

The Evolution of Values from the *Jāhili* Society to the Society of Faith in the Exegeses of *al-Mizān* and *Min Wahy al-Qur'ān*

Saleh Qanadi¹ , and Ali Reza Azimifar² , and Mahnaz Albolafy³  

1. Assistant Professor, Lecturer of Higher Levels of *Tafsīr* and Quranic Sciences, Qum Seminary, Qum, Iran. Email: sghanadi@gmail.com

2. Assistant Professor, Level Four in *Tafsīr* and Quranic Sciences, Qum Seminary, Qum, Iran. Email: Alirezaazimifar103@gmail.com

3. Corresponding Author, Ph.D. Student in Comparative Exegesis, Al-Zahra Higher Education Complex, Abadan, Iran. Email: albolafy@gmail.com

Article Info

Article type:
Research Article

Article history:

Received:

11 August 2026

Received in revised form:

25 August 2026

Accepted:

10 September 2026

Available online:

20 September 2026

Keywords:

Value transformation, Social exegesis, Society of faith, *jāhili* society, Conventional perceptions.

ABSTRACT

The evolution of value systems is not realized merely through a change in external behaviors; rather, it requires a transformation in the foundations of valuation, in the will of social actors, and in social relations. The explanation of how the transition from the culture of *jāhiliyyah* (pre-Islamic ignorance) to the society of faith occurs, and of the relationship between the inner transformation of the human being and the reform of social structures, is therefore among the important issues of the social exegesis of the Qur'an. The present study seeks to explain and compare the exegetical capacities of *al-Mizān* and *Min Wahy al-Qur'an* in analyzing the foundations, factors, obstacles, and indicators of this transformation. The research is organized through a library-based method, employing a descriptive-analytical approach, a comparative approach, and qualitative content analysis: relevant propositions were extracted from the two exegeses and categorized and compared on the basis of the following axes—the concept of *jāhiliyyah* and the society of faith, the foundations of transformation, the driving factors, the obstacles, and the indicators of the desired society. The findings show that both exegeses regard *jāhiliyyah* as an enduring, reproducible pattern of thought and behavior, and both emphasize human will, the gradualness of transformation, justice, brotherhood, social responsibility, and the negation of domination. In *al-Mizān*, however, the predominant emphasis is on a philosophical-social explanation of transformation and on the role of conventional perceptions (*i'tibārāt*) and the institutionalization of values, whereas *Min Wahy al-Qur'an* concentrates more on human agency, the negation of historical determinism, collective vigilance, and resistance against tyrannical (*tāghūt*) structures. Likewise, *al-Mizān* identifies unjust exploitation, and Faḍlullāh identifies unequal relations of power, as among the principal obstacles to transformation. The comparative outcome of the research indicates the possibility of reconstructing an analytical relation between the reform of social relations and the awakening of human agency—without this reconstruction being taken as an explicit or staged model proposed by either of the two exegetes.

Cite this article: Albolafy, M., Qanadi, S., & Azimifar, A. R. (2026). The Evolution of Values from the *Jāhili* Society to the Society of Faith in the Exegeses of *al-Mizān* and *Min Wahy al-Qur'an*. *The Quran: Contemporary Studies*, 5 (16), 99-126. <https://doi.org/10.22034/qns.2026.24758.1188>



© The Author(s).

Publisher: Al-Mustafa International University.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.22034/qns.2026.24758.1188>

Introduction

The value transformation from the *jāhili* society to the society of faith, in the logic of the Qur'an, is not confined merely to the reform of individual behavior or to the replacement of one set of moral norms with another; rather, it is a multidimensional process encompassing the transformation of epistemic foundations, carnal inclinations, human will, conventional perceptions, social relations, and power relations. "*Jāhiliyyah*" in this framework, beyond mere ignorance, denotes a system of false beliefs, prejudices, unjust values, and structures that reproduce domination; the society of faith, by contrast, is founded upon monotheism (*tawhīd*), justice, God-wariness (*taqwā*), brotherhood, mutual responsibility, and social oversight. The central problem of the research is this: what relation obtains between the inner transformation of the human being and the reform of social structures, and how do the two contemporary Shi'i exegeses, *al-Mizān* and *Min Wahy al-Qur'ān*, explain this relation?

The choice of these two exegeses is significant because, although both possess a social orientation, they do not share entirely identical foundations or points of departure. *Al-Mizān*, relying on the interpretation of the Qur'an by the Qur'an, on the divine Sunan (immutable patterns), and on the theory of conventional perceptions (*idrākāt-i i'tibārī*), possesses a distinctive capacity to explain the emergence, transformation, and consolidation of collective rules and relations. *Min Wahy al-Qur'ān*, for its part, by foregrounding will, responsibility, the negation of determinism, resistance to domination, and the linking of individual reform to the transformation of the social environment, offers an agency-centered reading of transformation. Nevertheless, this distinction cannot be reduced in advance either to an absolute opposition between structure and agency or to a definitive complementarity between the two approaches; rather, the boundaries of their commonality, difference, and overlap must be assessed on the basis of the exegetical propositions themselves.

The main research question is as follows: how can the course of the value transformation of the *jāhili* society into the society of faith be reconstructed in *al-Mizān* and *Min Wahy al-Qur'ān*? The sub-questions

are: What are the components of the *jāhili* condition and of the society of faith in the two exegeses? How is the relation between the transformation of “what is within the self” (*mā bi-al-nafs*) and social change explained? And what are the most important points of commonality and difference between the two exegeses, and where is their respective focus of emphasis?

Literature Review

Prior research can be grouped into three categories. The first category comprises studies concerning the social exegesis and the desired society in *al-Mizān*. Ḥusaynī Mīrṣafī has examined the social orientation of *al-Mizān* and has shown that ‘Allāmah Ṭabāṭabā’ī, in his exegesis of the verses, does not treat society as a marginal subject (Ḥusaynī Mīrṣafī 2014). Sulṭānī Ranānī has likewise analyzed the structure of the desired ethical society from ‘Allāmah’s viewpoint, with emphasis on components such as social bonding, moral responsibility, and collective welfare (Sulṭānī Ranānī 2011). These studies are useful for understanding the social foundations of *al-Mizān*, but they have not aimed at a systematic comparison with *Min Wahy al-Qur’an* or at reconstructing the path of transition out of *jāhiliyyah*.

The second category comprises studies concerned with the theory of conventional perceptions (*i’tibārāt*) and cultural transformation. Ebrāhīmīpūr and Fakhrī have examined the capacity of ‘Allāmah Ṭabāṭabā’ī’s viewpoint for explaining cultural change (Ebrāhīmīpūr and Fakhrī 2018). Parsāniyā, Dānā’ī-Fard, and Ḥusaynī have likewise formulated the implications of the theory of conventional perceptions for transformation in the human sciences (Parsāniyā et al. 2014), and Mudāmī has discussed the capacity of this theory for peace and peaceful coexistence (Mudāmī 2022). These works provide a suitable conceptual apparatus for understanding the relation among need, perception, norm, and social action; nevertheless, the researchers’ formulations concerning conventional perceptions should not be reported unmediated as ‘Allāmah’s own explicit model of the “stages of societal transformation.”

The third category comprises studies related to *jāhiliyyah* and Qur'anic strategies for confronting it. Sha'bānpūr and Bishārtī have examined a number of components of *jāhiliyyah* in new societies and the moral strategies for confronting them (Sha'bānpūr and Bishārtī 2014). Qāḍavī, Parvāneh, and Sa'īdīnasab have likewise studied the points of distinction between primary and modern *jāhiliyyah* (Qāḍavī et al. 2020). These studies are important in demonstrating the possibility of the reproduction of *jāhili* patterns, but their analysis is not focused on the direct comparison of the two exegeses that is the subject of the present research. The critical outcome of this review shows that existing studies have focused either on the social foundations of *al-Mizān*, or on the theory of conventional perceptions, or on the concept of *jāhiliyyah*. A research gap exists in the absence of a text-centered comparison between *al-Mizān* and *Min Wahy al-Qur'ān* regarding the relation among inner change, collective action, and social order. The present study seeks to fill this gap through direct recourse to the two exegeses, while at the same time preserving the boundary between “the exegete’s explicit statement” and “the author’s analytical reconstruction.”

Research Methodology

This fundamental study employs a descriptive–analytical method with a comparative approach and qualitative content analysis. Data were collected through library research, with primary reliance on the Arabic texts of *al-Mizān* and *Min Wahy al-Qur'an*. The textual corpus comprises exegetical propositions concerning *jāhiliyyah*, faith, individual and social transformation, *ḥukm* and *wilāyah*, justice, brotherhood, the *ummah*, enjoining good, reform, and the negation of domination. Relevant verses were selected based on the presence of these concepts or their direct relevance to changes in beliefs, behaviors, interpersonal relations, and social norms. The unit of analysis was the “meaningful exegetical proposition,” defined as a sentence or coherent set of sentences addressing the origins, obstacles, contributing factors, or indicators of value transformation. The extracted propositions were descriptively coded and organized into

four analytical categories: the components of the *jāhili* condition, the foundations of transformation, the mechanisms of change, and the indicators of a faith-based society. The two exegeses were then compared along common analytical axes, with explicit exegetical statements distinguished from the researcher's inferences and all attributions verified against the primary texts. To enhance analytical reliability, the relevant verses and their surrounding contexts were reread, and the codes were examined against contrary or limiting instances. The four-part model of transformation presented in this study is therefore understood as the researcher's analytical reconstruction rather than a linear or explicitly stage-based model proposed by either exegete.

1. Conceptual Analysis

1.1. The *Jāhili* Society

In the lexical sources, *jahl* (ignorance) is not merely the absence of knowledge; it also encompasses false belief and conduct at variance with the truth (Rāghib Iṣfahānī ١٩٩١, 209). Ibn Fāris regards it as the opposite of knowledge and tranquility, and speaks of its association with rashness and precipitancy (Ibn Fāris 1994, 1:489). In *al-ʿAyn* and *Tāj al-ʿArūs* as well, *jahl*, beyond mere unawareness, denotes foolish and reprehensible conduct (Farāhīdī 1989, 3:390; Zabīdī 1993, 14:255).

The Qur'anic usages of "*jāhiliyyah*" in verses such as (*Āl ʿImrān*/154, *al-Mā'idah*/50, *al-Aḥzāb*/33, and *al-Fath*/26) characterize it as pertaining to ill opinion, judgment contrary to the divine, transgression of norms, and prejudice. *Jāhiliyyah* as a historical epoch is accordingly not identical with *jāhiliyyah* as a value orientation: the former refers to the context of pre-Islamic Arabia, while the latter refers to the reproduction of beliefs and relations at variance with monotheistic guidance. On this basis, the *jāhili* society in the present study is a society in which the authority of revelation has been weakened and in which tribal fanaticism, boastfulness, domination, exploitation, and subservience to *ṭaghūt* (false authority) prevail.

1.2. The Society of Faith

Īmān (faith) derives from the root “*aman*,” and pertains to trustworthiness, tranquility of heart, and affirmation (Ibn Fāris 1983, 1:133-134). Rāghib regards it as knowledge, avowal, and practical commitment (Rāghib Iṣfahānī ١٩٩١, pp. 25-26). The society of faith is thus not merely a collection of believers, but a society in which faith is manifest in its relations and institutions.

The Qur’an enumerates mutual guardianship (*wilāyah*), enjoining what is right, brotherhood, reform, cooperation, and justice among its indicators (*al-Mā’idah*/2 and 8; *al-Mā’idah*/55; *al-Nisā’*/135; *al-Tawbah*/71; *al-Hujurat*/10). ‘Allāmah Ṭabāṭabā’ī regards the brotherhood of faith as a conventional relation (*nisbah i’tibāriyyah*) possessing legal and social effects (Ṭabāṭabā’ī 1973, 18:315), and Faḍlullāh connects it to mutual responsibility and resistance to domination (Faḍlullāh 1998, 11:128-130). In the present article, the society of faith is a gradable society in which monotheism and revelation constitute the predominant foundation of the prevailing beliefs, values, rules, and collective actions.

1.3. Value Transformation (*Taḥawwul-i Arzishī*)

The word “*taḥawwul*” (transformation) derives from the root *ḥ-w-l*, meaning movement, change, and passage from one state to another (Ibn Fāris 1983, 2:122; Rāghib Iṣfahānī ١٩٩١, 1:266). “Values” refers to the criteria by which the desirability of beliefs, behaviors, and social relations is measured. On the basis of the theory of conventional perceptions, values and social rules take shape in connection with human needs, practical perceptions, and the regulation of social relations (see Parsāniyā et al. 2014, pp. 23-48; Mudāmī 2022, pp. 325-360).

1.4. Social Exegesis

“*Tafsīr*” derives from the root *fasr*, meaning to disclose what is concealed and to clarify the intent of an ambiguous expression; lexically, therefore, it denotes the removal of ambiguity and the discovery of intended meaning (Ibn Manẓūr 1993, 5:55). “*Ijtimā’*” (society/the collective) is taken from the root *jama’a*, and denotes assembling, connectedness, and the placing of persons or things

alongside one another; it is accordingly applied to matters pertaining to collective life and to relations among persons (see Jawharī 1984, 3:1198-1200). As a technical term, social exegesis is an exegetical approach that, attentive to the collective dimensions of the verses, explains the Qur'an's view of social relations, values, issues, and transformations, and applies Qur'anic teachings toward the guidance and reform of society. In this approach, the exegete, attentive to the needs and issues of society, extracts the Qur'an's social messages and connects them to the realities of collective life. Iyāzī regards social exegesis as concerned with examining the transformations of human societies and drawing upon Qur'anic teachings for the guidance and reform of society (Iyāzī 1993, 1:71-72). Nafīsī, likewise, emphasizes the necessity of defining this approach on the basis of its characteristics and its orientation in confronting social issues (see Nafīsī 2014, pp. 46-66).

1.5. Theory of Conventional Perceptions (*Naẓariyyah I'tibāriyyāt*)

In the thought of 'Allāmah Ṭabāṭabā'ī, conventional perceptions (*i'tibārāt*) are practical perceptions arising from the genuine needs of the human being, constructed in order to regulate behavior and social life; being "conventional," therefore, does not mean being illusory or without effect. When collectively accepted, these conventions organize social rules, rights, and institutions (see Parsāniyā et al. 2014, pp. 29-37). The brotherhood of faith is an instance of precisely such a relation, which, notwithstanding its conventional character, has genuine legal and social effects (Ṭabāṭabā'ī 1973, 18:316). In this research, *i'tibārāt* refers to the network of meanings, rules, and accepted norms that mediate between human needs and social organization, and which, in the analysis of *al-Mizān*, are employed to explain the transformation of the monotheistic value into a social rule and institution.

2. The Qur'anic Foundations of Value Transformation

The primary and foundational basis of value transformation in the exegeses of *al-Mizān* and *Min Wahy al-Qur'an* rests, before all else, upon the immutable divine patterns (*sunan*) and upon the principle of

“inner transformation.” The noble verse, “...*Indeed Allah does not change a people's lot, unless they change what is in their souls...*”¹ (*Quran* 13:11), constitutes the focal point and principal basis of this transformation. ‘Allāmah Ṭabāṭabā’ī, in *al-Mīzān*, regards this verse as expressing a definite divine pattern and existential (*takwīnī*) concomitance between the inner states of the human being and divine bounties or chastisements, such that steadfastness upon the innate human nature (*fiṭrah*) and righteous action bring about the descent of blessings, while a change in this inner state brings about the transformation of bounty into chastisement and the decline of society (Ṭabāṭabā’ī 1973, 11:310). By contrast, the approach of Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Faḍlullāh in *Min Wahy al-Qur’ān* has a more sociological and voluntarist coloring. He emphasizes that God has not subjected the human being to rigid historical laws, but has created him as a dynamic being who, through his own free will, constructs his history and his social realities (Faḍlullāh 1998, 13:28). On this basis, in both exegeses the human being, together with his will and awareness, is regarded as the principal foundation of the transition from the *jāhili* to the society of faith, and no transformation occurs unless the will is directed toward changing thoughts and concepts.

The second Qur’anic foundation of value transformation is the reliance of conventional perceptions (*i’tibārāt*) and social values upon the “system of createdness” (*niẓām-i takwīn*) and upon “monotheistic innate human nature” (*fiṭrat-i tawhīdī*). In the thought of ‘Allāmah Ṭabāṭabā’ī, the Noble Qur’an, unlike *jāhili* and materialist societies that ground their laws in changeable desires, in the exploitation of the weak by the strong, and in illusions, has founded the legislation of laws and the establishment of *i’tibārāt* upon the seed of *takwīn* and the ordinances of existence—that is, upon innate monotheism and innate virtuous character (see Ṭabāṭabā’ī 1973, 10:364). On this basis, the transformation from the *jāhili* to the society of faith is a return to true conventions that accord with innate human nature and that secure the felicity of both this world and the hereafter together. In the exegesis of *Min Wahy al-Qur’ān*, this

¹ ﴿إِنَّ اللَّهَ لَا يُغَيِّرُ مَا بِقَوْمٍ حَتَّى يُغَيِّرُوا مَا بِأَنْفُسِهِمْ﴾ (الرعد/ ١١)

connection among monotheism, the human being, society, and history can likewise be reconstructed through a thematic and holistic approach to the contents of the Qur'an—an approach that analyzes scattered concepts within a single constellation oriented toward social guidance. This monotheistic foundation is analyzed in the form of the expansion of the “brotherhood of faith” and its substitution for “*jāhili* fanaticism.” Faḍlullāh holds that faith in God transforms the geometry of social relations from bonds of blood, tribe, and blind prejudice into solidarity grounded in truth and justice, and that this monotheism is the factor of balance and of granting rights to their rightful holders within the society of faith (Faḍlullāh 1998, 21:146).

The third Qur'anic foundation is the negation of material criteria of valuation and the establishment of God-wariness (*taqwā*) as the sole criterion of human dignity. The Noble Qur'an, through the verse, “*O mankind! Indeed We created you from a male and a female, and made you nations and tribes that you may identify yourselves with one another. Indeed, the noblest of you in the sight of Allah is the most God wary among you...*”² (Quran 49:13), drew a line of invalidation through boasting of lineage, race, and wealth, which had constituted the principal fabric of *jāhili* culture. ‘Allāmah Ṭabāṭabā’ī, in his exegesis of this verse, states that the creation of human beings from various peoples and tribes is solely for the sake of mutual acquaintance, so that social order may be organized, and not as an instrument for *jāhili* boastfulness and the pursuit of superiority (Ṭabāṭabā’ī 1973, 18:327). Faḍlullāh likewise emphasizes that God-wariness is the sense of the continual divine presence in one’s deeds and words, which constructs the committed Islamic personality and defines human worth in terms of adherence to the straight path and the acceptance of responsibility, rather than in personal or racial characteristics (Faḍlullāh 1998, 21:161). This change of criterion became a fundamental basis for the elimination of false suppositions and unjust judgments, and for their replacement with equality and justice within the society of faith.

². ﴿يَا أَيُّهَا النَّاسُ إِنَّا خَلَقْنَاكُمْ مِنْ ذَكَرٍ وَأُنْثَىٰ وَجَعَلْنَاكُمْ شُعُوبًا وَقَبَائِلَ لِتَعَارَفُوا إِنَّ أَكْرَمَكُمْ عِنْدَ اللَّهِ أَتْقَاكُمْ...﴾

(الحجرات/١٣)

The fourth foundation is a realistic approach combined with “wisdom and gradualness” (*ḥikmah wa tadarruj*) in the process of value transformation. In the approach of *al-Mizān*, value transformation is a gradual and evolutionary course, since the sudden transformation of deep-rooted *jāhili* customs and conventions encounters the resistance of the target society. For this reason, the Qur’an first addressed the reform of tangible practical behaviors and, making use of existing social frameworks such as trade and commerce, reformed unjust rulings such as usury (*ribā*), and only thereafter transformed deep-seated beliefs. In *Min Wahy al-Qur’ān*, this process is formulated under the concept of “wisdom” (*ḥikmah*) and the connection of theory to practice. Faḍlullāh, citing the verse, “... and teaches them the Book and wisdom...”³ (*Quran* 62:2), states that value transformation is not merely the presentation of an abstract cultural theory, but rather setting Islamic concepts in motion along the line of practical application, so that human beings may be formed through wisdom and the balance of theory and reality, and so that the structure of society may actually be transformed (Faḍlullāh 1998, 22:206). In this way, the Qur’an, through the gradual formation of believing cadres and the purification of the self, secured the foundations of the transformation from the *jāhili* society to the virtuous Islamic city.

3. The Exegetical Approach of *al-Mizān* and *Min Wahy al-Qur’ān* in the Analysis of Social Transformations

The exegeses of *al-Mizān* and *Min Wahy al-Qur’ān* both belong to the ranks of contemporary exegetical schools with a “social orientation,” which, moving beyond purely abstract, lexical, and historical perspectives, have brought the Qur’an into the very text of human collective life (Ḥusaynī Mīrṣafī 2014, 131). In this approach, the Qur’an is not merely a sacred text for recitation, but a book of guidance and of life that must respond to the needs of the day and to the concrete challenges of societies (Ḥusaynī Mīrṣafī 2014, 132 and

³ ﴿...وَيُعَلِّمُهُمُ الْكِتَابَ وَالْحِكْمَةَ...﴾ (الجمعة/٢)

144). On this basis, both exegetes, in analyzing social transformations, adopt a trans-temporal view of the verses and strive to reproduce the divine patterns and Qur'anic principles for the transformation and reform of contemporary society, avoiding mere imitation of the past (Iyāzī 1993, 74). Nevertheless, the origin and methodology of these two exegeses in dissecting social transformations are entirely distinct.

‘Allāmah Ṭabāṭabā’ī’s exegetical approach to the analysis of social transformations is a “philosophical–social” and structuralist approach, whose foundation rests upon the original theory of “conventional perceptions” (see Parsāniyā et al. 2014, 23). ‘Allāmah holds that laws, values, and social norms are conventional concepts that the human being institutes in order to secure the needs and ends of his collective life, and that social transformation is the product of the natural change and development of these needs and ends (Ebrāhīmīpūr and Fakhri 2018, 12). In this approach, the transition from a decadent to a developed society occurs when society grounds these variable conventions and legal rules upon the “seed of createdness and the ordinances of existence,” so that they may accord with innate human nature. The approach of *al-Mīzān*, in organizing this transformation, takes a macro-level view that emphasizes the reciprocal connection between individual and collective life, the role of elites, rationalism, and the necessity of institutional coherence (Ḥusaynī Mīrṣafī 2014, 136). By contrast, the exegetical approach of Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Faḍlullāh in *Min Waḥy al-Qur’ān* bears a “dynamic, sociological, and agency-centered” character. Faḍlullāh removes the verses of the Qur’an from the material and historical context of the time of revelation and connects them concretely to the challenges, political currents, and disorders of the contemporary world, so that the “dynamic” and constructive aspect of the Qur’an may crystallize (Faḍlullāh 1998, 1:15). In this exegetical system, the analysis of social transformation proceeds on the basis of the “negation of historical determinism” and reliance upon “human free will.” Citing the noble verse, “...Indeed Allah does not change a people’s lot, unless they change what is in their souls” (*Quran 13:11*), he emphasizes that the objective determinants and conditions of society depend, before all

else, upon the inner revolution and the will of human beings themselves—such that the human being is not the product of circumstances, but the creator of social conditions. From this perspective, the exegete continually seeks to respond to the challenges of daily life, such as confronting Zionism and global arrogance (*istikbār*), through the interrogation of the divine verses (Faḍlullāh 1998, 1:15).

4. The Course of Value Transformation from the *Jāhili* Society to the Society of Faith in the Two Exegeses

The transformation from a fragmented society into a cohesive society (the society of faith) is another foundational component upon which both exegeses converge in focus. ‘Allāmah Ṭabāṭabā’ī, with an anthropological perspective, analyzes that human nature and instinct are founded upon self-interest, which inevitably leads to the exploitation of others, miserliness, transgression, and social strife. From his viewpoint, Islam, by directing society’s attention toward eternal life and spiritual enjoyments, dries up the root of this corruption (miserliness and excessive desire) and, through divine grace, transforms enmities into brotherhood and solidarity (Ṭabāṭabā’ī 1973, 6:342).

Faḍlullāh likewise emphasizes that the affinity (*ulfah*) among hearts does not arise from a simple, superficial emotional state or from reliance upon material wealth, but is founded upon a new intellectual and spiritual principle—namely, the thought and spirit of Islam itself (Faḍlullāh 1998, 6:195). With a diagnostic view of modern societies, he holds that division and conflict in the Islamic world are due to a reversion to inner complexes and to ethnic and national fanaticism, and that the sole path to deliverance is a return to Qur’anic discourse and to “holding fast to the rope of Allah” (*i’tiṣām bi-ḥabl Allāh*) as the concrete embodiment of a single intellectual and political line (see Faḍlullāh 1998, 6:194-197).

The direction of social transformations in the Qur’an is the establishment of justice and the negation of *ṭāghūt* (tyrannical) systems. In explaining the aims of the mission (the sending down of

the Book and the Balance), Faḍlullāh regards “*qisṭ*” (equity) as the very foundation of the soundness of individual and social life, and concludes that the question of governance and legislation is the foundational question of every religion; religion and politics are therefore fully interwoven, and religion flows within the horizons of governance for the management of conflicts (Faḍlullāh 1998, 22:46-47). In a highly contemporary analysis, he regards “*jāhiliyyah*” not as a temporal, historical period, but as a materialist mode of thought that takes shape apart from divine guidance and solely on the basis of interests and domination; he accordingly explicitly identifies contemporary secular and positive law in Islamic countries as a manifest instance of “the judgment of *jāhiliyyah*” (*ḥukm al-jāhiliyyah*) and “the judgment of *ṭāghūt*” (Faḍlullāh 1998, 8:207). On the other side, ‘Allāmah Ṭabāṭabā’ī, with a profoundly ontological approach, interprets the transformation from *jāhiliyyah* to Islam as a passage from darkness to light, and emphasizes that the concept of “light and darkness” in the Qur’an is not a metaphor or figure of speech, but an existential (*takwīnī*) and real truth interwoven with human obedience and disobedience (Ṭabāṭabā’ī 1973, 2:346). ‘Allāmah names the desired Qur’anic society the “middle ummah” (*ummat al-wasat*)—a society safeguarded from the excess of materialists such as the polytheists and the deficiency of world-renouncers such as distorted Christianity, and one that secures the rights of body and spirit in tandem (Ṭabāṭabā’ī 1973, 1:319).

The comparative examination shows that both exegetes are in complete agreement on principles such as human agency and will, the necessity of binding believers together on the axis of doctrine, and the ultimacy of social justice. There is, nevertheless, a profound difference of approach in their respective points of view: ‘Allāmah Ṭabāṭabā’ī’s approach in *al-Mizān* is philosophical, esoteric (*bāṭinī*), and existential (*takwīnī*). He analyzes social transformations as a reflection of the inner transformations of the human soul and of its connection to, or severance from, the truths of the unseen realm such as the presence of the recording and guardian angels, or the true meanings of light and darkness (Ṭabāṭabā’ī 1973, 11:309-423). The capacity of this

viewpoint for explaining the psychological, epistemological, and philosophical roots of the decline or elevation of societies is unparalleled. By contrast, the approach of Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Faḍlullāh in *Min Wahy al-Qur'ān* is an entirely “movemental” (*ḥarakī*), pragmatic, and socio-political approach. He removes Qur'anic concepts from abstraction and connects them directly to daily challenges, the negation of secularism in legislation, the necessity of forming an Islamic government, and the management of conflicts of interest in modern societies (Faḍlullāh 1998, 8:207; 6:197). The capacity of Faḍlullāh's exegesis lies in offering practical directives for contemporary Islamic movements and for the awakening of the ummahs. The convergence of these two approaches yields a comprehensive constellation of final causes (philosophical) and efficient causes (socio-political) in the analysis of the transformations of Qur'anic society.

4.1. The Components of the Value System of the *Jāhili* Society

In its dissection of the value system of the *jāhili* society, the Noble Qur'an highlights components such as false suppositions, unjust judgments, blind prejudices, and self-display through the expressions “*ẓann al-jāhiliyyah*” (the notion of [pagan] ignorance), “*ḥukm al-jāhiliyyah*” (the judgment of [pagan] ignorance), “*ḥamiyyat al-jāhiliyyah*” (the bigotry of pagan ignorance), and “*tabarruj al-jāhiliyyah*” (the display of the former [days of] ignorance) (Sha'bānpūr and Bishārī 2014, 70). Classical exegeses have generally interpreted these components in individual and moral terms; thus, Ṭabarsī confines them largely to anger, aggression, and moral folly (Ṭabarsī 1993, 9:130), and Zamakhsharī holds that *jāhili* judgment is a judgment devoid of revelatory support and arising from the pursuit of caprice (Zamakhsharī 1986, 1:265). On this basis, the *jāhili* system in these exegeses has largely been regarded as a set of individual vices and as a historical period that came to an end with the advent of Islam (Qāḍavī et al. 2020, 56).

In contrast to the view of the earlier exegetes, 'Allāmah Ṭabāṭabā'ī locates the root of the *jāhili* value system in the transgression of the instinct of “exploitation” of others—an instinct that, if left unbridled,

leads to transgression, the domination of the powerful, and the collapse of human equality (Ṭabāṭabā'ī 1973, 2:430). From this perspective, the components of *jāhiliyyah* are false and illusion-laden conventional perceptions that have grown distant from innate human nature and the system of createdness, and that are founded upon carnal desires (Mudāmī 2022, 329).

In *Min Wahy al-Qur'ān*, Faḍlullāh regards *jāhiliyyah* as an intellectual, practical, and power-centered condition that, through the distancing of rulings from revelation, is reproduced in the form of “modern *jāhiliyyah*” (Faḍlullāh 1998, 8:207). The principal component of this condition is the sovereignty of “the judgment of *tāghūt*” and of positive, secular laws as against divine guardianship (*wilāyah*) (Faḍlullāh 1998, 8:208). Under such conditions, unequal power relations, the interests of the arrogant, class privileges, and *jāhili* fanaticism weaken the pursuit of truth and social resistance (see Faḍlullāh 1998, 13:28; Sha'bānpūr and Bishārī 2014, 72). The sanctification of ancestral ideas and intellectual rigidity are likewise instruments for the preservation of domination and for the prevention of the transformation of society (Faḍlullāh 1998, 13:29).

4.2. The Factors and Grounds of Value Transformation

The explanation of the factors and grounds of the transition from the *jāhili* value system to the society of faith is among the most important analytical axes in the history of Qur'anic exegesis. Examination of these components within the history of exegesis shows that the exegetes' approach has evolved from an individualist and theological perspective in the earlier exegeses to a comprehensive, structuralist, and sociological approach in the later exegeses (in particular *al-Mīzān* and *Min Wahy al-Qur'ān*).

In the approach of the earlier, ḥadīth-based exegeses, such as *Jāmi' al-Bayān*, *al-Tibyān*, *Majma' al-Bayān*, *al-Kashshāf*, and *Mafātīḥ al-Ghayb*, the factors of value transformation have generally been analyzed with a negative, individualist approach centered on the theological concepts of reward and punishment. In this intellectual constellation, “faith” and “*tawḥīd*” are represented not as the foundations of a new social order, but chiefly as beliefs for individual

salvation in the hereafter. The earlier exegetes, in interpreting the key verse, “...*Indeed Allah does not change a people’s lot, unless they change what is in their souls*” (*Quran 13:11*), have generally assessed the factor of change as equivalent to “the removal of divine bounties on account of the commission of individual sins,” confining human agency to the dyad of sin and punishment (see Fakhr Rāzī 1999, 11:49; Ṭabarī 1991, 14:10).

In dissecting the manner of *jāhiliyyah*’s negation, exegeses such as *Majma‘ al-Bayān* have interpreted the reform of the value system chiefly in terms of the removal of individual moral vices such as anger and folly (Ṭabarsī 1993, 9:67), and Zamakhsharī likewise regards *jāhili* judgment as nothing more than the following of individual caprice (Zamakhsharī 1986, 1:265). In this period, factors such as “migration” (*hijrah*), “*jihād*,” and “guardianship” (*wilāyah*) are generally reported as juristic or historical occurrences of the age of prophethood, and a networked view of their connection in producing a large-scale civilizational transformation is absent.

With the emergence of exegeses possessing a “social orientation” in the contemporary era, Qur’anic concepts were released from the confines of abstract discussion and analyzed as a roadmap for collective life (Ḥusaynī Mīrṣafī 2014, 131). In this approach, ‘Allāmah Ṭabāṭabā’ī and ‘Allāmah Faḍlullāh, notwithstanding their difference in epistemological foundations, have interpreted all the aforementioned factors within a single coherent network for the construction of a system:

a. Revelation, Prophethood, Monotheism, and Faith (The Epistemic Foundations of Transformation)

In *al-Mīzān*, value transformation rests upon the foundation of the theory of “conventional perceptions.” ‘Allāmah holds that the *jāhili* system was built upon illusions and upon the instinct of exploitation (*istikhdām*). The role of “revelation” and “prophethood” is that, by presenting the Book and the Balance, they align these human conventions with the system of createdness and with innate human nature. “Monotheism” and “faith” here are not merely a belief of the heart, but the origin of the constitution of new conventions that negate the lordship of the *ṭawāghīt* (false authorities). By contrast, Sayyid

Muḥammad Ḥusayn Faḍlullāh, in *Min Wahy al-Qur'ān*, relying on the negation of determinism, regards faith and Qur'anic formation as instruments for “the awakening of individual conscience.” In this view, knowledge joined with the purification of the self, awakens the human free will for the transformation of objective realities (the transformation of the self) (Riḍāzādih Jūdī 2015, 170).

b. The Brotherhood of Faith, Guardianship and God-Wariness (The Structural and Cohesive Foundations)

‘Allāmah Ṭabāṭabā’ī does not regard the “brotherhood of faith” as a blood bond or a merely sentimental one; rather, he presents it as a “conventional and contractual relation” instituted by the religion of Islam, possessing legal, canonical, and social effects that are binding for the establishment of peace (Ṭabāṭabā’ī 1973, 18:324). Moreover, for the consolidation of these new norms and for the breaking apart of *jāhili* sedimentations, possession of “guardianship” (*wilāyah*) and of political sovereignty is a key factor, since political power causes norms to take root more rapidly. “God-Wariness” (*Taqwā*) in *al-Mīzān* is likewise the guarantor of the descent of blessings and of the stability of this structure. In *Min Wahy al-Qur'ān*, however, brotherhood and *taqwā* are analyzed as factors for the reconciliation of hearts and the removal of *jāhili* rancor, and likewise as the foundation for the establishment of a resistance-fostering ummah that replaces blind fanaticisms (Faḍlullāh 1998, 8:207).

c. Migration (*Hijrah*), *Jihād*, Social Responsibility, and the Negation of Jāhiliyyah (The Mechanisms of Consolidation and Continuity)

In this school, migration and *jihād* are not merely historical events, but are regarded as practical strategies for confronting class privileges and legal systems incompatible with the *sharī'ah*. ‘Allāmah Ṭabāṭabā’ī likewise regards the Prophet’s migration and the formation of the state as the turning point of the transition from the stage of invalidation and proclamation (*ibtāl wa bayān*) to the stage of establishment, the reform of the value system, and the implementation of “justice” in the rights pertaining to life—a transition that prevents the domination of despots (Ṭabāṭabā’ī 1973, 5:53).

Examination of the evolution of exegetical thought reveals a profound epistemological shift. The earlier exegeses, focusing on the individual's salvation in the hereafter, conceived of social transformation as merely a subordinate and necessary consequence of abstention from sins. In the later period, however, the exegeses of *al-Mizān* and *Min Wahy al-Qur'ān*, in critiquing this reductive view, defined *jāhiliyyah* as “an enduring pattern of decline” and the society of faith as “an organized system” (see Qāḍavī et al. 2020, 56).

The two later exegeses share the following points in common: both explicitly reject historical determinism, regard the human being as a free agent, and treat all the components — revelation, *jihād*, brotherhood, and so on — as parts of a single continuous system for negating domination (*tāghūt*) and establishing justice (Riḍāzādih Jūdī 2015, 186). They diverge, however, in their point of departure and their locus of agency. *Al-Mizān* analyzes transformation in a philosophical–social idiom, as a macro-level process moving from the outside inward: elites, together with the institution of guardianship (*wilāyah*) and the power it confers, first reform conventional behaviors (*i'tibārāt*), and inner faith is consolidated thereafter. *Min Wahy al-Qur'ān*, by contrast, adopts a sociological and movement-oriented idiom and treats transformation as a movement from the inside outward, driven by the awakening of individual consciousness through Qur'anic formation, the rejection of blind imitation, and the deployment of social responsibility — enjoining the good — against corrupt structures.

The development of exegetical thought on this subject ultimately suggests that a comprehensive, Qur'an-based model of value transformation requires both dimensions: the structural–institutional development and philosophical rationality contributed by *al-Mizān*, and the awakening of human agency, sustained resistance, and social mobilization contributed by *Min Wahy al-Qur'ān*.

4.3. The Stages of the Transformation of the *Jāhili* Society into the Society of Faith

The Evolution of Exegetical Thought in Explaining the Stages of Transformation. Examination of the history of exegesis shows that the understanding of the “stages of transformation” from the *jāhili* condition to the society of faith has undergone a profound epistemological evolution. In the approach of the earlier exegeses, such as *Majma‘ al-Bayān* and *Maḥāṣin al-Ghayb*, the passage out of *jāhiliyyah* was generally not regarded as a structured, staged social process; rather, with a predominantly individualist and theological approach, it was assessed as equivalent to individual repentance, the abandonment of moral vices, such as folly and anger, and a sudden calendrical shift from the period before the mission to the period after it (Ṭabarsī 1993, 9:67). In this traditional view, the sociological mechanism of change remained neglected. With the emergence of contemporary exegeses possessing a social orientation, however, this reductive approach gave way to a coherent systematization, such that the Noble Qur’an is regarded not only as aiming at transformation, but as having designed, for this foundational transformation, stages, steps, and a fully methodical course, so as to prevent the reproduction of *jāhiliyyah* (see Ḥusaynī Mīrṣafī 2014, 131).

a. The Stages of Transformation in the Exegetical School of *al-Mīzān* (A Structuralist Approach of Gradual Institutionalization)

‘Allāmah Ṭabāṭabā’ī explains the stages of value transformation with a philosophical–social approach grounded in the theory of “conventional perceptions.” He holds that, in the social sphere, “the precedence of change in behavior over change in beliefs” obtains; that is, human beings first grow accustomed to a behavior through its repetition and through the satisfaction of their needs by it, and this behavior subsequently settles into the deep strata of belief (Ebrāhīmīpūr and Fakhrī 2018, 28). On this basis, the first stage of transformation is the reform of objective structures and behaviors. ‘Allāmah Ṭabāṭabā’ī emphasizes that these stages must be entirely “gradual,” since the sudden introduction of new norms produces confrontation and “cultural rejection” on the part of the target society (*jāhili* culture) (Ebrāhīmīpūr and Fakhrī 2018, 28; Ṭabāṭabā’ī 1973,

6:5). In this model, the religion of Islam, in its very first days, presented true beliefs (such as monotheism) all at once, but in the stage of legislation and the transformation of practical customs, it institutionalized the laws gradually, over the course of twenty-three years (Ṭabāṭabā'ī 1973, 4:248). In the end, these stages, through the instruments of “persuasion” (for the elite) and “imitation and diffusion” (for the masses), and relying upon the political power of the Prophet, lead to the establishment of the society of faith (Ebrāhīmīpūr and Fakhrī 2018, 23 and 27).

b. The Stages of Transformation in the School of *Min Wahy al-Qur'ān* and Aligned Approaches (A Movement-Based, Networked Approach)

In contrast to the structure-centered approach of *al-Mīzān*, Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Faḍlullāh and researchers aligned with his school have formulated the stages of transformation through a movement-centered approach. The point of departure and the first stage in this model is “individual transformation,” realized through the awakening of conscience, the purification of the self, and the change of the human being’s inner sentiments (the transformation of the self) (Faḍlullāh 1998, 13:28; Abū Bakr 2021, 286). After the transformation of human agency, this change extends in networked fashion, through the successive stages of “familial transformation” (Abū Bakr 2021, pp. 286-287), “tribal transformation” (the warning of one’s clan and kin) (Abū Bakr 2021, pp. 287-288), “communal transformation” (the transformation of the structure of Meccan society as the Mother of Cities [*umm al-qurā*]) (Abū Bakr 2021, pp. 288-289), and, finally, “global and transnational transformation” (Abū Bakr 2021, pp. 289-291). In this reading, the historical stages of the mission comprise a Meccan phase of communal formation and a Medinan phase in which new institutions — the mosque, social solidarity, the market, and an administrative and military order — consolidated the transformation (Abū Bakr 2021, pp. 288-290). Faḍlullāh, like ‘Allāmah Ṭabāṭabā'ī, emphasizes the definite pattern of “gradualness” in these stages, so that the nascent society may be able to bear the heavy burden of religious obligations and of struggle against the *ṭawāghūt* of *jāhiliyyah*.

4.4. The Indicators of the Society of Faith

The transition from *jāhiliyyah* to the society of faith requires the establishment of indicators that guarantee the cohesion, stability, rationality, and resistance of the ummah. These indicators have been formulated, in the two contemporary exegetical schools, in the form of legal, moral, oversight-related, and transnational components.

a. Structural and Legal Indicators

Equality and Substitutive Brotherhood, as against Fanaticism and Exploitation. In the intellectual system of ‘Allāmah Ṭabāṭabā’ī, the first indicator of the society of faith is the bridling of the despotic instinct of “the exploitation of others” and the establishment of “social justice” in the sense of equality in the rights of life and freedom of righteous will (Ṭabāṭabā’ī 1973, 3:575). In this system, the “brotherhood of faith” is not merely an emotional slogan, but a “conventional and contractual relation” that carries binding legal and canonical effects for the regulation of social relations (Ṭabāṭabā’ī 1973, 18:315-316). In the school of *Min Wahy al-Qur’ān*, Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Faḍlullāh analyzes this indicator through the expression, “faith is a bond of flesh like the bond of lineage,” and regards it as the definitive substitute for blind *jāhili* fanaticisms (Faḍlullāh 1998, 21:146). From his perspective, the salient indicator of the society of faith is the creation of balance among the members of society, the restoration of affairs to their natural course, and the granting of the right to its rightful holder, so that, through this, obedience to the divine commands may be realized within the very fabric of society (Faḍlullāh 1998, 21:146).

b. Moral and Cohesive Indicators

Social Patience, Forgiveness, and the Consolidation of Minor Bonds. One of the analytical innovations in explaining the indicators of the society of faith is attention to moral virtues not as an individual matter, but as “the pillars of social stability.” In the exegesis of *al-Mīzān*, “social patience” is one of the principal pillars of the society of faith; that is, society, in order to pass through crises and to keep pace with material and spiritual development, requires collective steadfastness and endurance in the face of hardships (Sulṭānī Ranānī 2011, pp. 65 & 83). In addition, indicators such as “forgiveness and

pardon” and “the joining of kinship ties” (*ṣilat al-raḥim*) are counted among the key factors in the internal consolidation of society, such that the severance of these bonds (*qaṭ‘ al-raḥim*) is assessed as a sign of the moral decline of society and a cause of corruption on the earth, and a society lacking these indicators will not be worthy of survival (Sulṭānī Ranānī 2011, 88). These moral components, together with modesty and chastity, prevent transgression against the sanctity of one’s fellow human beings and guarantee the stability of society.

c. Indicators of Agency and Oversight

In the analysis of the indicators pertaining to human agency, “enjoining the good and forbidding the evil” (*al-amr bi-al-ma‘rūf wa-al-nahy ‘an al-munkar*) is, in both exegeses, counted among the factors of the dynamism, responsibility, and safeguarding of the society of faith. ‘Allāmah Ṭabāṭabā’ī regards this obligation as the guarantor of the survival of sound conventional perceptions and as one of the characteristics of the social spirit of Islam, capable of protecting society against the encroachment of despots and tyrants (see Ṭabāṭabā’ī 1973, 6:353; Sulṭānī Ranānī 2011, 88).

In the exegesis of the concept of the “middle ummah” as well, a commonality in the principle of the distinguished station of the Islamic ummah is observed, together with a difference in the two exegetes’ respective focus of emphasis. In *al-Mizān*, the middleness of the ummah refers chiefly to moderation and to the avoidance of excess and deficiency in the material and spiritual dimensions (Ṭabāṭabā’ī 1973, 1:323). In *Min Waḥy al-Qur’ān*, greater emphasis is observed on the vanguard station, leadership, and exemplary role of the Islamic ummah for other nations, and on its fulfillment of the role of a witness over the people (Faḍlullāh 1998, 3:73). This difference, accordingly, should be regarded as the outcome of the present study’s own analytical comparison, and not as one exegete’s direct critique of the other’s viewpoint, nor as a fundamental opposition between them.

d. Civilizational and Transnational Indicators

Doctrinal Independence and the Negation of Submission to Domination. On the macro, civilizational level, the most important indicator of the society of faith upon which both thinkers hold a strategic consensus is “the preservation of doctrinal independence” and

“the negation of any guardianship of unbelievers” (the rule of the negation of a way [for unbelievers over believers]). The society of faith is a society that stands firm against the hegemony of arrogant currents and modern *ṭawāghīt*, and that avoids any leniency in its foundational principles (see Ṭabāṭabā’ī 1973, 12:266; Faḍlullāh 1998, 24:459). Likewise, in the sphere of international interactions, this society engages with other societies on the basis of strategies such as freedom of invitation, Islamic sovereignty, and the implementation of divine ordinances, so that, while preserving its own identity, it may expand the monotheistic discourse. The combination of this political and cultural independence with economic dynamism creates a society that is the concrete model for emergence from history’s enduring *jāhiliyyah*.

5. Comparative Analysis of the Views of *al-Mīzān* and *Min Wahy al-Qur’ān*

The comparative examination of the two exegeses *al-Mīzān* and *Min Wahy al-Qur’ān* regarding the transition from the *jāhili* society to the society of faith reveals the intersection of two approaches that are different yet complementary within Qur’anic thought. In this section, the points of commonality and the foundational differences between the two works in explaining social transformations are analyzed.

5.1. Exegetical Commonalities in the Analysis of the Transition from *Jāhiliyyah*

The comparative examination of the exegeses of *al-Mīzān* and *Min Wahy al-Qur’ān* shows that the two exegetes converge on three axes in explaining the transition from the *jāhili* to the society of faith. First, both, citing the divine pattern, “...*Indeed Allah does not change a people’s lot, unless they change what is in their souls...*” (*al-Ra’d*/13), emphasize human agency and the negation of historical determinism, and relate social changes to the inner, volitional transformation of human beings (Ṭabāṭabā’ī 1973, 11:310; Faḍlullāh 1998, 13:28). Second, both regard the reconciliation of hearts as a condition for passing beyond *jāhili* division and fanaticism; ‘Allāmah Ṭabāṭabā’ī presents it as an affinity that is innate and beyond material means (Ṭabāṭabā’ī 1973, 9:118–119), while Faḍlullāh regards it as a bond grounded in the thought and spirit of Islam as against former fanaticisms (Faḍlullāh 1998, 6:195–196). Third, both exegetes identify

blind imitation of forebears and the sanctification of false customs as among the factors sustaining *jāhiliyyah* and resisting rational and revelatory guidance (Ṭabāṭabā'ī 1973, 18:93; Faḍlullāh 1998, 20:226).

5.2. Differences of Approach and Analysis

Despite the commonalities between the two exegeses, differences are observed in their language and focus of analysis. 'Allāmah Ṭabāṭabā'ī, with an ontological and philosophical approach, regards the concepts of “light,” “darkness,” and “bringing forth from darkness into light” as existential (*takwīnī*) truths connected to the inward reality of obedience and disobedience, and not merely as metaphors for guidance and misguidance (Ṭabāṭabā'ī 1973, 2:346). In *Min Wahy al-Qur'ān*-without this being taken as an explicit critique of 'Allāmah Ṭabāṭabā'ī's view-a greater emphasis on the conventional signification and the concrete effects of guidance and misguidance in human life is observed (Faḍlullāh 1998, 5:59-60). A further difference pertains to the scope of application of the concept of *jāhiliyyah*: 'Allāmah Ṭabāṭabā'ī examines its roots in severance from the truth, self-centeredness, and the absence of genuine knowledge (Ṭabāṭabā'ī 1973, 4:152), whereas Faḍlullāh extends “the judgment of *jāhiliyyah*” to the contemporary political sphere, counting secular legislative systems independent of revelation among the instances of *jāhiliyyah* and *ṭāghūt* (Faḍlullāh 1998, 8:206-207).

Conclusion

The comparative examination of the exegetical propositions of *al-Mizān* and *Min Wahy al-Qur'ān* showed that the transition from the *jāhilī* society to the society of faith, in both exegeses, is a multidimensional process and the product of the connection between the inner transformation of the human being and the reform of social relations. *Jāhiliyyah*, within this framework, is not confined merely to a historical period prior to the mission (*bi'thah*); rather, it is an intellectual, evaluative, and social condition that is reproduced through the predominance of non-monotheistic criteria, prejudice, unjust judgment, and illegitimate domination. The society of faith, by contrast, is realized when monotheistic faith transcends the level of individual belief and manifests itself in behavior, in reciprocal relations, and in social rules.

The most important commonality between the two exegetes is their linking of social transformation to revelatory guidance and to the human being's responsible choice. On the basis of this understanding, the transformation of a society's condition will not be stable without the reform of the beliefs, motivations, and inner orientations of its actors; just as inner transformation, likewise, does not culminate in social transformation without its manifestation in righteous action, justice, brotherhood, the reform of relations, and collective responsibility. Accordingly, monotheism, God-wariness, justice, the brotherhood of faith, moral oversight, and the negation of unjust domination are the most important indicators of the society of faith within the data examined.

The most important difference between the two exegeses pertains to their focus of emphasis and their analytical idiom. In *al-Mīzān*, the explanation of the relation among innate human nature (*fiṭrah*), the divine *sunan*, legislation (*tashrīʿ*), conventional relations, and social order is more prominent; whereas in *Min Wahy al-Qurʾān*, a formational-movemental idiom, the awakening of the will, the responsibility of choice, resistance to domination, and the active presence of believers in the reform of social reality are more manifest. This difference, nevertheless, cannot be reduced to an absolute opposition between "structuralism" and "agency-centeredness," or to movement "from outside to inside" versus "from inside to outside"; for both exegetes, albeit in differing degrees, attend to the role of the responsible human being and to the necessity of reforming social order.

The findings of the research further showed that neither exegete has offered an explicit, linear, and named model of the stages of the transformation of the *jāhili* society into the society of faith. Accordingly, the stages of "the manifestation of the crisis of *jāhili* criteria, inner reorientation, the conversion of the values of faith into action and relation, and their consolidation in social rules" constitute the present study's own analytical reconstruction from the set of exegetical propositions. Gradualness within this reconstruction signifies the continuity among awareness-raising, formation, action, and the social consolidation of values, and not a fixed, unalterable temporal sequence; for these dimensions may be realized simultaneously or in interaction with one another.

The final outcome of the research is that the society of faith arises neither merely from the assembly of righteous individuals nor solely through the establishment of legal structures; rather, it is the product of a relatively coherent connection among faith, ethics, responsible action, justice, and rules that protect rights. The innovation of this research lies in the direct comparison of the two exegeses on the axis of the relation between the transformation of “what is within the self” and social order, and likewise in the separation between the exegetes’ explicit viewpoints and the author’s analytical reconstruction. Given that the research is limited to selected exegetical propositions, the generalization of these findings to operative models of social transformation requires the determination of operational indicators and an independent examination of historical and social evidence.

References

- Qarai, Ali Quli. Trans. (2005). *The Quran: With a Phrase-by-Phrase English Translation* (2nd ed.). London: ICAS Press.
- Abū Bakr, Drāmī. (2021). A model of socio-cultural transformation in the Qur’anic perspective. *Humanitarian & Natural Sciences Journal*, 2(11), 278-297. <https://www.hnjournal.net/en/2-11-18/>
- Ebrāhīmīpūr, Q., & Fakhri, M. (1396Sh/2018). Cultural changes from the perspective of ‘Allāmah Ṭabāṭabā’ī. *Social- Cultural Studies of Hawzah*, 1(2), 1-22. doi: 10.22081/scs.2018.67379
- Faḍlullāh, Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn. (1419AH/1998). *Min wahy al-Qur’an*. Beirut: Dār al-Malāk lil-Ṭibā’ah wa-al-Nashr.
- Fakhr Rāzī, Muḥammad ibn ‘Umar. (1420AH/1999). *Mafātīḥ al-ghayb* (3rd ed.). Beirut: Dār Iḥyā’ al-Turāth al-‘Arabī.
- Farāhīdī, Khalīl b. Aḥmad. (1410AH/1989). *Kitāb al-‘ayn* (2nd ed.). Qum: Hijrat Publications.
- Ḥusaynī Mīrṣafī, F. (1393Sh/2014). Social Tendency in Al-Mīzān fī Tafsīr al-Qur’an. *Andisheh Allameh*, 1(1), 131-145.
- Ibn Fāris, Aḥmad. (1404AH/1983). *Mu‘jam maqāyīs al-lughah*. Qum: Maktab al-A‘lām al-Islāmī.

- Ibn Manẓūr, Muḥammad ibn Mukarram. (1414AH/1993). *Lisān al-‘Arab* (3rd ed.). Beirut: Dār al-Fikr_ Dār Ṣādir.
- Iyāzī, Muḥammad ‘Alī. (1414AH/1993). *Al-Mufasssirūn: Ḥayātuhum wa-manhajuhum*. Tehran: Mu’assasat al-Ṭibā‘ah wa-al-Nashr, Wizārat al-Thaqāfah wa-al-‘Irshād al-Islāmī.
- Jawharī, Ismā‘īl ibn Ḥammād. (1404AH/1984). *Al-Ṣiḥāḥ: Tāj al-lughah wa-ṣiḥāḥ al-‘arabiyyah*. Beirut: Dār al-‘Ilm lil-Malāyīn.
- Mudāmī, R. (1401Sh/2022). Examining the strategies embedded in ‘Allāmah Ṭabāṭabā’ī’s theory of conventional perceptions for the attainment of peace and peaceful coexistence. *Metaphysical Research*, 3(1), 325-360. Dor: 20.1001.1.21982783.1401.3.5.18.9
- Nafīsī, Shādī. (1393Sh/2014). Social Interpretation of Quran; Definition and Traits. *Journal of Qur’anic Interpretation and language*, 2(2), 46-66.
- Parsāniyā, Ḥ., Dānā’ī-Fard, Ḥ., & Ḥusaynī, Sayyid A. (1393Sh/2014). Implications of the Theory of Conventions in order to transform the Humanities. *Islam and Social Studies*, 2(5), 23-48. https://jiss.isca.ac.ir/article_48.html?lang=en
- Qāḍavī, Sayyid H., Parvāneh, F., & Sa‘īdīnasab, T. (1399Sh/2020). Examining the Differences Between Early and Modern Ignorance in the Quran, Hadiths and Narrations and The Role of the Islamic Revolution of Iran In Eliminating Modern Ignorance. *Islamic Revolution Research*, 9(1), 55-72. https://www.roir.ir/article_111633.html?lang=en
- Rāghib Iṣfahānī, Ḥusayn b. Muḥammad. (1412AH/1991). *Mufradāt-i alfāz al-Qur’ān*. Lebanon-Syria: Dār al-‘Ilm-Al-Dār al-Shāmiyyah.
- Riḍāzādih Jūdī, Muḥammad Kāzīm, & Riḍāzādih Jūdī, Mahdī. (1394Sh/2015). The Civilizational Model of Islam in Prophetic Tradition with an Emphasize on the Verses of the Holy Quran. *Journal of Quranic Knowledge*, 6(20), 166-189. <https://doi.org/10.22054/rjqk.2015.2357>
- Sha‘bānpūr, M., & Bishārtī, Z. (1393Sh/2014). Strategies to Deal with the Moral Dimensions of Ignorance in Modern Societies (Relying on the Quran and the Makarem Al-Akhlaq Prayer). *Journal of Quranic Knowledge*, 4(15), 69-93. <https://doi.org/10.22054/rjqk.2015.1031>

- Sultānī Ranānī, Sayyid Mahdī. (1390Sh/2011). The structural analysis of the desired ethical society from the viewpoint of ‘Allāmah Ṭabāṭabā’ī. *Applied Ethics Studies*, 7(25), 65-88.
https://akhlagh.morsalat.ir/article_21109.html?lang=en
- Ṭabarī, Abū Ja‘far Muḥammad ibn Jarīr. (1412AH/1991). *Jāmi‘ al-bayān fī tafsīr al-Qur‘ān*. Beirut: Dār al-Ma‘rifah.
- Ṭabarsī, Faḍl ibn Ḥasan. (1372Sh/1993). *Majma‘ al-bayān fī tafsīr al-Qur‘ān* (3rd ed.). Tehran: Intishārāt-i Nāṣir Khusraw.
- Ṭabāṭabā’ī, Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn. (1393AH/1973). *Al-Mīzān fī tafsīr al-Qur‘ān*. Beirut: Mu‘assasat al-A‘lamī lil-Maṭbū‘āt.
- Zabīdī, Murtaḍā. (1414AH/1993). *Tāj al-‘arūs min jawāhir al-qāmūs*. Beirut: Dār al-Fikr.
- Zamakhsharī, Maḥmūd ibn ‘Umar. (1407AH/1986). *Al-Kashshāf ‘an ḥaqā’iq ghawāmiḍ al-tanzīl*. Beirut: Dār al-Kitāb al-‘Arabī.