# QURANIC LEXICAL SEMANTICS OF IZUTSU AND 'ALLĀMAH ṬABĀTABĀ'Ī: A COMPARATIVE APPRAISAL

## Semántica léxica coránica de Izutsu y 'Allāmah Ṭabātabā'ī: una evaluación comparativa

Seyyed Hamid-Reza MirAzimi y Afrasiab Salehi Shahroudi
University of Teherán y Zahedan University of Medical Sciences
hmirazimi@ut.ac.ir y salehishahroudi@zaums.ac.ir
https://orcid.org/0000000280459908 y https://orcid.org/0000000157256777

**Abstract**: This study evaluates the principles and methods of Izutsu and 'Allāmah Ṭabāṭabā'ī in the semantics of Quranic concepts, using a comparative analysis. Looking at his semantic principles, it becomes clear that 'Allāmah believed in more flexibility for the meaning of each word in the text, and this flexibility could bring him closer to the various messages incorporated into the text by the words used by the author, although he did not make full use of this capacity in practice. In contrast, Izutsu emphasized the principle that the meanings of words change in relation to individuals' changing worldview. Although this principle facilitated better semantics of the Quranic concepts, it also abandoned the basic core meaning of words, replacing them with alternative, false meanings. Additionally, it did not specify the principles of sentence semantics and had an ineffective method of analyzing conflicts in the meanings of a word in the text, especially in a religious text. The semantic principle used by Allāmah appears to be more efficient in understanding the real message of the text. Therefore, a fusion of his method with Izutsu's 'semantic fields' would be a big step towards achieving a correct understanding of the meanings of Quranic words.

**Resumen**: Este estudio evalúa los principios y métodos de 'Allāmah Ṭabāṭabā'ī e Izutsu en la semántica de los conceptos coránicos, utilizando un análisis comparativo. Basándose en sus principios semánticos, 'Allāmah creía en una mayor flexibilidad para el significado de cada palabra en el texto, y esta flexibilidad podría acercarlo a los diversos mensajes incorporados en el texto por las palabras utilizadas por el autor, aunque no utilizó completamente esta capacidad en la práctica. Por el contrario, Izutsu hizo hincapié en el principio de que el significado de las palabras cambia en relación con la visión cambiante del mundo de los individuos. Aunque este principio facilitó una mejor semántica de los conceptos coránicos, abandonó el significado básico y central de las palabras reemplazando los significados alternativos y falsos por ellos. Tampoco especificó los principios de la semántica de las oraciones y tenía un método ineficaz para analizar los conflictos en los significados de una palabra en el texto, especialmente en un texto religioso. El principio semántico utilizado por Allāmah parece ser más eficiente para comprender el mensaje real del texto. Por lo tanto, una fusión de su método con los "campos semánticos" de Izutsu será un gran paso para lograr una correcta comprensión de los significados de las palabras coránicas.

**Key words**: Quranic lexis. Lexical semantics. Izutsu. 'Allāmah Ṭabāṭabā'ī.
**Palabras clave**: Léxico coránico. Semántica léxica. Izutsu. 'Allāmah Ṭabāṭabā'ī.

*INTRODUCTION*

The content of religion sources, including Quran, are literal proofs. One of the objectives of explaining religion is to respond to the multifarious and evolving issues of human life, through understanding the meaning of these proofs[1]. Quranic exegetes attempt to understand the text of the Quran more accurately by understanding the meaning of the words in Quran while considering the ethnical, cultural and historical contexts at the time of revelation of Quranic verses[2].

The lexical semantics of Quran has a long history that goes back to the time of Prophet Muhammad and infallible imams, when people asked them questions about the meaning of Quranic verses and words. Afterwards, some classical religious scholars responded questions raised about the meaning of specific words in Quran that had different meanings[3]. In the past century, traditional exegetes have written comments (*Tafsīr*) on the verses of the Quran. As one of the prominent traditional interpreters of Quran is the Shia Muslim scholar and philosopher, Allāmah Sayyid Muhammad Husayn Ṭabāṭabā'ī (1892-1981) who interpreted all verses of the Quran in a set of 25 volumes, entitled *Tafsīr al-Mizan*. Like the classic scholars, his interpretation of the meaning of Quranic words were not based on the scientific method of semantics that was just developed in the past century as a branch of linguistics. However, the contemporary Japanese exegete, Professor Toshihiko Izutsu, with a semantically view different from the traditional exegetes, stepped into the semantics of the Quranic concepts and his view was welcomed by many Quranic scholars.

This study intends to evaluate the validity of the principles and method proposed by Izutsu in understanding the meaning of Quranic words, in relative to the methodology of 'Allāmah Ṭabāṭabā'ī. This comparison will be a useful attempt to improve our understanding of the literal proofs of the Quran.

## 1. *IZUTSU'S SEMANTIC PRINCIPLES*

Izutsu's semantics of Quranic words is based on two key language regulations that influence the meaning of words[4]. In the following after describing them, we will argue that his stress on these two regulations have biased his interpretation of the meaning of Quranic words.

1. Mīr'azīmī. "Deficiency in explaining religión", pp. 253-274.
2. Sajedi and Sajedi. "A new analysis of the semantic interaction", pp.11-33.
3. Sajadi and Ashnavar. "Semantical comparison of word's "Alagheh", pp. 95-11; Noya. *Quranic interpretation*; Mokhtar. *Semantics*, p. 86.
4. Luṭfī. "Study and critique of Izutsu's", pp. 37-50.

## 1.1. *Language relativity and linguistic worldview*

In his book, God and Man in the Quran (1964), Izutsu introduced himself as the follower of the Ethnological-anthropological theory, which was initially proposed by Sapir-Whorf. Izutsu believed that speakers of every language understand the world as their language depicts it[5]. Some scholars have debated this theory. For example, Steven Pinker pointed to the results of studies on the processes of remembering and reasoning, which showed language and thought were two separate and independent phenomena. The studies also indicated that people of different languages were similar in many processes of thought. Moreover, psychological studies indicated the existence of visual thinking, that is, thinking with the help of a mental image without language[6].

Regardless of the debates raised about the ethnological-anthropological theory, we have focused on Izutsu's analysis of this theory and the effects of this analysis on his semantical analysis. Unlike Pinker, Izutsu believed in a mutual relationship between language and worldview. On the one hand, the meaning of a word is influenced by individuals' worldview and is the crystallization of their cultural perceptions[7]:

> All words without exception are more or less markedly tinged with some special coloring coming from the peculiar structure of the cultural milieu in which they actually exist[8].

On the other hand, he emphasized that words affect the worldview of people of any ethnicities[9]. He believed that the task of a semanticist, including himself, is to investigate the effects of people's language on the construction of their worldview. That is, the semanticist determines what part of the imagination and worldview of people is embedded in one particular term:

> Theoretically, I do not in any way deny the possibility of the existence of 'pre-linguistic' concepts, but if they do exist, they lie outside the limits of our scientific interest. Anyhow, whenever I use the term 'concept' in this book I understand one having a definite word at its back[10].

Izutsu's emphasis on the point that the purpose of semanticist is simply to dis-

---

5. *Ibidem.*
6. Ṣafavī. *An introduction to semantics*, pp. 87-88.
7. Izutsu. *God and man in the Quran*, p. 3.
8. *Idem*, p. 16.
9. *Idem*, p. 3.
10. *Idem*, pp. 27-28.

cover the concepts that each word gives the listener, is to an extent that if the reader has not seen the phrase above, he/she thinks that he believes in Sapir's theory:

> Semantics as I understand it is analytic study of the key-terms of a language with a view to arriving eventually at a conceptual grasp of the *weltanschauung* or world-view of the people who use that language as a tool not only of speaking, but, more important still, of conceptualizing and interpreting the world that surrounds them[11].

We believed that the worldview of each nation is the product of various individual and collective experiences that have occurred throughout the history and for many, language may not play a role. However, the product of those experiences is crystallized in the language of that people and is instilled into children in successive generations by teaching the language. Based on the mutual relationship between language and worldview, Izutsu considered a semanticist like the child, who learns the worldview of his/her community through language learning. That is, the semanticist extracts and describes the worldview of an ethnic group from the words they use, with the reverse engineering and methodological analysis of concepts:

> The analysis of the basic relational elements of a key-term should be conducted in such a way that, when we really succeed in doing it, the combination of the two aspects of the meaning would bring to light one particular aspect, one significant facet of culture as it was, or is, being experienced consciously by those belonging to that culture. And at the end, if we ever reach that final stage, all the analysis done must help us reconstruct on an analytic level the whole structure of the culture as it really lived —or lives as the case may be— in the conception of the people. This is what I would call 'semantic *weltanschauung*' of a culture[12].

### 1.2. *Linguistic system and semantic fields*

According to Izutsu, the worldview and the thought system of people are embedded in their language and word collections, which means each word refers to a particular part of the speakers' worldview of that language. He argues that as in any worldview, some beliefs are considered principle and each principle may have branches, some words are keys and encompass a larger part of the worldview of that people, and some words are also subsets of the keywords and refer to the minor part of that worldview. In other words, there is a particular system or hie-

---

11. *Idem*, p. 3.
12. *Idem*, p. 17.

rarchy among the words of each nation and the semanticist's job is to show what role each concept plays in building their worldview. For Izutsu, the most difficult job of semanticist is to design a model to represent the semantic hierarchy of words in a worldview. He called this design the "semantic field" and explained that at the heart of the main semantic field, containing an important part of the people's worldview, there are smaller semantic fields reflecting the ontological notion of sub-words, in which the role of words is not equal[13].

## 2. *IZUTSU'S SEMANTIC METHOD*

Izutsu noted the fact that there is always a possibility of complete or partial changes in the worldview of the people, and believed that in no language would the semantic scope of words be sufficient to cover the whole new conceptual system. To fill this void, societies usually make changes to the meaning of words, using the same old words to refer to new concepts:

> The Arabic language —or, any language for that matter— however rich it may be, is not rich enough to supply each of the different systems with an entirely new and different setoff words. So most of the elements used in constructing the systems must of necessity be common to them. Only, each elaborates nearly the same elements in its own peculiar way, and thereby constructs an independent network of words and concepts[14].

Words, therefore, have different meanings in various texts, and the prerequisite of semantics of the words in each context is to be familiar with the conceptual system embedded in that text. According to these explanations, Izutsu believed when a word taken outside the sentence, it would point to a meaning different from what was in a particular conceptual system in harmony with other words in the text. He gave the example of word *kitab* (book) that "means basically the same thing whether it is found in the Quran or outside of the Quran"[15]. This word has a 'constant semantic element', which remains attached to the word wherever it goes and whether it is used in a text or alone outside a text. Izutsu called it the "basic" meaning of the word. However, the meaning of the word *kitab* in the text of Quran, which is the Quranic conceptual system, "stands in a very close relation to the concept of Divine Revelation, or rather various concepts having direct reference to Revelation", such as "*Allah*, *wahy* (revelation), *tanzil* (sending down, of Divine words), *nabiy* (Prophet), *ahl* (people; in the particular combination of *ahl*

---

13. *Idem*, pp. 17-18.
14. *Idem*, pp. 42-43.
15. *Idem*, p. 11.

*al-kitab* —the people of the Scripture— meaning peoples who possess a Book of Revelation)"[16]. Therefore, the word *kitab* in the Quranic context should be understood in terms of all these related terms. Izutsu called this second meaning of the word *kitab* as "relational" meaning.

He considered semanticists' main job to discover the relational meaning or meanings of the words within the conceptual system of the text. That is, semanticists have to find both the worldview of a nation and their lexical meanings at the same time. To do so, Izutsu studied series of semantical relationships between words, which helped him to identify the main part of designing semantic field, namely identifying the key terms and the words having a sub-role in constructing that field[17]. This identified semantic design represented the conceptual system of a community[18].

## 3. *REVIEWING IZUTSU'S VIEWPOINT*

Izutsu's semantic principles and method, despite their strengths, have some drawbacks that we will explain as follows.

### 3.1. *To abandon the basic meaning of the words and to replace them with fake meanings*

The prerequisite for language regulation and the possibility of mutual understanding between the speaker and the listener is that the concept is transferred to a new conceptual system and the acceptance of a new meaning appropriate to that system should be in such a way that the semantic relevance of the word is not interrupted in the two conceptual systems. Therefore, a listener who was familiar with the meaning of the word in the prior conceptual system had a way to understand the new meaning of the word in the new conceptual system. What makes it certain is that every concept has a basic and intrinsic meaning, and this basic meaning is accompanied by the many meanings that the word takes in different contexts. In other words, all the meanings that a word takes in different conceptual systems are derived from that basic meaning; like the tree trunk from which all branches branch out. Although Izutsu accepts the existence of a basic meaning for each concept, he considers its role to be very faint:

---

16. *Idem*, p. 12.
17. Izutsu. *Ethico religious concepts in the Quran*, pp. 37-41.
18. Izutsu. *God and man in the Quran*, pp. 18, 20.

> Basic meaning is in reality but a methodological concept, that is to say, a theoretic postulate which proves useful whenever we want to analyze the meaning of a word scientifically, which, however we never find in this abstract form in the world of reality[19].

He believed that in most cases "the modifying power of the whole system works upon the words so strongly that the latter ends by almost losing its original meaning", as if we are witnessing the birth of a new word[20].

The fact is that Izutsu usually substituted one or two of the most commonly used meanings of each concept for its basic meaning. In this way, he tried to explain all the applications of that concept. In other words, he attributed the role of the main tree trunk (i.e., basic meaning) to one or two branches of the branch (i.e., relational meanings) from which the trunk branched out, and ignored many of the semantic capacities of the word.

To improve the Izutsu's view, we would suggest adding a complementary part to its method by saying that not only words in the new conceptual system can take new meanings, but they also have the capacity, within the same conceptual system (worldview), to convey a variety of messages and create many meanings in the mind of the reader, proportional to the sentences and texts in which they are located, while adhering to the basic meaning of the word. Ignoring this point and confine a concept to one or two semantic uses not only keep some text messages hidden, but also will increase the risk of being interfered by exegete's and semanticist's assumptions. Because when it is supposed to choose one or two meanings from the multiple potential meanings that a word can take in interacting with different sentences, unconsciously from different meanings, the meaning that the semanticist tends toward shows off and is considered the main meaning of the word. For example, the basic meaning of the concept "*ṣidq*" in Arabic language is 'conformity' between two things, and the Quran in various verses refers to the types of conformity such as, conformity of words with deeds, conformity of outer with inner, etc. However, influenced by his studies in Jewish and Christian religions, in which the "covenant between man and God" is meant by "religión", Izutsu has considered "adherence to the covenant between man and God" just the meaning of the concept "*ṣidq*" (conformity) in the Quran[21]. In fact, by replacing the meaning of *ṣidq* (conformity) with "covenant", as one of the "relational" meaning of *ṣidq* in this conceptual system, other meanings of *ṣidq* that refer to a kind of "conformity" between two things cannot be traced back and inferred any

---

19. *Idem*, p. 16.
20. *Idem*, p. 14.
21. Mīrʿaẓīmī et al. "Measuring the efficiency of semantics", pp. 69-94.

more from the new word of "covenant". Therefore, we will lose several semantic capacities of the word *ṣidq*.

## 3.2. *To disregard the difference between people's understanding of the Quran and not to refer to the traditions of the infallible (AS)*

Understanding the semantic aspects of a text depends on being present in the context of that text. Being aware of facts such as the customs and culture of the people at the time of the revelation of the Quran, or being aware of what caused some verses to be revealed, which all are necessary for understanding the messages of the Quran. Therefore, it is necessary to distinguish between the understanding of different language groups such as immigrants and *Anṣār*, who made up the largest proportion of the new Muslim population in the revelation space and time, those who had the highest awareness of the explanations of the Holy Prophet (PBUH) of the Quran that might not have been recorded anywhere else. The distinction between understanding of the lingual groups like immigrants and Anṣār is very important, but this issue has been neglected in Izutsu's semantics. This weakness in the Izutsu's semantical analysis has also been noted by other scholars:

> Prophetic traditions and practices sharing the same process with the Quran's divine revelation are deliberately neglected in Izutsu's analyses[22].

If physical presence and awareness of facts such as the reason for the revelation of verses is useful in understanding the Quran, knowing the opinions of those who have a broader understanding of the spiritual truths and the general spirit of the Quran will be far more important. Therefore, it is highly imperative and necessary to refer to the Quranic explanations of these people. Unfortunately, Izutsu did not refer to the hadiths of the infallibles (AS), as the true and perfect explicators of the Divine Book and Religion with special qualifications and requirements, such as infallibility and explanatory revelation[23].

The justification of Izutsu and some other scholars, including ʿAllāmah Ṭabātabāʾī for not referring to the hadiths of infallibles and the others' interpretations (*Tafsīr*) of Quran and relying on their own understanding for the semantics of the Quran is that they want the Quran to speak in its own language. This justification is the result of the disillusionment arising from unreliable content and the comments of uninformed commentators on the verses of the Quran. Although the-

22. Albayrak. "The reception of Toshihiko Izutsu's", p. 85.
23. Mīrʿazīmī. "Deficiency in explaining religión", pp. 253-274.

re might be some truth in this justification, Quranic exegetes historically have not worked hard to identify valid Quranic explanations produced by religious figures.

### 3.3. *Not specifying principles of sentence semantics*

A review of Izutsu's works shows that after examining the different meanings of a concept in different sentences, he comes to the final conclusion about the meaning of that concept. Unfortunately, he has not explained the principles of his sentence semantics. In fact, he has not paid enough attention to the semantic principles of the sentence and its effect on lexical semantics[24].

### 3.4. *Inability to analyze conflicts about the characteristics of a concept*

One of the drawbacks to the conceptualization[25], which is the basis of Izutsu's work, is that he does not explain the contradictions found especially in the Scriptures (although apparently) about the features of a concept[26].

### 4. THE SEMANTIC PRINCIPLES OF 'ALLĀMAH ṬABĀṬABĀ'Ī

The criteria for extracting the meaning and understanding of Quranic lexis in the view of 'Allāmah Ṭabāṭabā'ī are as follows:

### 4.1. *The centrality of 'effect' and 'benefit' for the meanings of words*

For 'Allāmah, human beings first coined words to refer to the material benefits and effects of things[27]. Since words referred to the functions of tools rather than to their primitive specific form, their names were not changed despite fundamental changes that took place over time for those tools. For example, although today's 'lights' bear no resemblance to the primitive lights, since they share in luminosity as the benefits of lamps, they are still referred to as 'lights'. Accordingly, the survival of the meaning of words depends on the continuing survival of the effect and benefit of the intended meaning of the words[28].

The conclusion of 'Allāmah's view will be that in order to understand the true meaning of a word, it is necessary to be aware of the primary purpose for which the word was made.

---

24. Qā'imīnīa. *Cognitive semantics of the Quran*, p. 50.

25. A way to put together all the sentences in which our intended concept is used and to collect the features attributed to that concept in each sentence, and then to create an idea of the concept in our minds which has all the features of that concept, and whenever we hear that word, we should present that idea in our minds.

26. Malikīyān. "Introduction", pp. 8-12.

27. Ṭabāṭabā'ī. *Tafsīr al-Mīzān*, vol. 1, p. 10.

28. *Idem*, vol. 2, p. 320.

## 4.2. *Semantic development*

'Allāmah believed in a "semantic development" of words and phrases, which means different types of a thing, which all have the same effect and benefit, related to one word. For example, there are a variety of lighting devices, which all are referred to and called by the concept of light. This is not the only instance of semantic development in the Allameh's semantical analysis. In the next step, words in accordance with their basic meaning were also used for some 'abstract' meanings. In this way, humans were able to share nonverbal experiences with the same words. As an example, the first instance of the word *kalām* was the sounds that humans produced for communication, but the basic meaning of this word is "giving awareness about the intention". For this reason, the word "*kalām*" also is attributed to God in the verses of the Quran. Therefore, on this basis, 'Allāmah has interpreted God's word (*Kalām*) as "creating something that creates an inner science in man"[29], That is, although God, like human, does not have lip and tongue for speaking, He sends His messages to humans in other ways. For instance, by creating all creatures in this world, God illustrates His intentions and informs us of His purpose of the creation. In this example, the meaning of word *kalām* has extended abstractly to 'creatures', so the creatures are also the God's words (*kalām*). In the following, we will describe one of the main Allāmah's semantic sub-principles.

## 4.3. *Common customary error in understanding the meanings of words*

Like Allāmah and other scholars, we believe that the words have not been created only for a specific meaning[30]. A concept has the potential to take new forms and new meanings in different situations and texts. As a result, the features of the text in which the words is located affect the meaning of the words. Accordingly, Allāmah believes that the prerequisite for true semantics of Quranic words is to pay attention to Quranic convention and verbal evidence in it. He argued that use of words that are commonly used by ordinary people in the semantics of the Quran will take us away from the text message[31]. As noted by Allāmah, one of the common deviations in understanding the Quran is to interpret the Quranic words by their customary forms and concepts, so much so that the public understand the Divine attributes and actions with the meaning of the ordinary words they use in their daily language[32]. In line with this common error, other scholars have stressed on some important points. First, it should be noted that after the re-

29. *Idem*, vol. 2, p. 318.
30. Vāʻizī. *Text interpretation theory*, p. 140.
31. Ṭabāṭabāʾī. *Tafsīr al-Mīzān*, vol. 12, p. 207.
32. *Idem*, vol. 1, p. 9.

velation of the Quran, the semantic development of words continued and some concepts were used in a meaning other than its Quranic meaning. For example, some concepts were used to name some worships and rituals. These changes have been called "Manqūl al-Sharʿī"[33] (religiously-transferred) in the Principles of Jurisprudence. Second, it is necessary to consider the mixture created between the Arabic language and other languages which has caused a semantic transformation of some words and caused ambiguity in their Quranic meaning[34].

Based on the above points and what we discussed before, one needs to consider three semantic steps for each Quranic concept:

1) To consider the meaning(s) of the word and its derivatives and applications in the Arabic language at the time of the revelation of the Quran and before that.

2) To consider what has been emphasized in the verses and the semantic aspects of the word in the verses.

3) To consider the terms and definitions of words made by religious figures in different Islamic sciences, such as jurisprudence, principles of jurisprudence, theology, interpretation, etc. in the following periods as well as semantic evolution of the word and its usage based on its prevalence of those definitions and terms.

Therefore, in order to understand the meanings of Quranic lexis, firstly, it is necessary to pay attention to the meaning of those words before and at the time of revelation. Secondly, in many cases, God provides definitions, links, and applications for those words in the verses of the Holy Quran, which represent the semantic and practical limits and the specific definition of those words and their connection with other concepts in a semantic network[35].

## 5. ʿALLĀMAH ṬABĀṬABĀʾĪ'S SEMANTIC METHOD

Despite that ʿAllāmah gave a special place to the "semantic basis" of words in his lexical semantics, he has not entered into extensive discussions on the subject[36]. To access the semantic basis of words, he has mainly referred[37] to dictionaries and lexical topics of other interpretations and lexis science describing and interpreting the words of the Holy Quran[38].

Some scholars have found it unreliable to refer to dictionaries to understand

33. Bagheri Asl. *Principles of the Holy Quran*, p. 218
34. Ibn al-Athīr. *Al-Nihāya fī gharīb*, p. 5.
35. MīrʿAzīmī. *Legislation and explanation*, pp. 27-26.
36. Khākpūr and Bulūrdī. "Chronological semantics", pp. 43-67.
37. Ūsī. *The method of ʿAllāmah Ṭabāṭabāʾī's*, p. 94; Khākpūr and Bulūrdī. "Chronological semantics", pp. 43-67.
38. Shakūrī. *An introduction to the lexical interpretation of Quran*, pp. 71-81.

the meaning of Quranic lexis, and even considered it to be the cause of the departure of researcher's mind from the basic meaning of many words. This is because they believe that in the interval between the history of compiling lexical sources in Arabic language, and the era of the revelation of the Quran, many changes have taken place in Arabic language. Therefore, it is necessary to use a more reliable method than referring to the opinions of others to understand the semantic relations of the Quranic concepts[39]. In particular, in earlier dictionaries and commentaries, which used mostly lexical sources, the authors included their personal tastes in discovering the meanings of the words, thus sometimes they neglected some semantic aspects of the word[40]. It is noteworthy that in some cases 'Allāmah has criticized the findings of dictionaries based on the rule of context, and the interpretation of the Quran by the Quran, and in addition to using verses and hadiths, he has sometimes used Arabic poetry[41].

Some scholars believe that 'Allāmah, based on the interpretive Rule of Context, paid attention to and applied the mechanisms of semantics, including unfamiliarity, conceptual contraction, conceptual expansion, semantic promotion, semantic degradation, allusions, exaggeration, etc.[42]. Although lack of systematically documenting and describing semantic rules in Allāmah's works does not mean that he has not complied with them in the interpretation of the Divine Word, the lack of clarity of the interpreter's point of view and semantic position on the details of each of these criteria may cause some text messages to be overlooked.

Moreover, Allāmah has employed the method of interpreting the Quran by the Quran more in propositional semantics and has applied this method less in semantics of Quranic lexis due to his trust in dictionaries. Therefore, there is no complete semantics of some words in his interpretation. For example, his semantics of the concept of *ṣidq* (conformity) in the Quran has been criticized[43].

*Conclusion*

Both thinkers believed that concepts, while having a fixed semantic basis, have a kind of semantic flexibility and compatibility with the overall message of the text in which they are placed. The key difference between the two views is in the extent of the use and presence of the basic meaning of the word in their seman-

---

39. Maʿmūrī. "Linguistic knowledge and its uses", pp.176-161.
40. Usi. *The method of ʿAllāmah Ṭabāṭabāʾī's*, p. 164.
41. Saʿīdī; Bāqir and Sharīatī. "The relationship between linguistic semantics and the interpretation", pp. 5-24.
42. Saʿīdī and Bāqir. *Analysis of the language of the Quran*, p. 237.
43. *Ibidem*.

tics. Izutsu gives a weak role to the basic meaning and believes that the basic meaning can be useful only for starting the word semantics, while ʿAllāmah drew all the uses of the word around the basic meaning.

The high degree of freedom of action that Izutsu held in changing the meaning of words, greatly increases the risk of being biased in his semantic analysis by using his own semanticist's presuppositions in the semantical analysis, and in practice makes one of the general and frequently used meanings of the word a substitute for its basic meaning. Contrary, ʿAllāmah's principles appear to be more stable and reduce the impact of semanticist's presuppositions on the semantical analysis. However, his efforts have not reached the expected results because he has based his interpretation on the findings of dictionaries. Especially, ʿAllāmah has used the method of interpreting the Quran by the Quran more in the interpretation of verses or sentence semantics rather than discovering the meanings of words. His stress on the maximum use of literal meaning in interpretation made him to look for other capacities of the word only when the literal meaning did not provide a meaningful interpretation of the verse. Only in such situations, he tried to get an alternative meaning for the word. As a result, in his interpretations of verses some of the messages and meanings contained in the Quran are missing.

Izutsu's also explains many attributes of a concept by examining companionship, succession and comparison of verses with each other. However, by this method some attributes of a concept may not be counted and do not provide a clear picture of the concept. This makes it possible for new, fake words other than the real ones to be placed for that concept.

Based on this comparative appraisal of Izutsu and ʿAllāmah, we concluded that a combination of ʿAllāmah's principles and Izutsu's method could largely compensate the shortcomings of both thinkers' semantical analysis. Both accept the basis that each word has an immutable semantic core or basis that plays a significant role in the meaning of that concept in different situations and contexts. In addition to adhering to the basic meaning, the use of semantic fields and examining all usages and roles of a concept in the text will reduce biases in the semantic analysis of verses of the Quran.

*REFERENCES*

ALBAYRAK, Ismail. "The reception of Toshihiko Izutsu's Quranic studies in the Muslim world". *Journal of Quranic Studies*, 14, 1 (2012), pp. 73-106.

BAGHERI AṢL, Ḥiydar. *Principles of the Holy Quran*. Tabriz: Tabriz University Press, 2012. [in Persian]

IBN AL-ATHĪR, al-Mubārak Ibn Muḥammad al-Shaybānī l-Jazarī. *Al-Nihāya fī gharīb al-ḥadiṯ and al-athar*. Beirut: Dār-Eḥyā al-Turāth al-ʿArabī, 2001.

IZUTSU, Toshihiko. *Ethico-religious concepts in the Quran*. McGill-Queen's University Press, 2002.

—. *God and man in the Quran*. Islamic Book Trust, 2002.

KHĀKPŪR, Ḥusayn and BULŪRDĪ, Maryam. 'Chronological semantics of Quranic words in *Tafsīr al-Mizan*". *Maʿārīf Qurʿānī Research Journal*, 21 (2015), pp. 43-67. [in Persian]

LUṬFĪ, Seyyed Mahdī. "Study and critique of Izutsu's Quranic semantics". *Quranic Linguistic Research*, 6 (2014), pp. 37-50. [in Persian]

MALIKĪYĀN, Mustafa. "Introduction". En Toshihiko IZUTSU. *The concept of fait in the Islamic theology*. Trad. Zahra Pursina. Teheran: Soroush Publications, 2017, pp.8-12. [in Persian]

MAʿMŪRĪ, Ali. "Linguistic knowledge and its uses in Quranic studies". *The Quran and Science*, 1 (2007), pp. 161-176.

MĪRʿAẒĪMĪ, Seyyed Ḥamīd Reza. "Deficiency in explaining religion and ways to reduce it". *Islamic Teachings Association*, 23 (2010) pp. 253-274. [in Persian]

—. *Legislation and explanation of religion in Quran and Sunnah*. Tehran: Khānih Tārīkh va Taṣvīr Abrīshamī Publications, 2013. [in Persian]

—; ṢĀLIḤĪ SHĀHRŪDĪ, Afrāsīāb and MASʿŪDĪ, Abdulhādī. "Measuring the efficiency of semantics of Allameh Tabataba'i and Izutsu in the concept of ṣidq". *Religious Research*, 37 (2018) pp. 69-94. [in Persian]

MOKHTAR, Omar. *Semantics*. Trad. Sayaed Hossein Seyedi. Mashhad: University of Ferdowsi Publication, 2010. [in Persian]

NOYA, Paul. *Quranic interpretation and mystical language*. Trad. Ismail Saadat. Teheran: University Publication Center, 1994. [in Persian]

QĀʾIMĪNĪA, Alīriḍā. *Cognitive semantics of the Quran*. Teheran: Islamic Research Institute for Culture and Thought, 2013. [in Persian]

ṢAFAVĪ, Kūrush. *An introduction to semantics*. Tehran: Soore Mehr Publications, 2008. [in Persian]

SAʿĪDĪ, Rushan and BĀQIR, Muhammad. *Analysis of the language of the Quran and the methodology of understanding it*. Qom: Research Institute of Hawzeh and University, 2006. [in Persian]

SA‘ĪDĪ, Rushan; BĀQIR, Muhammad and SHARĪATĪ, Ghulām Muhammad. “The relationship between linguistic semantics and the interpretation of the Quran by the Quran with emphasis on ‘Allāmah Ṭabāṭabā’ī’s viewpoint”. *Quran Studies*, 14 (2014), pp. 5-24.

SAJADI, Sayaed Abolfazl and ASHNAVAR, Mahdi. “Semantical comparison of word’s “*Alagheh*” in the Holy Quran and medicine”. *Linguist Research in Holy Quran*, 1, 2 (2012), pp. 95-11.

SAJEDI, Abolfazl and SAJEDI, Hamed. “A new analysis of the semantic interaction and interpretation of the Quran to the Quran inspired by Izutsu”. *Journal of Quran Studies*, 2, 17 (2016), pp.11-33. [in Persian]

SHAKŪRĪ, Abulfaẓl. *An introduction to the lexical interpretation of Quran*. Qom, 2014. [in Persian]

ṬABĀṬABĀ’Ī, Seyyed Muhammad Ḥusayn. *Al-Mīzān fī Tafsīr al-Quran*. Qom: Society of Seminary Teachers, 1996.

ŪSĪ, Ali Ramaḍān. *The method of ‘Allāmah Ṭabāṭabā’ī in Tafsīr al-Mīzān*. Trad. Seyyed Ḥusayn Mīrjalīlī. Teheran: Islamic Development Organization, 2002. [in Persian]

VĀ‘IZĪ, Aḥmad. *Text interpretation theory*. Teheran: Research Institute of Islamic Seminary and University, 2011.