

A Syntactico-Semantic Analysis of *Ġahd* (=deny) Structure and its Equivalences in Quran's Persian Translations

Ali Hajikhani*

Department of Quran & Hadith Studies at Tarbiat Modares University (TMU), Tehran, Iran

Nosrat Hejazi

French Language Department at Tarbiat Modares University (TMU), Tehran, Iran

Sadegh Abbasi

. Alumni of Quran & Hadith Studies at Tarbiat Modares University (TMU), Tehran, Iran

Received on: 1-4-2024

Accepted on: 4-2-2025

Abstract

The word *Ġahd* and *Ġahd* structures being complex and polyvalent in the Arabic language, it is challenging to find an appropriate equivalent for this structure in most languages. This article deals with the analysis of the structure of *Ġahd* in 2 forms “*Mā kāna al-fāilo liyaḥ'al*” and “*Mā kāna liḥ'āilo an yaḥ'al*”, some of which have been criticized and evaluated after providing suitable equivalents for them in Persian. The most important results of this research indicate that in the analysis of the structure of *Ġahd*, either the Astarābādi's point of view according to which *Kāna* belongs to *Munāsiban* should be used, or *Kāna* defined as “*sabata*”[«سَبَّأَ»] should be taken into consideration. According to the first opinion, *Ġahd* structure is translatable to: “It is not in the subject's dignity to do so” and according to the second opinion, *Ġahd* is articulated and interpreted as: “The subject is not such as to do so”.

Keywords: *Ġahd* structure, *Lām Ġahūd*, Persian translations, *Qur'an*, Syntactico-Semantic Analysis.

Introduction

The Arabic word *Ġahd* is characterized by its complexity and difficulty, as it encompasses a range of definitions that are recognized by lexicographers but do not converge easily. This intricate nature has given rise to misleading interpretations, culminating in incorrect translations. Moreover, in other languages, it is frequently difficult, if not entirely impossible, to find an equivalent structure for the Arabic concepts of *Ġahd* and *Ġahūd*. This paper tends to answer these questions:

1. How many types of *Ġahd* structure are there in Arabic grammar and which of the analysis of grammarians is more compatible with the meaning and application of this structure in the Quran?
2. Were Persian translators successful in rendering the Farsi (Persian) equivalents of *Ġahd* structure and which syntactic analysis did they follow?

© 2026 JJMLL Publishers/Yarmouk University. All Rights Reserved,

* Doi: <https://doi.org/10.47012/jjml.18.1.2>

* Corresponding Author: nos_hej@modares.ac.ir

This paper commences with a review of the views held by syntacticians and semanticists, investigating the extent to which their interpretations correspond with examples from the Quran. It further critiques the success of Persian translators in translating this structural element in the Quran. Additionally, given that negative verbs with *lam* and *lammā* are categorized as *Ĝahd* verbs in various grammar references, this study will also encompass them.

The Literature Review in this respect is not fairly expanded. However, some articles in Persian have investigated this issue. The most noteworthy is titled as “*Mā kāna liyaʿalʿ*. Reflections on its Syntactic Structure and its Persian Renditions” (Āsch 2011), in which the author argues that the adverb “never” is a suitable equivalent for the Qur’anic expression “*Mā kāna liyaʿalʿ*”, while examining the success of the translators in rendering this construction and in interpreting this specific construction.

“Research on *Lām Ĝahūd* in the Qur’an and its Persian Comparison” (Šokrānī and Kiānī 2013) is another paper which investigates the structure of *Lām Ĝahūd* in the Qur’an. The study determined that the primary advantage of *Lām Ĝahūd* lies in its focus on negation rather than providing an explanation for the cause. Consequently, the predicate of the sentence is represented by the verb in the present tense, eliminating the necessity for any omitted elements, such as “*muridan*”. A significant limitation of both articles is their failure to elucidate the connection between the designation of *Ĝahd* and the structure under consideration. Furthermore, although they thoroughly analyzed the perspectives of both Basrians and Koufians, they conflated these two viewpoints in their conclusion. Specifically, the present tense verb is regarded as implicit (“in Basrian’s view”), and similarly, it is presented without necessitating a connection to the predicate of *Kāna* (“Kufian’s view”). Meanwhile, the verb associated with an is understood as an infinitive and does not qualify as a predicate on its own. Roostāyi and Kašfi (2016) contribute further research in this area, citing Rāġeb Esfahāni’s definition of the term. They describe it as “Negating everything that a person has believed and accepted in his heart” and classify the comprehension of the term into two separate categories:

The first category, which includes several linguists such as Farāhidi, Azhari, Johari, Tarihi, and Rāġeb Esfahāni, holds the view that the term *Jahd* is employed when the subject of *Ĝahd* (*Maġhūd*) is evident and apparent, and the individual is aware of it, but he concedes contrary to his understanding. Ibn Darid holds a comparable view, suggesting that the term “*Ĝahūd*” is relevant in scenarios where an individual comprehends the truth of a particular issue but deliberately denies it. This reflects a situation where an individual is aware of the facts yet opts to deny their existence.

In the second category, Ibn Fāres presents the original meaning of this term as “less good”. While he aligns with the group regarding the initial definition of the word, his explanation of the primary meaning diverges from the views of other lexicographers. Ibn Fāres’ viewpoint is notably differentiated from those of other linguists due to his focus on the word’s early position. At first, this term was solely interpreted as “less good”, but its semantic range has since expanded to include various other interpretations. By referencing a Qur’anic example, he finds common ground with other linguists.

1. Lexical analysis

A comprehensive examination reveals that lexicographers have identified two primary interpretations of the term *Ġahd*. One interpretation is associated with the concepts of (“less good” and “drought” and “low plant growth” and “poverty”). (Ibn Fāres 1983, 425; Zamaḥṣarī 2013, 83). Some scholars have interpreted it as the act of “denying something while being aware of its truth”, which stands in opposition to the concept of “admitting” (Farāhidi 1988, 72; Rāḡeb 1991, 187; Ibn Manzūr 1993, 106; Mostafavī 1989, 56). An analysis of the examples provided by the lexicographers reveals that it is feasible to condense the two differing opinions. The first group of examples includes the verb “*ġāhed, yaġhadu*”, along with its infinitive “*Ġahd*” and the related adjectives “*ġāhed*”, all of which are essential and convey meanings such as “less good”, “neglect”, “lack of rain/drought”, and “poverty”. Furthermore, the application of this term to verbs signifies the manifestation of this attribute in relation to its subject. For example, “*aġhada raġol*” means “He turns into a poor man” and “*āmon moġhid*” means “dry year”. In the instances belonging to the second category, the verb appears in the forms of “*ġahadah, yaġhado, ġahdan,* and *ġohudā*” as well as “*Ġahada beša'y*” all of which are in the transitive form. According to this interpretation, it can be asserted that the subject denies the good and benefit associated with its object. Consequently, the meaning of the term approaches that of “negation”, standing in contrast to “confession”. In the Qur'anic usage of this word, denial has usually occurred while the denier has knowledge in his heart about the truth of what he is denying, and even knowledge close to certainty: “and they denied it, while their souls unjustly and arrogantly affirmed it, so behold what was the end of the corruptors” (27; 14)². The term *Ġahd* in the Holy *Qur'an* is not employed in the absolute sense of denial; rather, it can be interpreted positively, such as in the context of rejecting falsehood. This usage appears to stem from the fact that *Ġahd* is consistently accompanied by the genitive prepositional letter *bā*³, which conveys the notion of “denial with knowledge” when the term is used transitively with this preposition. The citation from the author of *Tāġ al-Arus*, referencing a scholar of the Arabic language, supports this viewpoint: “One of them stated: Whenever *Ġahd* is used transitively, it conveys the meaning of disbelief” ([Al]Zabidi 1993, 376). As the research progresses, it is crucial to consider this assertion; for if we interpret *Ġahd* as “the denial of something while possessing internal knowledge of its truth,” it would be erroneous to label what grammarians refer to as *Ġahd* and *Ġahūd*. Such an interpretation necessitates a foundation of disbelief. In instances where the agents of the *Ġahd* structure are Allah, the Prophet, or the believers, it is not possible to attribute the denial of a fact, while also being aware of its authenticity, to these individuals. Thus, it is evident that when *Ġahd* is utilized in a transitive form without the genitive prepositional letter *bā*, it denotes “absolute denial” and does not imply a negative charge.

2. Syntactic analysis

The definition of *Ġahd* in *Al-Mu'ġam al-Mufassal fil Nahw al-Arabi* describes it as a unique form of negation that signifies the act of notifying the abandonment of an action. This concept is encapsulated in a single letter known as *Lām Ġahūd*, which pertains to the participle verb. It is usually preceded by the verb *Kāna* negated with *mā* or the verb *yakūn* negated with *Lām* (Bābati 1992, 402). The interpretation of

Ĝahd has been viewed differently by rhetoricians. According to Ibn Šeyṭ Qaraši, *Ĝahd* is defined as “the denial of something that is inherently undeniable, with this denial functioning as a form of exaggeration” (Matlūb 1989, 445). The verse (12; 31)⁴ articulates “≈And they said: May this be human! He is nothing but a noble angel”, it is clear that Yūsuf’s humanity is irrefutable. Nevertheless, the women of Egypt have dismissed his human attributes to enhance the perception of Ĝosef (Yūsuf) as an angelic figure. Grammarians have used to accept the definition of *Al-Mu’ğam al-Mufassal* for *Ĝahūd*. Therefore, the same structure is examined in the *Qur’an*.

3. Semantic analysis of the structure of *Ĝahd* in the *Holy Quran*

The prevalence of the *Ĝahd* structure in the *Holy Qur’an* is significant; thus, it is essential to explore its diverse forms, structural characteristics, and various applications within the text. Additionally, it is important to distinguish it from negation, which will aid in understanding the implementation of *Ĝahd* in the *Qur’an* and in identifying appropriate equivalents in both Persian and English. Research indicates that two distinct structures of *Ĝahd* can be recognized in the *Qur’an*, which will be succinctly presented.

3.1. Analysing the participle structure of “*mā kāna alfāilo liyaf’al*”⁵

The most significant structure recognized in Arabic grammar as *Ĝahd* is formed by the negative form of the verb *kāna* followed by a verb in the nominative case. Ibn Hishām defines *Lām Ĝahūd* as the structure that introduces the present tense in a word that is preceded by either *kāna* or *lam yakon* in an imperfect form. Furthermore, the verb that follows *lām* is also referenced. For instance, in the verse “≈And Allah would not reveal to you the unseen” (3, 179) and “≈Allah would never forgive them” (4, 137 & 4, 138).⁶ Most grammarians call it *Lām Ĝahūd*; because it is always associated with *Ĝahd* which means “negation”. Nahnās said: “The reward is to call it *Lām Naḫy*”; because *Ĝahd* in the word is denying what you know; no absolute denial. (Ibn Hishām 1985, 211). This structure, irrespective of the designation we assign to it, stands as one of the most significant and frequently employed structures within the *Qur’an*. It is evident from Ibn Hishām’s terminology and his references to Nahnās that he concurs with him and expresses a preference against the term *Ĝahūd*; however, the crucial point is that this structure is distinct from negation. One of the major differences that strikes at first glance is that in negation, there is a possibility that it will turn into proof; but in *Ĝahd*, negation is eternal. If we look at this structure in the *Holy Qur’an*, we encounter that many cases of *Ĝahd* are essentially transtemporal and are not limited to a specific period, neither in the past nor in the future. As per “≈Allah would not leave the believers in what you are in until He distinguished the bad from the good, and Allah would not reveal to you the unseen...” (3; 179)⁷. This verse, along with similar ones, constitutes part of Allah’s traditions, and in essence, it is not possible to designate a particular time for it.

Ibn Hishām designates this structure as “emphasis on negation” to establish a clear distinction. He further analyzes it through the lens of the grammarians from Kufa and Basra, indicating that the original formulation of “*Mā kāna leyaf’al*” was “*Mā kāna yaf’al*”. Consequently, among the Koufians, the term *lām* serves as an emphatic redundant element that does not render the subsequent word; but it indicates the present tense in *nasb*. Even if this *lām* were to function as a preposition, its redundancy would prevent

it from being associated with any particular element. Therefore, since it is not prepositional, it does not inherently relate to anything (Ibn Hishām 1985, 211).

Halabi, having cited the analysis from the Koufians, critiques their argument by referencing Abul-Baqāh : “If *Lām* is unnecessary, it cannot act as the agent”. He subsequently provides his own response: “*Lām* here is like the prepositional letters, which is both redundant and functional” (Halabi 1993, 270). Halabi has largely failed to address the issues raised by Abul-Baqāh. Firstly, the excessive use of prepositions is not universally accepted among grammarians. Secondly, there is a consensus among grammarians that when a verb is in the accusative case, it is understood as an infinitive. Once a verb is interpreted as an infinitive, it loses its status as a verb and instead becomes a noun. Therefore, how can a transformation that converts a verb into a noun be regarded as redundant?

The problem is particularly noticeable when the Koufians dismiss the identification of an after *lām* and link the assignment of *nasb* directly to *lām*. Furthermore, this analysis presents a considerable semantic dilemma; if *lām* is regarded as redundant, the meaning of *Ġahd* would be lost, making it inappropriate to refer to it as *Lām Ġahūd*. In this instance, similar to the approach taken by the Kufis, it is essential to assign the meaning of *Ġahd* to *Kāna*. This assertion is incorrect; if one were to eliminate the meaning of *Lām* and regard it as superfluous, the sentence's structure would transform into that of the past continuous tense, thereby rendering the interpretation of *Ġahd* impossible. For example, the interpretation of this verse would suggest that if a specific event had not occurred to you believers, another event would have taken place; for, in any circumstance, Allah would not abandon you in your current state.

A comparison of this structure with similar constructs in the *Holy Qur'an* highlights the significance of *An nasba*. For example, when this structure is juxtaposed with the statement “≈This Qur'an is not such as can be produced by other than Allah” (110; 37)⁸, it is apparent that both sentences exhibit the same structural characteristics as *Ġahd*, differing only in the removal of *lām* instead of *an nasaba*. To rephrase, this sentence may be expressed as follows: «وما كان هذا القرآن ليُفتري». When analyzing this sentence in relation to the structure of *Ġahd*, Astarābādi notes, “The absence of *lām* in this verse is due to the inclusion of *An in Nasba*, while the omission of *An* in *Nasba* within *Ġahd* is attributed to the presence of *Lām* in *Ġahūd*” (Astarābādi 2005, 62). The viewpoint of the Koufians, which claims that “*Lām* is not a prepositional term (*ġarrah*)⁹; instead, the verb determines its own meaning”, lacks substance and contradicts the realities of linguistic structure. Ibn Hishām then addresses the views of the Basrian scholars, noting, “From the perspective of the Basrian scholars, the fundamental meaning is ‘what was meant to be accomplished’¹⁰ and the negation of the intention is more significant than the negation of the verb”. Thus, these experts contend that *Lām* is a transitive predicate and falls under the category of omitted predicates, which must be acknowledged as an implied object (Ibn Hishām 1985, 211-212). A significant number of grammarians have accepted the Basrian viewpoint, referring to this omitted component as “intentional”, “desired”, or “fulfilled”¹¹ (Barakāt 2007, 61; Sāfi 1997, 385).

There are two problems with this combination:

To begin with, the syntactic and lexical forms that convey the infinitive intention (*Qasd*) ([Al]Fayūmi 1993, 505) and volition (*Irāda*) ([Al]Fayūmi 1993, 246) are characterized as transitive and

do not necessitate the use of *lām* to modify the object. This is illustrated by the fact that *Qāsedan* and *Arāda* in the *Qur'an* are transitive to their objects at all times without the presence of *lām*. Additionally, it is widely accepted among linguists that intention and volition are not modified by the prepositional letter *lām* (Rāḡeb 1991, 371; [Al]Fayūmi 1993, 245). Consequently, the phrases *Le yaḡara* or *Le yatla'a* in the verse under consideration cannot be attributed to *Qāsedan* and *Muridan*. The infinitive *reḡa* is rendered transitive either in the absence of a preposition or with the prepositions *bā* or *an*; *Raḡi Beh* or *Raḡi Anhu* (Ibn Fāres 1983, 402; Ibn Manzūr 1993, 325). However, if it is transitive with the letter *lām*, it conveys the meaning that “someone is content with something on behalf of someone else” ; as per “~And I have chosen for you Islam as your religion” (5; 3)¹². Therefore, the definition of *Rāḡian* is also incorrect.

The second challenge is of a semantic nature. By analyzing the structure of *Ġahd* in various *Qur'anic* verses and the narrations attributed to the “Infallibles” (peace be upon them), it becomes evident that the negation pertains to the potential for the act to transpire, rather than the existence of an active will. In other words, while the action cannot take place, it does not mean that the subject lacks the will to engage in it. For example, when Allah proclaims: “~It was not for Allah to oppress them” (29; 40)¹³, He denies the possibility of oppressing His servants, rather than indicating a lack of will or consent to do so.

In other words, oppression is entirely incompatible with the divine nature of Allah, and His dignity is not associated with oppression. It is not merely that Allah is incapable of oppressing His servants; rather, He chooses not to do so. This concept has been articulated by Allah in various other expressions. As per stated in the verse “~And I am not unjust to my servants” (50; 29)¹⁴.

Raziuddin Astarābādi presents another approach to addressing this dilemma. He posits that *Lām* in this sentence is comparable to *Lām* in the phrase «أنت لهذه الخطة» , much like saying أنت مناسبة لها أى تلىق , «أنت مناسبة لها أى تلىق» which translates to “You are suitable for it or this task is well-suited for you”. Therefore, when someone expresses, «ما كنت لأفعل كذا» (“I wouldn't do that”) it means to say «ما كنتُ مناسباً لأفعل كذا ولا» (“I was not fit to do this and it is not appropriate for me”) (Astarābādi 4; 61). Concurrently, this analysis regards the verb as being associated *an-moqqadara*¹⁵, however, it lacks the morpho-lexical deficiencies identified in the grammarians' examination. This is due to the fact that “property” or “worthiness” becomes transitive with the use of *lām*. Meanwhile, it is necessary to answer two important questions from a semantic point of view: First of all, does “*Kāna*” signify past tense based on its meaning, or is it a general term that encompasses all tenses? Second, is it necessary to interpret “*Lām*”—whatever its function may be—and the verb that follows it as belonging to an omitted verb or noun?

In response to the first question, grammarians have not considered *Kāna* to be specific to the past tense; Rather, negation includes past, present, and future. (Bābati 1992, 873)

Understanding the answer to the second question requires a comparison of the structure of *Ġahd* with its related negation, as seen in expressions such as “~It was not for Allah to oppress them” (29; 40)¹⁶ and “~And I am not unjust to my servants” (50; 29)¹⁷. As previously noted, the structure of the negation

inherently denies the possibility of an event occurring, rather than doing so in a relative or valid manner, such as through consent or will.

Based on the totality of what has been said, if we interpret verse 40 of Surah Anġabūt (=It was not for Allah to oppress them)¹⁸ based on each of the three analyses above, the result is as follows:

- Analysis of the Koufians: Allah does not oppress them. (Just negating and removing the meaning of Ġahd)
- Analysis of the Basrians: Allah did not intend or will or is not pleased to oppress them. (Negation of consent, volition and intention.)
- Astarābādi's analysis: It is not proper and appropriate for Allah to oppress them. (Negation of dignity and proportion).

Considering the syntactic and semantic limitations inherent in the perspectives of the Koufians and Basrians, Astarābādi's viewpoint appears more suitable. This is due to the fact that, apart from lacking the syntactical structures found in the analyses of the Koufians and Basrians, it also dismisses the potential for the verb to arise from the subject, both intrinsically and due to its incongruity with his esteemed status.

3.2. Analysing "mā kāna liġāilo an yaf'al"¹⁹ structure

The construction of Ġahd can occasionally be achieved by altering the placement of *lām*, positioning it prior to the subject. For instance, one may observe this in the phrase "≈And it is not attributable to a prophet that he should act unfaithfully" (3; 161)²⁰ or in "≈It is not befitting to (the majesty of) Allah that He should have a son" (19; 35)²¹. The distinction between this variant of Ġahd and the initial structure lies in the verbal and semantic role of *lām*. In the initial structure, the presence of *Lām* on the verb indicates that the subject lacks the honor associated with performing the action of the verb. In contrast, in the second construction, *Lām* is affixed to the subject, indicating that the verb in question does not carry the dignity of the subject. Although grammarians have not designated this structure as Ġahd, a careful examination of the Qur'anic verses employing this structure reveals that its meaning aligns closely with that of the first structure. In Surah Maryam, the notion of Allah having a child is fundamentally incompatible with His essence, which is referred to as an inherent impossibility. This does not imply that it is within Allah's capacity to have a child; rather, it emphasizes that He does not engage in such an act. For enhanced understanding, the subsequent two examples merit attention :

« وَمَا كَانَ لِمُؤْمِنٍ وَلَا مُمْمِنَةٍ إِذَا قَضَى اللَّهُ وَرَسُولُهُ أَمْرًا أَنْ يَكُونَ لَهُمُ الْخِيَرَةُ مِنْ أَمْرِهِمْ » (احزاب/36)²²

and

« وَمَا كَانَ لِمُؤْمِنٍ أَنْ يَقْتُلَ مُؤْمِنًا إِلَّا خَطَأً » (نسا/93)²³

In the context of these two verses, the notions of free choice and the willful disregard for the commands of Allah and His Messenger, as well as the intentional act of killing a believer, are shown to be irreconcilable with true faith. A significant inquiry arising from the analysis of these verses is whether the term "*lām*" and its suffix are linked to "*kāna*" or to an omitted subject. It appears that the association of

the preposition with “*kāna*”, independent of any omitted reference, is the more valid interpretation. The reason grammarians value “*lām*” in the structure mentioned is their view that “*kāna*” is incomplete. They see “*kāna*” in a nominal sentence as linking the predicate to the subject. However, if we think of “*kāna*” as meaning “stability and constancy” then no assignment is necessary. Viewing “*kāna*” as complete changes the entire sentence structure. For example, in the verse 19: 35²⁴, “*mā kāna*” functions as a verb. “*Lillah*” serves as a preposition connected to “*kāna*”. The phrase “*an yattahez*” is a verb tied to its infinitive and subject, which is why it is nominative.

In comparing the first and second structures, we find that if the predicate, such as *Yanāseb*, is not intransitive in the second structure, then the first structure does not require an accusative assignment. Thus, we can see *Kāna* as complete and meaning “fixed”. In this case, for example, in the verse (3; 179)²⁵ “≈It is not (the purpose) of Allah to leave you in your present state” in the first structure, *Kāna* is a verb, *Allah* is a subject and *Leyaḍara* is an accusative verb. Based on this, it can be said in the translation: “Allah is not such as to abandon the believers”.

4. The Persian equivalent of the *Ĝahd* structure and its analysis in the translation of Pāyandeh, Foulādvand and Makārem

4.1. Proposing a Persian equivalent for the structure of Ĝahd

In order to evaluate the translations of the *Qur’an* from the structures of *Ĝahd*, since there is no completely equivalent structure for it in Persian, the correct method of translating this structure in Persian must first be determined.

4.1.1. Suggested Persian equivalent for Lām Ĝahūd (Mā kāna al-fāil liya’al).

Based on the analysis provided about *Lām Ĝahūd*, its former *Kāna* and its predicate, the following suggestions are offered:

- A- According to Astarābādi, constructions such as “It does not befit him that” or “It is not worthy / suitable for him” or “It is not worthy of him” and similar phrases should be used.
- B- If we agree with the opinion presented in this article regarding the completeness of *Kāna*, then structures such as (“the subject is not such as to do such a thing”) should be used.

Note: In the two articles mentioned in the literature review, the negation adverb in the Persian language “never” is proposed as an appropriate equivalent for the translation of the structure of *Ĝahd*. It is noteworthy that, Šokrāni and Kiyāni have understood *Ĝahd* to mean emphasizing negation. Therefore, they pinpoint that the word “never” is not used for emphasizing negation, but for indicating the necessity of negation in the future. But considering the fact that negation is emphatic, absolute, and is not time-bound in cases where *Ĝahd* is used about God’s actions, they have accepted the use of the affirmative adverb (never). (Šokrāni and Kiyāni 2013, 145 and Āseh 2011, 59). But this analysis is not deemed correct, because first of all, the structure of *Ĝahd* is not specific to a particular time; on the contrary, “never” is specific to future time. Secondly, as mentioned in this essay, better equivalents for the structure of *Ĝahd* can be found in the Persian language.

4.1.2. Suggested equivalent for second structure of Ġahd (*Mā kāna lilfā'ilo an yaf'al*)

To translate the second type of the structure of Ġahd, we can use the duality proposed by the first structure, such as “it does not befit him that” or “it is not worthy / suitable for him” or “the subject is not such as to do such a thing” and the like, but we should not translate it into phrases like “it is not permissible for the subject” or “the subject has no right” and similar. Because, these expressions turn the meaning of Ġahd, which is the negation of the dignity and compatibility of the act with the agent, into a legal prohibition.

To assess the effectiveness of modern translators regarding this issue, we have gathered various examples of verses that feature different structures of Ġahd in the Persian translations by Pāyandeh, Foulādvand, and Makārem. Subsequently, we will provide a concise overview of their evaluations concerning their general perspectives on the Ġahd structure.

4.2. Evaluation of translations in the first structure

As mentioned, in the Qur'an there are 10 cases of the structure “*Mā kāna al-fā'ilo liyaf'al*” (of course, only with the first form of *kāna* negated with *mā*), which are: 143 Baqarah, 179 Al-Imrān (2 cases), 33 Anfāl, 115 and 122 Taubah. 37 Yūnus, 117 Hūd, 40 Ankabūt and 44 Fātir.

The first example²⁶ of 2; 143: «وَمَا كَانَ اللَّهُ لِيُضِيعَ إِيمَانَكُمْ إِنَّ اللَّهَ بِالنَّاسِ لَرُؤُوفٌ رَحِيمٌ»

1. Pāyandeh: خدا چنان نبود که ایمان شما را تباہ کند (=God was not such as to destroy your faith).
2. Foulādvand: و خدا بر آن نبود که ایمان شما را ضایع گرداند (=And God did not intend to destroy your faith).
3. Makārem: و خدا هرگز ایمان [نماز] شما را ضایع نمی‌گرداند (=And God will never waste your faith [prayer]).

Foulādvand's translation has been formulated in accordance with the Basrian interpretation, which considers “*Muridan*” as a deleted property of “*Liyodi'a*” and as a predicate of *Kāna*. The primary issue with this translation, as previously discussed, is the misconception that the negation of the desire to execute the action (Allah does not wish for it) signifies a negation of the subject's dignity to perform that act. Instead, what is negated in this verse and similar verses is the subject's dignity (not in the glory of Allah) to engage in the specific action. Moreover, this interpretation, which translates “not” as “was not”, limits the negation of intention to the past tense. Translating Makārem from Ġahd to “Never” is inappropriate, despite suggestions that this term could effectively represent the structure. It is essential to understand that “never” signifies a perpetual negation in the future and can function as an equivalent to a “negative verb with *lam*” in the Arabic language. Pāyandeh's translation indeed approaches the meaning of Ġahd; however, it rendered the verb in the simple past tense, whereas it should have been expressed in the present form of “not”. This is due to the fact that *Kāna* is in the past participle, yet its meaning is not confined to a specific time. In Persian, such a state is typically conveyed using the declarative present participle tense.²⁷

The second example is taken from 35;44

وَمَا كَانَ اللَّهُ لِيُعْجِزَهُ مِنْ شَيْءٍ فِي السَّمَاوَاتِ وَلَا فِي الْأَرْضِ... (فاطر/۴۴)»

1. Pāyandeh: خدا چنان نبود که در آسمانها و زمین چیزی از او پیشی گیرد (=God was not such that anything in the heavens and the earth could surpass Him)
2. Foulādvand: (=And nothing, neither in the heavens nor on earth, has made God helpless)
3. Makārem: (=Nothing in the heavens and nothing on earth will go out of his power domain)

The translation of Pāyandeh is similar to the meaning of *Ġahd*. According to the translation of the previous verse, the verb in this sentence appears in the past tense. However, Kufian's analysis indicates that both Foulādvand and Makārem have used negation as a stand-in for *Ġahd*. Moreover, Foulādvand has translated the verb into the past tense, leaving out the future tense, while Makārem has translated it into the future tense, excluding the past tense from the interpretation of this sentence. The verse seeks to convey the notion that Allah's divine nature and unparalleled essence are such that there exists no being in the heavens or on earth capable of assisting Him, reflecting His infinite nature.

The third example is selected from verses 11; 117:

وما كان نيك لهلك الذي يظلم وولها مصلحون (هود/117)

1. Pāyandeh: (=Your Lord was not such as to destroy these villages as a punishment for oppression if their people were reformers)
2. Foulādvand: و پروردگار تو [هرگز] بر آن نبوده است که شهرهایی را که مردمش اصلاح‌گرنند، به ستم هلاک کند (=And your Lord [never] intended to destroy cities whose people are reformers by oppression)
3. Makārem: و چینی نبود که پروردگارت آبادی‌ها را بظلم و ستم نابود کند در حالی که اهلس در صد اصلاح (=And it was not like this that your Lord destroyed the villages with cruelty and oppression while her people were trying to reform!)

In Pāyandeh's translation (پروردگارت چنان نبود که)، the *Ġahd* is interpreted as the negation of God's negative acts [your Lord was not such as to destroy], since negative acts or attributes cannot be ascribed to God.

Foulādvand also interpreted the structure of *Ġahd* as the "negation of the will" (according to the Basrian's opinion) [and your Lord [never] intended to..

Makārem has interpreted the *Ġahd* structure as "it is not befitted to God to destroy". The only problem is that Makārem has translated *Mā kāna* as belonging to the past tense.

Another example that may appear in compliance with *Ġahd* structure "*Mā kāna al-fā'ilo liyaf'al*" is taken from 8; 133:

وَمَا كَانَ اللَّهُ لِيُعَذِّبَهُمْ وَأَنْتَ فِيهِمْ [...] (انفال/ 33)

which intends to say "And God will not punish them while you are among them [...].

1. Pāyandeh: (=And God will not punish them while you are among them [...]).

2. Foulādvand: خدا بر آن نیست که ایشان را عذاب کند [ولی] تا تو در میان آنان هستی، (As long as you are among them, God will not intend punish them)
3. Makārem: ولی (ای پیامبر!) تا تو در میان آنها هستی، خداوند آنها را مجازات نخواهد کرد (=But (O Prophet!) as long as you are among them, God will not punish them).

Pāyandeh's translation illustrates the structure of Ġahd as "absolute negation", which is entirely consistent with Koufian's opinion. However, Pāyandeh's choice to translate the Ġahd structure in the past tense is not appropriate.

On the contrary, Foulādvand considers Ġahd structure in this verse as "Negation of volition" (God will not intend punish them). This is in accordance with the Basrian's interpretation, which considers "Muridan" as a deleted property of "Liyoaḍḍiba" and as a predicate of Kāna.

In Makarem's translation, Koufian's opinion is taken into consideration and the structure of Ġahd is interpreted as "absolute negation" [God will not punish them].

Eight other examples: Pāyandeh translated the holy verses 143 Baqarah, 115 Taubah, 117 Hūd, 40 Ankabūt and 44 Fātir (50%) according to the first structure of Ġahd and the equivalents suggested in this paper, but he has turned the verbs into the past tense. In verses 179 of Al-Imrān, 33 of Anfāl, 122 of Taubah and 37 of Yūnus (50%), he has made absolute negation _ In compliance with Koufian's opinion _ as a substitute for Ġahd.

Foulādvand has translated 122 verses from Taubah and 37 verses from Yūnus, representing 20% of the total, in accordance with the recommendations and findings of this article. Furthermore, he has translated verses 143 from Baqarah 179 from Al-Imrān 33 from Anfāl 115 from Taubah and 117 from Hūd which constitutes 60% of the work, based on the analysis of Basrian's regarding the "negation of volition". Lastly, he has translated verses 40 from Ankabūt and 44 from Fātir, accounting for 20%, as instances of "absolute negation" (Koufian's opinion).

4.3. Evaluation of translations in the second structure

As formerly explained, the structure *Mā kānal fā'ilo an yaf'al* (=It is not the subject's dignity to do) is used 19 times in the *Holy Qur'an*: in verses 114 of Baqarah 79, 145, and 161 of Al-Imrān 92 of Nissā 7 of Anfāl 17, 113, and 120 of Taubah 100 Yūnus 38 Yusuf, 38 Ra'd 11 Ibrāhim 35 Maryam 60 Naml 36 and 53 Ahzāb, 78 Ghāfir and 51 Shurā. In the following, we evaluate the translations of one verse (rendered by Pāyandeh, Foulādvand and Makārem) in detail and present briefly eighteen other verses from the same Persian translators as they come hereby.

First example is taken from 33, 5²⁹:

1. Pāyandeh: شما را نرسد که پیمبر را آزار کنید (=It is not suitable for you to bother the messenger)
2. Foulādvand: و شما حق ندارید رسول خدا را برنجانید (=And you have no right to hurt the Messenger of God)
3. Makārem: و شما حق ندارید رسول خدا را آزار دهید (=And you have no right to bother the Messenger of God)

The translation of Pāyandeh is absolutely correct. The translation of Makārem and Foulādvand is not as clear as Pāyandeh's, and the aspect of conclusion prevails in the verse; that is, the translator has reflected the meaning of *Ġahd* in the verse (it is not proper to hurt the Messenger of God), which means that it is not permissible to do such and that you do not have the right.

The second example is taken from 10; 37:

وما كان لنا بالقرآن من دُونِ اللَّهِ ولو كن تصديقاً الذي بين يديه (يونس/37)

1. Pāyandeh: (=This Qur'an is not something other than God, but confirmation of what preceded).
2. Foulādvand: و چنان نیست که این قرآن از جانب غیر خدا [و] به دروغ ساخته شده باشد. بلکه تصدیق [کننده] آن چه (=And it is not like this Qur'an was made falsely by someone other than God. Rather, it confirms what is before it).
3. Makārem: شایسته نبود (و امکان نداشت) که این قرآن، بدون وحی الهی به خدا نسبت داده شود؛ ولی (=It was not appropriate (and it was not possible) that this Qur'an be attributed to God without divine revelation; but it is a confirmation for what is before it (from the holy books).

In Pāyandeh's translation (This Qur'an is "not") which complies with Koufian's opinion, "absolute negation" has replaced the structure of *Ġahd*.

Whereas Makārem brought the Persian translation based on the opinion of AstarAbadi according to which "It was not appropriate and it was not possible that this Qur'an was without revelation". Of course, Makārem's translation is rendered into the past tense, which seems incorrect. It should be a-temporal, encompassing the present, the past and the future.

In contrast, Foulādvand's translation aligns more closely with the arguments presented in this paper, particularly regarding the importance of considering Astarabadi's interpretation of the *Ġahd* structure: And "It is not like this" / "It is not suitable that [...]" this Qur'an was made falsely by someone other than God.

The verse 51 of 42 Surah is translated based upon the same structure:

وَمَا كَانَ لِبَشَرٍ أَنْ يَكْلِمَهُ اللَّهُ [...] (شوری/51)

1. Pāyandeh: (=It is not befitting of any human being that God would speak to him)
2. Foulādvand: (=It is not [suitable] for any human that Allah should speak to him)
3. Makārem: (=It is not fitting for a man that Allah should speak to him)

As clearly stated in all the three translation, this second structure of *Ġahd* *Mā kānal fā'ilo an yaf'al* (=It is not the subject's dignity to do) is utilized, since *Ġahd* implies essentially the negation of dignity

and proportionality, and, according to Asterabadi's suggestion, it should be interpreted as "it is not befitted for the subject to do so" or "it is not suitable/ proper for the subject to undertake such action"

Eighteen other examples: Based on this structure, Pāyandeh has translated verses 114 of Baqarah, 161 of Al-Imrān, 92 of Nissā, 7 of Anfāl, 100 of Yūnus, 35 of Maryam, 36 of Ahzāb, 78 of Ghāfir, 51 of Shurā, 38 of Yūsuf, 60 of Naml, and 53 of Ahzāb (in total 63%) in accordance with the suggestion of this research. He has translated verse 145 of Al-Imrān (5%) as negation and verses 79 of Al-Imrān, 113 of Taubah, 120 of Taubah, 38 of Ra'd, 11 of Ibrāhim and 53 of Ahzāb (in total 32%) as legal prohibition.

Based on this structure, Foulādvand has translated verses 79 and 161 of Al-Imrān, 92 of Nissā, 67 of Anfāl, 17, 113 and 120 of Taubah, 100 of Yūnus, 38 of Ra'd, 35 of Maryam, 36 of Ahzāb, 78 of Ghāfir, 51 of Shurā, 38 of Yūsuf, 11 of Ibrāhim, 60 of Naml (in total 85%) in accordance with the suggestion of this research. He has translated verse 145 of Al-Imrān (5%) as negation and verses 114 of Baqarah and 53 Ahzāb (10%) as prohibition. Based on this structure, Makārem has translated verses 79 and 161 of Al-Imrān, 113 and 120 of Taubah, 35 of Maryam, 51 of Šurā, 114 of Baqarah, 38 of Yūsuf, 60 of Naml, 100 of Yūnus, 38 of Ra'd, 11 of Ibrāhim (in total 63%) in compliance with the suggestion of this research. He has translated verse 145 of Al-Imrān (5%) as negation and verses 92 of Nissā, 67 of Anfāl, 17 Taubah, 36 Ahzāb, 87 Ghāfir and 53 Ahzāb (in total 32%) as prohibition.

Conclusion

The following results can be obtained from the current research:

1. By analyzing the structure of Ğahd and the reasons presented in this research, it was found that none of the analyses of the Koufians and Basrians on the structure of Ğahd are acceptable. Because the analysis of the Koufians means absolute negation, and the analysis of the Basrians means the negation of volition, but the structure of Ğahd aims for the negation of dignity and proportionality. As a result, we should either accept Astarābādi's opinion and recognize *lām Ğahūd* and the verb assigned to it as belonging to *munāsiban* and the like, or consider the verb *kāna* as complete and recognize *lām* and the verb assigned to it as they belong to *kāna*.
2. The Ğahd structure (*Mā kānal fā'ilo an ya'al*) also expresses the meaning of Ğahd, which was determined as the second structure of Ğahd in this paper.

In the translation of the first and second structures of Ğahd, we have two options. The first option is to follow Astarābādi's opinion and use an equivalent phrase such as "It is not worthy of the subject to do such" and similar expressions. The second option is to consider *kāna* as conveying "completeness and translate it as "The subject is not such as to do such a thing". When negative verbs are expressed with *lam* and *lammā*, their translation should depend on the event they are being compared to, and they should be shifted to the tense prior to the event. It is also important to include the adverb in the translation of *lammā*, as the negation in *lammā* is not definite. An analysis of the translations provided by Pāyandeh, Foulādvand, and Makārem indicates that for the first structure of Ğahd, which consists of 10 relevant Quranic verses, Pāyandeh achieved a success rate of 50%, Foulādvand 20%, and Makārem 60%. For the

second structure of *Ġahd*, which includes a total of 19 verses in the Qur'an, Pāyandeh's success rate was 63%, whereas Makārem's was notably higher at 85%.

التحليل النحوي الدلالي لبنية الجحد (= الإنكار) ومرادفاتها في ترجمات القرآن الفارسية

علي حاجيخاني

قسم دراسات القرآن والحديث، جامعة تربيت مدرس، طهران، إيران

نصرت حجازي

قسم اللغة الفرنسية في جامعة تربيت مدرس (TMU)، طهران، إيران

صادق عباسي

. خريجو دراسات القرآن والحديث في جامعة تربيت مدرس (TMU)، طهران، إيران

الملخص

بما أن مصطلح "الجحد" والأساليب المرتبطة به في نحو العربية ولغتها معقدة ومتعددة الأبعاد، فإن العثور على معادل لهذه البنية في معظم اللغات يبدو صعباً، تناولت هذه المقالة تحليل بنية "الجحد" في شكلي "ما كان الفاعل ليفعل" و "ما كان للفاعل أن يفعل" ويعد تقديم معادلات مناسبة لهما باللغة الفارسية، أنتقدت بعض المعادلات المقدمة من مترجمي القرآن وقيمت، وأهم نتائج هذا البحث هي: أنه في تحليل بنية الجحد ينبغي إما استخدام رأي "الإسترايادي" القائل بتعلق "كان" بـ "مناسباً" أو اعتبار "كان" تامة بمعنى "ثبت". ويترجم على أساس الرأي الأول إلى أساليب نحو: "لا يليق بالفاعل أو لا يناسب شأنه أن يفعل كذا" وعلى الرأي الثاني إلى أساليب نحو: "ليس الفاعل بالذي يفعل كذا".

الكلمات المفتاحية بنية الجحد، لام الجحود، تراجم القرآن الفارسية، التحليل النحوي - اللغوي.

Endnotes

- ¹ ما كان لفاعل
- ² «وَجَدُوا بِهَا وَاسْتَيْقَنَتْهَا أَنفُسُهُمْ ظُلْمًا وَ عَلُوا فَانظُرْ كَيْفَ كَانَ عَاقِبَةُ الْمُفْسِدِينَ» (نمل/14)
- ³ حرف الجر Harful-jarr
- ⁴ [wa qolnā haša lillah mā hađâ bašaran in] «وَقُلْنَ حَاشَ لِلَّهِ مَا هَذَا بَشَرًا إِنْ هَذَا إِلَّا مَلَكٌ كَرِيمٌ» (يوسف/31)
[hāđā illā malekon karim]
- ⁵ ما كان الفاعل ليعمل (=It is not for the subject to do)
- ⁶ [lam yakon Allaho liyağfera lahom] «لَمْ يَكُنِ اللَّهُ لِيُغْفِرَ لَهُمْ» (نساء/137؛ 168)
- ⁷ «مَا كَانَ اللَّهُ لِيَذَرَ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ عَلَىٰ مَا أَنْتُمْ عَلَيْهِ حَتَّىٰ يَمِيزَ الْخَبِيثَ مِنَ الطَّيِّبِ وَ مَا كَانَ اللَّهُ لِيُطْلِعَكُمْ عَلَى الْغَيْبِ...» (آل)
[mā kāna Alloho leyadara almo'menin ... wa mā kāna Alloho leyotle'akom alal qayb...]
- ⁸ [wa mā kāna hāzal Qorāno an yoftarā] «وَ مَا كَانَ هَذَا الْقُرْآنُ أَنْ يُفْتَرَىٰ» (يونس/37)
- ⁹ جاره
- ¹⁰ «ما كان قاصدا للفاعل» mā kāna qāsidan lilfe'l
- ¹¹ راضياً
- ¹² [wa rađito lakomol islāma dinan] « وَضِيَّتْ لَكُمْ الْإِسْلَامَ دِينًا» (مائده/3)
- ¹³ [wa mā kāna alloho le yazlemahom] «وَ مَا كَانَ اللَّهُ لِيُظْلِمَهُمْ» (عن كعبوت/40)
- ¹⁴ [wa mā ana bezallamen lel abid] «وَ مَا أَنَا بِظَلَامٍ لِلْعَبِيدِ» (ق/29)
- ¹⁵ «أن مقدره»
- ¹⁶ [wa mā kāna alloho le yazlemahom] «وَ مَا كَانَ اللَّهُ لِيُظْلِمَهُمْ» (عن كعبوت/40)
- ¹⁷ [wa mā ana bezallamen lel abīd] «وَ مَا أَنَا بِظَلَامٍ لِلْعَبِيدِ» (ق/29)
- ¹⁸ [wa mā kāna alloho le yazlemahom] «وَ مَا كَانَ اللَّهُ لِيُظْلِمَهُمْ» (عن كعبوت/40)
- ¹⁹ (=It is not the subjects dignity to do) «ما كان للفاعل أن يفعل»
- ²⁰ [wa mā kāna lenabiyyen an yağolla] «وَ مَا كَانَ لِنَبِيِّ أَنْ يُغَلَّ» (آل عمران/161)
- ²¹ [Mā kāna lillah an yattaħeza men walad] «مَا كَانَ لِلَّهِ أَنْ يَتَّخِذَ مِنْ وَلَدٍ» (مریم/35)
- ²² [wa mā kāna lil] «وَ مَا كَانَ لِمُؤْمِنٍ وَلَا مُؤْمِنَةٍ إِذَا قَضَى اللَّهُ وَرَسُولُهُ أَمْرًا أَنْ يَكُونَ لَهُمُ الْخِيَرَةُ مِنْ أَمْرِهِمْ» (احزاب/36)
[mo'menen wal mo'menaten edā qađiya Allah...]

- ²³ «وَمَا كَانَ لِلْمُؤْمِنِينَ أَنْ يَقْتُلُوا الْمُؤْمِنِينَ إِنْ كَانُوا خَطَاءً» (نساء/93) [wa mā kāna lil mo'menen an yaqtola mo'menan ellā ḥatta'an]
- ²⁴ «مَا كَانَ لِلَّهِ أَنْ يَتَّخِذَ مِنْ وَلَدٍ» (مریم/35) [Mā kāna lillah an yattaḥez men walad]
- ²⁵ «مَا كَانَ اللَّهُ لِيَذَرَ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ...» (آل عمران/179) [Mā kāna Allah liyaḍdar al-Mu'minin]
- ²⁶ «وَمَا كَانَ اللَّهُ لِيُضَيِّعَ إِيْمَانَكُمْ إِنْ اللَّهُ بِالنَّاسِ لَرُؤُوفٌ رَحِيمٌ» (بقره/143)
- ²⁷ مضارع اخبارى
- ²⁸ «وَمَا كَانَ اللَّهُ لِيُعْجِزَهُ مِنْ شَيْءٍ فِي السَّمَاوَاتِ وَلَا فِي الْأَرْضِ...» (فاطر/44)
- ²⁹ ... وَ مَا كَانَ لَكُمْ أَنْ تُؤْتُوا رَسُولَ اللَّهِ... (احزاب/53)

References

The Holy Quran

- Āseh, Javād. 2011. 'Mā kāna liya' al'. Reflections on its Syntactic Structures and Persian Renditions. *The Journal of Interpretation of Revelation* 15 (1): 54-68.
- Astarābādi, Raziuddin Muhammad bin Hassan. 2005. *Razi Commentary on Kāfiyyah*. Vol. 4. 1st Ed., Tehran: Al-Sadegh Printing and Publishing Company.
- Bābati, Aziza Fawāl. 1992. *Al-Mu'jam Al-Mufasssal fil Nahw al-Arabi* (=The Detailed Dictionary of Arabic Grammar). Vol. 1. 1st Ed. Beirut: Dār ol-Kutub al-Ilmiya publications.
- Barakāt, Ibrāhim. 2007. *Al Nahw al-Arabi* (=Arabic Grammar). Vol. 2. 1st Ed. Cairo: Dārol Nashr lil Jāmeāt/Universities Publishing House.
- (Al)Fayūmi, Ahmad Bin Mohammad. 1993. *Al Mesbāhol Mūnir fi ġarib-il Šarh-il Kabir li-Rāfiyee*. Researched and Annotated by Abdul Karim Bin Mohammad Rāfeiyye Qazvini. 2 volumes. Qom: Dārol Hijra Institute.
- Farāhidī, Khalil Bin Ahmad. 1988. *Ketabol Ayn*, Researched by Ebrāhim Sāmerāyi and Mahdi Maḥzūmi. Vol. 3. 2nd Ed. Qom: Dārol Hijra Institute.
- Foulādvand, Mohammad Mahdi. 2019. *Persian Translation of The Holy Qur'an*. Tehran: Payām-e Edālat.
- Halabi, Samin [Abul Abbas Šahābiddin Ahmad Bin Yūsuf]. 1993. *Addor ol Masūn fi Olūmil ketābil Maknūn* (=Protected Pearl in Sciences of Hidden books). Researched by Ahmad Mohammad Sayreh, Vol. 2. 1st Ed. Beirut: Dārol Kotobil Elmiyah/Muhammad Ali Beyzūn Publications.
- Ibn Fāres, Abu al-Hussein Ahmad bin Fāres bin Zakariā Rāzi. 1983. *Mu'ġam Moqāyessa lūqqa* (=Dictionary of Comparative Language). Researched by Haroun Abd al-Salam Muhammad. Vol.1 & 2. Qom: Maktabol a'alām al-Islāmi.
- Ibn Hishām, Al-Ansāri Abdullah bin Yusuf. 2008. *Owzāh ol-Masālik ila Alfih Ibn Mālik* (=The Clearest Path to the Alfīya of Ibn Mālik). Researched and Annotated by Abdul Hamid Muhammad Muhyī al-Din. 4 volumes. 1st Ed. Beirut: Modern library Al Maktab'al Asriyah.

A Syntactico-Semantic Analysis of Ğahd (=deny) Structure and its Equivalences in Quran's Persian Translations

- Ibn Hishām, Al-Ansāri Abdullah bin Yūsuf. 1985. *Mūqni al-Labib an Kotobil a'Ārib*. Researched by Māzan Almobarāk and Mohammad Ali Hamdollāh. Vol. 1. Qom: Dāro Sayyedo Šohadā.
- Ibn Manzūr, Muhammad bin Mokaram. 1993. *Lisān al-Arab*. Edited & Revised by Jamāloddin Mirdāmādi. Vol. 3 & Vol.4. Beirut: Dar al-Fikr / Dar Sāder.
- Makārem Shirāzi, Nāsser. 2001. *Persian Translation of The Holy Qur'an*. Tehran: Dafter Motāle'āt-e Tariḥ va Ma'āref-e-Eslāmi
- Matlūb, Ahmad. 1989. *Al Mo'jame al Mustalahāt il Arabiyah wa Tataworihā (=A Dictionary of Rhetorical Terms and Their Development)*. 1 volume, 1st Ed. Beirut: Maktab Lubnān Našerūn/Lebanon Library Publishers.
- Mostafavi, Hassan. 1989. *Atahqiq fi Kalemāt il-Quran-il Karim (=Investigation in the Words of the Holy Qur'an)*. Vol. 2, Tehran: Ministry of Culture and Islamic Guidance.
- Nahr, Hādi. 2008. *Al-Nahw ol-Tatbiqi Wefqan li-Muqararat al-Nahw al-Arabi fil Ma'āhid wal Jāme'āt al-Arabi (=Applied Grammar According to the Courses of Arabic Grammar in Arab Institutes and Universities)*. 2 volumes, Irbid: Alam al-Kūtūb al-Hadiṭ Publisher.
- Pāyandeh, Abolqāssem. 1978. *Persian Translation of the Holy Qur'an*. Tehran: Jāvidān.
- Rāḡeb Esfahāni, Hossein bin Muhammad. 1991. *Mufradāt alfāzil Quran (=Al-Qur'an Vocabulary)*. Researched and Edited by Safwān Adnān Dāwoodi. 1st volume. Beirut: Dār ol-Qalam/Dār ol-šamia publisher.
- Roostāyi, Zeinab and Kašfi, Seyyedeh Mahbubeh. 2016. Semantics of the words “Ğahd” and “denial” in the *Holy Quran*. Proceedings of *National Conference on Terminology in Islamic Sciences*. SID. <https://sid.ir/paper/886387/fa>
- Sāfi, Mahmoud bin Abd al-Rahim. 1997. *Al-Jadwal fi E'rāb il-Qur'an (=Table of Qur'an's Marking Declensions)*, Vol. 4. 4th Ed., Damascus/Beirut: Dar Al-Rašīd/Al-Imān Foundation.
- Šokrāni, Rezā and Kiyāni, Zohreh. 2013. The Study of Emphatic Lām in *Qura'n* and its equivalent in Persian. *Journal of Literary Arts* 5(1): 141-154.
- [Al]Zabidi, Muhammad ibn Muhammad Mortadā. 1993. *Tāj Al'arus min Jawahir Al Qāmūs (=The Bride's Crown from Jewels Dictionary)*. edited / corrected by: Ali. Hilali & Siri. Ali. Vol. 4. Beirut: Dārol Fikr.
- Zamaḡšari, Ğarollah. 2013. *Al-Kashshāf fi Tafsir el Quran*. Persian Translation by Mas'ūd Ansāri, 4 volumes. Tehran: Qoqnūs Publishing Co.