



5<sup>th</sup>.International Congress on Management, Economy, Humanities,  
Education And Business Development / 16-17 July. 2026

Venue: East Azarbaijan Science and Technology Park

## Ziyarat Nahiya as Witness-Memory and Anti-Forgetting Architecture in Ashura Remembrance

SeyyedAbdolHojjat MoghadasNian\*

University of Religions and Denominations (URD), s14110213@gmail.com

### Abstract

This article analyses Ziyarat Nahiya as a witness-based, embodied, named and anti-forgetting memory architecture within Ashura remembrance. The primary research question asks how the text transforms Ashura from a general symbol of victimhood into witness-based, embodied, named and anti-forgetting memory. Using a qualitative, source-critical textual and reception design, the study treats Ziyarat Nahiya as a received Shii liturgical witness text whose ritual and mnemonic functions can be analysed without making unrestricted claims about attribution, isnad certainty or direct historical reporting. Ziyarat Shuhada is integrated as a supporting named-martyr memory module, while Ziyarat Rajabiyya is used cautiously as a seasonal companion-memory support. The findings show six linked functions: detail prevents symbolic flattening; the martyr's body becomes a carrier of embodied ritual memory; naming transforms martyrs from anonymous collectivity into responsibility-bearing memory; companion memory extends beyond Muharram; remembered suffering becomes anti-forgetting and justice expectation; and source-critical boundaries protect the analysis from overclaiming. The article contributes to Shii studies, cultural memory studies, ritual studies and martyrdom studies by proposing the construct of Witness-Memory and Anti-Forgetting Architecture. It also offers a non-reductionist methodological boundary: sacred truth, sincerity, divine acceptance, thawab, wilayah and the metaphysical rank of Imam al-Husayn are not measured; only textual reception, ritual function, public memory, translation, pedagogy and ethical responsibility are academically analysed.

**Keywords:** Ziyarat Nahiya; Ashura; witness memory; anti-forgetting; embodied ritual memory; source-critical textual analysis; Shii memory

### 1. Introduction

#### 1.1 Background and Context



Ashura is not preserved in Shi‘i devotional life merely as information about a past event. It is continually reactivated through narration, mourning, ziyārah, supplication, bodily presence, naming, ethical dissociation from injustice and expectation of justice. Among the devotional texts that sustain this living memory, Ziyarat Nahiya occupies a distinctive position: it does not leave Karbala at the level of general tragedy, but returns remembrance to the body, wound, thirst, battlefield, tent, captivity and named persons of the event. This makes the text a significant object for studying how sacred memory resists abstraction.

This study is positioned within a wider Ashura–Arbaeen research sequence. The study of Ziyārat ‘Āshūrā’ explains Ashura mourning as a covenantal-moral loop that moves from grief to responsible remembrance, wilāyah, barā’ah, supplication and present moral accountability [1]. The study of Ziyarat Warith explains Karbala through a Prophetic Inheritance–Legitimacy Cycle in which Imam al-Husayn is read within sacred history, imamate, guidance, legitimacy and human dignity [2]. The present study supplies the witness-memory layer: it asks how Ashura becomes detailed, embodied, named and resistant to forgetting.

The source field requires a layered validity position. In received Shi‘i devotional tradition, Ziyarat Nahiya is presented as a visitation for Imam al-Husayn, recited especially on Ashura and also in other devotional contexts [3]. The text begins with salutations to the prophets and the Ahl al-Bayt, proceeds to Imam al-Husayn and his companions, and then moves through the Imam’s virtues, the grounds of the uprising, the scenes of martyrdom, the suffering of the household and the mourning of creation [4]. Ibn al-Mashhadī reports the text in al-Mazār al-kabīr as something issued from the Nāhiyah, while al-Majlisī transmits it and reports a relation to the Kitāb al-Mazār attributed to Shaykh al-Mufīd [5,6]. At the same time, attribution, textual layering and the relationship between the famous Ziyarat Nahiya, Ziyarat Shuhada and related martyr-name materials require source-critical distinction [7].

The primary theoretical lens combines witness-memory, embodied ritual memory and anti-forgetting. Collective and cultural memory theory clarifies how communities preserve identity through socially framed and symbolically durable forms [8–10]. Ritual-memory theory clarifies how repeated address, salutation, mourning and bodily practice make memory socially performative rather than merely cognitive [11]. Anti-forgetting adds a further ethical layer: the problem is not only that communities may forget, but that they may remember in a flattened, generalised or morally neutral form [12]. A rival reading would treat Ziyarat Nahiya mainly as emotional lament, devotional amplification or a raw historical report. This study instead reads it as a received liturgical witness text whose textual, ritual and mnemonic functions can be analysed without converting devotional reception into unrestricted attribution certainty.

## **1.2 Statement of the Problem**

The central problem is analytical and methodological. Sacred suffering may be received in ways that are too general, too emotional, too historical, too polemical or too managerial. If the suffering of Karbala is described only through broad categories such as tragedy, oppression,



resistance or victimhood, the concreteness of bodies, wounds, thirst, captivity and named persons may disappear. This produces symbolic flattening: the event remains revered, but its specific ethical burden becomes weaker.

Ziyarat Nahiya addresses this problem by returning memory to detail. Its witness-memory logic moves from generic suffering to the martyr's body, wound, thirst, tents, captivity, names of martyrs, testimony, anti-forgetting and expectation of justice. In this structure, detail is not ornamental pathos. It is a safeguard against abstraction, normalisation and moral fatigue.

A second problem concerns source-critical responsibility. Ziyarat Nahiya has substantial devotional reception, but its attribution, textual history and relation to related martyr-name texts cannot be collapsed into a single unqualified claim. The resulting validity position is layered: the text may be analysed as a recognised received Shi'i liturgical text with memory-forming and ritual authority, while stronger claims concerning direct issuance, exact speaker, chain reliability or event-level historicity require separate source-critical evidence [7].

### **1.3 Research Gap**

Existing scholarship on Ashura has explained important dimensions of mourning, martyrdom, Shi'i identity, devotional reception, collective memory and ritual performance. However, the specific textual mechanism by which Ziyarat Nahiya protects Ashura from abstraction remains underdeveloped. The gap is not simply that few studies mention the text; the higher-value gap is that body, wound, thirst, tent, captivity, naming, seasonal companion-memory and justice expectation have not been integrated into a single source-critical model of witness-memory and anti-forgetting.

This study therefore posits the following conceptual movement: the risk of abstraction activates the need for witness-memory; Ziyarat Nahiya returns remembrance to embodied and situational detail; Ziyarat Shuhada supports named martyr memory; Ziyarat Rajabiyya supports companion-memory beyond Muharram; remembered suffering becomes anti-forgetting and justice expectation; and the cycle returns the visitor to responsible memory. The model is interpretive and textual, not a statistical or causal claim.

### **1.4 Research Purpose and Research Questions**

The purpose of this study is to explain how Ziyarat Nahiya transforms Ashura from a general symbol of victimhood into a witness-based, embodied, named and anti-forgetting memory. The study analyses Ziyarat Nahiya as the primary received liturgical text, with Ziyarat Shuhada and Ziyarat Rajabiyya treated as supporting modules for named martyr memory and seasonal companion-memory.

The Primary Research Question is: How does Ziyarat Nahiya transform Ashura from a general symbol of victimhood into a witness-based, embodied, named and anti-forgetting memory?



The subsidiary questions examine How do the details of suffering in Ziyarat Nahiya protect Ashura memory from abstraction, generalisation and symbolic flattening; What role do the martyr's body, wounds, thirst, tents, captivity and scenes of suffering play in forming embodied ritual memory; How does Ziyarat Shuhada support Ziyarat Nahiya by transforming the memory of martyrs from a general collective category into named and responsibility-bearing memory; How does Ziyarat Rajabiyya activate the memory of Imam al-Husayn's companions beyond Muharram and extend companion-memory across the Shi'i ritual calendar; How does Ziyarat Nahiya convert remembered suffering into anti-forgetting, justice expectation and present moral responsibility and How can Ziyarat Nahiya be analysed as a received liturgical text without reducing it to a raw historical report or making unverified historical claims beyond the source-critical evidence?

The objectives are to define Witness-Memory and Anti-Forgetting Architecture as a bounded construct; explain how detail safeguards Ashura memory from abstraction; analyse body, wound, thirst, tent, captivity and scene as elements of embodied ritual memory; integrate Ziyarat Shuhada and Ziyarat Rajabiyya as supporting modules; and establish a source-critical claim-boundary protocol for analysing received devotional texts.

### **1.5 Significance and Contributions**

The study contributes to Shi'i studies by offering a disciplined account of how a devotional text functions as ritual memory without turning theology into sociology. It contributes to cultural memory studies by showing that durable memory can be preserved through liturgical address, repeated visitation, naming and embodied detail, not only through archives, monuments or historical narrative. It contributes to ritual and embodiment studies by explaining how bodily suffering becomes a carrier of moral memory without reducing martyrdom to physicality. It also contributes to methodology by showing how a reception-heavy devotional text can be studied with source-critical restraint.

Practically, the study clarifies how education, translation and source annotation can support Ashura memory without treating sanctity, sincerity, divine acceptance or the metaphysical rank of Imam al-Husayn as measurable variables. The article contributes by defining Ziyarat Nahiya as a witness-memory and anti-forgetting architecture, explaining how embodied detail protects Ashura memory from symbolic flattening, and distinguishing the supporting roles of Ziyarat Shuhada and Ziyarat Rajabiyya within a source-critical boundary.

### **1.6 Scope and Boundary Conditions**

The study is deliberately narrow. Its core textual object is Ziyarat Nahiya. Ziyarat Shuhada is used as a supporting named-martyr memory text, and Ziyarat Rajabiyya is used as a supporting seasonal companion-memory text. The study does not reconstruct the full history of Karbala, prove all chains of transmission, compare all Ziyarat of Imam al-Husayn, or evaluate the spiritual merit of recitation.

The argument is expected to hold for Ziyarat Nahiya as a received Shi'i liturgical witness text and for closely related supporting materials where their source status and textual function are



explicitly distinguished. It should not be generalised to all Shi‘i rituals, all maqal literature, all martyrdom texts or all historical claims about Karbala without further source-critical and comparative evidence.

The study also maintains a non-reductionist boundary. Terms such as function, architecture, model, memory and governance refer to scholarly description of textual reception, social translation, educational responsibility and public memory practice. They do not measure sacred truth, sincerity, divine acceptance, wilāyah, martyrdom’s metaphysical rank or the rank of Imam al-Husayn.

## **2. Literature Review**

### **2.1 Review Scope and Selection Logic**

This literature review is integrative and theory-building. Its purpose is not to provide a chronological bibliography of Ashura studies, but to build the conceptual and source-critical foundation for analysing Ziyarat Nahiya as a witness-based, embodied, named and anti-forgetting memory architecture. The review therefore combines four bodies of literature: source-critical and devotional material on Ziyarat Nahiya and related visitations; Shi‘i studies and martyrdom studies on Ashura, Karbala and ritual remembrance; collective and cultural memory theory; and ritual, embodiment and ethical memory theory.

The inclusion logic follows the article’s research problem. Sources are included when they clarify at least one of the following: the textual transmission or reception of Ziyarat Nahiya; the distinction between Ziyarat Nahiya, Ziyarat Shuhada and Ziyarat Rajabiyya; the social and ritual formation of memory; the role of body, wound, thirst, tent and captivity in embodied ritual memory; or the transformation of remembered suffering into moral responsibility and anti-forgetting. Sources are excluded when they function only as devotional exhortation, unsupported polemic, general Ashura reflection without analytical value, or historical assertion without source-critical control.

The review is not a statistical meta-analysis and does not claim exhaustive database coverage. Its evidence logic is qualitative, source-sensitive and claim-boundary oriented. Primary and near-primary devotional sources are used for transmission, wording and reception context. Source-critical studies are used for attribution, version control and limits of historical use. Theoretical works are used to construct the memory and ritual framework. Shi‘i and martyrdom studies are used to situate Karbala within wider debates on mourning, witness, identity and moral protest. This layered selection prevents a common methodological error: using devotional reception as proof of isnād certainty, or using source-critical caution as a reason to ignore the text’s ritual and mnemonic authority.

### **2.2 Source-Critical and Devotional Background**

The textual dossier of Ziyarat Nahiya requires source-critical discipline. Ibn al-Mashhadī’s al-Mazār al-kabīr provides the central transmitted form of the famous visitation, and the book’s introductory claim that its materials come through trustworthy transmitters to the sādāt has been read by some scholars as a form of general authentication [5,13]. Yet this position is



contested. Al-Khū'ī rejects full reliance on al-Mazār al-kabīr and treats Ibn al-Mashhadī's identity and status as problematic [14]. Yūsufī Gharawī raises historical-content concerns regarding some passages [15], while Ṭabasī argues that the reliance of later authorities such as Ibn Ṭāwūs, al-Shahīd al-Awwal, al-Majlisī and Muḥaddith Nūrī supports confidence in Ibn al-Mashhadī [16]. The evidence strength is therefore mixed: the devotional reception is significant, but attribution and historical use require bounded claims.

The relationship between the famous Ziyarat Nahiya, Ziyarat Shuhada and other martyr-name lists is equally important. Ibn Ṭāwūs transmits a visitation from al-Sayyid al-Murtaḍā as part of Ashura practice [17]. Eḥsānīfar notes textual overlap between that material and Ziyarat Nahiya, while warning against unqualified attribution of the version to an Imam [7]. Ranjbar examines contested passages, including the description of women leaving the tents in distress and the description of Shimr's killing of Imam al-Husayn, noting both objections and interpretive responses [18]. These debates show that the relevant textual field cannot be treated as one undifferentiated block. The famous Nahiya text, the martyr-name recension, maqṭal reports, Rajabiyyah materials and later devotional reception must remain analytically distinct.

Reception-defence sources add another layer. A contemporary Shi'ī reception strand presents Ziyarat Nahiya as a ziyārah muṭlaqah, meaning a visitation that may be recited for Imam al-Husayn on Ashura and outside Ashura. It summarises the text as beginning with salutations to the prophets and the Ahl al-Bayt, moving to Imam al-Husayn and his loyal companions, and then describing the Imam's qualities, the background of the uprising, the Karbala scene, martyrdom, cosmic mourning, tawassul and final supplication [19]. This strand is valuable for establishing received devotional authority and ritual use, but it does not by itself prove every attribution detail or every historical description. Mahdīpūr's reception-historical distinction between two visitations known as Nāḥiyah further strengthens the need to distinguish the famous Ziyarat Nahiya from the martyr-name visitation and seasonal companion-memory materials [20]. The resulting validity position is layered: Ziyarat Nahiya is a recognised received Shi'ī liturgical text with substantial devotional reception; its attribution to a specific Imam and its use as a raw historical report require separate source-critical verification.

### **2.3 Theoretical Background: Memory, Ritual, Embodiment and Martyrdom**

Collective and cultural memory theory provides the first theoretical foundation. Halbwachs argues that memory is socially framed rather than merely individually retained [8]. Assmann's distinction between communicative and cultural memory clarifies how memory can move from ordinary social transmission into durable symbolic forms, texts, rituals and archives [9,10,21]. This framework is directly relevant to Ziyarat Nahiya because the text does not function as an isolated composition. It is recited, transmitted, translated, taught, embodied and embedded in communal remembrance. Its memory function is therefore social, textual and ritual at once.



Ritual theory provides the second lens. Connerton's account of bodily practices and commemorative ceremonies explains how societies remember through repeated acts, not only through propositions [11]. Turner's work on ritual process clarifies how ritual can generate liminal intensity and moral reorientation [22]. Bell's theory of ritualisation explains how patterned action creates distinction, discipline and embodied meaning [23]. These approaches support the article's claim that Ziyarat Nahiya is more than devotional wording: it functions as a repeated ritual grammar through which Ashura memory is re-performed.

Embodiment theory gives the third lens. In this article, embodiment does not reduce martyrdom to physicality. Rather, it explains why the martyr's body, wound, thirst, tent, battlefield and captivity have mnemonic force. The body is not treated as spectacle, but as a carrier of witness. Ziyarat Nahiya repeatedly returns memory to bodily vulnerability so that Karbala does not become only an abstract sign of oppression. The relevant construct is therefore embodied ritual memory: memory formed through textual address to bodily suffering and ritually sustained through recitation, grief and moral identification.

Shi'i and martyrdom studies provide the fourth lens. Studies of Karbala and Shi'i ritual memory have shown that Imam al-Husayn's martyrdom is remembered not merely as death, but as moral witness, loyalty, sacrifice, truth and resistance to injustice [24–28]. Studies of ta'ziyeh, public piety, ritual drama and Shi'i communal formation further show that Ashura memory is enacted through performance, lamentation, identity formation and moral protest [29–33]. This literature is indispensable, but it often gives less focused attention to the internal textual mechanism by which Ziyarat Nahiya keeps suffering concrete, embodied and named.

Forgetting and ethical memory provide the fifth lens. The problem is not only that communities may forget. They may also remember in a flattened way. Memory can become general, symbolic, safe and emotionally consumed without remaining ethically demanding. Ricoeur's work on memory, history and forgetting clarifies the ethical stakes of remembering responsibly [12]. Within the present article, anti-forgetting means more than preservation of information. It means resisting abstraction, anonymity, moral neutrality and normalisation of injustice.

#### **2.4 Conceptual Domain Map**

This article uses eight bounded constructs to analyse Ziyarat Nahiya without exceeding the available source-critical evidence. A received liturgical text refers to a devotional text recognised through transmission, citation, recitation, commentary, educational use and ritual reception; its reception does not by itself prove complete isnad certainty or historical factuality. Witness-memory refers to memory that does not merely recall Ashura, but bears testimony to it through phrases that locate suffering, identify persons, address bodies, preserve scenes and keep injustice morally answerable. Anti-forgetting denotes a structured resistance to erasure, abstraction, anonymity and moral neutralisation through repeated detail, naming, embodied suffering and justice expectation.



The article also uses embodied ritual memory to describe how body, wound, blood, thirst, dust, tent, battlefield, captivity and exposed vulnerability carry moral witness without reducing martyrdom to spectacle or physicality. Named martyr memory identifies the function of naming martyrs and companions so that sacred collectives do not become anonymous; Ziyarat Shuhada supports this function without replacing the core role of Ziyarat Nahiya. Seasonal companion-memory refers to the cautious use of Ziyarat Rajabiyya as a supporting module for reactivating companion-memory beyond the peak mourning season. Justice expectation describes the movement from remembered suffering to moral demand and future-oriented accountability. Finally, the claim-boundary protocol separates textual, source-critical, reception-based, theoretical, normative and practical claims, ensuring that the text is neither dismissed because of attribution debate nor overused as unqualified historical proof.

### **2.5 Critical Synthesis by Themes and Mechanisms**

The first synthesis concerns source status and devotional reception. The literature indicates that Ziyarat Nahiya has meaningful devotional reception and a recognised place in Shii liturgical practice [3–6,19]. At the same time, this reception does not settle all questions of attribution, isnad certainty or historical use. Ibn al-Mashhadi's transmission, al-Khui's reservations, Yusufi Gharawi's historical-content concerns and Tabasi's defence of Ibn al-Mashhadi show that the source field remains contested [5,14–16]. Ehsanifar and Ranjbar further show that the relationship among the famous Nahiya text, martyr-name materials, maqal comparison and contested passages requires careful distinction [7,17,18]. The article therefore treats the text as a received liturgical witness text whose ritual and mnemonic functions can be analysed, while stronger attribution and historical claims remain source-critically bounded.

The second synthesis concerns suffering, embodiment and naming. Existing Ashura literature recognises grief, mourning, martyrdom and resistance as central themes [24–33], but the specific function of detail in preventing symbolic flattening remains less developed. Ziyarat Nahiya repeatedly returns memory to bodily and situational particulars: wound, thirst, dust, exposed body, tent, captivity and family suffering [3–5]. These details are not treated as ornament or spectacle; they function as ethical specificity. Ritual and memory theory explain how memory is sustained through repeated embodied forms [11,22,23], while Shii ritual studies show that Ashura memory is enacted through mourning, lamentation, performance and public practice [29–33]. Within this framework, embodied ritual memory means memory carried through body-related textual signs and ritual reception without reducing martyrdom to physical pain. Ziyarat Shuhada and related martyr-name materials add a further layer by preventing the companions from becoming an anonymous sacred background, while their exact source relationship to the famous Nahiya text remains analytically distinct [7,17,20].

The third synthesis concerns ritual time, anti-forgetting and justice expectation. Ashura memory is often centred on Muharram and Arbaeen, but the supporting role of Ziyarat Rajabiyya suggests that companion-memory may also be ritually reactivated beyond the peak mourning calendar [18,20]. This seasonal extension remains cautious because calendar-



memory, textual variation and devotional reception must not be collapsed into one claim. More broadly, Shii studies has long shown that Karbala is remembered as moral witness and resistance to injustice, not merely as death [24–33]. Memory theory clarifies that remembering becomes ethically demanding when it resists erasure and forgetting [12]. Ziyarat Nahiya contributes to this process by converting remembered suffering into anti-forgetting, justice expectation and present moral responsibility.

## **2.6 Operationalisation and Validity Controls**

The constructs are operationalised through qualitative phrase-function coding rather than statistical measurement. Witness-memory is identified where the text preserves morally charged detail, speaks in a testimonial register or places the visitor before the suffering of Imam al-Husayn and his companions. Embodied ritual memory is traced through references to body, wound, thirst, tent, battlefield, captivity, dust and exposed vulnerability, while named martyr memory is identified where martyr-name materials transform collective martyrdom into addressable persons. Anti-forgetting is identified where the text resists abstraction, anonymity, moral neutrality or the normalisation of injustice. To limit overinterpretation, the analysis requires a traceable link among phrase, function, source status and theoretical construct. Claim-boundary control is maintained by distinguishing textual, source-critical, reception-based, historical, theoretical and normative claims through a non-statistical audit trail.

## **3. Methodology**

### **3.1 Research Design**

This study uses a qualitative, source-critical textual and reception design. It does not make causal, statistical or generalisable empirical claims. Its unit of analysis is the textual and ritual function of Ziyarat Nahiya within Shi'i memory, with Ziyarat Shuhada and Ziyarat Rajabiyya used only where they support named martyr memory and seasonal companion-memory. The earlier studies on Ziyarat Ashura and Ziyarat Warith are used as contextual comparators within the wider Ashura–Arbaeen research architecture, not as evidence for the attribution, wording or historical status of Ziyarat Nahiya [1,2].

The design is claim-boundary oriented. Each claim is treated as textual, source-critical, reception-based, theoretical, ethical or practical. This prevents reception evidence from being used as proof of isnād certainty, theoretical language from being used as proof of historical detail, or ritual function from being treated as measurement of sacred reality.

### **3.2 Sampling, Data Collection and Analysis**

The study uses purposive textual sampling. The core sample is Ziyarat Nahiya as a received liturgical witness text. The supporting textual sample includes Ziyarat Shuhada for named martyr memory and Ziyarat Rajabiyya for seasonal companion-memory. The evidence base consists of four data families: primary and received textual material; source-critical literature on attribution and version control; theoretical literature on memory, ritual, embodiment and



martyrdom; and the two prior programme studies used only for conceptual comparison. No human participants, interviews, surveys or participant observations are included.

Analysis proceeded through six linked procedures: source-boundary mapping; phrase-function coding; mechanism clustering; support-module comparison; claim-boundary testing; and model synthesis. Phrase-function coding examined whether a textual cluster names a person, marks a body, preserves a wound, recalls thirst, situates a tent, narrates captivity, activates companion-memory, bears witness to suffering, resists forgetting or converts grief into justice expectation. These codes were then grouped into six constructs: witness-memory, embodied ritual memory, named martyr memory, seasonal companion-memory, anti-forgetting and claim-boundary control. The outcome is an interpretive construct model, not a statistical finding.

### **3.3 Reliability, Validity and Ethics**

Reliability is supported through explicit coding logic, traceable source use and a non-statistical audit trail linking the working text, coding categories, source hierarchy, phrase-function decisions and claim boundaries. Validity is pursued through construct validity, interpretive validity and source-critical validity. Construct validity requires defining witness-memory, embodied ritual memory and anti-forgetting before applying them. Interpretive validity requires external theory to illuminate the text without replacing its theological grammar. Source-critical validity requires stronger attribution or historical claims to remain conditional on independent Arabic source verification.

The ethical obligations are sacred-text and trauma-related rather than participant-related. Bodily suffering is analysed as witness-memory, not spectacle. The study does not measure sanctity, sincerity, divine acceptance, *thawāb*, intercession, *wilāyah*, sacred tears or the metaphysical rank of Imam al-Husayn. Its analysable objects are textual reception, ritual function, public memory, translation, pedagogy and social responsibility.

## **4. Findings and Results**

### **4.1 Data Overview and Evidence Base**

The findings are based on a qualitative, source-critical textual and reception analysis. The core evidence is Ziyarat Nahiya as a received Shi‘i liturgical witness text. Ziyarat Shuhada is used as a supporting text for named martyr memory, and Ziyarat Rajabiyya is used cautiously as a supporting text for seasonal companion-memory. The unit of analysis is not a person, institution or statistical observation, but the textual and ritual function of phrases, scenes, names and memory-structures within Shi‘i devotional reception.

No human participants, interviews, surveys or observational data are included. Therefore, there are no sample exclusions, missing cases, imputation procedures, response rates or statistical groupings to report. The evidence base is textual and interpretive: phrases and thematic clusters are analysed according to their function in preserving suffering, embodiment, naming, witness, anti-forgetting and justice expectation. The findings should therefore be read as conceptual-textual results, not as empirical estimates.



#### **4.2 Measurement Checks and Quality Diagnostics**

Quantitative diagnostics such as reliability coefficients, factor loadings, model-fit indices, multicollinearity tests, p-values and confidence intervals are not applicable because the study does not use survey, experimental, archival or statistical modelling data. The relevant quality diagnostics are qualitative and source-critical.

Three checks were applied. First, source-boundary checking separated the famous Ziyarat Nahiya from related martyr-name and seasonal visitation materials. This prevents the analysis from treating all Nahiya-related or martyr-name texts as a single textual layer. Second, phrase-function coding distinguished between phrases that perform lament, bodily memory, naming, witness, anti-forgetting, justice orientation or source-critical caution. Third, claim-boundary testing separated textual claims, reception claims, theoretical claims and historical-attribution claims. This prevents devotional reception from being used as automatic proof of isnād certainty and prevents source-critical caution from erasing the text's ritual and mnemonic function.

A negative-case control is built into the analysis: the existence of attribution debate, textual overlap and version questions weakens unrestricted historical claims but does not invalidate the study of Ziyarat Nahiya as a received liturgical witness-memory text. This tension is not treated as a defect in the findings; it is part of the article's source-critical result.

#### **4.3 Main Findings Mapped to the Research Questions**

##### **4.3.1 PRQ: Ziyarat Nahiya transforms Ashura into witness-based, embodied, named and anti-forgetting memory**

The primary finding is that Ziyarat Nahiya transforms Ashura from a general symbol of victimhood into a witness-based, embodied, named and anti-forgetting memory. The text does not merely intensify grief. It structures memory by moving from general suffering to bodily detail, from bodily detail to witness, from witness to naming, from naming to anti-forgetting, and from anti-forgetting to expectation of justice.

This finding answers the PRQ by showing that the text's central function is architectural. It organises memory through a chain of connected operations: detail prevents abstraction; bodily suffering carries testimony; naming prevents anonymity; companion-memory extends the event across ritual time; and remembered suffering becomes a present ethical claim. The result is the Witness-Memory and Anti-Forgetting Architecture.

##### **4.3.2 SRQ1: Details of suffering protect Ashura memory from abstraction**

The first subsidiary finding is that the details of suffering in Ziyarat Nahiya protect Ashura memory from symbolic flattening. The text refuses to let Karbala remain a general idea such as tragedy, oppression or victimhood. Instead, it returns memory to wound, thirst, dust, exposed body, battlefield, tent, separation, family suffering and captivity.



The finding is textual rather than statistical. Its evidentiary force comes from the repeated movement from general remembrance to concrete detail. Detail functions as an ethical safeguard: it prevents the visitor from admiring Karbala abstractly while forgetting the specificity of the suffering. In relation to SRQ1, the result shows that detail is not decorative lament; it is a mechanism of memory protection.

#### 4.3.3 SRQ2: The martyr's body forms embodied ritual memory

The second finding is that the martyr's body in Ziyarat Nahiya functions as a carrier of embodied ritual memory. The body is not presented as a passive victim-object. It becomes a witness-bearing site through which injustice remains visible and morally answerable. Wounds, thirst, bodily exposure and vulnerability are not merely emotional intensifiers; they are textual signs that make suffering difficult to neutralise.

This finding links the text to embodied memory without reducing martyrdom to physical pain. The martyr's body is not analysed as spectacle or physiology. It is analysed as a carrier of sacred witness within ritual address. In relation to SRQ2, the finding shows that embodied ritual memory is formed when bodily suffering is ritually recited, ethically recognised and preserved within devotional remembrance.

#### 4.3.4 SRQ3: Ziyarat Shuhada strengthens named martyr memory

The third finding is that Ziyarat Shuhada strengthens the named-memory dimension of the article's model. Its function is not to replace Ziyarat Nahiya, but to support the transformation of martyr memory from anonymous collectivity into addressable and responsibility-bearing remembrance.

Naming changes the ethical texture of memory. A martyr remembered only as part of a group may remain symbolically honoured but personally indistinct. A martyr remembered by name becomes a specific witness within collective memory. In relation to SRQ3, the finding shows that Ziyarat Shuhada supports the witness-memory architecture by preventing the companions of Imam al-Husayn from becoming an unnamed sacred background.

#### 4.3.5 SRQ4: Ziyarat Rajabiyya extends companion-memory beyond Muharram

The fourth finding is that Ziyarat Rajabiyya can be used cautiously to show the seasonal activation of companion-memory beyond Muharram and Arbaeen. Its contribution is not central proof for the whole model, but ritual-calendar support. It indicates that the memory of Imam al-Husayn's companions can be reactivated beyond the immediate Ashura mourning season.

This finding is deliberately bounded. Because source and name-list issues require verification, Rajabiyyah is treated as a supporting and comparative module rather than the article's main textual base. In relation to SRQ4, the result shows that companion-memory is not necessarily



confined to one ritual time; it can be extended across the Shi'i devotional calendar when source-critical limits are observed.

#### 4.3.6 SRQ5: Remembered suffering becomes anti-forgetting and justice expectation

The fifth finding is that Ziyarat Nahiya converts remembered suffering into anti-forgetting and justice expectation. Anti-forgetting is not simple recollection. It is a structured refusal to let violence become abstract, anonymous, normalised or morally neutral. The text keeps suffering ethically open toward justice.

This finding shows that mourning in Ziyarat Nahiya does not end in passive emotion. The remembered wound produces moral attention, refusal of normalised injustice and accountability in the present. In relation to SRQ5, the result shows that grief is transformed into a justice-oriented memory claim upon the reciter and the community.

#### 4.3.7 SRQ6: Ziyarat Nahiya can be analysed without overclaiming

The sixth finding is that Ziyarat Nahiya can be rigorously analysed as a received liturgical witness-memory text when the analysis separates textual, theological, reception-based, historical and normative claims. This is the article's methodological finding.

The safest scholarly position is neither rejection nor overclaim. The text may be analysed for its structure, ritual function, reception history, mnemonic role, ethical orientation, embodied memory, naming logic and anti-forgetting architecture. However, the analysis should not claim that every detail is independently confirmed as historical fact, that reception alone proves isnād certainty, that all name-lists belong to the same textual layer, or that the famous Nahiya text and martyr-name recension are identical. In relation to SRQ6, the finding shows that source-critical caution is not a retreat from the argument; it is the condition of academic credibility.

### **4.4 Results-to-Objectives Traceability**

The findings answer the article's objectives directly. The first objective, defining Witness-Memory and Anti-Forgetting Architecture, is answered by the PRQ finding. The second objective, showing how detail safeguards Ashura memory, is answered by SRQ1. The third objective, explaining embodied ritual memory through body, wound, thirst, tent, captivity and scene, is answered by SRQ2. The fourth objective, integrating Ziyarat Shuhada and Ziyarat Rajabiyya as supporting modules, is answered by SRQ3 and SRQ4. The fifth objective, establishing a source-critical claim-boundary protocol, is answered by SRQ6. The only objective not fully completed within the present design is full Arabic manuscript-level verification of all variants and attribution pathways; that task remains outside this article's evidence base unless a complete Arabic source dossier is added.

## **5. Discussion**

### **5.1 Summary of Principal Findings**



This study shows that Ziyarat Nahiya functions as more than a text of lamentation. Its principal contribution is the formation of a Witness-Memory and Anti-Forgetting Architecture in which Ashura is protected from abstraction through embodied detail, named remembrance and justice-oriented memory. The text moves the visitor from general grief to the martyr's body, wound, thirst, tent, captivity, named martyrs, moral testimony and resistance to forgetting.

The findings also show that Ziyarat Shuhada strengthens the named-memory dimension by preventing the martyrs from becoming an anonymous sacred collective. Ziyarat Rajabiyya adds a cautious seasonal-memory layer by extending remembrance of Imam al-Husayn's companions beyond Muharram. The results therefore support a bounded model: Ziyarat Nahiya remains the core text, while Ziyarat Shuhada and Ziyarat Rajabiyya function as supporting modules.

A further finding is methodological. The article confirms that Ziyarat Nahiya can be analysed as a received Shi'i liturgical witness text without making unrestricted claims about attribution, isnād certainty or direct historical reporting. This source-critical boundary strengthens rather than weakens the argument.

## **5.2 Interpretation and Mechanisms**

The evidence supports three linked mechanisms. First, detail resists abstraction. When the text repeatedly returns to wound, thirst, body, dust, tent and captivity, it prevents Ashura from becoming a safe, general symbol of victimhood. The function of detail is therefore not decorative; it is morally protective.

Second, embodiment carries witness. The martyr's body is not presented as spectacle, but as a site of sacred testimony. Bodily suffering becomes a textual means through which injustice remains visible and ethically answerable. This mechanism supports the construct of embodied ritual memory.

Third, naming creates responsibility. Named martyr memory changes the status of remembrance from collective reverence to addressable responsibility. The martyrs are not only honoured as a group; they remain identifiable witnesses within Shi'i memory.

A further interpretive mechanism is plausible but requires deeper reception research: repeated recitation may shape the visitor's moral imagination over time by converting grief into resistance to the normalisation of injustice. This claim is consistent with the model, but it remains interpretive rather than empirically measured.

## **5.3 Comparison with Prior Literature**

The findings align with collective and cultural memory theory, which treats memory as socially framed, ritually transmitted and institutionally preserved rather than merely individually recalled [8–10]. Ziyarat Nahiya supports this view because it operates through repeated recitation, devotional transmission, translation, teaching and ritual reception.



The findings also extend ritual-memory theory. Connerton's account of bodily practices and commemorative ceremonies explains why societies remember through repeated embodied forms [11]. This article adds that, in Ziyarat Nahiya, embodiment is not only located in the body of the reciter or the ritual performer; it is also located in the remembered body of the martyr. The body of Imam al-Husayn becomes a textual and ritual carrier of witness.

The findings further refine Shi'i and martyrdom studies. Existing scholarship has shown that Karbala is remembered as moral witness, sacrifice, loyalty and resistance to injustice [24–33]. This article contributes a more specific textual mechanism: Ziyarat Nahiya keeps that witness concrete by binding memory to body, wound, thirst, captivity and names. In this sense, the article does not replace historical, devotional or sociological approaches to Ashura; it adds a source-critical textual model of anti-forgetting.

#### **5.4 Alternative Explanations and Rival Mechanisms**

One alternative explanation is that Ziyarat Nahiya is mainly an emotional lamentation text. This captures part of the text's devotional force, but it does not explain the structured movement from suffering detail to witness, naming, anti-forgetting and expectation of justice.

A second explanation is that the text should be analysed primarily as a historical report. This approach rightly demands source-critical caution, but it risks missing the text's received liturgical and mnemonic function. The present study therefore does not use the text as an unrestricted historical source.

A third explanation is sociological reduction: the text could be read mainly as a mechanism of communal identity formation. This explains part of its public-memory function, but it does not adequately preserve the internal theological grammar of ziyārah, witness, wilāyah, grief and justice.

#### **5.5 Theoretical Implications**

The first theoretical contribution is the construct of Witness-Memory and Anti-Forgetting Architecture. This construct addresses the literature gap concerning how Ziyarat Nahiya prevents Ashura from becoming abstract, anonymous or morally neutral.

The second contribution is the concept of embodied ritual memory as applied to the remembered martyr's body. The study shows that body, wound, thirst and captivity can function as carriers of moral memory without reducing martyrdom to physical suffering.

The third contribution is the distinction between core text and supporting modules. Ziyarat Nahiya provides the main witness-memory architecture; Ziyarat Shuhada supports named martyr memory; and Ziyarat Rajabiyya cautiously supports seasonal companion-memory.

The fourth contribution is methodological. The claim-boundary protocol offers a way to analyse received devotional texts without either dismissing them because of attribution debates or overclaiming their historical status.



## **5.6 Practical and Policy Implications**

For religious educators, the findings suggest that teaching Ziyarat Nahiya should not reduce the text to emotional lament. Instruction should clarify how detail, body, name and justice expectation form responsible memory. The relevant educational KPI is not spiritual value, but clarity of translation, source annotation and learner understanding of the text's ethical structure.

For shrine institutions and cultural organisations, the findings support curated recitation guides, annotated translations and educational materials that distinguish devotional reception, source-critical caution and ethical meaning. The key risk is either excessive historicisation or excessive emotionalisation. The mitigation is transparent source framing.

For translators and publishers, the findings require careful treatment of bodily language. Translation should preserve the force of wound, thirst, body, tent and captivity without sensationalising violence. The relevant quality measure is fidelity to the Arabic wording, clarity of theological register and avoidance of reductionist language.

## **5.7 Boundary Conditions, Limitations and Threats to Validity**

The study is qualitative and textual. It does not measure the effect of Ziyarat Nahiya on reciters, pilgrims or communities. It therefore cannot claim causal impact on behaviour, identity or moral action.

The second limitation is source-critical. Attribution, version history, textual overlap and the relationship between the famous Ziyarat Nahiya, Ziyarat Shuhada and related materials require further Arabic source verification. This limitation narrows historical claims but does not invalidate analysis of the text's received liturgical function.

The third limitation is interpretive. The model depends on phrase-function analysis and theoretical synthesis. Although the audit trail strengthens transparency, alternative readings remain possible, especially from purely historical, devotional or sociological perspectives.

## **6. Conclusion**

### **6.1 Summary of Key Findings**

This article examined how Ziyarat Nahiya transforms Ashura from a general symbol of victimhood into a witness-based, embodied, named and anti-forgetting memory. The study found that the text does not merely intensify grief; it protects the ethical concreteness of Karbala by returning memory to wounds, thirst, bodies, tents, captivity, names and scenes of suffering. In response to SRQ1, detail functions as a safeguard against abstraction and symbolic flattening. In response to SRQ2, the martyr's body operates as a carrier of embodied ritual memory. In response to SRQ3, Ziyarat Shuhada strengthens named martyr memory by preventing the martyrs from becoming an anonymous sacred collective. In response to SRQ4, Ziyarat Rajabiyya cautiously extends companion-memory beyond Muharram. In response to SRQ5, remembered suffering becomes anti-forgetting, justice expectation and present moral responsibility. In response to SRQ6, the article shows that Ziyarat Nahiya can be analysed as



a received liturgical witness text without making unrestricted claims about attribution, isnād certainty or historical factuality.

### **6.2 Scholarly Contributions**

The article makes three scholarly contributions. First, it proposes Witness-Memory and Anti-Forgetting Architecture as a bounded construct for analysing how Ziyarat Nahiya preserves Ashura as concrete, embodied and ethically demanding memory. Second, it refines embodied ritual memory by showing that the remembered martyr's body can function as moral testimony without reducing martyrdom to physical suffering. Third, it contributes a source-critical claim-boundary protocol for received devotional texts: ritual reception, textual function, attribution claims and historical evidentiary use must be distinguished rather than collapsed into one level of authority.

### **6.3 Limitations**

This study is qualitative, textual and interpretive. It does not measure the effect of Ziyarat Nahiya on reciters, pilgrims, institutions or communities; therefore, it cannot claim causal impact on behaviour, identity or moral action. Its second limitation is source-critical: attribution, version history and the relationship between the famous Ziyarat Nahiya, Ziyarat Shuhada, Ziyarat Rajabiyya and martyr-name materials require fuller Arabic verification. Its third limitation is interpretive: phrase-function coding supports analytical transparency, but alternative historical, devotional or sociological readings remain possible. These limitations narrow the claim, but they do not weaken the article's core contribution as a source-critical analysis of received liturgical witness-memory.

### **6.4 Directions for Future Research**

Future research should first conduct a full Arabic source-critical study using primary devotional, hadith, maqal and ziyārah sources to classify variants, attribution pathways and reception layers. Second, a comparative textual study should examine whether variant passages materially alter the witness-memory model. Third, reception research should use interviews or focus groups with reciters, seminary teachers, translators and shrine educators to test how body, wound, thirst, naming and justice are understood in practice. Fourth, comparative ziyārah research should place Ziyarat Nahiya alongside Ziyārat Ashura, Ziyarat Warith and Ziyārat al-Arba'īn to refine the wider Ashura–Arbaeen architecture. Fifth, pedagogical research should evaluate how anti-forgetting can be taught without turning sacred suffering into spectacle, slogan or measurable spirituality.

### **6.5 Closing Synthesis**

Ziyarat Nahiya is not only a text of sorrow. It is a disciplined refusal of forgetting. It prevents Karbala from becoming a generic symbol by returning memory to the wounded body, the thirsty martyr, the violated tent, the captive family, the named witnesses and the expectation of justice. This paper changes the literature on Ziyarat Nahiya by moving from lamentation as description to witness-memory as anti-forgetting architecture, and enables scholars, educators,



translators and cultural institutions to preserve Ashura memory with source-critical restraint and ethical responsibility.

## References

- [1] MoghadasNian SAH. Ziyarat Ashura as a holistic covenantal loop: Responsible mourning, ethical dissociation from injustice, and present moral accountability. 2026.
- [2] MoghadasNian SAH. Ziyarat Warith as a prophetic inheritance-legitimacy cycle: From Karbala to the history of guidance, imamate, and human dignity. 2026.
- [3] Fū`ādiyān MR. Sīrī dar Ziyārat Nāḥiyah Muqaddasah [A survey of Ziyarat Nahiya Muqaddasah]. Pajoohe.ir; 2018/1397 SH.
- [4] Shīrāzī AH. Dar maḥḍar-i Ziyārat Nāḥiyah [In the presence of Ziyarat Nahiya]. Maw`ūd; 2, 1997/1376 SH.
- [5] Ibn al-Mashhadī M ibn J. al-Mazār al-Kabīr. Qayyūmī Iṣfahānī J, editor. Qom: Islamic Publications Office; 1998/1419 AH.
- [6] al-Majlisī MB. Biḥār al-Anwār. Beirut: Mu`assasat al-Wafā` ; 1983/1403 AH.
- [7] Eḥsānīfar Langarūdī M. I`tibār-i sanadī-yi ziyārat-hā-yi Nāḥiyah Muqaddasah [The chain validity of the sacred Nahiya visitations]. `Ulūm-i Ḥadīth; 8(4): 32–67, 2003/1382 SH.
- [8] Halbwachs M. On collective memory. Coser LA, editor and translator. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; 1992.
- [9] Assmann J. Collective memory and cultural identity. New German Critique; 65: 125–133, 1995.
- [10] Assmann J. Communicative and cultural memory. In: Erll A, Nünning A, editors. Cultural memory studies: An international and interdisciplinary handbook. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter; 2008. pp. 109–118.
- [11] Connerton P. How societies remember. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 1989.
- [12] Ricoeur P. Memory, history, forgetting. Blamey K, Pellauer D, translators. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; 2004.
- [13] al-Mūsawī al-Gharīfī M. Qawā`id al-ḥadīth. Beirut: Dār al-Aḍwā` ; 1986/1406 AH.
- [14] al-Khū`ī AS. Mu`jam rijāl al-ḥadīth. Vol. 1. Qom: Markaz Nashr Āthār al-Shī`ah; 1993/1372 SH.
- [15] Yūsufī Gharawī MH. Guzārish-i nishast-i barrasī-yi taḥlīlī-yi sīr-i maqṭal-negārī-yi `Āshūrā [Report of the analytical session on the development of Ashura maqṭal writing]. Kitāb Māh-i Dīn; 199: 97–104, 2014/1393 SH.
- [16] Ṭabasī N. Ziyārat Nāḥiyah Muqaddasah [Ziyarat Nahiya Muqaddasah]. Intizār; 20: 194–209, 2007/1386 SH.
- [17] Ibn Ṭāwūs AM. Miṣbāḥ al-zā`ir. Qom: Āl al-Bayt Institute; 1996/1417 AH.
- [18] Ranjbar M. A study on Nahiya and Rajabiya Ziyarats [Pazhūhishī dar bārah-yi do ziyārat Nāḥiyah wa Rajabiyyah]. Islamic History Studies; 7(26): 53–72, 2015/1394 SH.
- [19] IslamQuest and Andishe Qom. Ziyārat Nāḥiyah Muqaddasah: validity, source and devotional reception [Persian online answer/article].
- [20] Mahdīpūr AA. Reception-historical discussion of the two Nāḥiyah visitations and martyr-name transmission [Persian source; full bibliographic details require completion from the Arabic/Persian source dossier].



**5<sup>th</sup>.International Congress on Management, Economy, Humanities,  
Education And Business Development / 16-17 July. 2026**

**Venue: East Azarbaijan Science and Technology Park**

- [21] Assmann J. Cultural memory and early civilization: Writing, remembrance, and political imagination. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2011.
- [22] Turner V. The ritual process: Structure and anti-structure. Chicago: Aldine; 1969.
- [23] Bell C. Ritual theory, ritual practice. New York: Oxford University Press; 1992.
- [24] Ayoub MM. Redemptive suffering in Islam: A study of the devotional aspects of Ashura in Twelver Shi'ism. The Hague: Mouton; 1978.
- [25] Aghaie KS. The martyrs of Karbala: Shi'i symbols and rituals in modern Iran. Seattle: University of Washington Press; 2004.
- [26] Halm H. Shi'a Islam: From religion to revolution. Princeton: Markus Wiener Publishers; 1997.
- [27] Momen M. An introduction to Shi'i Islam: The history and doctrines of Twelver Shi'ism. New Haven: Yale University Press; 1985.
- [28] Pinault D. The Shiites: Ritual and popular piety in a Muslim community. New York: St. Martin's Press; 1992.
- [29] Chelkowski PJ, editor. Ta'ziyeh: Ritual and drama in Iran. New York: New York University Press; 1979.
- [30] Deeb L. An enchanted modern: Gender and public piety in Shi'i Lebanon. Princeton: Princeton University Press; 2006.
- [31] Fischer MMJ. Iran: From religious dispute to revolution. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press; 1980.
- [32] Nakash Y. An attempt to trace the origin of the rituals of Ashura. *Die Welt des Islams*; 33(2): 161–181, 1993.
- [33] Hyder SAA. Reliving Karbala: Martyrdom in South Asian memory. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2006.