:** perfection-bearing divine beauty.
- **CAT layer:** attractive coherence and humane legitimacy layer.
- **Systemic function:** renders normativity relationally bearable and prevents majesty from collapsing into remoteness.
- **Algorithmic role:** coherence softener / relational-attraction modulator.
- **Governance translation:** humane legitimacy, affective coherence, soft-consent architecture.
- **Indicative KPI:** Attractive Coherence Index.

B.3. *Wakīl*

- **Semantic core:** trusteeship, reliable delegation, entrusted support, responsible backing.
- **Theological category:** fiduciary divine care.
- **CAT layer:** support-and-stewardship layer.
- **Systemic function:** provides dependable support without erasing agency.
- **Algorithmic role:** support allocator / entrusted-agency stabilizer.
- **Governance translation:** support architecture, stewardship logic, responsible reliance.
- **Indicative KPI:** Trusted Support Reliance Index.

B.4. *Kafīl*

- **Semantic core:** guarantee, assurance, continuity, non-abandonment.
- **Theological category:** assurance-bearing divine care.
- **CAT layer:** continuity and assurance layer.
- **Systemic function:** stabilizes expectations, reduces fragility, and secures continuity under pressure.
- **Algorithmic role:** assurance buffer / continuity stabilizer.
- **Governance translation:** continuity management, assurance obligations, reliability architecture.
- **Indicative KPI:** Assurance Continuity Index.

B.5. *Dalīl*

- **Semantic core:** guidance, direction, clarification, route-setting.
- **Theological category:** orienting divine guidance.
- **CAT layer:** epistemic-clarification and directionality layer.
- **Systemic function:** reduces ambiguity and restores navigable direction.
- **Algorithmic role:** orientation engine / ambiguity reducer.
- **Governance translation:** clarification protocol, guidance architecture, decision coherence.
- **Indicative KPI:** Guidance Clarity Index.

B.6. *Qabīl*

- **Semantic core:** receptivity, acceptance, fair hearing, admissibility, possibility of re-entry.
- **Theological category:** receptive divine response.
- **CAT layer:** intake, reception, and bounded openness layer.
- **Systemic function:** opens regulated entry without dissolving normative boundaries.
- **Algorithmic role:** intake gate / responsible-reception filter.
- **Governance translation:** fair intake, re-entry pathways, non-exclusionary review.
- **Indicative KPI:** Responsible Reception and Re-entry Index.

B.7. *Mudīl*

- **Semantic core:** alternation, change of state, circulation, adaptive reconfiguration.
- **Theological category:** reconfiguring divine action.
- **CAT layer:** transition and redesign layer.
- **Systemic function:** changes stagnant or mismatched conditions and makes adaptive restructuring possible.
- **Algorithmic role:** state-transition engine / reconfiguration switch.
- **Governance translation:** adaptive redesign, transition governance, anti-stagnation architecture.
- **Indicative KPI:** Adaptive Reconfiguration Effectiveness Index.

B.8. *Munīl*

- **Semantic core:** bestowal, attainment, granting, enabling delivery of benefit.
- **Theological category:** benefactive divine giving.

- **CAT layer:** value-delivery and realized-benefit layer.
- **Systemic function:** converts prepared or promised good into actualized attainment.
- **Algorithmic role:** benefit-delivery node / attainment enabler.
- **Governance translation:** equitable delivery, value realization, benefit-access architecture.
- **Indicative KPI:** Benefactive Delivery and Attainment Index.

B.9. *Muqīl*

- **Semantic core:** reprieve, absolution, release from burden, restorative reset.
- **Theological category:** restorative divine mercy.
- **CAT layer:** repair, reprieve, and second-beginning layer.
- **Systemic function:** interrupts burden lock, enables restoration, and permits disciplined re-entry after failure.
- **Algorithmic role:** restorative reset / burden-release processor.
- **Governance translation:** restorative correction, repair pathways, anti-permanent-exclusion architecture.
- **Indicative KPI:** Restorative Reprieve Effectiveness Index.

B.10. *Muḥīl*

- **Semantic core:** transformation, transposition, change of condition, terminal phase shift.
- **Theological category:** transformative divine action.
- **CAT layer:** renewal and phase-transition layer.
- **Systemic function:** moves the system from one stabilized condition to another and closes the sequence through transformative transition.
- **Algorithmic role:** phase-shift transformer / renewal actuator.
- **Governance translation:** transition governance, renewal architecture, lawful transformation.
- **Indicative KPI:** Transformative Transition Readiness and Success Index.

B.11. Integrative Coding Note

Taken together, the ten invocatory units yield a sequential architecture rather than ten disconnected semantic particles. The coding logic moves from majestic and beautiful framing, through entrusted support, assurance, and guidance, toward receptivity and adaptive reconfiguration, then into benefactive delivery, restorative reprieve, and transformative renewal. In CAT terms, the thirteenth section therefore functions as a norm-framing-coherence-support-assurance-guidance-reception-reconfiguration-delivery-repair-transition architecture. Its distinctive contribution within the broader *Jawshan al-Kabir* corpus lies in formalizing how transcendence becomes relationally accessible, how support becomes reliable and directional, how receptivity opens the possibility of structured re-entry, and how that ordered passage culminates not merely in preservation but in reprieve and transformation (MoghadasNian, 2026; MoghadasNian et al., 2026).

Appendix C. Indicative Governance and KPI Translation Notes

This appendix presents concise explanatory notes on the ten indicative governance and KPI variables derived from the CAT-based reconstruction of the eleventh section of *Jawshan al-Kabir*: “Allāhumma innī as’aluka bismika yā ‘uddatī ‘inda shiddatī, yā rajā’ī ‘inda muṣībatī, yā mūnīsī ‘inda waḥshatī, yā ṣāhibī ‘inda ghurbatī, yā waliyyī ‘inda nī matī, yā ghiyāthī ‘inda kurbatī, yā dalīlī ‘inda ḥayratī, yā ghinā’ī ‘inda iftiqārī, yā malja’ī ‘inda idṭirārī, yā mu’īnī ‘inda mafza’ī.” These variables are heuristic and translational rather than psychometric instruments in a finalized empirical sense. Their primary function is to demonstrate how a bounded sacred semantic sequence may be translated into an evaluative governance grammar capable of supporting future conceptual refinement, expert

validation, and applied operationalization. In this section, the indicators are designed not to quantify divine ontology, but to capture institutional or civilizational analogues inspired by the section's semantic logic. This is fully consistent with CAT's design-science role as an upstream ontology-to-governance method that yields indicative KPI scaffolds for later validation, calibration, and dashboard use.

C.1 Support Reserve Readiness Index

Derived from *Uddatī*, the Support Reserve Readiness Index measures the extent to which a system possesses adequate backing, reserve capacity, and supportive buffering to prevent first-order collapse under pressure. It captures whether support remains merely aspirational or exists in a form that is structurally available, timely, and reliable when hardship intensifies. In governance terms, it reflects reserve sufficiency, support readiness, anti-collapse architecture, and the extent to which a field of action can remain viable under strain.

C.2 Hope Continuity Index

Derived from *Rajā'ī*, the Hope Continuity Index measures the degree to which a system under affliction retains meaningful horizon, motivational continuity, and the capacity to orient itself toward recovery rather than despair. It does not measure affective uplift in isolation, but the persistence of direction, intelligibility, and future-bearing morale after loss or injury. In governance terms, it reflects recovery discourse, meaning continuity, morale preservation, and the system's ability to resist stagnation under affliction.

C.3 Intimacy Restoration Score

Derived from *Mūnisī*, the Intimacy Restoration Score measures the extent to which loneliness, interior fear, and isolation are reduced through the restoration of reassuring presence and relational nearness. It captures whether comfort, companionship, and anti-isolation functions are genuinely re-established or merely symbolically invoked. In governance terms, it reflects care quality, relational safety, presence restoration, and the system's capacity to counteract disconnection at the interior and interpersonal levels.

C.4 Relational Accompaniment Continuity Score

Derived from *Šāhibī*, the Relational Accompaniment Continuity Score measures the degree to which companionship, belonging, and continuity of presence are preserved under estrangement, displacement, or social unfamiliarity. It captures whether accompaniment remains durable enough to sustain identity, orientation, and inclusion in conditions of separation or distance. In governance terms, it reflects accompaniment design, belonging continuity, anti-exclusion architecture, and the capacity to stabilize relational presence under social vulnerability.

C.5 Gratitude-Governed Stewardship Index

Derived from *Walīyyī*, the Gratitude-Governed Stewardship Index measures the extent to which blessing is governed through gratitude, humility, care, and stewardship rather than allowed to drift into entitlement, complacency, or self-sufficiency. It captures whether abundance is normatively regulated or left vulnerable to distortion. In governance terms, it reflects stewardship under favorable conditions, ethics of abundance, anti-drift oversight, and the capacity to govern blessing without converting it into domination or moral decay.

C.6 Distress Response Effectiveness Index

Derived from *Ghiyāthī*, the Distress Response Effectiveness Index measures the degree to which acute distress is met with timely, effective, and proportionate succour. It captures whether distress signals are merely recognized or actually converted into operative relief before escalation takes hold. In governance terms, it reflects crisis-response timeliness, relief effectiveness, de-escalation capacity, and the operational ability to intervene under compressed pressure.

C.7 Guidance Clarity Score

Derived from *Dalīlī*, the Guidance Clarity Score measures the extent to which bewilderment, ambiguity, and disorientation are reduced through credible orientation and path clarification. It captures whether guidance remains abstract and symbolic or becomes concretely decision-relevant. In governance terms, it reflects clarification quality, coherence of direction, ambiguity reduction, and the system's capacity to produce orienting guidance under uncertainty.

C.8 Sufficiency under Need Index

Derived from *Ghinā'ī*, the Sufficiency under Need Index measures the extent to which chronic lack, deprivation, or insufficiency is reduced through the provision of threshold adequacy and dignity-preserving support. It distinguishes genuine sufficiency from merely symbolic relief or temporary mitigation. In governance terms, it reflects viability under lack, adequacy of support, sufficiency thresholds, and the ability to prevent deprivation from widening into structural instability.

C.9 Refuge Integrity under Necessity Score

Derived from *Malja'ī*, the Refuge Integrity under Necessity Score measures the degree to which a system can provide trustworthy refuge, final recourse, and protective anchoring when ordinary options are exhausted. It captures whether refuge functions as real sanctuary or as a nominal claim unsupported by safety and containment. In governance terms, it reflects refuge reliability, protective recourse, safeguarding integrity, and the system's capacity to furnish meaningful shelter under necessity.

C.10 Assisted Response Effectiveness Index

Derived from *Mu'imī*, the Assisted Response Effectiveness Index measures the extent to which alarm is translated into coordinated, enabling, and practically effective assistance rather than paralysis, fragmentation, or confused reaction. It captures whether help remains passive sympathy or becomes operationally consequential support. In governance terms, it reflects mobilization readiness, coordination quality, role clarity, and the system's ability to convert alarm into effective action.

C.11 Operational Note

These ten variables should be read as indicative conceptual measures rather than finalized empirical instruments. Their purpose in the present article is to demonstrate how the CAT-based reading of the eleventh section of *Jawshan al-Kabir* can move from sacred semantics to a governance grammar of reserve, hope, intimacy, companionship, stewardship under blessing, distress response, guidance, sufficiency, refuge, and enabling help. At this stage, the indicators function as analytically disciplined prototypes. Subsequent research may further specify their formulas, thresholds, weighting logics, data sources, validation procedures, dashboard applications, and sector-specific implementations through expert review, Delphi studies, AHP weighting, field calibration, institutional testing, or simulation-based refinement.