

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.1250043

INJUSTICE AND ENTITLEMENT DENIAL IN ISLAMIC NARRATIONS ON FADAK: A RELEVANCE-THEORETIC ANALYSIS

Zahraa Abdul Wahid Sultan Al-Debi¹, Khalida Hashoosh Addai Al-Ghezzezy²

^{1,2}*Dep. of English, College of Education for Human Sciences, Wasit University*

Received: 11/12/2025
Accepted: 25/02/2026

Corresponding author: Zahraa Abdul Wahid Sultan Al-Debi
(std2024208.Zahraa.A@uowasit.edu.iq)

ABSTRACT

This study explores the notion of linguistic injustice and the processes governing the claim and denial of rights against the background of four historical versions of the Fadak dispute. The study aims to investigate explicit-implicit distinctions of meaning, contextual effects and optimal relevance dimensions in the selected extracts of religious texts on Al-Zaraa's Inheritance. The study is qualitative in nature and is based on the Relevance Theory by Sperber and Wilson (1995). Four extracts have been selected as samples of the current study. The results confirm the presence of a deep textual imbalance in the direction of reader cognition. Entitlement is cognitively marginalised in some of the narrations because of relevance compression, making its cancellation an implicature-heavy inference to promote a rapid, authoritative conclusion. Other narrations, on the other hand, heavily foreshadow entitlement by replacing supporting premises with explicit inputs, so that the authoritative denial is an inferentially expensive constraint, instead of smooth discursive substitution. The study finds that these classical works are not mere descriptions of the past but instead constructive agents of linguistic injustice as they push the inferential directions in this way, providing a new methodological approach to historical pragmatics.

KEYWORDS: Relevance Theory, Pragmatic Analysis, Injustice, Entitlement Denial, Fadak, Islamic Narrations

1. INTRODUCTION

Fricker (2007) identifies two primary types of epistemic injustice, testimonial injustice and hermeneutic injustice. Testimonial injustice is a situation in which a speaker is given a credibility deficit because of prejudice, whereas hermeneutic injustice happens when people have no conceptual resources to attribute their experiences to dominating structures. "When people systemically exclude people of a particular social identity, such as women, people of colour, disabled people, and many intersectional identities, we enact both epistemic and political violence" (p. 442).

In line with these perspectives, the current study highlights the phenomenon of injustice against the prophet's daughter, Sayyidah Fatima Al Zahraa, in Islamic society. This is achieved by conducting a detailed linguistic analysis of selected Islamic narrations across two groups of traditions, employing a pragmatic approach. The aim is to uncover the different uses of linguistic strategies within the narrations of two groups to construct, express, or deny her perceived injustice.

In this context, linguistic representation emerges as a central procedure whereby some of the perspectives are foregrounded and others relegated. According to Halliday (1994), language is a social semiotic system, and Fowler (1991) stressed that decisions in linguistic practices have an ideological bias. Subsequently, the linguistic representation of the events might influence various understandings, such as perceptions about injustice.

Pragmatically, this study implements Relevance Theory to examine how the narrations achieve communicative success. According to Relevance Theory, when speakers produce their utterances, they try to achieve the maximum cognitive effect with the minimum processing effort (Sperber & Wilson, 1995). Using this framework to analyse the Islamic narrations can reveal the ways that these narrations make use of implicatures, presupposition, and contextual references to express arguably sophisticated ideas about injustice and entitlement denial.

In addition, injustice and entitlement denial are not just declared plainly in the narrations, but often implicitly communicated via pragmatic strategies. The elements have been explored as to how meaning works through the filter of Relevance Theory, which suggests that meaning is inferred instead of being directly encoded (Wilson & Sperber, 2004).

1.1. Problem Statement

While the significance of the Islamic texts has been

widely acknowledged in the literature of Islamic studies, most of the studies have been limited to its historical authenticity, theological dimensions, or rhetorical style and have neglected its pragmatic aspects. In particular, less attention has been focused on how meaning is extracted from context and what hidden communication leads to realising the persuasive objectives of the narrations. This peculiar gap is all the more troublesome, when one considers the fact that works such as these narrations are deeply infused with cultural information and religious inference, thus being ideal candidates for Relevance-Theoretic analysis (Madelung, 1997).

In addition, Islamic texts often treat justice and entitlement denial as directly thematic issues, as opposed to being pragmatically negotiated meanings. They neglect the manner in which Fatimah al-Zahraa employs rhetoric to direct the readership towards certain conclusions. If we consider the need for a Relevance-Theoretic element at work, there is limited research on aspects of implicature, contextual effects and cognitive processing, although they are certainly part of the narrations experience (Sperber & Wilson, 1995).

In addition, while the work here is certainly important, there are not many studies that use modern linguistic theories and analysis to frame classical Islamic texts that contextualise communicative acts within specific social-political conditions. Without a systematic application of Relevance Theory to Islamic narrations, it cannot fully produce its communicative depth and strategic design. This calls for a pragmatic analysis that would explain how injustice and denial of entitlement are communicated not just in the text.

1.2. Aims of the Study

The current study aims at

1. Analysing the ways in which explicature-implicature distinction is employed in the language of the selected religious texts on Al-Zaraa's Inheritance.
2. Interpreting the ways in which the strategies of contextual effect are utilised in the language of the selected religious texts on Al-Zaraa's Inheritance.
3. Identifying the ways in which the aspects of optimal relevance are used in the language of the selected religious texts on Al-Zaraa's Inheritance.

1.3. Research Questions

1. How is the explicature-implicature distinction used in the language of the selected religious texts on Al-Zaraa's Inheritance?
2. How are the strategies of contextual effects

employed in the language of the selected religious texts on Al-Zaraa's Inheritance?

3. In what ways do the aspects of optimal relevance are utilised in the language of the selected religious texts on Al-Zaraa's Inheritance?

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1. Definition of Pragmatics

Pragmatics is a discipline that studies language as a mode of social action. Language is not just a system of sentences; rather, the speaker does not simply produce a sentence, but performs the act, negotiates the relationship, shows the face, and manages social meaning. In this sense, pragmatics is necessary for the study of human communication, which always exists within context, which has a social dimension. Pragmatics also explains that many meanings during communication are not uttered directly. Implicature, presupposition, deixis and speech acts all show that most of what is communicated is based on inference, common ground, and context, not on literal meaning (Grice, 1975).

Scholars have conceptualised pragmatics from different perspectives. Therefore, it is defined in different ways. Lyons (1981) states that pragmatics is variously defined as "the study of actual utterance, the study of use rather than meaning, the study of that part of meaning which is not purely truth-conditioned; the study of performance rather than competence." According to Levinson (1983), "pragmatics is attached to the study of the principles that will account for why a certain set of sentences is anomalous, or not a possible utterance."

Leech (1983) stated that pragmatics is "the study of meaning in relation to speech situation." In this definition, the role of context is highlighted at the expense of formal features of language. Mey (1993) viewed pragmatics as "the study of the conditions of human language use as these are determined by the context of society." In Mey's definition, pragmatics is viewed as the impact a context has on the speaker's meaning. Being more specific, Thomas (1995) defined pragmatics as "meaning in interaction." In this way, he takes into account the speaker, the hearer, the utterance and the whole context.

Huang (2007) defined pragmatics as the rigorous study of meaning in relation to language use. Pragmatics is commonly thought of as the empirical study of the use of language, which includes the analysis of context-dependent meanings as well as meanings that were intended by the speaker (Fetzer, 2011). According to Levinson (1983), pragmatics is the examination of the relationships between language and situation that are essential to an

interpretation of language recognition.

2.2. Relevance Theory

Relevance Theory is a cognitive theory of human communication developed by D. Sperber and D. Wilson and was articulated in full in their publication in 1986. According to the inferential model, a communicator provides some evidence of her intent to convey a specific meaning, which the audience then infers according to the evidentiary material presented. The linguistic meaning recovered by means of decoding is only one of the inputs involved in the non-demonstrative inference process leading finally to an interpretation of the speaker's intended meaning (Wilson & Sperber, 2004).

2.2.1. Explicature and Implicature

Comprehension starts with the context-free identification of the logical form of an utterance, which is further developed to yield explicit information (Explicatures) and/or implicit information (implicatures). An explicature is an explicitly expressed assumption based on the logical form embodied by the utterance, whereas implicatures are assumptions which a communicator intends to express, but does not express (Sperber & Wilson, 1995).

2.2.2. Contextual Effects

The most salient type of cognitive effect that emerges from the processing of an input in terms of a contextual framework is a contextual implication, a conclusion that can be inferred only from the joint consideration of an input in combination with the surrounding context, but not from either of them alone. Additional categories of cognitive effect are the strengthening, the modification, or the abandonment of these pre-existing assumptions (Wilson & Sperber, 2004; 2012).

2.2.3. Optimal Relevance

Human cognitive processes, we contend, are set to generate the greatest cognitive effect with as little processing effort as possible. By the same token, relevance theory is that an input is relevant if it results in a positive cognitive effect as the result of its processing in a context of available assumptions (Yus, 2006).

2.3. Definition of Injustice

Great theorists have segmented four fundamental principles of justice, which they refer to as human rights. In this regard, any legal system that corresponds to these four principles and proves to adopt a higher respect towards them can be said to have a higher proportion of justice. A right to life is

the primary natural human right that cannot be denied to any person. This right is the basis of other rights, such as the right to defense. The second natural human right is the right to live according to reason; human society should free people to this natural ability (Akhzarian Kashani, 2017).

Injustice is the value or evidence of being unfair; iniquity, oppression. Also, an unfair doing or occurrence, the denial of other's rights. Shklar (1990) addressed the difference between misfortune and injustice based on our willingness and capacity to act or to abstain from acting for those who suffer; on whether we blame or exonerate; whether we assist or deny; and whether we justify or merely explain.

In religious, injustice is the disobedience of a commandment or a prevention of Almighty Allah. The term injustice is obtained from a root meaning, to misplace something. Therefore, it means to override the appropriate limit, to violate upon the right of people, or to commit a deed of oppression. In Qur'an, injustice is an inclusive term covering all formulae of injustice, from polytheism to the certain acts of transgression against one's self or others (Khadduri, 1984).

2.4. The Pragmatic Perspective of Injustice and Entailment Denial

A more pragmatic perspective on injustice and denial of entitlement is rooted in practical consequence rather than abstract construct of morals, and morality itself. Drawing from the philosophical tradition of pragmatism, closely linked to John Dewey and William James, this framework judges injustices based on their impact on lived experiences, social functioning, and human flourishing. From this perspective, injustice is not merely a violation of universal rights, but a disruption to social cooperation and the concrete conditions, which enable people to flourish (Dewey, 1927).

A more pragmatic view of entitlement is one, which sees it not as an abstract, static concept, but as something ultimately constructed socially and negotiated against a backdrop of specific contexts. Who has a "right" to what is subject to shifting norms, institutions, and power relations. Entitlement denial manifests in a system that does not fairly distribute benefit or recognition, which ironically targets marginalised communities (Anderson, 2010). This perspective emphasises, among other things, practical solutions and reform. Yet, the pragmatists note, that pin pointing injustice is only one-step, the end goal is to change the situation through practical means. It requires democratic deliberation, empirical inquiry, and experimentation with policies that further reduce inequality and restore fair access to

entitlements. Therefore, denial of entitlement is considered a social issue that needs societal attention, rather than mere reprobation (Pogge, 2008).

Finally, the pragmatic perspective draws attention to context, flexibility and inclusion in addressing injustice. It denies blanket solutions and calls for flexible strategies responsive to unique social conditions. Crucially, it centers the work of those impacted by denial of entitlements, because these individuals are the most critical actors for understanding and addressing injustice. The pragmatic view offers a functional and relational approach to moral reasoning that, based on practical outcomes and democratic processes, tends to avoid static views of social injustice, therefore allowing for solutions that are both theoretically grounded and socially engaged (Fraser, 2009).

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1. Nature of the Study

The current study is qualitative in nature and is devoted to the analysis of injustice and entailment denial in the language of the selected religious texts on Al-Zaraa's Inheritance. Qualitative research is an umbrella term encompassing an array of interpretive techniques which try to describe, decode, translate and otherwise come to terms with the meaning, not the frequency, of some more or less naturally occurring phenomena in the social world (Van Maanen, 1979). Dörnyei (2007) noted that qualitative research involves data collection procedures which result mainly in open-ended, non-numerical data that is then analysed primarily by non-statistical methods (Silverman, 2011).

The process of data selection used in this study follows purposive sampling, where the selection of the cases is aimed at choosing the cases that are particularly informative and relevant to the research objectives. As Patton notes, "the logic and power of purposeful sampling lie in selecting information-rich cases" (Patton, 2002, p.230). Accordingly, the selected narrations are chosen according to the relevance of the narration to the theme of injustice as well as the suitability of the narration to linguistic and interpretive analysis. The data of the present study includes four carefully chosen Extracts from selected religious texts on Al-Zaraa's Inheritance. Moreover, the researcher adopts Relevance theory as a model for the analysis of the selected data. The primary principles of Relevance Theory adopted in this study can be described as; Explicature-Implicature Distinction, Contextual Effects and Optimal Relevance.

4. DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

4.1. Extract (1)

حَدَّثَنَا عَبْدُ اللَّهِ بْنُ مُحَمَّدٍ حَدَّثَنَا هِشَامٌ أَخْبَرَنَا مَعْمَرٌ عَنِ الزُّهْرِيِّ عَنْ عُرْوَةَ (عن عائشة أَنَّ فَاطِمَةَ وَالْعَبَّاسَ وَالْعَبَّاسَ عَلَيْهِمَا السَّلَامُ أَتَيَا أَبَا بَكْرٍ يَلْتَمِسَانِ مِيرَاثَهُمَا مِنْ رَسُولِ اللَّهِ ﷺ وَهُمَا جَائِعَانِ يَطْلُبَانِ أَرْضَيْهِمَا مِنْ فَدَكٍ وَسَهْمَهُمَا مِنْ خَيْبَرَ). فَقَالَ لِهَيْمَا أَبُو بَكْرٍ: (سَمِعْتُ رَسُولَ اللَّهِ ﷺ يَقُولُ: لَا تُورَثُ، مَا تَرَكَنَا صَدَقَةً، إِنَّمَا يَأْكُلُ آلُ مُحَمَّدٍ مِنْ هَذَا الْمَالِ، قَالَ أَبُو بَكْرٍ: وَاللَّهِ لَا أَدْعُ أَمْرًا رَأَيْتُ رَسُولَ اللَّهِ ﷺ يَصْنَعُهُ فِيهِ إِلَّا صَنَعْتَهُ، قَالَ: فَهَجَرْتُهُ فَاطِمَةَ، فَلَمْ تَكَلِّمْهُ حَتَّى مَاتَتْ." (البخاري، 1997، كتاب الفرائض، حديث 6725-6726، ص381)

Narrated 'Aishah رضي الله عنها Fāṭima and al-'Abbās came to Abū Bakr, seeking their share from the property of Allāh's Messenger ﷺ, and at that time, they were asking for their land at Fadak and their share from Khaibar.... Abū Bakr said to them, "I have heard from Allāh's Messenger ﷺ saying, 'Our property is not to be inherited, and whatever we (after our death) leave is to be spent in charity, but the family of Muḥammad (ﷺ) may take their provisions from this property.'" Abū Bakr added, "By Allāh, I will not leave the procedure I saw Allāh's Messenger ﷺ following during his lifetime concerning this property." Therefore Fāṭima left Abū Bakr and did not speak to him till she died. (Al-Bukhari, 1997, The book of Al-Farā'id, Hadith nos. 6725-6726, p.381)

From a pragmatic perspective, this narration encodes the denial of entitlement via inferential design and not through explicit refusal, which puts Fatimah's right in a pragmatically weakened position. At the level of **Explicature-Implicature Distinction**, the explicatures in the narration are two authoritative propositions: the attributed prophetic maxim, "Our property is not to be inherited," and the procedural commitment, "I will not leave the procedure I saw the Messenger following." Both clauses do not necessarily encode a direct refusal speech act to the request that Fatimah made.

There is no surface-level proposition that can be identified as "your claim is rejected." Instead, rejection is an implicature that is required due to incompatibility between the inheritance request and the cited rule. This entails that the denial is inferentially constructed, not linguistically declared. In terms of relevance, when denial is encoded as implicature, as opposed to explicature, interpretive responsibility is located on the hearer, and the linguistic visibility of denial is diminished.

In terms of **Contextual Effects**, the action the narration performs is a frame replacement, which lowers the cognitive strength of the entitlement expectation. The first context set up by the clause "came seeking their share" sets up a frame of expectation of kinship inheritance. However, this frame is not actually expanded by supporting explicatures, such as transfer events, ownership predicates, or evidential markers. It is, however, contextually light. The introduced prophetic rule then serves as a context-replacing input, not only an

input that extends a context.

The entitlement frame had not been elaborated strongly, and hence the contextual revision occurred with rather low resistance. The next fact that Fatimah has no words to say for the rest of her life gives a strong interpersonal consequence, yet there is no evaluative commentary, so the reader has to form his or her own contextual evaluation. Therefore, the asymmetries in the distribution of contextual effects are rule activation is contextually strong, entitlement expectation is contextually thin.

Under **Optimal Relevance**, the narration is structured towards authoritative closure and minimum linguistic expansion, resulting in a phenomenon that can be termed relevance compression. A simple procedural rule, an attributed rule, and an oath-backed procedural commitment are given as being adequate to resolve the dispute; no long justification sequence exists and no dialogic elaboration. This has a high cognitive effect and claims termination at low processing cost.

By contrast, the claimant's loss and withdrawal require more inferential work for the reader to make the connection between consequence and cause. The processing burden is thus not evenly distributed, authority position is relevance-efficient; entitlement loss is inference-heavy. Pragmatically, this design gives precedence to the acceptance of rules and secondary to the denial of rights. Marginalisation is thus accomplished by optimal-relevance asymmetry; one side is coded as inferentially economical and decisive, the other as inferentially diffuse and indirect.

4.2. Extract (2)

يَابْنَ أَبِي قُحَافَةَ أَفِي كِتَابِ اللَّهِ تَرِثُ أَبَاكَ وَلَا أَرِثُ أَبِي؟ لَقَدْ جِئْتُ شَيْئًا فَرِيًّا! أَفْعَلِي عَمْدٍ تَرَكَتُمْ كِتَابَ اللَّهِ وَنَبَيْتُمُوهُ وَرَاءَ ظَهْرِكُمْ؟ إِذْ يَقُولُ: "وَرِثْ سُلَيْمَانَ دَاوُودَ..." وَرِثْ عَمْتَمَ: أَنْ لَا حِظْوَةَ لِي وَلَا أَرِثُ مِنْ أَبِي، وَلَا رَحِمَ بَيْنِنَا، أَفْخَصْكُمْ اللَّهُ بَابِيهَ أَخْرَجَ أَبِي مِنْهَا؟ أَمْ هَلْ تَقُولُونَ: أَنْ أَهْلَ مَلْتَيْنِ لَا يَتَوَارَثَانِ؟ أَوْلَسْتُ أَنَا وَأَبِي مِنْ أَهْلِ مَلَّةٍ وَاحِدَةٍ؟ (الطبرسي، 1966، ص138)

O son of Abu Quhafah! Where is it written in the Book of Allah that you inherit your father and I do not inherit mine? Surely you have come up with an unprecedented thing. Did you intentionally abandon the Book of Allah and turn your back on it? Have you not read where it says: 'And Sulaiman inherited Dawood?... You claimed that I have no share and that I do not inherit my father and there is no kinship between us! Did Allah reveal a verse regarding you from which He excluded my father? Or do you say, 'Fatimah and her father are the people of two faiths, they do not inherit each other! Are we not, me and my father, a people adhering to one faith? (Al-Tabarsi, 2017, p.132)

From a relevance-theoretic perspective, this narration builds up Fatimah's entitlement as

inferentially strong and highly visible by making supporting premises into explicit inputs, which tightly limit interpretation. At the point of the **Explicature-Implicature Distinction**, the discourse provides more than one entitlement, supporting explicatures: Qur'anic precedent of inheritance, continuity of kinship and identity of shared faith. Clauses like "*Sulaiman inherited Dawood*" and "*Are we not, me and my father, a people adhering to one faith?*" are explicit propositional content as opposed to background assumptions. These explicatures do not merely introduce a question to the picture, but rather introduce into the cognitive environment doctrinal and genealogical premises as processed assumptions. The accusation structures, "*Did you abandon the Book of Allah?*" provide another encoding of explicit challenge propositions.

Consequently, the inference space is greatly guided; to deny something one now must settle it to a set of explicit premises. In relevance terms, in cases where supporting premises have a high explicature, the competing interpretation, denial validity is inferentially costly. Entitlement is therefore brought to the centre of attention as it is explicature-supported as opposed to implicature-dependent.

Concerning **Contextual Effects**, the narration generates layering and mutually enhancing contextual inputs, and this contributes to the cognitive burden of the entitlement frame. The scriptural precedent, the kinship relation and the religious unity are not listed separately but piled up one after the other, and it forms the cumulative strengthening of the context. And every premise added increases contextual commitment and less interpretive flexibility.

Any competing rule will now have to override a thick rather than a thin constructed context. This leads to high contextual tension and high salience. In relevance theory, interpretations that resolve the most conflicts and have the fewest contradictions are preferred. Because the entitlement supporting context is constructed so richly, an interpretation that denial is problematic is made very accessible. Linguistically, injustice is not asserted, but comes out as the most context-coherent resolution of the premise cluster.

Under **Optimal Relevance**, the narration makes use of structured rhetorical interrogatives functioning as high-yield inferential stimuli that lead the reader to a constrained conclusion. Each question is intended to elicit powerful cognitive impacts with minimal processing effort based on the fact that it is making a known scriptural or doctrinal schema come to life. This is a kind of guided inferential

optimisation; instead of the long declarative accusation, the use of tightly targeted questions reduces interpretive possibilities. Processing effort is controlled, whereas cognitive effect is cumulative.

The argument is therefore highly relevant and efficient without being compressed; it is highly relevant through premise density. Unlike the relevance compression of the first narration in favour of authority closure, here relevance design is in favour of entitlement visibility in terms of inferential guidance. The most accessible interpretation in light of the stacked premises is that the denial is at odds with established norms. Entitlement is brought to the foreground due to the fact that relevance optimisation is not connected to the rule closure but to the premise reinforcement.

4.3. Extract (3)

أُرْسِلَتْ فَاطِمَةُ إِلَى أَبِي بَكْرٍ: أَنْتَ وَرَثَتِ رَسُولِ اللَّهِ ﷺ، أَمْ أَهْلُهُ؟ فَقَالَ: لَا، بَلْ أَهْلُهُ. قَالَتْ: فَأَيْنَ سَهْمُ رَسُولِ اللَّهِ ﷺ؟ فَقَالَ أَبُو بَكْرٍ: إِنِّي سَمِعْتُ رَسُولَ اللَّهِ ﷺ يَقُولُ: ((إِنَّ اللَّهَ عَزَّ وَجَلَّ إِذَا أَطْعَمَ نَبِيًّا طَعْمَةً، ثُمَّ قَبَضَهُ جَعَلَهُ لِلَّذِي يَقُومُ مِنْ بَعْدِهِ) فَرَأَيْتَ أَنْ أُرَدَّهُ عَلَى الْمُسْلِمِينَ. قَالَتْ: بَلَّأْتُ، وَمَا سَمِعْتُ مِنْ رَسُولِ اللَّهِ ﷺ أَعْلَمُ. (بن حنبل، 2008، ج1، ص56-57)

Fatimah sent word to Abu Bakr saying: Are you the heir of the Messenger of Allah or are his family? He said: No; rather his family (are his heirs). She said: Where is the share of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ? Abu Bakr said: I heard the Messenger of Allah ﷺ say: "If Allah grants some wealth to a Prophet, then takes his soul, He grants it to the one who took charge after him." So I have decided to give the benefit of it to the Muslims. She said: That is fine, and you know best what you heard from the Messenger of Allah ﷺ (Bin Hanbal, 2012, pp.31-32).

From a relevance theoretical perspective, this narration places Fatimah's entitlement in a pragmatically reduced inferential position, since the assertion is introduced mostly through the use of interrogatives instead of explicit propositions of entitlement. At the level of the **Explicature - Implicature distinction**, her utterances, "*Are you the heir ... or are his family?*" and "*Where is the share of the Messenger of Allah?*" are formulated as questions, and thus encode no declarative ownership statements. Interrogatives, unlike declaratives, do not have truth-conditional content; they do not make a claim to truth, but rather, they are meant to prompt clarification; therefore, the entitlement does not penetrate the hearer's cognitive environment with the force of a strong explicature, but rather, it remains an open issue to be answered.

In contrast, the reply "*I heard the Messenger of Allah say ...*" is in the form of an attributive report in the declarative manner, thus producing a full explicature grounded in authoritative tradition. The rejecting rule is therefore processed as explicit propositional

content, whereas the entitlement is still partially implicature-dependent. This explicature asymmetry explicit rule against interrogative claim has the consequence of a relatively poor inferential status for Fatimah's right vis-a-vis a relatively better status for the counter-position.

In terms of **Contextual Effects**, the order of narration establishes a low entitlement expectation before the rule-based override and therefore diminishes the cognitive salience of her right. Since no transfer verbs, proof markers, or evidential supports are evident from her speech, the contextual model developed by the reader only includes a general entitlement question, rather than a reinforced ownership assumption.

As a result, the contextual effects are still moderate and do not provide a strong stabilisation of an entitlement frame. When the attributed prophetic rule is introduced, there is no incompatibility with a heavily reinforced context, but the preceding questions create an interpretive gap, and the attributed rule helps fill it. This produces context-completing effects and not context-overturning effects.

Pragmatically, if the rule applies in a weak context instead of contradicting a strong one, the override seems smoother from a linguistic point of view and less disruptive. This smoothness exactly reduces the cognitive visibility of right denial: the contextual update prefers accepting a rule to reinforcing a claim; the claim had not been contextually amplified in advance.

Under **Optimal Relevance**, the narration is structured in such a way that the minimum number of authoritative words generates the greatest amount of interpretive payoff, to the benefit of the rejecting party. The entitlement aspect is reflected in the short interrogatives that take the response of the addressee before becoming cognitively productive and alone, having only limited cognitive effects.

On the other hand, the counter side provides a compact but high-yield stimulus; an attributed prophetic report and an executive decision "I heard ..." and "I have decided ..." have a strong cognitive effect with minimal processing effort. This is a good example of an optimal-relevance configuration with little linguistic material comes decisive interpretive payoff. Since relevance-guided interpretation follows the path of maximum cognitive effect for minimum effort, the hearer's inferential trail stabilises around the rule and decision structure as opposed to the unresolved issue of entitlement.

The final acceptance, "That is fine, and you know best," further reduces inferential competition by

signalling interpretive closure. Linguistically, this relevance design leads to a pragmatic marginalisation. The right is formulated as a question but is settled in a more relevant, efficient, and authoritative answer so that the right of override is cognitively more dominant than the right of the claim.

4.4. Extract (4)

لما قبض رسول الله صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم وجلس أبو بكر مجلسه، بعث أبو بكر إلى وكيل فاطمة عليها السلام فأخبره من فدك، فأنته فاطمة عليها السلام فقالت: يا أبا بكر ادعيت أنك خليفة أبي وجلست مجلسه، وأنت بعثت إلى وكيلي فأخرجته من فدك وقد تعلم أن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم صدق بها علي وأن لي بذلك شهوداً، فقال: إن النبي صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم لا يورث. (القمي، 2007، ص. 168)

When the Prophet of Allāh passed away and Abū Bakr sat in his place (as the caliph), he sent a message to the representative of Fāṭemah at Fadak and expelled him. Fāṭemah came to Abū Bakr and said, 'O Abū Bakr! You claim to be the successor of my father and sit in his place, and you sent your messenger to expel my representative from Fadak when you know that the Prophet of Allāh had gifted it to me and I have witnesses for it. Abu Bakr replied, 'The Prophets do not leave anything as inheritance.' (Al-Qummi, 2010, pp. 155–156)

From a relevance theorist's point of view, this narration is pragmatically constructed such that Fatimah's entitlement is processed as high-certainty interpretation before any rejecting rule is introduced. At the level of the **Explicature - Implicature Distinction**, the main elements of the entitlement claim are expressed in the form of full explicatures, instead of being left to inference. The schemes "the Prophet had gifted it to me" and "I have witnesses for it" are instantiated linguistically as direct, truth-conditional content including both completed-transfer and evidential predicates.

Since these elements are explicatures, the hearer is not obliged to carry out contextual enrichment to establish an ownership status, the entitlement comes to the cognitive environment directly, as an explicit assumption. The rejecting reply, a general inheritance rule, does not explicitly negate the gift event, nor the testimonies; rather, the denial effect takes place as an implicature resulting from applying the rule to the case.

This creates an explicature-implicature asymmetry in that the entitlement is explicit, while the cancellation is inferential. In terms of relevance theory, however, explicitly encoded assumptions have more initial cognitive stability than implicature-based cancellations, and this means that Fatimah's entitlement survives the process of interpretation despite the processing of the counter-rule.

In terms of the **Contextual Effects**, the narrative

develops entitlement salience with cumulative contextual strengthening before the introduction of conflict. Each explicature, of the type of *gift transfer*, *representative presence*, *witness testimony*, is an assumptive strengthening input, raising the level of activation of the ownership frame in the hearer's mental context. These inputs are not stated redundantly, rather mutually reinforcing and thus producing layered contextual effects, in opposed to isolated effects. When the categorical inheritance rule is then introduced, it does not build on this context but instead conflicts with it requiring an operation of contextual revision.

Relevance theory argues that when a strongly established assumption is forced to revise, high levels of cognitive contrast and, consequently, salience will be created. Linguistically, this shows in the fact that the entitlement is not backgrounded: it is rendered first cognitively prominent and only then constrained. Because of contextual strengthening prior to the override, the entitlement is in the foreground of the inferential record and its restriction is processed as an interpretive visible adjustment rather than a neutral clarification.

Under the **Optimal Relevance** Framework, the narrative gives more processing space and informational weight to the entitlement side than to the rejecting side and this affects interpretive prominence. The claim of the entitlement is expressed through a number of clauses and evidential markers, which result in a high information stimulus that has rich cognitive effects that justify more processing effort.

On the contrary, the counter-statement is linguistically compact, a short categorical rule, which represents a low processing-cost stimulus with global cancelling scope. This creates an imbalance in relevance, the audience puts forth greater resources in the creation of the entitlement interpretation than in processing the rule of override. In relevance-theoretic terms, interpretations that require more justified processing effort are more likely to remain cognitively traceable even after being modified.

Consequently, Fatimah's right remains

inferentially foregrounded, the rule being a superimposed constraint and not discursive replacement. Thus, in terms of pragmatic level, optimal relevance design in this narrative allows for the visibility of her entitlement despite categorical denial.

5. CONCLUSION

This study concludes that the marginalisation or foregrounding of Sayyidah Fatimah's entitlement in the selected Islamic narrations is not merely a thematic element of historical reporting, but also a pragmatic mechanism used to control the inferences of the reader. In the Relevance-Theoretic analysis of the four narrations, an in-depth inferential imbalance between the discourse of the claim and the discourse of denial is apparent. The entitlement in the texts that prefer authoritative closure, such as in 1 and 3 extracts is pragmatically backgrounded. It is either formulated as an underspecified interrogative or cancelled as a heavy implicature rather than an assertion. By relevance compression, the authoritative denial is coded to produce the greatest cognitive impact with the least processing costs, which makes the right diffuse indirectly to the audience.

Extracts 2 and 4, on the other hand, represent a pragmatic design that foreshadows the entitlement with power. The cognitive context becomes exceptionally strong and confident by reducing the evidence for the claim like: scriptural precedent, the gift, and witnesses to explicit and truth-conditional explicatures. The rejecting rule is deprived of its inferential advantage in such cases; it becomes an overlay that does not fit the given context but is a discontinuous discursive supplement. Finally, this study confirms that, in these classical texts, linguistic injustice is actively implemented through an optimal-relevance design. The historical marginalisation of rights is entrenched in the unequal allocation of cognitive energies, the explicit encoding of language, and the strategic manipulation of interpretive routes to create historical perception.

REFERENCES

- Akhzarian Kashani, M. R. (2017). An overview on the dimensions and pillars of justice in Islam. *Review of European Studies*, 9(3), 1-7. <https://doi.org/10.5539/res.v9n3p1>
- Al-Bukhari, M. I. (1997). *The translation of the meanings of Sahîh Al-Bukhârî* (M. M. Khan, Trans.). Darussalam.
- Al-Qummi, A. (2007). *Bayt al-ahzan fi masa'ib sayyidat al-niswan*. Faros.
- Al-Qummi, A. (2010). *House of sorrows: A translation of Baytul Ahzan: The life of Sayyidah Fatimah al-Zahra and her grief* (A. A. T. Husain, Trans.). Islamic Publishing House.
- Al-Tabarsi, A. M. (1966). *Al-Ihtijaj* [Argumentation]. Dar al-Nu'man.
- Al-Tabarsi, A. M. (2017). *Ihtijaj (Argumentation)* (S. A. H. Sarkeshikian, Trans.). Ansariyan Publications.

- Anderson, E. (2010). *The imperative of integration*. Princeton University Press.
- Dewey, J. (1927). *The public and its problems*. Henry Holt and Company.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methodologies*. Oxford University Press.
- Fetzer, A. (2011). Pragmatics as a linguistic concept. In W. Bublitz & N. R. Norrick (Eds.), *Foundations of pragmatics* (pp. 23–50). De Gruyter Mouton.
- Fowler, R. (1991). *Language in the news: Discourse and ideology in the press*. Routledge.
- Fraser, N. (2009). *Scales of justice: Reimagining political space in a globalizing world*. Columbia University Press.
- Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics: Vol. 3. Speech acts* (pp. 41–58). Academic Press.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1994). *An introduction to functional grammar*. Edward Arnold.
- Huang, Y. (2007). *Pragmatics*. Oxford University Press.
- Ibn Hanbal, A. (2008). *Al-Musnad* (M. A. 'Ata, Ed.). Dar Al-Kotob Al-Ilmiyah.
- Ibn Hanbal, A. (2012). *Musnad Imam Ahmad bin Hanbal* (Vol. 1, N. al-Khattab, Trans.; H. al-Khattab, Ed.). Darussalam.
- Khadduri, M. (1984). *The Islamic conception of justice*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. Longman.
- Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Lyons, J. (1981). *Language and linguistics: An introduction*. Cambridge University Press.
- Madelung, W. (1997). *The succession to Muhammad: A study of the early caliphate*. Cambridge University Press.
- Mey, J. L. (1993). *Pragmatics: An introduction*. Blackwell.
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Pogge, T. (2008). *World poverty and human rights*. Polity Press.
- Shklar, J. N. (1990). *The faces of injustice*. Yale University Press.
- Silverman, D. (2011). *Interpreting qualitative data* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Sperber, D., & Wilson, D. (1995). *Relevance: Communication and cognition* (2nd ed.). Blackwell.
- Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in interaction: An introduction to pragmatics*. Longman.
- Van Maanen, J. (1979). Reclaiming qualitative methods for organizational research: A preface. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 24(4), 520–526.
- Wilson, D., & Sperber, D. (2004). Relevance theory. In L. Horn & G. Ward (Eds.), *The handbook of pragmatics* (pp. 607–632). Blackwell.
- Wilson, D., & Sperber, D. (2012). *Meaning and relevance*. Cambridge University Press.
- Yus, F. (2006). Relevance theory. In K. Brown (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of language and linguistics* (2nd ed.). Elsevier.