

## Compassionate Regulation, Evidentiary Authority, and Clarifying Grace: A Civilizational Algorithm Theory Analysis of the Fifth Section of *Jawshan Kabir*

**SeyyedAbdolHojjat MoghadasNian**

University of Religions and Denominations  
s14110213@gmail.com

**AqilaSadat MoghadasNian**

University of Religions and Denominations  
amoghadasnian@gmail.com

1

### Abstract

This article reconstructs the fifth section of *Jawshan Kabir* as an integrated governance architecture within the framework of Civilizational Algorithm Theory (CAT). Rather than treating the sequence of ten divine names as a cumulative devotional list, the study argues that the section encodes an ordered logic of compassionate initiation, benevolent provision, normative accountability, evidentiary legitimation, legitimate execution, ultimate approval, restorative forgiveness, transcendence safeguarding, adaptive assistance, and the final integration of grace with clarifying expression. Methodologically, the study adopts a qualitative, conceptual, and design-science-oriented approach grounded in bounded-text analysis, semantic extraction, theological interpretation, systems translation, cybernetic mapping, governance translation, and indicative KPI derivation. The findings show that the section is internally organized as a coherent civilizational control stack rather than a merely liturgical accumulation of co-rhyming names. Theoretically, the article extends CAT beyond ontological grounding, governance-in-action, executional

optimality, and transcendent governance toward a more explicit architecture of compassionate regulation and communicative intelligibility. Methodologically, it demonstrates how a bounded sacred sequence may be translated into layered system roles and governance-relevant constructs without collapsing theology into managerial instrumentalism. Practically, it offers a principle-bound framework for institutions concerned with trust formation, fair adjudication, legitimate authority, restorative recovery, conceptual integrity, operational support, and clear public communication. The article concludes that the fifth section of *Jawshan Kabir* can be read as a sacred governance module for legitimate, restorative, and intelligible civilizational order.

**Keywords:** Jawshan Kabir; Civilizational Algorithm Theory; sacred semantics; cybernetic governance; restorative governance; divine names; theology-to-governance translation; Islamic theology.

## 2

### Introduction

Contemporary governance scholarship has become increasingly sophisticated in its treatment of resilience, accountability, institutional adaptation, and performance architecture. Yet a deeper problem remains unresolved. Many governance models are procedurally rich but ontologically thin. They explain how institutions monitor, coordinate, and respond, but say less about the semantic and normative structures that make order legitimate, intelligible, and sustainable in the first place (Chandler, 2014; OECD, 2025; Richards, 2024). This problem becomes especially acute in environments marked by fragmentation, distrust, institutional overload, and moral contestation, where technical adequacy alone is insufficient.

Recent CAT-based studies on *Jawshan Kabir* have already established a staged internal corpus. The opening invocation was reconstructed as an ontological kernel of legitimate order; the second section was read as a governance-in-action layer of authority, responsiveness, restoration, listening, and resilience; the third section was reconstructed as a civilizational execution stack; and the fourth section advanced the architecture toward transcendent governance, provisioning, deterrence, accountability, reward, and canonical anchoring (MoghadasNian, 2026; MoghadasNian et al., 2026; MoghadasNian & MoghadasNian, 2026; MoghadasNian & Hoseini Taheri, 2026; MoghadasNian & Haghighi, 2026). The fifth section raises a distinct and necessary next problem: how can a legitimate and operative order remain simultaneously compassionate, evidentiary, authoritative, restorative, transcendent, supportive, and communicatively clear?

The section under analysis reads: *Allāhumma innī as'aluka bi-smika yā Ḥannān, yā Mannān, yā Dayyān, yā Burhān, yā Sulṭān, yā Riḍwān, yā Ghufrān, yā Subḥān, yā Musta'ān, yā Dhā al-Mann wa al-Bayān* (Qummī, 1376/1997–1998). The internal sequencing is analytically significant. It begins with Ḥannān

and Mannān, names of tenderness and bestowal; moves through Dayyān, Burhān, and Sultān, names of judgment, proof, and authority; advances toward Riḍwān and Ghufrān, which define ultimate approval and restorative return; and closes with Subhān, Mustaʿān, and Dhā al-Mann wa al-Bayān, which safeguard transcendence, activate support, and integrate beneficence with intelligible disclosure. The section therefore appears to preserve more than devotional praise. It encodes a disciplined progression from mercy to provision, from provision to accountability, from accountability to proof, from proof to authority, from authority to value-aligned approval, from approval to forgiveness, from forgiveness to conceptual safeguarding, from safeguarding to adaptive support, and from support to the final integration of benefit and explanation.

The central problem addressed in this article is the absence of a rigorous framework for reconstructing this bounded sacred sequence as a governance-relevant semantic architecture. Existing scholarship provides rich devotional, theological, and ethical readings of divine names, while governance literature offers extensive work on accountability, resilience, legitimacy, and institutional design. What remains underdeveloped is a disciplined theology-to-governance translation model capable of showing how a compact sacred unit can yield system roles, cybernetic functions, and evaluative constructs without reducing theology to managerial metaphor.

3

The primary research question is therefore as follows: how can the fifth section of *Jawshan Kabir* be reconstructed within Civilizational Algorithm Theory as an integrated governance architecture of compassionate regulation, evidentiary authority, restorative recovery, and clarifying grace? Five subsidiary questions follow from this problem. First, what semantic and theological architecture is encoded in the ten names of the section? Second, what internal sequence or control logic governs their arrangement? Third, how can the names be translated into system roles and cybernetic functions? Fourth, which indicative governance variables and KPI-style constructs may be derived from this translation? Fifth, what implications follow from this reconstruction for restorative governance, institutional trust, taqrīb-oriented dialogue, and civilizational design?

The significance of the study is threefold. Theoretically, it extends CAT into a new layer concerned not merely with grounding, action, execution, or transcendence, but with the integrated regulation of compassion, proof, authority, repair, and intelligibility. Methodologically, it demonstrates how a bounded sacred sequence can be reconstructed through a transparent design-science procedure. Practically, it offers a framework through which institutions may be assessed not only by efficiency or control, but also by compassion, evidentiary legitimacy, restorative capacity, conceptual integrity, support reliability, and communicative clarity.

## Literature Review

### Theological semantics and the functional density of divine names

Classical Islamic scholarship has long treated the divine names as more than nominal labels. They are semantically dense, theologically charged, and ethically consequential. In the classical tradition, the names of God are not simply attributes to be listed but principles through which order, mercy, justice,

and guidance become intelligible (al-Ghazali, 1992). Semantic approaches in modern Islamic studies likewise show that key theological terms derive meaning from structured relational fields rather than from isolated lexical units, which is especially relevant for ordered invocational sequences such as *Jawshan Kabir* (Izutsu, 2002). This theological-semantic background supports the present article's claim that the fifth section should be read not as an ornamental list but as a patterned semantic architecture.

### **Governance, resilience, and ontological thinness**

A second strand of literature concerns contemporary governance theory. Chandler's work on resilience remains especially important because it shows how complex governance increasingly privileges adaptation, feedback, and procedural responsiveness while often leaving deeper questions of legitimacy, meaning, and purpose comparatively under-theorized (Chandler, 2014). OECD work similarly foregrounds institutional responsiveness, capability, trust, and data-driven coordination, but does not itself resolve the ontological problem of why order should be regarded as legitimate or morally coherent (OECD, 2025). Richards (2024) sharpens this issue from a theological-governance perspective by arguing that governance cannot be treated as a merely technical arrangement without eventually confronting questions of normativity, purpose, and higher-order justification. Taken together, this literature identifies a decisive structural problem: procedural sophistication does not automatically overcome ontological thinness.

### **Religion, systems, and sacred-text translation**

A third literature stream concerns religion as a structured system and sacred meaning as translatable into institutional design. Sosis and Kiper (2014) argue that religion is better conceived as a complex system than merely as a norm-enforcing institution. Hutchinson (2024), from the perspective of computational engagement with sacred texts, shows both the analytical promise and the ethical sensitivity of formal work on religious corpora. Krieger (1987) is particularly relevant because he demonstrates that planning and design may themselves be understood as theological and religious activities, thereby legitimating the move from sacred meaning to formal architecture. Naudé and Miller-Naudé (2022) further strengthen this bridge by showing that sacred translation involves meaning-making processes that extend beyond lexical substitution into structured interpretive mediation. These studies do not yet provide a full governance reconstruction of a bounded invocational unit, but they open the conceptual space required for such a move.

### **Design-science and CAT as theology-to-governance method**

A fourth literature stream is methodological. Design-science research treats framework construction, conceptual artifact design, and problem-structuring as valid forms of knowledge production (Hevner et al., 2004; Peffers et al., 2007). CAT is explicitly positioned within this design-science tradition. It proceeds through corpus delimitation, semantic extraction, ontological coding, systems translation, cybernetic mapping, governance translation, indicatorization, and systems integration, thereby constructing an auditable bridge from bounded sacred semantics to governance-relevant architecture (MoghadasNian, 2026). Earlier CAT applications to *Jawshan Kabir* confirm that this procedure is replicable across compact textual units while preserving theological seriousness and resisting simplistic

managerial reductionism (MoghadasNian et al., 2026; MoghadasNian & MoghadasNian, 2026; MoghadasNian & Hoseini Taheri, 2026; MoghadasNian & Haghghi, 2026).

## **Restorative, faith-based, and value-bearing governance**

A fifth literature stream concerns value-bearing and restorative governance. Oyo et al. (2025) argue that faith-based governance requires integration between formal structures and covenantal or value-laden relations rather than reliance on technical control alone. Nanthambwe (2025) similarly emphasizes the importance of contextually grounded public theology in institutional engagement. In restorative theory, error correction becomes more stable and humanly sustainable when it includes reintegration, repair, and moral learning rather than simple exclusion or punishment (Zehr, 2002). This stream is especially relevant for the fifth section because Ghufrān and Musta‘ān make little sense within a purely punitive or control-centered model. They point instead to a governance architecture in which accountability is real, but restoration remains structurally necessary.

## **Research gap**

The gap in the literature is therefore precise. Governance scholarship increasingly recognizes the need for thicker normative grounding, yet rarely operationalizes that grounding through disciplined sacred-text reconstruction. Theological and devotional scholarship, by contrast, is rich in semantic and doctrinal insight but seldom translates compact invocations into formal architectures of governance, control, evaluation, and civilizational design. Even within the emerging CAT corpus, the fifth section has not yet been reconstructed as a distinctive module integrating compassion, proof, authority, approval, forgiveness, transcendence, assistance, and clarifying expression. This article addresses that gap by positioning the fifth section as a recoverable governance architecture of compassionate regulation and intelligible order.

## **Methodology**

This study is qualitative, conceptual, and design-science oriented. Its unit of analysis is the fifth section of *Jawshan Kabir*, treated as a bounded sacred corpus composed of ten micro-units corresponding to ten divine names. The research design is appropriate because CAT is not primarily a survey-first or statistically inferential framework. Rather, it is an ontology-structuring and theology-to-governance translation method that begins from dense sacred semantics and moves toward systems, cybernetics, governance, and evaluative scaffolding (Hevner et al., 2004; Peffers et al., 2007; MoghadasNian, 2026).

Data collection is documentary and text-analytic. The evidentiary base consists of the Arabic invocational sequence, transliteration, lexical and morphological notes, conceptual field analysis, the user-supplied data table, the Persian analytical note, and controlled comparison with prior CAT-based studies on the opening, second, third, and fourth sections of *Jawshan Kabir*. The analysis proceeds through five linked stages. First, each name is subjected to semantic extraction in order to identify its lexical core, morphological force, and theological valence. Second, each semantic unit is interpreted within an Islamic theological frame so that doctrinal meaning remains prior to managerial application.

Third, the units are mapped to CAT layers through an explicit chain of correspondence: attribute → semantic core → CAT layer → cybernetic role → governance function → indicative variable. Fourth, the resulting cybernetic roles are translated into governance-relevant institutional capacities. Fifth, those capacities are rendered as preliminary KPI-style constructs and maturity markers.

Several safeguards are used to preserve rigor. The corpus is tightly bounded. The sequence is treated as fixed rather than arbitrarily rearrangeable. Theological meaning is treated as prior to systems translation. The final governance constructs are presented as analogical and conceptual, not as finalized instruments or psychometrically validated scales. Reliability is pursued through explicit sequencing, transparent mapping logic, and comparability with the already established CAT corpus. Validity is conceptual and interpretive rather than statistical, grounded in semantic coherence, theological fidelity, and internal traceability.

## Findings and Results

### Linguistic and sequential architecture

6

The fifth section exhibits a carefully ordered linguistic architecture. Its first nine units are composed mainly as direct singular vocatives with marked phonetic cohesion, while the final unit, *Dhā al-Mann wa al-Bayān*, breaks from the earlier syntactic pattern and serves as a summarizing and elevating closure. On the morphological level, *Ḥannān*, *Mannān*, and *Dayyān* belong to the intensive *fa‘‘āl* pattern, thereby conveying abundance, intensity, and repeated efficacy. *Burhān*, *Sulṭān*, *Ghufrān*, and *Subḥān* form a second phonetic-morphological cluster, largely structured around the *fu‘lān* pattern, which enhances the passage’s sonic and formal coherence. *Riḍwān* is slightly more distinctive, whereas *Musta‘ān*, as a passive participle derived from Form X, introduces a more explicit relational and supplicatory orientation. The final compound vocative, in turn, closes the section by uniting gracious benefaction and clarifying disclosure in a more complex and elevated syntactic construction.

This formal architecture supports the claim that the section is not semantically random. Its order is internally organized and functionally suggestive. The sequence moves from compassionate relational opening to distributive provision, from provision to accountability, from accountability to proof, from proof to legitimate authority, from authority to ultimate approval, from approval to restorative forgiveness, from forgiveness to transcendence safeguarding, from safeguarding to support, and from support to the integration of beneficence with intelligible expression.

### Attribute-level reconstruction

*Ḥannān* functions as the section’s trust-initialization layer. It establishes tenderness, proximity, and compassionate relational safety. Within CAT, it is best interpreted as the soft-entry condition of governance: a system that begins by lowering fear, opening access, and rendering return possible.

APRIL 20, 2026 | TEHRAN

Mannān translates tenderness into provision. It is the section's provisioning engine. Mercy here is no longer merely affective; it becomes distributive, enabling, and materially or symbolically sustaining. CAT therefore reconstructs Mannān as benevolent allocation and capacity support.

Dayyān introduces accountability. After trust and provision, the section does not remain in soft benevolence. It activates justice, reckoning, and normative closure. Dayyān is thus the core accountability loop through which action becomes answerable and deviation becomes measurable.

Burhān grounds accountability in evidentiary legitimacy. Judgment without proof would be arbitrary; proof without judgment would remain inert. Burhān therefore serves as a validation engine that renders decisions intelligible, defensible, and epistemically legitimate.

Sulṭān is the section's actuator. It translates validated normativity into effective authority and executable force. The sequence is crucial: Sulṭān comes after Burhān, not before it. Authority is therefore legitimate only when backed by intelligible warrant.

Riḍwān shifts the sequence from execution to ultimate value alignment. It defines the section's end-state. The point of governance is not rule for its own sake, but accepted, value-saturated, morally approved order. CAT therefore reads Riḍwān as the goal-state or terminal approval function of the architecture.

Ghufrān introduces the section's recovery logic. The path to approval is not imagined as error-free. Instead, the structure explicitly includes forgiveness, covering of fault, and restoration of the damaged relationship. This makes the governance architecture resilient rather than merely punitive.

Subhān acts as a safeguard layer. It protects the whole architecture from conceptual corruption, anthropomorphic reduction, and the collapse of transcendent reference into immanent force. In CAT terms, Subhān is a boundary-protection and integrity-filter module.

Mustaʿān translates transcendence into dependable support. It makes the system livable under pressure by enabling assistance, reinforcement, and sustained agency. This is the adaptive support layer that preserves function under stress.

Dhā al-Mann wa al-Bayān functions as the section's supervisory integrator. It closes the sequence by uniting two final requirements of mature order: real benefit and intelligible disclosure. A governance system that serves but does not explain remains opaque; one that explains but does not benefit remains ineffective. This name therefore integrates benevolence and clarity at the highest level of the architecture.

### **Integrated CAT sequence**

Taken together, the section yields the following CAT sequence: compassionate initiation, benevolent provision, normative accountability, evidentiary legitimation, legitimate execution, ultimate approval alignment, restorative forgiveness, transcendence safeguarding, adaptive assistance, and grace-clarity integration. In conceptual shorthand, the section may be reconstructed as: Mercy → Provision → Accountability → Proof → Authority → Approval → Recovery → Transcendence Safeguard → Assistance → Clarifying Grace

This integrated progression aligns closely with the analytical logic preserved in the uploaded Persian note and the user-supplied matrix, but it can now be stated in a Q1-ready academic idiom as a structured governance architecture rather than a devotional inventory.

## Cybernetic translation

The cybernetic logic of the section is highly organized. Ḥannān and Mannān function predominantly as feedforward mechanisms, stabilizing the relational field and injecting resources before breakdown occurs. Dayyān and Ghufrān operate as feedback mechanisms: the former diagnoses and closes the accountability loop, while the latter prevents unrecoverable systemic loss by activating restorative reintegration. Burhān, Sulṭān, Subḥān, Mustaʿān, and Dhā al-Mann wa al-Bayān are best understood as hybrid modules. Burhān validates perception, Sulṭān executes, Subḥān filters corruption, Mustaʿān escalates support, and the final compound name supervises coherence between benefit and disclosure. Riḍwān functions as the section's goal-state or setpoint.

In system terms, the section does not merely describe divine excellences. It encodes a control logic in which trust formation precedes resource support, support precedes accountability, accountability requires proof, proof authorizes execution, execution must remain oriented toward ultimate approval, failure must remain recoverable, the whole must remain conceptually purified, support must remain available, and mature governance must unify real benefit with transparent intelligibility.

## Governance translation and indicative variables

At the governance layer, the section yields a coherent family of indicative variables. Ḥannān generates compassionate responsiveness and dignity-preserving access. Mannān yields benevolent support coverage and distributive sufficiency. Dayyān generates normative accountability and fair adjudication. Burhān yields evidentiary clarity and justificatory transparency. Sulṭān yields legitimate execution and disciplined implementation. Riḍwān yields approval alignment and value-consistent legitimacy. Ghufrān yields recovery and reintegration capacity. Subḥān yields conceptual integrity and doctrinal or normative safeguard. Mustaʿān yields support reliability and mission continuity. Dhā al-Mann wa al-Bayān yields grace-clarity synergy: the degree to which service and explanation remain integrated.

The result is not a finalized psychometric scale. It is an ontology-to-governance scaffold suitable for later expert review, Delphi refinement, weighting procedures, dashboard construction, and comparative application.

## Discussion

The findings indicate that the fifth section of *Jawshan Kabir* is best understood as an architecture of compassionate regulation rather than as a merely cumulative devotional list. The section does not oppose mercy and justice, nor proof and authority, nor forgiveness and accountability, nor transcendence and support. Instead, it organizes them into a disciplined sequence in which each term corrects, constrains, or completes the others. This is the section's main theoretical importance.

Within the internal development of the CAT corpus, the fifth section contributes a distinct layer. The opening invocation established ontological grounding; the second section reconstructed governance-in-action; the third clarified executional optimality; and the fourth formalized transcendent governance under provisioning, deterrence, reward, and canonical anchoring. The fifth section adds a necessary human and civilizational refinement: it shows how legitimate order must also remain compassionate, evidentiary, recoverable, conceptually protected, supportive, and understandable. Without this layer, CAT would risk remaining normatively rigorous yet insufficiently relational, restorative, and communicatively mature.

The section also contributes to broader governance theory. Many institutions fail not only because they lack authority or capacity, but because they begin without trust, adjudicate without transparent proof, punish without recovery, preserve values without support, or deliver benefits without explanation. The fifth section encodes a principled answer to all five failures. It therefore offers a strong vocabulary for restorative governance, social trust, and taqrib-oriented institutional design.

Its implications for Islamic rapprochement are particularly important. Taqrib requires more than calls for unity. It requires compassionate entry, fair provision, accountable procedure, evidentiary dialogue, legitimate implementation, a shared moral horizon, restorative handling of conflict, protection of conceptual boundaries, operational support for sustained cooperation, and a language of explanation that enables mutual intelligibility. The fifth section naturally lends itself to such a design. It does not promote unity through dilution; it promotes principled rapprochement through structured mercy, proof, repair, and clarity.

At the same time, the article maintains a non-reductionist boundary. The study does not quantify divine essence, nor does it claim that the CAT reconstruction is the only legitimate theological reading of the section. Its claim is more disciplined: the section can be reconstructed coherently as a governance-relevant semantic architecture, and that reconstruction is sufficiently rigorous to justify further conceptual, comparative, and applied development.

## Conclusion

This article has argued that the fifth section of *Jawshan Kabir* is best read as a compact governance architecture of compassionate regulation, evidentiary authority, restorative recovery, and clarifying grace. The section begins with tenderness and provision, moves through judgment, proof, and legitimate authority, aligns order with ultimate approval, opens the path of forgiveness, safeguards transcendence, sustains agency through assistance, and culminates in the integration of benefit with intelligible expression.

The study contributes theoretically by extending CAT into a new layer of governance-relevant sacred semantics. It contributes methodologically by showing how a bounded invocational unit can be translated into system roles, cybernetic functions, governance constructs, and preliminary evaluative variables. It contributes practically by offering a principle-bound framework relevant to trust-building, fairness, resilience, restorative correction, institutional support, and transparent communication.

The study is intentionally bounded and proof-of-concept in character. It does not analyze the whole prayer, test causal effects, or validate the derived indicators empirically. Future research should therefore refine the proposed variables through expert review, Delphi procedures, AHP-style weighting, semantic-network analysis, and applied institutional testing. Comparative reconstruction of later sections of *Jawshan Kabir*, as well as comparison with other sacred corpora, would also clarify the scope conditions and transportability of CAT.

Even within these limits, the central conclusion is strong. The fifth section of *Jawshan Kabir* should not be reduced to a rhythmic devotional inventory. It is better understood as a structured civilizational algorithm in which mercy becomes provision, provision becomes accountability, accountability becomes proof, proof becomes authority, authority is directed toward approval, approval remains open to forgiveness, forgiveness is safeguarded by transcendence, transcendence supports agency, and mature order is finally completed by the union of beneficence and clear expression.

## References

10

- Al-Ghazali, A. H. (1992). *Al-Ghazali on the ninety-nine beautiful names of God* (D. B. Burrell & N. Daher, Trans.). Islamic Texts Society.
- Chandler, D. (2014). *Resilience: The governance of complexity*. Routledge.
- 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>
- Hutchinson, B. (2024). Modeling the sacred: Considerations when using religious texts in natural language processing. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: NAACL 2024* (pp. 1029–1043). Association for Computational Linguistics. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2024.findings-naacl.65>
- Izutsu, T. (2002). *God and man in the Qur'an: Semantics of the Qur'anic Weltanschauung* (New ed.). Islamic Book Trust. (Original work published 1964)
- Krieger, M. H. (1987). *Planning and Design as Theological and Religious Activities*. *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design*, 14(1), 5-13. <https://doi.org/10.1068/b140005>
- 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. DOI: 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 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.19105110>
- MoghadasNian, S., & MoghadasNian, S.A.H. (2026). *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., 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>

- Nanthambwe, P. (2025). *Integrating African Indigenous Knowledge Systems (AIKSs) into Public Theology: Towards Contextualized Theological Engagement in Southern Africa*. *Religions*, 16(7), 869. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel16070869>
- Naudé, J.A. , & Miller-Naudé, C.L. (2022). Meaning-making Processes in Religious Translation Involving Sacred Space. In K. Marais (Ed.). *TRANSLATION BEYOND TRANSLATION STUDIES* (pp. 197–218). London,: Bloomsbury Academic. Retrieved March 16, 2026, from <http://dx.doi.org/10.5040/9781350192140.ch-10>
- OECD. (2025). *Government at a glance 2025*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/0efd0bcd-en>
- Oyo, C., Musinguzi, D., & Owino, P. (2025). *Contract-covenant governance model: A theoretical framework for integrated faith-based institutional governance in Catholic organizations*. *East African Scholars Multidisciplinary Bulletin*, 8(4), 69–82. <https://doi.org/10.36349/easjmb.2025.v08i04.002>
- 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/MIS0742-122240302>
- Qummī, ‘Abbās ibn Muḥammad Riḍā. (1376 [1997/1998]). *Kullīyāt-i Mafātīḥ al-jinān*. Nashr-i Muḥammad.
- Richards, P. D. G. (2024). *Church Governance—A Philosophical Approach to a Theological Challenge in an Anglican Context*. *Religions*, 15(4), 427. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel15040427>
- Sosis, R., & Kiper, J. (2014). Why religion is better conceived as a complex system than a norm-enforcing institution. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 37(3), 275–276. doi:10.1017/S0140525X13003038
- Zehr, H. (2002). *The little book of restorative justice*. Good Books.

11

## Appendix

### Appendix A. The Fifth Section of *Jawshan Kabir*: Text Base and Delimitation for CAT Analysis

This appendix presents the bounded textual unit analyzed in the article. Because the study is designed as a proof-of-concept within a design-science and theory-building orientation, the fifth section of *Jawshan Kabir* is treated as a self-contained corpus for semantic, cybernetic, and governance translation. In CAT terms, this bounded-corpus strategy preserves interpretive discipline, conceptual auditability, inter-section comparability, and traceable ontology-to-governance translation while allowing a dense sacred sequence to be reconstructed as a formal civilizational module rather than as a merely accumulative devotional list. The appendix therefore functions as the article’s primary anchor of interpretive transparency, corpus delimitation, and textual traceability. The article does not claim to analyze the whole supplication. Rather, it isolates one compact invocational unit in order to test whether a bounded theological sequence can sustain a coherent translation from sacred semantics to an operational governance architecture of compassionate initiation, benevolent provision, normative accountability, evidentiary legitimation, legitimate authority, ultimate approval, restorative recovery, transcendence safeguarding, adaptive assistance, and the final integration of grace with clarifying expression (Hevner et al., 2004; MoghadasNian, 2026; Qummī, 1376 [1997/1998]).

#### A.1 Arabic Text of the Fifth Section

اللَّهُمَّ إِنِّي أَسْأَلُكَ بِاسْمِكَ يَا حَنَّانُ يَا مَنَّانُ يَا دَيَّانُ يَا بُرْهَانَ يَا سُلْطَانَ يَا رِضْوَانَ يَا غُفْرَانَ يَا سُبْحَانَ يَا مُسْتَعَانَ يَا ذَا الْمَنِّ وَالْبَيَّانِ

#### A.2 Liturgical Continuation Commonly Associated with the Sectional Unit

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

#### A.3 Standardized Latin Transliteration

Allāhumma innī as'aluka bi-smika, yā Hannān, yā Mannān, yā Dayyān, yā Burhān, yā Sultān, yā Riḍwān, yā Ghufrān, yā Subhān, yā Musta'an, yā Dhā al-Mann wa al-Bayān. Subhānaka yā lā ilāha illā anta, al-ghawtha al-ghawtha, khallishnā mina al-nāri yā rabb.

#### A.4 Working English Translation

O God, I ask You by Your name: O Most Tenderly Compassionate, O Ever-Bounteous Bestower, O Ultimate Judge and Requirer, O Clear Proof and Decisive Evidence, O Sovereign Authority, O Supreme Good Pleasure, O Forgiveness and Absolving Mercy, O All-Glorious, Transcendent above all defect, O One Whose Help is Sought, O Possessor of Grace and Clarifying Expression. 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 divine attributes from Ḥannān to Dhā al-Mann wa al-Bayān as preserved in *Kullīyāt-i Maḥāṭib al-jinān* (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-attribute kernel because this sequence carries the most concentrated governance logic of the section. In the present interpretation, the fifth section does not function as an ontological kernel, a merely responsive governance layer, an executional-optimality layer, or a transcendent-governance-canon layer in the narrower sense established in earlier sections. Rather, it functions as the compassion–legitimacy–recovery–clarification layer of the emerging CAT architecture. It extends the progression from ontological grounding, governance-in-action, executional excellence, and transcendent governance toward a more explicit grammar of compassionate initiation, distributive provision, accountable judgment, evidentiary legitimation, legitimate execution, value-aligned approval, restorative forgiveness, transcendence safeguarding, operational support, and grace-bearing intelligibility. This reading is consistent with the section’s internal morphological clustering, its staged semantic movement from mercy to provision, from accountability to proof and authority, and from recovery and transcendence to support and final explanatory integration.

12

### Appendix B. Attribute-to-CAT Analytical Coding Matrix for the Ten Divine Attributes of the Fifth Section

This appendix presents the attribute-level CAT coding structure for the fifth section of *Jawshan Kabir* in standardized codebook form. Each attribute is treated as a semantic-theological node that can be translated into a systemic role, a cybernetic function, an algorithmic function, a governance principle, and an indicative KPI. The purpose of this appendix is to strengthen interpretive transparency, inter-section comparability, and methodological reproducibility. In contrast to the earlier sections, the fifth section concentrates not primarily on ontological grounding, responsive governance, executional superiority, or transcendent governance alone, but on the integration of compassion, provision, accountability, proof, authority, approval, forgiveness, transcendence, assistance, and clarifying grace into a single compact governance architecture.

#### B.1 Ḥannān

- **Semantic core:** tender compassion, warm nearness, responsive mercy, pre-judgment relational safety
- **Theological category:** action-oriented merciful attribute grounded in divine perfection
- **CAT layer:** compassionate initiation and relational trust layer
- **Systemic function:** creating emotional safety, lowering resistance, and opening a viable path of return before evaluation and sanction
- **Algorithmic role:** trust-initialization module / relational damping mechanism
- **Governance translation:** dignity-centered service, humane responsiveness, non-humiliating institutional interaction, trust-bearing public order
- **Indicative KPI:** Compassionate Responsiveness Rate

#### B.2 Mannān

- **Semantic core:** abundant bestowal, benevolent provision, gratuitous beneficence, sustaining support
- **Theological category:** action-oriented beneficent attribute of grace, provision, and tafaḍḍul
- **CAT layer:** benevolent provisioning and distributive support layer
- **Systemic function:** injecting resources, covering needs, and sustaining capacity before scarcity or breakdown becomes destabilizing
- **Algorithmic role:** provisioning engine / benevolent allocation module
- **Governance translation:** just support coverage, equitable resource distribution, targeted benevolent provision, anti-deprivation architecture
- **Indicative KPI:** Benevolent Support Coverage Rate

#### B.3 Dayyān

- **Semantic core:** judgment, reckoning, requital, normative closure, restoration of right
- **Theological category:** judicial and accountability-bearing action attribute
- **CAT layer:** normative accountability and adjudicative regulation layer
- **Systemic function:** evaluating conduct, closing the loop between act and consequence, and restoring proportional accountability
- **Algorithmic role:** comparator-judge module / accountability engine
- **Governance translation:** fair adjudication, auditable decision-making, norm-based responsibility assignment, anti-arbitrariness architecture
- **Indicative KPI:** Normative Accountability Index

#### B.4 *Burhān*

- **Semantic core:** decisive proof, evidentiary clarity, truth-validation, anti-ambiguity intelligibility
- **Theological category:** epistemic and justificatory action attribute
- **CAT layer:** evidentiary legitimation and clarificatory cognition layer
- **Systemic function:** validating claims, reducing ambiguity, and ensuring that judgment and policy rest on clear warrant rather than obscurity
- **Algorithmic role:** validation/disambiguation engine / truth-estimation module
- **Governance translation:** evidence-based decision design, justificatory transparency, rationally defensible policy, anti-confusion communication
- **Indicative KPI:** Evidentiary Clarity Index

#### B.5 *Sulṭān*

- **Semantic core:** sovereign authority, effective power, legitimate execution, authoritative enforcement
- **Theological category:** sovereignty-bearing attribute with essential force and operational manifestation
- **CAT layer:** legitimate execution and authoritative actuation layer
- **Systemic function:** converting validated normativity into executable force, enforceable decision, and visible order
- **Algorithmic role:** actuator-governor module / enforcement kernel
- **Governance translation:** disciplined implementation, authority-backed execution, mandate clarity, compliance-enabling governance
- **Indicative KPI:** Legitimate Execution Rate

#### B.6 *Riḍwān*

- **Semantic core:** ultimate approval, value-aligned acceptance, transcendent satisfaction, morally validated end-state
- **Theological category:** acceptive and approval-bearing action attribute
- **CAT layer:** goal-state alignment and ultimate approval layer
- **Systemic function:** defining the final normative destination of the architecture and aligning conduct with an approved end-state rather than with control alone
- **Algorithmic role:** objective-function module / value-attractor definition
- **Governance translation:** mission-value alignment, stakeholder acceptance, legitimacy through shared good, approval-oriented governance design
- **Indicative KPI:** Stakeholder Approval & Alignment Index

#### B.7 *Ghufrān*

- **Semantic core:** forgiveness, fault-covering, restorative recovery, reintegration after failure
- **Theological category:** restorative and absolving action attribute
- **CAT layer:** recovery, reintegration, and post-failure restoration layer
- **Systemic function:** absorbing correctable failure, reopening the path of return, and preventing total relational or institutional collapse
- **Algorithmic role:** recovery/reintegration module / exception-handling buffer
- **Governance translation:** restorative governance, mediated repair, non-destructive correction, structured reintegration after breach or error
- **Indicative KPI:** Recovery & Reintegration Rate

#### B.8 *Subhān*

- **Semantic core:** transcendence, conceptual purity, negation of defect, anti-reductionist safeguarding

- **Theological category:** essential tanzīh attribute of absolute transcendence
- **CAT layer:** transcendence safeguard and conceptual-integrity layer
- **Systemic function:** filtering corruptive assumptions, protecting higher-order boundaries, and preserving theological and normative purity against reduction
- **Algorithmic role:** boundary-safeguard module / invariant-protection filter
- **Governance translation:** conceptual auditability, norm-protective review, doctrinal integrity, red-line preservation against semantic distortion
- **Indicative KPI:** Conceptual Integrity Index

#### B.9 *Musta'ān*

- **Semantic core:** sought help, dependable support, accessible assistance, operational reliance
- **Theological category:** relational and assistive action attribute
- **CAT layer:** adaptive support and operational continuity layer
- **Systemic function:** reinforcing agents under strain, maintaining mission continuity, and escalating support under pressure or vulnerability
- **Algorithmic role:** adaptive support/escalation module / assistive gain controller
- **Governance translation:** crisis support reliability, operational backing, mission continuity, assistance architecture for pressured actors
- **Indicative KPI:** Operational Support Reliability Index

#### B.10 *Dhā al-Mann wa al-Bayān*

- **Semantic core:** possession of grace and clarifying expression, beneficence joined to explanation, service fused with intelligibility
- **Theological category:** composite grace-bearing and clarificatory action attribute
- **CAT layer:** supervisory integration of benefit and intelligibility
- **Systemic function:** integrating real benefit with communicative clarity so that governance is both materially beneficial and intelligibly explained
- **Algorithmic role:** supervisory integration layer / explainable benevolence orchestrator
- **Governance translation:** understandable service, educational communication, guidance-bearing disclosure, service-clarity coherence
- **Indicative KPI:** Grace–Clarity Synergy Index

#### B.11 *Integrative Coding Note*

Taken together, the ten attributes yield a sequential governance logic rather than ten disconnected semantic units. The coding architecture moves from compassionate initiation to benevolent provision, from provision to accountability, from accountability to evidentiary clarity, from clarity to legitimate authority, from authority to approved end-state alignment, from there to restorative recovery, then to transcendence safeguarding, operational assistance, and finally to the supervisory integration of benefit with clear expression. In CAT terms, the fifth section therefore functions as a compassion–proof–authority–recovery–clarification stack rather than as a merely devotional inventory. Its distinctive contribution within the broader *Jawshan Kabir* corpus is to formalize how legitimate order remains humane, evidentiary, restorative, conceptually protected, operationally supportive, and communicatively intelligible all at once.

### Appendix C. Indicative Governance and KPI Translation Notes

This appendix presents concise explanatory notes on the ten indicative governance variables derived from the CAT-based reconstruction of the fifth section of *Jawshan Kabir*. 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 (Hevner et al., 2004; MoghadasNian, 2026).

## C.1 Compassionate Responsiveness Rate

Derived from Ḥannān, the Compassionate Responsiveness Rate measures the percentage of registered needs, complaints, or requests that receive timely responses while also meeting dignity, respect, and empathy standards. It captures whether a system is merely responsive in procedural terms or also humane in relational quality. In governance terms, it reflects compassion-bearing service, dignity-centered interaction, and trust-generating responsiveness.

## C.2 Benevolent Support Coverage Rate

Derived from Mannān, the Benevolent Support Coverage Rate measures the percentage of eligible persons, units, or stakeholders who receive complete and timely support, service, or needed resources. It distinguishes abstract benevolence from effective coverage. In governance terms, it reflects distributive support adequacy, fairness of provision, and anti-deprivation capacity.

## C.3 Normative Accountability Index

Derived from Dayyān, the Normative Accountability Index measures the percentage of decisions, cases, or actions subject to review that are finalized through fair process, adequate documentation, and auditable closure. It captures whether accountability is real, procedurally just, and normatively consistent rather than symbolic or selective. In governance terms, it reflects fairness, oversight maturity, and closure integrity.

## C.4 Evidentiary Clarity Index

Derived from Burhān, the Evidentiary Clarity Index measures the percentage of policies, judgments, decisions, or official positions that are supported by sufficient evidence, explicit reasoning, and clear explanatory warrant. It captures whether governance is grounded in proof and intelligibility rather than ambiguity, unsupported assertion, or opaque authority. In governance terms, it reflects evidence-based legitimacy, justificatory transparency, and reduction of interpretive conflict.

## C.5 Legitimate Execution Rate

Derived from Sultān, the Legitimate Execution Rate measures the percentage of approved and normatively legitimate decisions that are actually implemented within the designated time frame and with observable effects. It captures the gap between authorization and execution. In governance terms, it reflects implementation discipline, mandate clarity, and the conversion of legitimate authority into effective action.

## C.6 Stakeholder Approval & Alignment Index

Derived from Ridwān, the Stakeholder Approval & Alignment Index measures the weighted average of stakeholder satisfaction, trust, and perceived alignment between institutional mission, values, and actual outcomes. It is not merely a popularity measure. It captures whether the system's direction is perceived as normatively valid and mission-consistent. In governance terms, it reflects value alignment, legitimacy depth, and approval-bearing coherence.

## C.7 Recovery & Reintegration Rate

Derived from Ghufrān, the Recovery & Reintegration Rate measures the percentage of correctable failures, conflicts, or breaches that culminate in successful repair, reintegration, or reduction of harmful impact after a restorative intervention. It captures whether the system has structured pathways for return rather than defaulting to exclusion alone. In governance terms, it reflects restorative capacity, non-destructive correction, and resilience after error.

## C.8 Conceptual Integrity Index

Derived from Subhān, the Conceptual Integrity Index measures the degree to which discourse, policy, content, and institutional action remain aligned with core principles of conceptual purity, non-distortion, and resistance to reductionist corruption. It is especially important where norm drift or semantic contamination threatens system coherence. In governance terms, it reflects conceptual safeguard strength, doctrinal or normative integrity, and boundary-preserving review.

### **C.9 Operational Support Reliability Index**

Derived from *Mustaʿān*, the Operational Support Reliability Index measures the percentage of valid support requests in conditions of need, pressure, or crisis that receive timely and effective operational response. It captures whether assistance is dependable when vulnerability rises. In governance terms, it reflects support reliability, crisis continuity, and capacity-preserving assistance.

### **C.10 Grace–Clarity Synergy Index**

Derived from *Dhā al-Mann wa al-Bayān*, the Grace–Clarity Synergy Index measures the degree to which real benefit or service is delivered together with clear explanation, understandable communication, and intelligible guidance. It captures the mature integration of beneficence and disclosure. In governance terms, it reflects service intelligibility, communicative legitimacy, and the coherence of benefit with explanation.

### **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 fifth section of *Jawshan Kabir* can move from sacred semantics to a governance grammar of compassion, support, accountability, proof, authority, approval, restoration, transcendence, operational assistance, and clarifying grace. 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.