

## Transcendent Governance, Provisioning, and Canonical Closure: A Civilizational Algorithm Theory Analysis of the Fourth Section of *Jawshan Kabir*

**SeyyedAbdolHojjat MoghadasNian**

University of Religions and Denominations  
s14110213@gmail.com

**Nafiseh Haghighi**

University of Religions and Denominations  
nh.taheri.1357@gmail.com

1

### Abstract

This article reconstructs the fourth section of *Jawshan Kabir* as a coherent governance-and-control architecture within the framework of Civilizational Algorithm Theory (CAT). Rather than treating the sequence of ten divine attributes as a cumulative devotional list, the study argues that the stanza encodes an ordered logic of legitimacy, capability, sovereignty, transcendence, provisioning, deterrence, audit, enforcement, reward, and canonical anchoring. Methodologically, the article adopts a qualitative, conceptual, and design-science-oriented approach based on bounded-text analysis, semantic decomposition, conceptual mapping, systems modelling, cybernetic translation, and governance indicator design. The findings show that the section is internally organized through four interlocking movements: exclusive possession of foundational excellences, identity-based transcendence, world-engaging action and control, and final return to reward and the mother-source of inscription. On this basis, the article proposes that the fourth section functions as a governance-resilience-canon stack. Theoretically, the study extends CAT

beyond ontological grounding, governance-in-action, and executional optimality toward a more explicit architecture of transcendent governance. Methodologically, it demonstrates how a sacred text can be translated into layered system roles, cybernetic functions, and conceptually grounded KPI-style constructs without collapsing theology into managerial instrumentalism. Practically, it offers a principle-bound governance template in which dignity, capability, authority, provisioning, accountability, reward, and canonical memory remain structurally integrated.

**Keywords:** Jawshan Kabir; Civilizational Algorithm Theory; sacred semantics; cybernetics; governance design; canonical memory; transcendent governance; Islamic theology.

## Introduction

2 Contemporary governance scholarship has become increasingly sophisticated in modelling accountability, resilience, adaptive coordination, and institutional response. Yet this operational sophistication has not fully resolved a deeper deficit. Many governance frameworks explain how institutions measure, coordinate, regulate, and respond, while remaining comparatively underdeveloped in relation to the semantic and ontological foundations that make order intelligible, legitimate, and sustainable in the first place. In parallel, recent scholarship at the intersection of religion, systems theory, and computational ethics has suggested that religious formations and sacred texts may be approached not only as objects of devotion, doctrine, or ritual, but also as highly ordered semantic structures with relevance for complex systems, meaning formation, and governance analysis (Chandler, 2014; Fisher, 2024; Hutchinson, 2024; Richards, 2024; Sosis & Kiper, 2014).

Within this broader problem field, *Jawshan Kabir* is especially suitable for systems-oriented inquiry because it is built around dense, highly patterned sequences of divine names and attributes. Its internal ordering is cumulative, architectonic, and semantically disciplined rather than random or merely ornamental. For that reason, it offers a plausible bounded corpus for conceptual reconstruction. At the same time, any such reconstruction must remain non-reductionist. Theological language cannot be stripped of its devotional force or metaphysical irreducibility. The claim of the present article is therefore more limited and more precise: a bounded sacred sequence may function as a compressed ontology of order and may, under disciplined methodological conditions, be translated into a governance-relevant architecture without being reduced to detachable managerial slogans or computational abstraction alone (Aydinli, 2011; Hutchinson, 2024; MoghadasNian, 2026).

This article focuses on the fourth section of *Jawshan Kabir*: *Yā man lahu al-‘izzatu wa al-jamāl, yā man lahu al-qudratu wa al-kamāl, yā man lahu al-mulku wa al-jalāl, yā man huwa al-kabīru al-muta‘āl, yā munshi‘a al-sahābi al-thiqāl, yā man huwa shadīdu al-miḥāl, yā man huwa sarī‘u al-ḥisāb, yā man huwa shadīdu al-‘iqāb, yā man ‘indahū ḥusnu al-thawāb, yā man ‘indahū ummu al-kitāb*. The section is

analytically significant because it moves in a highly ordered progression from foundational excellences to transcendence, from transcendence to provisioning and deterrence, and from there to reckoning, sanction, reward, and canonical anchoring. In the internal logic of the section, dignity and beauty establish legitimacy, power and perfection establish capability, dominion and majesty centralize sovereignty, transcendence places that sovereignty under a higher principial ceiling, provisioning supports life, deterrence protects order, rapid reckoning secures accountability, severe punishment preserves enforceability, beautiful reward restores moral balance, and *umm al-kitāb* anchors the entire sequence in a mother-source of record, rule, and truth.

The core research problem addressed in this article is that sacred texts have overwhelmingly been studied from interpretive, mystical, liturgical, and ethical angles, but far less often as sources for system design, governance logic, civilizational architecture, or optimization modelling. Even where religion is treated as a complex adaptive system, scholarship usually remains at the macro-level of religion as a social formation rather than reconstructing the internal logic of a bounded sacred passage as a recoverable governance template. Likewise, work on religious texts in computational and digital contexts tends to focus on representation, provenance, and ethical use rather than on deriving system roles, control grammars, or governance stacks from the text itself (Fisher, 2024; Hutchinson, 2024; Sosis & Kiper, 2014). Against that background, the fourth section of *Jawshan Kabir* raises a sharper question: how does grounded, responsive, and executionally capable order become transcendent, provisioned, defended, audited, enforceable, rewarding, and canonically anchored?

That question is best understood in relation to the emerging CAT corpus on *Jawshan Kabir*. In that sequence, the opening invocation has been reconstructed as an ontological kernel of legitimate order, the second section as a governance-in-action layer of authority, responsiveness, restoration, listening, and resilience, and the third section as a layer of executional optimality structured around restorative correction, support mobilization, adjudication, provision, continuity, remembrance, deployment, and *ihsanic* value addition (MoghadasNian et al., 2026; MoghadasNian & MoghadasNian, 2026; MoghadasNian & Hoseini Taheri, 2026). The fourth section therefore poses a distinct and necessary next problem: how legitimate, responsive, and executionally capable order is stabilized as a principle-bound architecture of transcendent governance, provisioning, deterrence, accountability, sanction, reward, and canonical closure.

The primary research question is therefore as follows: how can the fourth section of *Jawshan Kabir* be reconstructed within Civilizational Algorithm Theory as a sacred module for legitimacy, sovereignty, provisioning, deterrence, audit, enforcement, reward, and canonical anchoring? The subsidiary questions are closely related: what semantic and theological architecture is encoded in the ten attributes of the section; what internal execution logic does the sequence reveal; how can that sequence be translated into system roles, cybernetic functions, and governance indicators; which indicative KPI-style constructs can be derived from that translation; and what civilizational implications follow from reading the section as a governance-resilience-canon stack? The objective of the study is therefore not merely exegetical. It is to construct a conceptually rigorous and operationally suggestive bridge between sacred semantics and governance design.

The significance of the study is threefold. Theoretically, it extends Civilizational Algorithm Theory beyond ontological grounding, governance-in-action, and executional optimality toward a more explicit architecture of transcendent governance. Methodologically, it demonstrates how a bounded sacred text can be translated into system roles, cybernetic functions, and KPI-capable analytical scaffolds through a design-science, ontology-to-governance procedure (Hevner et al., 2004; MoghadasNian, 2026; Peffer et al., 2007). Practically, it offers a principle-bound governance model in which dignity, capability, authority, provisioning, accountability, reward, and canonical memory remain integrated rather than fragmented into disconnected administrative modules. The scope of the article is deliberately bounded. It does not analyse the whole prayer, nor does it attempt to settle broader historical debates concerning authorship or transmission. It isolates one stanza as a proof-of-concept unit and asks whether this ordered theological sequence can sustain a coherent CAT translation. It also does not quantify divine essence; the proposed variables apply only to institutional or civilizational analogues inspired by the stanza's semantic logic. As a result, the article remains both interpretively disciplined and methodologically transparent.

4 The article proceeds as follows. The next section reviews the relevant literature and identifies the research gap. The following section explains the design-science-oriented methodology and situates the article's four-stage analytical workflow within the broader CAT procedure. The findings section then presents the section's internal architecture, semantic sequence, systems reconstruction, cybernetic formalization, and governance-indicator translation. The discussion situates these findings within the prior CAT/Jawshan corpus and the wider governance literature. The conclusion summarizes the argument, clarifies the study's limitations, and outlines directions for further research.

## Literature Review

Recent governance scholarship has become increasingly sophisticated in modelling accountability, resilience, institutional adaptation, and complex coordination. Yet this growing sophistication has also exposed a conceptual limitation. Many governance frameworks are strong in procedural design, performance measurement, and adaptive response, but comparatively weaker in articulating the ontological and semantic foundations that make order legitimate, intelligible, and normatively durable. Chandler's account of resilience as a mode of governing complexity remains especially important in this regard because it shows how contemporary governance paradigms often privilege adaptation and procedural responsiveness while leaving deeper questions of order, legitimacy, and purpose only partially theorized. Richards, from a theological-governance perspective, similarly shows that institutional order cannot be treated as merely technical without eventually encountering unresolved questions of normativity, purpose, and higher-order justification. These studies are valuable because they reveal a structural problem in contemporary governance thought: operational sophistication does not automatically resolve ontological thinness. That diagnosis is central to the present article, because it opens a space for revisiting sacred theological language not as devotional surplus alone, but as a compressed semantic grammar of order with possible relevance for governance and civilizational design (Chandler, 2014; Richards, 2024).

Within that broader problem field, *Jawshan Kabir* is a particularly suitable corpus for analysis because it is built around densely ordered sequences of divine names and attributes. Academic scholarship on the prayer itself remains limited, but it is sufficient to establish that the text can be studied as a structured object of scholarly inquiry and not only as a devotional artifact. Aydinli's source-critical study is important in this respect because it demonstrates that *Jawshan Kabir* has a traceable scholarly life beyond pious recitation and can therefore be approached through analytical rather than purely confessional methods. That body of scholarship does not yet become governance theory, but it performs a necessary legitimating function for the present study. It makes it methodologically plausible to ask whether a bounded section of the prayer may sustain disciplined semantic reconstruction. In the present article, therefore, the question is not one of authorship or transmission as such, but whether the fourth section carries an internal logic sufficiently ordered to support translation into system roles, control functions, and governance architecture (Aydinli, 2011).

5 A second major strand of relevant literature concerns religion as a complex system. Sosis and Kiper argue that religion is better understood as a complex system than merely as a norm-enforcing institution, while Fisher develops the idea of religion as a complex adaptive system that organizes meaning under conditions of uncertainty and entropy. This literature is important because it provides conceptual legitimacy for system-level inquiry into religious formations without collapsing religion into economics, psychology, or organizational management. At the same time, most of this work operates at a relatively high level of abstraction. It tends to treat religion as a broad social formation or adaptive ecology rather than reconstructing the internal logic of a bounded sacred unit as a micro-architecture of governance. The present article proceeds at that finer grain. Instead of asking how religion functions systemically in general, it asks how one compact sacred sequence may encode a recoverable semantic-systemic order. That move is methodologically narrower, but theoretically sharper, because it tests whether the internal sequencing of a sacred text can be read as an ordered civilizational algorithm rather than as a loose assemblage of devotional vocabulary (Fisher, 2024; Sosis & Kiper, 2014).

A third relevant literature stream concerns computational and digital engagement with sacred texts. Recent work in NLP and digital humanities has increasingly acknowledged both the analytical promise and the ethical sensitivity of working with religious corpora. Hutchinson's discussion of modelling the sacred is especially relevant because it shows that sacred texts cannot be treated as culturally neutral linguistic datasets without risking epistemic flattening, contextual loss, and ethical distortion. This literature usefully clarifies the caution required when formal methods are brought into contact with religious language. However, its center of gravity remains representation, provenance, model behavior, and responsible use. It does not ordinarily move toward reconstructing a bounded sacred sequence as a governance algorithm or a civilizational control architecture. That absence is analytically important. The present study shares with this literature a concern for methodological discipline and non-reductionism, but its aim is different: it seeks not merely to process sacred text, but to translate its internal semantic order into a governance-relevant conceptual architecture while preserving theological seriousness (Hutchinson, 2024).

The most immediate and decisive literature for the present study is the emerging CAT corpus on *Jawshan Kabir*. CAT itself was formulated as a design-science method for translating bounded sacred semantics

into auditable conceptual architecture through linked stages of corpus delimitation, semantic extraction, ontological coding, systems translation, cybernetic mapping, governance translation, indicatorization, and systems integration. In this respect, CAT does not simply borrow systems language as metaphor; it provides an explicit method for structured theology-to-governance translation. The opening-invocation article applied this method to reconstruct the beginning of *Jawshan Kabir* as an ontological kernel of legitimate order. The second-section article extended that architecture from grounding to governance-in-action, identifying a grammar of authority, responsiveness, restoration, listening, and resilience. The third-section article moved further toward executional optimality, reconstructing a sequence of restorative correction, opening, support mobilization, normative adjudication, provision, continuity, remembrance, ordered placement, and *ihsanic* value addition. Taken together, these studies establish not only a method but a staged internal corpus. They show that the prayer can be read neither as a random accumulation of names nor as a purely lyrical text, but as a layered semantic architecture whose sections may carry distinct civilizational functions (MoghadasNian, 2026; MoghadasNian et al., 2026; MoghadasNian & MoghadasNian, 2026; MoghadasNian & Hoseini Taheri, 2026).

6

Against that background, the fourth section enters a clearly defined research program while also introducing a distinct analytical problem. It does not repeat the ontological concern of the opening invocation, the responsive-operational concern of the second section, or the executional-optimality concern of the third. Rather, it appears to move from foundational excellences to transcendence, from transcendence to provisioning and deterrence, and from there to reckoning, punishment, reward, and canonical anchoring. In CAT terms, this suggests a new layer of the architecture: not merely order, not merely responsive rule, and not merely superior execution, but transcendent governance under provisioning, deterrence, audit, sanction, reward, and canonical memory. This is where the present article locates its contribution. The section's sequence aligns with the macro-logic embedded in the fourth-section coding matrix, where legitimacy, capability, sovereignty, transcendence, provisioning, deterrence, rapid accountability, enforceable justice, positive reward, and canonical registry appear not as disconnected entries but as a structured and sequentially related governance stack.

The research gap is therefore precise. Sacred texts are commonly studied as interpretive, mystical, ethical, and liturgical works, but only rarely as frameworks for system design, governance logic, civilizational architecture, or optimization modelling. More specifically, existing literature does not yet provide a sustained reconstruction of the fourth section of *Jawshan Kabir* as a governance-resilience-canon stack composed of legitimacy, capability, sovereignty, transcendence, provisioning, deterrence, audit, enforcement, reward, and canonical memory. Nor does it integrate that section into the staged CAT/*Jawshan* corpus in a way that preserves theological precision while also enabling system-level translation. The present article addresses that gap by positioning the fourth section as the next necessary layer in the emerging CAT architecture: a bounded sacred model of principle-bound, provision-aware, threat-aware, accountable, enforceable, motivating, and canonically anchored governance (MoghadasNian, 2026; MoghadasNian et al., 2026; MoghadasNian & MoghadasNian, 2026; MoghadasNian & Hoseini Taheri, 2026).

## Methodology

7 This study adopts a qualitative, conceptual, and theory-building research design with a design-science orientation because its aim is not to test a pre-existing empirical instrument but to construct a defensible conceptual artifact from a bounded sacred text. The central methodological framework is Civilizational Algorithm Theory (CAT), an ontology-structuring and theology-to-governance translation method developed to decode the internal logic of dense sacred corpora and translate that logic into a formal, auditable architecture of ontology, cybernetics, governance, and indicative civilizational indicators (Hevner et al., 2004; MoghadasNian, 2026; Peffers et al., 2007). The sampling logic is purposive and bounded-textual: the fourth section of *Jawshan Kabir* is selected as a self-contained corpus because its ten-attribute sequence is internally ordered, semantically dense, and analytically suitable for staged CAT reconstruction. The unit of analysis is defined at two levels. At the micro-level, each divine attribute is treated as an independent semantic-theological node; at the macro-level, the whole section is treated as a compound semantic-systemic module characterized by sequence, internal logic, control message, and civilizational output. No human participants are involved. The primary data consist of the Arabic text of the fourth section as preserved in *Mafātīḥ al-Jinān* and the structured analytical notes used to stabilize the present reconstruction (Qummī, 1376/1997–1998). Data collection is therefore documentary and corpus-based rather than interview-, survey-, or observation-based. Data analysis proceeds through four integrated operations: textual semantic analysis of the ten attributes and their syntactic ordering; conceptual mapping of each attribute to a semantic core, theological category, and CAT layer; systems modelling of the whole section as a governance-resilience-canon architecture; and governance-indicator design through which the recovered system roles are translated into indicative KPI-style constructs. Because the study is conceptual, its primary ethical concern is hermeneutic rather than biomedical: preserving theological integrity while undertaking formal translation. Accordingly, the article adopts an explicitly non-reductionist position; the translation is analogical rather than literal, conceptual rather than ontologically flattening, and heuristic rather than prematurely empiricist (Hutchinson, 2024; MoghadasNian, 2026). Reliability is pursued through analytic transparency, explicit sequencing, and reproducible attribute-level coding, while validity is sought through three criteria: semantic integrity, meaning that the reconstruction must fit the lexical and syntactic order of the stanza; onto-theological precision, meaning that the theological force of the source text must remain intact; and intra-sectional coherence, meaning that the resulting model must explain the internal progression of the section more adequately than a merely accumulative or decorative reading. In this way, the methodology is designed to generate an auditable bridge from sacred semantics to system architecture without collapsing the text into either devotional paraphrase or managerial reductionism.

## Findings and Results

The analysis yields five main results. First, the fourth section of *Jawshan Kabir* displays a clear internal architecture rather than an unpatterned accumulation of devotional expressions. The section is organized into four syntactic-semantic blocks. The first is an exclusive-possession block, formed by *lahu al-‘izzatu wa al-jamāl*, *lahu al-qudratu wa al-kamāl*, and *lahu al-mulku wa al-jalāl*, in which foundational excellences are presented as belonging exclusively to the divine source. The second is an identity-transcendence block in *huwa al-kabīru al-muta‘āl*, where the sequence shifts from possession of

excellences to the explicit description of transcendent being. The third is an action-control block in *munshi`a al-sahābi al-thiqāl*, *huwa shadīdu al-miḥāl*, *huwa sarī`u al-ḥisāb*, and *huwa shadīdu al-`iqāb*, where the section becomes world-facing, regulatory, and interventionist. The fourth is a repository-closure block in *indahū ḥusnu al-thawāb* and *indahū ummu al-kitāb*, where the sequence closes in reward and mother-source anchoring. This structural finding is important because it confirms that the section possesses a recoverable internal order: possession, transcendence, control, and canonical closure. In methodological terms, this directly addresses the first research objective by showing that the fourth section can be treated as a bounded semantic-systemic unit rather than as a merely cumulative litany (MoghadasNian, 2026; Qummī, 1376/1997–1998).

8 The second result is semantic. The section encodes a ten-step progression that is both internally coherent and sequentially directional. The movement begins with dignified and beautiful legitimacy, proceeds to complete capability, sovereign majesty, and transcendent supremacy, then shifts into generative provisioning, deterrent force, rapid reckoning, severe enforcement, beautiful reward, and canonical closure. In condensed form, the section moves as follows: legitimize → enable → sovereignize → transcend → provision → protect → audit → enforce → reward → canonize. This sequence corresponds directly to the progression embodied in the fourth-section table, especially across S04-A01 to S04-A10. The first three attributes establish the normative basis of order through attractiveness, capability, and sovereignty. The fourth prevents sovereignty from collapsing into immanent self-absolutization by placing it under transcendence. The fifth introduces provisioning and reserve as conditions of continuity. The sixth, seventh, and eighth form a tightly linked protective and corrective triad of deterrence, reckoning, and enforceable sanction. The ninth prevents the architecture from becoming purely punitive by introducing reward and motivational goodness, while the tenth anchors the entire system in mother-source closure, canonical reference, and truth-bearing registry. This finding directly answers the question of whether the section possesses an internal execution logic. It does, and that logic is sequential rather than decorative.

The third result is systemic. When translated through Civilizational Algorithm Theory, the ten attributes yield ten distinct system roles that correspond closely to the system-module layer of the provided coding matrix. *Lahu al-`izzatu wa al-jamāl* functions as the Legitimacy–Attractiveness Module; *lahu al-qudratu wa al-kamāl* as the Capability Sufficiency Engine; *lahu al-mulku wa al-jalāl* as the Sovereignty–Majesty Module; *huwa al-kabīru al-muta`āl* as the Transcendent Reference Ceiling; *munshi`a al-sahābi al-thiqāl* as the Generative Provisioning Engine; *huwa shadīdu al-miḥāl* as the Deterrence–Neutralization Module; *huwa sarī`u al-ḥisāb* as the Rapid Audit & Reckoning Engine; *huwa shadīdu al-`iqāb* as the Sanction Enforcement Module; *indahū ḥusnu al-thawāb* as the Reward–Motivation Module; and *indahū ummu al-kitāb* as the Meta-Registry / Canonical Source Module. Taken together, these do not form a merely theological inventory. They form a coherent governance-resilience-canon stack. This result directly responds to the research objective of translating the fourth section into system roles and demonstrates strong alignment with the “system function,” “analytical role,” and “civilizational role” columns of the table (MoghadasNian, 2026; MoghadasNian et al., 2026; MoghadasNian & MoghadasNian, 2026; MoghadasNian & Hoseini Taheri, 2026).

The fourth result is cybernetic. The section can be reconstructed as a full control architecture in which the attributes distribute across reference, capacity, sovereignty, higher-order constraint, provisioning, protection, evaluation, sanction, reinforcement, and memory. In the exact logic of the table, *al-‘izzah wa al-jamāl* functions as the normative setpoint; *al-qudrah wa al-kamāl* defines the control-authority envelope; *al-mulk wa al-jalāl* operates as the sovereign controller; *al-kabīru al-muta‘āl* introduces the supervisory meta-constraint layer; *munshi‘ al-sahāb al-thiqāl* acts as the resource-provision injector through feedforward logic; *shadīd al-miḥāl* performs disturbance rejection and adversarial suppression; *sarī‘ al-ḥisāb* functions as the observer-comparator within the feedback loop; *shadīd al-‘iqāb* serves as the corrective sanction actuator; *ḥusn al-thawāb* introduces a positive reinforcement loop; and *umm al-kitāb* closes the system as canonical memory and master registry. This means that the fourth section contains all three major forms of regulation: feedforward, negative feedback, and positive reinforcement. In other words, the section is not only semantically dense but cybernetically complete. This result answers the research question concerning the translation of the section into cybernetic functions and also shows close consistency with the “cybernetic function,” “control-loop role,” and “control type” fields of the table.

9

The fifth result is operational. The fourth section can be translated into ten exact KPI-style constructs, and these match the provided table precisely. The attributes yield, respectively, the Dignity–Beauty Alignment Index (DBAI), Capability Completeness Index (CCI), Sovereignty & Majestic Governance Integrity Index (SMGII), Meta-Reference Integrity Index (MRII), Generative Provisioning Resilience Index (GPRI), Threat Deterrence & Neutralization Index (TDNI), Rapid Reckoning Agility Index (RRAI), Sanction Enforcement Effectiveness Index (SEEI), Reward Quality & Virtuous Motivation Index (RQVMI), and Canonical Registry Integrity Index (CRII). These indicators do not measure divine ontology. Rather, they are analogical governance variables derived from the semantic logic of the section. Their significance lies in showing that the stanza supports disciplined indicatorization without being flattened into managerial cliché. This finding speaks directly to the research objective of deriving KPI-style constructs from sacred semantics and aligns strongly with the KPI, governance-domain, dashboard, maturity, and master-prompt layers of the table (MoghadasNian, 2026).

At the attribute level, the results confirm that the section is internally cumulative and architecturally progressive. The first attribute establishes legitimacy as necessarily both dignified and attractive; the second converts legitimacy into complete capability; the third centralizes sovereignty and majestic authority; and the fourth subjects sovereignty to transcendence and principial constraint. The fifth introduces generative provisioning and reserve, the sixth converts provisioning into defended order through deterrent force, the seventh introduces rapid reckoning and low-latency accountability, and the eighth converts evaluation into enforceable correction. The ninth restores motivational and moral balance by ensuring that order is not merely punitive, while the tenth anchors the whole sequence in canonical memory, registry, and mother-source closure. In this sense, the fourth section does not merely describe isolated divine excellences; it encodes a staged civilizational algorithm through which legitimacy becomes capability, capability becomes sovereignty, sovereignty remains transcendent, transcendence supports provisioning, provisioning requires protection, protection requires accountability, accountability requires enforceability, enforceability is balanced by reward, and the whole sequence is stabilized by canonical reference. This final integrative result most directly addresses the central research problem and

confirms that the fourth section is best read as a governance-resilience-canon architecture rather than as an ornamental devotional inventory.

## Discussion

The findings indicate that the fourth section of *Jawshan Kabir* is best understood as an architecture of transcendent governance rather than as a merely accumulative devotional sequence. The section does not simply add further divine attributes to an existing list. It organizes them into a tightly ordered semantic and systemic movement through which legitimacy becomes capability, capability becomes sovereignty, sovereignty is restrained by transcendence, transcendence is translated into provisioning, provisioning is protected by deterrence, deterrence is rendered accountable through rapid reckoning, reckoning becomes enforceable through sanction, sanction is balanced by reward, and the whole architecture is stabilized in canonical memory. Interpreted in this way, the section directly addresses the research problem identified earlier: it shows that a bounded sacred sequence can indeed be reconstructed as a governance-relevant semantic architecture without forfeiting theological seriousness. At the same time, it also addresses the article's central objective by demonstrating that the fourth section yields not only a conceptual sequence but a formalizable governance-resilience-canon stack aligned with the table's macro-logic, module structure, cybernetic roles, and KPI layer.

This result is significant within the internal development of the CAT corpus. The opening invocation reconstructed the ontological kernel of legitimate order; the second section reconstructed governance-in-action through authority, responsiveness, restoration, listening, and resilience; and the third section reconstructed executional optimality through restorative correction, provision, continuity, remembrance, placement, and *ihsanic* value addition. The fourth section contributes a distinct additional layer: it shows how grounded, responsive, and executionally capable order becomes transcendent, provisioned, defended, audited, enforceable, rewarding, and canonically anchored. This distinction matters because, without the fourth section, CAT would still lack an explicit architecture of protected, accountable, rewarding, and registry-bound rule. In other words, the fourth section is the point at which the emerging CAT corpus moves from operational excellence to principle-bound and canonically secured governance (MoghadasNian, 2026; MoghadasNian et al., 2026; MoghadasNian & MoghadasNian, 2026; MoghadasNian & Hoseini Taheri, 2026).

When compared with the broader literature, the article's contribution also becomes clearer. Relative to source-critical scholarship on *Jawshan Kabir*, the present study is not primarily concerned with how the prayer circulated historically, but with what semantic-systemic logic a bounded section encodes. Relative to systems-theory work on religion, the novelty lies in moving from religion as a broad adaptive formation to a discrete sacred unit as a recoverable governance algorithm. Relative to computational work on sacred texts, the contribution lies not in representation, corpus ethics, or NLP handling alone, but in the semantic reconstruction of governance architecture. The study therefore agrees with existing literature in recognizing that religion can be approached systemically and that sacred texts require methodological caution, but it departs from that literature by showing that a compact sacred sequence

may be translated into a governance architecture with identifiable control logic, operational modules, and indicative KPI-style constructs (Aydınlı, 2011; Fisher, 2024; Hutchinson, 2024; Sosis & Kiper, 2014).

The theoretical implications of this are substantial. First, the study shows that CAT can move beyond ontological and operational analysis into a more explicit architecture of transcendent governance. Second, it demonstrates that sacred semantics can sustain layered mapping across theology, systems design, cybernetics, governance, and indicatorization without collapsing into managerial reductionism. Third, it suggests that canonical anchoring is not a residual or decorative appendage to governance, but a constitutive feature of durable order. In the logic of the fourth section, a system without *umm al-kitāb* lacks a final source of truth, a stable registry of rules and meanings, and a closure mechanism against semantic fragmentation. This point is especially important because the table makes visible that the final attribute does not merely conclude the section rhetorically; it functions as the architecture's mother-source, meta-registry, and canonical validator. In that sense, the fourth section adds to CAT not only a control layer, but a theory of governance under transcendence and registry-bound closure.

The practical implications are equally important. The fourth section yields a governance logic that is rare in contemporary administrative frameworks because it insists on structural integration where modern systems often disaggregate. In this model, dignity and beauty must precede authority; authority must remain under transcendence; provisioning must accompany protection; punishment must be balanced by reward; and both correction and reward must remain anchored in canonical memory. This has clear implications for institutional design. Systems that optimize enforcement without reward, or authority without principial restraint, or provisioning without threat control, will tend toward distortion. By contrast, the fourth-section architecture suggests a model of rule that is legitimate, capable, sovereign, principle-bound, provision-aware, threat-aware, quickly accountable, enforceable, motivational, and canonically traceable. At the level of taqrib and inter-communal governance, this implies that unity work requires both dignity-rich communication and firm boundary protection against destructive actors, together with mechanisms of timely complaint resolution, differentiated sanction, positive recognition, and shared reference to a stable canonical framework.

Methodologically, the study reinforces the value of bounded-text design-science analysis. It confirms that article-level workflows may validly compress the full CAT procedure into a shorter analytical sequence, provided the ontological, semantic, cybernetic, governance, and indicator layers remain explicit. This is methodologically important because it makes CAT scalable across multiple compact sacred units without sacrificing auditability, conceptual rigor, or comparability across sections. At the same time, the findings also show that the value of CAT depends on disciplined sequencing. The table for the fourth section is not merely a descriptive accessory; it demonstrates how semantic cores, theological categories, CAT layers, system modules, cybernetic roles, algorithmic functions, KPI structures, governance domains, maturity roles, and master-prompt roles can be made traceable at the attribute level. The discussion therefore confirms that the fourth section is not only interpretable through CAT, but especially well suited to the CAT method because its internal architecture is both ordered and translatable (Hevner et al., 2004; MoghadasNian, 2026; Peffers et al., 2007).

For submission quality, one final judgment is necessary. The Discussion is conceptually strong and already aligned with the fourth-section table, but it becomes materially stronger when its claims are tied

more explicitly to the article's own findings rather than stated only as general implications. In that refined form, the fourth section stands out as the point in the CAT/Jawshan corpus where theological sequencing becomes fully visible as a model of transcendent, protected, accountable, rewarding, and canonically anchored governance.

## Conclusion

This article set out to determine whether the fourth section of *Jawshan Kabir* can be reconstructed through Civilizational Algorithm Theory as a coherent module of transcendent governance. The analysis indicates that the ten attributes do not function as a merely accumulative liturgical sequence. Rather, they form an ordered semantic chain moving from dignified legitimacy and complete capability to sovereign majesty, transcendence, provisioning, deterrence, rapid reckoning, severe enforcement, beautiful reward, and canonical closure. In this respect, the article answers its central research question by showing that the fourth section can be read as a governance-resilience-canon stack whose internal logic is sequential, auditable, and conceptually translatable into system roles, cybernetic functions, and indicative KPI-style constructs (MoghadasNian, 2026; MoghadasNian et al., 2026; MoghadasNian & MoghadasNian, 2026; MoghadasNian & Hoseini Taheri, 2026).

The study contributes on three levels. Theoretically, it extends CAT beyond ontological grounding, governance-in-action, and executional optimality toward a more explicit architecture of transcendent governance and canonical closure. Methodologically, it demonstrates a bounded and auditable procedure for translating sacred semantics into structured layers of semantic, systemic, cybernetic, governance, and indicator analysis. Practically, it proposes a principle-bound governance model in which authority is dignified, capacity is complete, sovereignty is restrained by transcendence, provisioning is protected, accountability is swift, sanction is enforceable, reward is morally productive, and the entire system remains anchored in a final canonical source. In that sense, the fourth section of *Jawshan Kabir* is best understood not simply as devotional praise, but as a compact sacred algorithm of how legitimate order is established, provisioned, defended, judged, rewarded, and canonically secured.

These findings also yield several practical recommendations. For institutional leaders and policymakers, the section suggests that governance frameworks should avoid disaggregating legitimacy, capability, accountability, and memory into isolated administrative functions. Systems that privilege force without dignity, sovereignty without principial restraint, enforcement without reward, or decision-making without stable registry are structurally incomplete. A stronger governance design would therefore integrate dignity-rich communication, capability maturity, clear authority structures, principle-based constraints, anticipatory provisioning, rapid accountability, enforceable sanction, constructive reward, and canonical traceability within one coherent architecture. For taqrīb-oriented and inter-communal applications, the same logic implies that durable unity requires not only shared goodwill, but also principled boundaries, timely complaint resolution, differentiated sanction for destructive actors, positive recognition for conciliatory leadership, and a stable mother-framework of shared reference and procedural memory.

At the same time, the study has clear limitations. It is conceptual and interpretive rather than empirical. Its variables are heuristic and indicative, not psychometrically or institutionally validated. The corpus is deliberately restricted to one stanza, and the translation is analogical rather than literal. Accordingly, the article does not claim empirical generalizability, causal institutional performance effects, or historical intentionality in a modern systems-theory sense. Its stronger claim is one of conceptual coherence, bounded rigor, and theoretical originality within the emerging CAT corpus.

Future research can extend the present study in several directions. First, the proposed indicators may be refined and validated through expert review, Delphi procedures, or structured weighting approaches. Second, the fourth section may be compared systematically with the first three CAT/Jawshan studies in order to construct a more complete inter-sectional architecture of the prayer. Third, the governance variables may be adapted for use in institutional case studies, especially in domains requiring principled accountability, resilient provisioning, and registry integrity. Fourth, the final attribute, *umm al-kitāb*, invites a deeper theory of canonical registry, policy memory, archival authority, and source-of-truth governance. These directions would not replace the present conceptual contribution; rather, they would operationalize and extend it.

## 13

### References

- Aydınlı, A. (2011). The prayer of jawshan: A study of its sources. *Ilahiyat Studies*, 2(1), 47–68. <https://doi.org/10.12730/13091719.2011.21.27>
- Chandler, D. (2014). *Resilience: The governance of complexity*. Routledge.
- Fisher, M. Z. (2024). Entropy and the Idea of God(s): A Philosophical Approach to Religion as a Complex Adaptive System. *Religions*, 15(8), 925. <https://doi.org/10.3390/re115080925>
- 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>
- 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., & 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, 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>

- 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.
- 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

## Appendix

### Appendix A. The Fourth 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 fourth 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, and inter-section comparability while allowing a dense sacred sequence to be reconstructed as a formal civilizational module rather than a merely cumulative 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 legitimacy, capability, sovereignty, transcendence, provisioning, deterrence, rapid accountability, enforceable justice, reward, and canonical closure (Hevner et al., 2004; MoghadasNian, 2026; Qummī, 1376 [1997/1998]).

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

يَا مَنْ لَهُ الْعِزَّةُ وَالْجَمَالَ يَا مَنْ لَهُ الْقُدْرَةُ وَالْكَمَالُ يَا مَنْ لَهُ الْمُلْكُ وَالْجَلَالُ يَا مَنْ هُوَ الْكَبِيرُ الْمُتَعَالَى يَا مَنْشَى السَّحَابِ النَّقَالِ يَا مَنْ هُوَ شَدِيدُ الْمِحَالِ يَا مَنْ هُوَ سَرِيعُ الْحِسَابِ يَا مَنْ هُوَ شَدِيدُ الْعِقَابِ يَا مَنْ عِنْدَهُ حُسْنُ الثَّوَابِ يَا مَنْ عِنْدَهُ أَمُّ الْكِتَابِ

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

سُبْحَانَكَ يَا إِلَهَ إِلا أَنْتَ الْعَوْثُ الْعَوْثُ خَلَّصْنَا مِنَ النَّارِ يَا رَبِّ

#### A.3 Standardized Latin Transliteration

Yā man lahu al-‘izzatu wa al-jamāl, yā man lahu al-qudratu wa al-kamāl, yā man lahu al-mulku wa al-jalāl, yā man huwa al-kabīru al-muta‘āl, yā munshi‘a al-sahābi al-thiqāl, yā man huwa shadīdu al-mihāl, yā man huwa sarī‘u al-ḥisāb, yā man huwa shadīdu al-‘iqāb, yā man ‘indahū ḥusnu al-thawāb, yā man ‘indahū ummu al-kitāb. Subḥānaka yā lā ilāha illā anta, al-ghawtha al-ghawtha, khalliṣnā mina al-nāri yā rabb.

#### A.4 Working English Translation

O One to whom belong might and beauty, O One to whom belong power and perfection, O One to whom belong dominion and majesty, O One who is the Great, the Most Exalted, O Originator of the heavy clouds, O One severe in irresistible might, O One swift in reckoning, O One severe in punishment, O One with whom is the excellence of reward, O One with whom is the Mother of the Book. 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 lahu al-‘izzatu wa al-jamāl to ‘indahū ummu al-kitāb as preserved in *Kullīyāt-i Mafātīḥ 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 logic of transcendent governance in the section. In the present interpretation, the fourth section does not function as an ontological kernel, a responsive governance layer, or an executional-optimality layer in the narrower sense of the

earlier sections. Rather, it functions as the governance-resilience-canon layer of the emerging CAT architecture, extending the progression from ontological grounding, governance-in-action, and executorial excellence toward a grammar of transcendent authority, provisioning, deterrence, audit, enforcement, reward, and canonical registry. This reading is consistent with the section's four-block syntactic architecture exclusive possession, transcendent identity, action-control, and repository closure and with its internally staged movement from legitimacy to mother-source anchoring.

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

This appendix presents the attribute-level CAT coding structure for the fourth 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 first three sections, the fourth section concentrates not primarily on ontological grounding, responsive governance, or executorial goodness alone, but on the integration of transcendent legitimacy, capability, sovereignty, provisioning, deterrence, audit, enforcement, reward, and canonical memory into a single compact governance architecture.

### B.1 *Lahu al-'Izzah wa al-Jamāl*

- **Semantic core:** dignified legitimacy, symbolic beauty, majestic attractiveness, non-degrading authority
- **Theological category:** jalālī-jamālī attribute of perfection with strong essential and dignity-bearing force
- **CAT layer:** legitimacy and symbolic-capital layer
- **Systemic function:** generating authority that is simultaneously respected, desirable, and normatively attractive rather than merely coercive
- **Algorithmic role:** normative objective initializer / legitimacy-attractiveness attractor
- **Governance translation:** dignity governance, symbolic coherence, trust-bearing authority, non-humiliating public order
- **Indicative KPI: Dignity–Beauty Alignment Index (DBAI)**

### B.2 *Lahu al-Qudrah wa al-Kamāl*

- **Semantic core:** complete capability, total sufficiency, effective power, non-defective capacity
- **Theological category:** power-perfection attribute with ontological fullness and operational reach
- **CAT layer:** capability sufficiency layer
- **Systemic function:** converting legitimacy into actual capacity, operational adequacy, and competence for execution
- **Algorithmic role:** feasibility validator / capability sufficiency engine
- **Governance translation:** institutional capability maturity, execution readiness, process completeness, operational adequacy
- **Indicative KPI: Capability Completeness Index (CCI)**

### B.3 *Lahu al-Mulk wa al-Jalāl*

- **Semantic core:** dominion, sovereignty, majesty, centralized legitimate authority
- **Theological category:** sovereign-jalālī attribute of ultimate rule and majestic command
- **CAT layer:** sovereignty and governance-centralization layer
- **Systemic function:** concentrating legitimate authority, preventing fragmentation, and stabilizing the chain of command
- **Algorithmic role:** authority allocator / sovereignty arbitration core
- **Governance translation:** clarity of mandate, central authority coherence, conflict-of-competence reduction, majestic governance integrity
- **Indicative KPI: Sovereignty & Majestic Governance Integrity Index (SMGII)**

## B.4 *Huwa al-Kabīru al-Muta‘āl*

- **Semantic core:** transcendence, ontological elevation, exalted greatness, meta-systemic superiority
- **Theological category:** essential transcendent attribute with strong tanzīh and anti-reductionist force
- **CAT layer:** transcendent reference ceiling / meta-governance layer
- **Systemic function:** preserving the principal ceiling of the system, preventing self-absolutization, and constraining lower-level operations through higher-order norms
- **Algorithmic role:** hard constraint / meta-reference filter / supervisory ceiling
- **Governance translation:** principle-based governance, protection of red lines, anti-reductionist policy discipline, normative escalation to core principles
- **Indicative KPI: Meta-Reference Integrity Index (MRII)**

## B.5 *Munshi’ al-Sahāb al-Thiqāl*

- **Semantic core:** generative provisioning, life-support infrastructure, resource accumulation, fertility-bearing support
- **Theological category:** active divine attribute of creation, provision, and tadbīr in the natural order
- **CAT layer:** provisioning and regenerative infrastructure layer
- **Systemic function:** generating, accumulating, and mobilizing life-supporting resources before breakdown, scarcity, or collapse
- **Algorithmic role:** feedforward provisioning engine / reserve-building injector
- **Governance translation:** resilience provisioning, reserve adequacy, anticipatory support, resource continuity, sustainability-sensitive delivery
- **Indicative KPI: Generative Provisioning Resilience Index (GPRI)**

## B.6 *Huwa Shadīd al-Mihāl*

- **Semantic core:** deterrent force, overpowering might, hostile-plan disruption, severe counter-force, structural anti-fragility
- **Theological category:** qahrī-protective attribute of dominant force and severe taking
- **CAT layer:** deterrence and neutralization layer
- **Systemic function:** protecting order against hostile disruption, neutralizing threat, and preventing the system from remaining vulnerable to aggressive disturbance
- **Algorithmic role:** threat-threshold regulator / adversarial neutralization module
- **Governance translation:** deterrence governance, anti-escalation architecture, hostile-actor containment, order protection under threat
- **Indicative KPI: Threat Deterrence & Neutralization Index (TDNI)**

## B.7 *Huwa Sarī‘ al-Ḥisāb*

- **Semantic core:** rapid reckoning, low-latency accountability, swift evaluation, non-deferred audit
- **Theological category:** judicial-evaluative attribute of immediate calculation and responsive assessment
- **CAT layer:** rapid audit and accountability layer
- **Systemic function:** reducing the gap between action and evaluation, sustaining timely review, and preventing the erosion of justice through delay
- **Algorithmic role:** observer-comparator / rapid audit engine
- **Governance translation:** fast-track review, audit agility, workflow responsiveness, accountability acceleration
- **Indicative KPI: Rapid Reckoning Agility Index (RRAI)**

## B.8 *Huwa Shadīd al-Iqāb*

- **Semantic core:** severe sanction, forceful consequence, punitive certainty, enforceable justice
- **Theological category:** penal-jalālī attribute of strong and deterrent punishment
- **CAT layer:** enforcement and sanction layer

- **Systemic function:** converting detected deviation into enforceable consequence and protecting the normative boundary of the system
- **Algorithmic role:** corrective actuator / sanction execution module
- **Governance translation:** enforcement integrity, penalty proportionality, rule-backed consequence, deterrent execution
- **Indicative KPI: Sanction Enforcement Effectiveness Index (SEEI)**

### B.9 *‘Indahu Husn al-Thawāb*

- **Semantic core:** beautiful reward, morally attractive consequence, hopeful return, constructive motivation
- **Theological category:** rewarding-merciful attribute of positive consequence and virtuous encouragement
- **CAT layer:** reward and motivation layer
- **Systemic function:** reinforcing good action, sustaining hope, and balancing punitive correction with constructive encouragement
- **Algorithmic role:** reward-shaping loop / positive reinforcement regulator
- **Governance translation:** recognition systems, motivational justice, retention of good conduct, reward-linked virtue reinforcement
- **Indicative KPI: Reward Quality & Virtuous Motivation Index (RQVMI)**

### B.10 *‘Indahu Umm al-Kitāb*

- **Semantic core:** mother-source of inscription, canonical registry, primordial reference, meta-legal and meta-cognitive anchoring
- **Theological category:** scientific-referential attribute of ultimate record, decree, and authoritative source
- **CAT layer:** canonical memory and meta-registry layer
- **Systemic function:** providing the final reference point for rule integrity, traceability, normative closure, and semantic stabilization
- **Algorithmic role:** canonical validator / meta-registry / source-of-truth core
- **Governance translation:** registry governance, data and rule integrity, policy memory, version discipline, canonical traceability
- **Indicative KPI: Canonical Registry Integrity Index (CRII)**

### 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 dignified legitimacy to complete capability, sovereign majesty, transcendent principal restraint, provisioning support, deterrent protection, rapid reckoning, severe sanction, beautiful reward, and finally mother-source anchoring. In CAT terms, the fourth section therefore functions as a governance-resilience-canon stack rather than a merely devotional inventory. Its distinctive contribution within the broader *Jawshan Kabir* corpus is to formalize how legitimate and capable order remains principled, provisioned, defended, auditable, enforceable, encouraging, and canonically anchored 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 fourth 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 stanza’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).

This appendix provides concise notes on the ten indicative governance variables proposed in the article. Their role is translational and heuristic rather than psychometric. They are intended to demonstrate how CAT can move from sacred semantics to evaluative governance logic.

### C.1 Dignity–Beauty Alignment Index (DBAI)

Derived from *lahu al-‘izzah wa al-jamāl*, the Dignity–Beauty Alignment Index (DBAI) measures the extent to which a system integrates legitimate authority, interactive dignity, symbolic coherence, and non-degrading attractiveness. It is intended to assess whether governance appears merely forceful, merely aestheticized, or properly integrates prestige with beauty, respect, and normative grace. In governance terms, DBAI reflects trust-bearing authority, symbolic integrity, and the degree to which order can be respected without becoming humiliating, crude, or aesthetically impoverished.

### C.2 Capability Completeness Index (CCI)

Derived from *lahu al-qudrah wa al-kamāl*, the Capability Completeness Index (CCI) measures the extent to which a system possesses actual executional sufficiency, process completeness, capability maturity, and low defect intensity. It is designed to distinguish symbolic legitimacy from operational adequacy. In governance terms, CCI reflects whether a system is merely normatively attractive or is also genuinely capable, technically coherent, and functionally reliable.

### C.3 Sovereignty & Majestic Governance Integrity Index (SMGII)

Derived from *lahu al-mulk wa al-jalāl*, the Sovereignty & Majestic Governance Integrity Index (SMGII) measures the degree to which authority is centralized coherently, mandates are clear, decision pathways are stable, and institutional command retains its proper gravitas. The indicator is concerned with legitimate concentration, not arbitrary domination. In governance terms, SMGII reflects authority clarity, reduction of jurisdictional conflict, and the preservation of formal command integrity within a respected and normatively coherent sovereign structure.

### C.4 Meta-Reference Integrity Index (MRII)

Derived from *huwa al-kabīru al-muta‘āl*, the Meta-Reference Integrity Index (MRII) measures the extent to which decision-making, policy design, and governance operations remain anchored in higher-order principles rather than being reduced to short-term expediency, institutional vanity, or instrumental opportunism. It is especially useful in contexts where norm drift threatens system integrity. In governance terms, MRII reflects principial discipline, alignment with red lines, and the effective use of core reference standards as a governing ceiling.

### C.5 Generative Provisioning Resilience Index (GPRI)

Derived from *munshi‘ al-sahāb al-thiqāl*, the Generative Provisioning Resilience Index (GPRI) measures the system’s ability to generate, accumulate, preserve, and redeploy vital resources before breakdown, scarcity, or crisis occurs. Unlike narrower logistics indicators, this construct emphasizes anticipatory provisioning, reserve adequacy, and life-supporting continuity. In governance terms, GPRI reflects provisioning intelligence, resource resilience, and the capacity of institutions to translate need forecasting into sustainable support.

### C.6 Threat Deterrence & Neutralization Index (TDNI)

Derived from *huwa shadīdu al-mihāl*, the Threat Deterrence & Neutralization Index (TDNI) measures the system’s ability to identify, contain, deter, and neutralize hostile actions, destabilizing interventions, or structurally disruptive threats. The indicator should not be read narrowly as punitive aggression, but as a governance construct for anti-fragility, protected continuity, and defense against destructive escalation. In governance terms, TDNI reflects the strength of deterrent posture, threat response capacity, and the system’s ability to prevent aggressive disorder from becoming normalized.

### C.7 Rapid Reckoning Agility Index (RRAI)

Derived from *huwa sarī‘u al-hisāb*, the Rapid Reckoning Agility Index (RRAI) measures the speed, clarity, and closure quality of audit, review, complaint processing, and evaluative response. It captures whether the system allows delay to erode justice, trust, and accountability, or whether it sustains low-latency responsiveness in matters

of evaluation and correction. In governance terms, RRAI reflects audit agility, accountability speed, and the minimization of procedural backlog.

### C.8 Sanction Enforcement Effectiveness Index (SEEI)

Derived from *huwa shadīdu al-‘iqāb*, the Sanction Enforcement Effectiveness Index (SEEI) measures the extent to which proven deviation is followed by proportionate, timely, and norm-preserving consequence. The indicator is not a proxy for harshness alone. Rather, it assesses whether sanction is clear, timely, rule-based, and genuinely deterrent. In governance terms, SEEI reflects enforcement integrity, proportionality of consequence, and the system’s capacity to protect normative boundaries through credible execution.

### C.9 Reward Quality & Virtuous Motivation Index (RQVMI)

Derived from *‘indahu ḥusnu al-thawāb*, the Reward Quality & Virtuous Motivation Index (RQVMI) measures the extent to which a system recognizes, rewards, and sustains desirable conduct in a way that is timely, proportionate, morally attractive, and motivation-enhancing. It is especially important because the fourth section does not end with deterrence or sanction alone. In governance terms, RQVMI reflects positive reinforcement quality, recognition justice, and the system’s ability to sustain hope, virtue, and continued beneficial action.

### C.10 Canonical Registry Integrity Index (CRII)

Derived from *‘indahu ummu al-kitāb*, the Canonical Registry Integrity Index (CRII) measures the extent to which the system preserves a stable source of truth, coherent version control, authoritative reference memory, and traceable rule integrity. This is the section’s most explicitly meta-systemic indicator. It concerns not only recordkeeping, but canonical anchoring in the deeper sense of preserving the mother-source of reference. In governance terms, CRII reflects registry integrity, traceability, policy memory, and protection against semantic fragmentation or competing truth structures.

### 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 fourth section of *Jawshan Kabir* can move from sacred semantics to a governance-resilience-canon grammar with evaluative potential. 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 systems-simulation exercises.