



The Socio-Theological Foundations of Religious and Interreligious Dialogues in the Qur'ān*

*Seyyed Mahmoud Nejati Hosseini (Khorasani)*¹ 

Submitted: 2025.09.30 | Accepted: 2025.11.25

Abstract

Dialogue is the foundation of peaceful collective life in the contemporary modern world. Within the religious and interreligious lifeworld as well, dialogue constitutes the basis of peaceful religiosity. The foundation of a peaceful religious dialogue is also tolerance–understanding–agreement; which itself is a socio-cultural institution and the product of the history, culture, and society in which this process is to be realized. In other words, religious dialogues—interreligious, intrareligious, and extrareligious—arise from the interaction and tension between text and context. In this regard, the mode of reading and interpreting sacred texts (including the Qur'ān) can contribute, from cognitive and doctrinal perspectives, to understanding these dialogues. The problem addressed in this article is likewise the hermeneutical understanding of interreligious, intrareligious, extrareligious, and inter-sectarian religious dialogues within the contemporary Islamic lifeworld, with reference to the text of the Qur'ān. By posing the following guiding key question—“How is the culture of foundational dialogue in the Qur'ān formulated, and upon what social context does it take shape?”—this article seeks to provide text-based responses accompanied by their

© The Author(s) 2026.



* A shortened version of this article was presented at the “International Conference on Imam Riḍā and Interreligious Dialogue” (January 2024, Mashhad – Āstān Quds Raḍavī) and was also published in the volume Proceedings of the Selected Papers of the “International Conference on Imam Riḍā and Interreligious Dialogue” (Imam Riḍā and Interreligious Dialogue, 2025, pp. 279–291), edited by the Islamic Research Foundation of Āstān Quds Raḍavī. The present article, however, constitutes an expanded and detailed version of the aforementioned published article, together with a new revision of it. It should be noted that a more extensive version of this article had previously been presented at the “International Conference on Interreligious Dialogue: Peaceful Coexistence”, University of Sistan and Baluchestan – Faculty of Theology and Islamic Studies (November 2022; <http://seminars.usb.ac.ir/icid>).

1. Head of the Sociology of Religion Section, Institute for Social Studies and Research, University of Tehran (Nejati.hosseini@gmail.com)

hermeneutical interpretation. Accordingly, for this purpose, the methods of “religious and theological hermeneutics” and the “sociology of theology theory” have been employed, as appropriate to the discussion, in order to analyze the responses.

Keywords: Qur’ān, Religious and Interreligious Dialogues, Religious Hermeneutics, Hermeneutics of the Sacred Text, Theological Hermeneutics, Sociology of Theology

1. Introduction: on the relationship between sociology and theology

The *theological* in the Abrahamic religions, depending on its nature, encompasses concepts- phenomena such as: the attributes of glory (jalāl), beauty (jamāl), perfection, and the power of God; revelation (waḥy); faith (īmān); resurrection (ma’ād); divine justice (‘adl ilāhī); the hereafter (ākhirah); salvation; deliverance; divine providence; miracles; the divine kingdom (malakūt); creation (khalq); the soul (rūḥ); glad tidings and warnings (indhār); promise (wa’d); punishment and retribution (‘adhāb wa ‘iqāb wa ‘itāb); reward; and intercession (shafā’at). Knowledge related to the understanding of the *theological*, both in its traditional and academic forms, is *ilāhiyyāt* (theology in the Judeo-Christian cultural context) and *kalām* (in the Islamic tradition). Philosophical theology and the philosophy of religion are also modernized disciplines whose subject matter is the theological, but addressed in the form of rational discussion and philosophical argumentation. These fields fundamentally concern the nature and meaning of the theological, rather than the modes of its manifestation and the mechanisms of its realization within historical, cultural, and social contexts.

Accordingly, the historical–empirical investigation of the relationship between *the theological* and *the social* is undertaken within other fields of study, which include: 1) **social theology** (the examination of the relationship between the theological and the social with the aim of understanding the manner of the manifestation of the theological within the social context, the ways in which the theological is understood and rendered meaningful in society, and the manner of the social application of the theological as understood and made meaningful within the social context); 2) **sociotheology** (the study of the reciprocal influences between society and the theological); and 3) **theosociology** (the sociological inference of social themes, social concepts, social teachings, social patterns, social mechanisms, and social processes related to the theological and affected and inspired by the theological, derived from the sacred text).

In sum, whereas the discipline of **sociotheology** concerns itself with the study of

the manner, trajectory, and mechanisms of the realization of the theological within the historical-social setting and the cultural and social context, the subject and aim of **theosociology** is the understanding of the social that is formulated in the theological text and the sacred text in the form of the theological, yet with a social orientation. Therefore, from this perspective, the theoretical and methodological orientation of the present article properly belongs to the domain of **sociotheology**, rather than social theology or theosociology, in the sense explained above.

2. The Question of Religious Dialogue

The question of the article is how this peaceful religious dialogue has been formulated within the dialogical logic of the Qur'ān. Our idea is that this Qur'ānic dialogical logic, while being unique in its own kind, also possesses intercultural implications and permits comparison with the Abrahamic sacred texts—the Torah and the Gospel—and with Asian traditions within other religious contexts—Judaism, Christianity, Hindu-Buddhism, Zoroastrianism, and Manichaeism. In the Qur'ān, this logic is oriented toward the discovery and understanding of the truth of the theological and monotheistic reality for both the participants in dialogue and those addressed in dialogue, drawn from diverse religious subcultures, and its aim is spiritual-ethical salvation and socio-cultural liberation.

In this regard, the mode of reading sacred texts, including the Qur'ān, can contribute to the understanding of these dialogues from cognitive and doctrinal perspectives. The problem of the present article is the hermeneutical understanding of such interreligious, intrareligious, and extrareligious religious dialogues within the contemporary Islamic lifeworld, with reference to the text of the Qur'ān, without referring to Qur'ānic exegeses. Therefore, by posing the following guiding key question—"How is the culture of foundational dialogue in the Qur'ān formulated, and upon what social context is it capable of appearance and manifestation?"—the present article seeks to provide text-based responses accompanied by their hermeneutical interpretation. Our assumption is that this Qur'ānic logic is close to the "philosophical logic of Socratic-Habermasian dialogue."

Methodologically as well, in this article we have employed the method of religious-theological hermeneutics and, as appropriate to the discussion, the theory of sociotheology, in order to understand the Qur'ānic dialogical logic as well as the Socratic-Habermasian dialogical logic, so that we may attain a Theo-Philosophico-social analysis of the responses.

3. On Philosophical–Theological and Cultural–Social Dialogical Logics

Dialogue constitutes the foundation of peaceful collective life in the contemporary world. With reference to “*discursive ethics*”, developed by the great contemporary European philosopher–sociologist Jürgen Habermas (see Holub 1375SH; Manūchihrī and Nejātī Ḥusaynī 1385SH), the life-activity of the modern social actor within the public sphere and civil society is contingent upon the possession of a cultural language for peaceful interaction. The roots of this are grounded in a dialogue imbued with *understanding* (rational understanding of the issue), *mutual understanding* (the rational making-understood of the issue to one another), and *agreement* (the rational acceptance of mutual understandings for collective joint action) (see Nejātī Ḥusaynī 1389SH).

According to Habermasian discursive logic, two categories are central: first, the justification for the necessity of dialogue; second, the fulfillment of the necessary conditions for the formation of an ideal dialogue. Attention to these two, especially when compared with the Qur’ānic discursive logic (see Nejātī Ḥusaynī 1400SH) and its philosophical dialogical logic, namely “Socratic dialogue” (*Socratic logoi*) (see Nejātī Ḥusaynī 1386SH), is essential. In brief, Habermasian discursive logic is founded upon the following components (see Nejātī Ḥusaynī 1389SH):

A) According to Habermasian discursive logic, all human beings, as actors, possess the “*right, capacity, and communicative rational competence for dialogue*.” Accordingly, this dialogical logic is founded upon the following requirements, rules, and processes:

1. Human beings, as social entities, seek social interaction.
2. Any form of social interaction requires mutual understanding, that is, one’s understanding of the other.
3. Moreover, interaction necessitates agreement, that is, the acceptance of mutual self–other understandings.
4. Any authentic understanding and agreement of this kind itself requires a form of argumentative and deliberative dialogue.
5. The precondition of such dialogue is the use of language.
6. Language must be employed within the framework of communicative action—one that is generated solely for the non-instrumental and non-strategic coordination of the process of reaching understanding and agreement.
7. Within this linguistic dialogical action, there exists a form of communicative rationality, meaning the competence to use language for debating, arguing, persuading, convincing, and satisfying the other toward the acceptance of

shared understandings.

8. This communicative rationality is grounded in a rule concerning the production of communicative, dialogical, and linguistic norms of action, generated with the aim of attaining understanding and agreement for coordinated action in the social, cultural, legal, and political spheres.
9. Any such intersubjective dialogue, oriented toward the production of norms of understanding and agreement, must be based upon a form of discursive ethics that encompasses validity claims (intelligibility, truth, rightness, and moral sincerity).
10. These claims imply that the propositions advanced must be comprehensible to the other; they must correspond to reality and be truthful; they must be expressed with honesty, integrity, and moral sincerity; and finally, they must possess a genuine normative grounding, such that maximal desirable understanding, agreement, and consensus may be attained regarding them.

B) The principal foundation of this discursive ethics—which, in a certain sense, rests upon just, equal, and fair social and political structures and serves as the primary determinant of any dialogical norm-production—also applies to order and discipline. These must be realized within the framework of the following conditions:

First, the outcomes of deliberation must be derived from strong rational argumentation, and chance, luck, fortune, contingent circumstances, and the like must have no role in them.

Second, all participants in dialogue must enjoy equal opportunity for deliberation and mutual persuasion.

Third, force, domination, repression, hegemony, ideological distortion, metaphysical commands, and the like must not overshadow the rational arguments of the interlocutors.

Fourth, unequal social, political, legal, and cultural conditions must not affect the opportunities that ought to secure a just and fair situation for dialogue and for the processes of reaching conclusions and attaining maximal understanding, agreement, and consensus.

As stated earlier, within the religious and interreligious lifeworld as well, dialogue constitutes the fundamental substratum of peaceful religious practice. The foundation of a peaceful religious dialogue—grounded in tolerance, understanding, and agreement—is itself a cultural and social construct, a product of the history, culture, and society within which such dialogue is to be realized. In other words,

interreligious, intrareligious, and extrareligious religious dialogues arise from the interaction and dialectical engagement between text and context.

In this regard, it is also necessary to attend to the “logic of Socratic argumentation,” which demonstrates the logical mechanism for advancing a dialogue toward an ideal outcome (see Nejati Hosseini 1385SH):

A) The Socratic method is an intersubjective dialectical dialogue—a method grounded in question and answer among living human beings for the purpose of discovering the truth of human affairs. From Socrates’ perspective, since the knowledge of truth and the essence of things are mutually related, the only proper method for uncovering such truth is precisely this dialogical method, which also holds a distinctive place in everyday life. Socrates’ aim in adopting this method was to lead interlocutors to an awareness of their own ignorance regarding truth and the fundamental questions of human life. His role, however, consisted primarily in posing essential questions; thus, it was seldom the case that he had ready-made answers up his sleeve.

B) To understand this logic, its constituent elements must be arranged together so that the manner of applying this *intersubjective dialectical dialogical* method becomes clearer. In what follows, the stages of this reconstructed logic are presented. The process as a whole consists of four principal phases—“posing the problem, raising questions, offering definitions, and pursuing the chain of reasoning in dialogue”.

1. **First stage:** A problem or subject is introduced as the point of entry into the dialogue.
2. **Second stage:** Several key questions concerning the subject are raised.
3. **Third stage:** A number of definitions are proposed in order to clarify the subject.
4. **Fourth stage:** A chain of reasoning is advanced in order to arrive at an appropriate definition.
5. **Fifth stage:** Through a review of the proposed definitions, inadequate definitions are rejected and the more adequate one is accepted.
6. **Sixth stage:** If the dialogue is guided toward an appropriate definition of the subject, the intended philosophical, ethical, and political inferences are derived from it.
7. **Seventh stage:** With the clarification of the definition of the problem, the principal presupposition of the dialogue is directed toward genuine knowledge of the subject.
8. **Eighth stage:** The fundamental presupposition of the dialogue is that, upon

attaining knowledge of the subject, correct conduct related to the matter under discussion will take shape.

This logic is grounded in the method of doubt and definition: doubting everything and proposing multiple definitions. It also embodies a form of Socratic “irony”—that is, the avowal of ignorance regarding the subjects under discussion.

These two dialogical logics, which we designate as philosophical-cultural-social dialogical logic, function in the contemporary modern lifeworld as a foundational presupposition—and even as an ideal-typical model—for advancing *intra-discursive dialogues*, particularly among religious subcultures, as well as *inter-discursive dialogues*, especially between religionists, secularists, non-religionists, and atheists.

4. The Conceptual Construct of Qur'ānic Dialogue

In a comparative perspective, we are likewise confronted with the formats of Qur'ānic dialogue—that is, the dialogical phenomenon as it is inscribed in the Qur'ān. Such an engagement may be understood as a traditional-modern-postmodern rendering, rather than a mere replication of the exact form in which the Qur'ān itself articulated it. In another study, the present author has examined this significant matter in detail under the title “*The Dialogical Logic of the Qur'ān: Sapiential-Philosophical Requirements, Theological-Metaphysical Implications, and Discursive-Ideological Guidelines*” (see Nejati Hosseini 1400SH). According to this modern Qur'ānic inquiry, the characteristics, dimensions, and requisites of the primary format of Qur'ānic dialogical logic—which are of the genus of ‘theologico-cultural discourse’—may be summarized under several components. It should be clarified that the foundations of *inter-religious dialogue* in the Qur'ān, while in themselves situated under this broader framework, nevertheless possess distinctive and differentiated characteristics of their own, depending on the specific conditions and requisites of the interreligious (between religions) and intrareligious (within religion) domains. These will be addressed in due course. The principal characteristics of Qur'ānic dialogical discourse may be outlined as follows (see Nejati Hosseini 1400SH):

First – The Gestalt of Dialogue in the Qur'ān. Dialogues in the Qur'ān appear in two forms and are correspondingly intelligible and knowable in these two respects: as *form* and as *content*. As **form**, they assume particular configurations—for example, the dialogue between God and the prophets; with the angels; with Iblīs and Satan; with Adam; with human beings; with history; with existence; and with nature. As **content**, they consist in the object of God's dialogue with His dialogical subject and interlocutor—ranging from the object of promise and warning, to admonition and

glad tidings, and from the object of the nature of the human being, existence, history, and the world, to the ultimate destiny of them all.

Second – Dialogue-Indicative Keywords in the Qur’ān. Among the most significant dialogue-generating keywords in the Qur’ānic verses (occurring approximately 530 times) are the terms: *qālat* (she said), *qālū* (they said), *qulnā* (We said), *qīla* (it was said), *al-qawl* (speech), *qawlan* (a saying), *qawlahum* (their saying), *qūlū* (say!), and *nādī* (he called).

Third – The Processual Mechanism of Dialogue in the Qur’ān. This mechanism is “theological–sapiential–metaphysical–cultural” in nature, in the following sense:

A) All Qur’ānic dialogues, in one way or another, pertain to the necessary, perpetual, pre-eternal, and everlasting relation of God with *being, nature, humanity, and history* (the **theological dimension**);

B) This theological relation, as manifested in Qur’ānic dialogue, inherently contains instruction concerning life and felicity (the **sapiential dimension**).

C) Such sapiential instruction—concerning the primordial nature (*fiṭrah*) of the human being and the ultimate destiny of humankind—leads to the discussion of foundational existential questions, questions to which science and even philosophy are unable to provide definitive and final answers (the **metaphysical dimension**).

D) Finally, the outcomes derived from this metaphysical grounding in Qur’ānic dialogues generate a form of value–normative model-building for the life-project and life-policy of social human beings—past, present, and future—aimed at attaining worldly and otherworldly felicity (the **cultural dimension**).

Fourth – Representative and General Types of Dialogue in the Qur’ān. On the basis of the aforementioned analytical patterns and a hermeneutical understanding of the verses corresponding to the dialogical phenomenon in the Qur’ān—as elaborated and documented in detail in the body of the article—five principal Qur’ānic dialogical models may be identified:

A) The “Speech-Act Model” and God as Dialogical Agent. This model serves to manifest truth, awaken awareness, liberate from ignorance, and accepting the truth and acting upon the truth. It constitutes a form of “saying in order to perform an act.” In the Qur’ān and its dialogical logic, speaking and hearing are not for mere exchange, but for stabilizing the condition of acting upon the intended truth—or refraining from acting against it. The primary addressees of such speech are the principal metaphysical–theological objects and subjects of creation—namely, the angels, Adam, Iblīs, and Satan. These dialogues unfold across several diverse yet interconnected episodes, functioning together as a systemic whole.

B) The “Guidance–Liberation Model.” In this form, dialogue contains elements of spiritual–ethical guidance and a path out of crisis. Here, God assumes the position of the *overseer* of dialogue, while the prophet addressed assumes the role of the *dialogical agent*.

C) The “Protest–Critical Dialogue Model.” In this model, protest and critical exchanges culminate in prophetic guidance and warning, demonstrating the stabilization of God’s law-governed historical traditions and the everlasting logic of divine care, grace, mercy, and justice, which encompass believing servants. Conversely, the logic of wrath, anger, chastisement, and punishment encompasses unbelieving deniers. These dialogues convey a profound lesson in spiritual–ethical existence for all addressees of the Qur’ān and for adherents of monotheistic theology: namely, that according to the all-encompassing divine justice and divinely ordained standards—including the decree of deliverance for believers and destruction for unbelievers—divine commands apply without discrimination, irrespective of lineage, even familial relation to a prophet. They also demonstrate the socio-historical reality that deliverance from destruction derives solely from the worthiness of God’s servants (albeit through divine grace), and bears no relation to partisan, class, gender, racial, or tribal affiliations—whether modern or traditional. In the Qur’ānic tradition, the righteous flourish, and the unrighteous perish.

D) The “Admonitory–Guidance Dialogue Model.” Here, divine criticism of the addressed prophet—due to an unwarranted request grounded in insufficient knowledge—leads to the admonition that the prophet must avoid falling into ignorance. Subsequently, given the expansiveness of prophetic spirit aligned with truth rather than opposition to it, the prophet accepts the critique, seeks forgiveness and mercy from God, and implicitly commits to refraining from requests that lie outside divine logic and tradition.

E) The “Narrative–Historical–Ritual Dialogue Model.” This type of dialogue is confined to narrating historical and communal “ritual events,” occurring predominantly in the exchanges between prophets and their peoples—particularly disbelieving groups—and portraying the respective positions and ultimate destinies of believers and unbelievers. Rhetorically, the principal form of these dialogues is a synthesis of *narration* (a plot-structured account) and *story* (a report without structured plot). It thus constitutes a purposeful and meaningful historical recounting of events, descriptive of their beginnings and ends, sufficient to convey the historical destiny of a community and its religious tradition. The Qur’ānic *Qīṣaṣ al-Anbiyā’* (Stories of the Prophets) abounds in this type of dialogue.

We derived the specific instances of these types of dialogue in the Qur'ān through systematic sampling and case analysis. According to our analytical survey of the Qur'ānic verses, a total of 1114 occurrences contain keywords pertaining to the content, meaning, and mechanism of "dialogue." These verses include references to the *logic of dialogue*, *form of dialogue*, *content of dialogue*, *problematics of dialogue*, *dialogical theses*, *dialogical synthesis*, *dialogical strategy*, and *dialogical recommendation*. The relevant lexical items are as follows: *qāla* (529 instances); *qālat* (43 instances); *qālū* (332 instances); *qulnā* (27 instances); *qīla* (49 instances); *al-qawl* (52 instances); *qawlan* (19 instances); *qawlahum* (12 instances); *qūlū* (12 instances); and *qīla* (49 instances) (see Nejātī Ḥusaynī 1400SH).

5. On the Methodological-Theoretical Dimensions of Religious–Theological Hermeneutics of the Sacred Text

The methodological-theoretical dimensions of religious–theological hermeneutics of the sacred text—which are concerned with the precise and profound analysis of meaning, the recovery of the author's intended meaning, the contextual factors shaping the form and content of the text, and the mechanism of meaning-transmission to the audience—possess particular resonance for Islamic studies and, consequently, for modern Qur'ānic scholarship. This is especially significant from the perspective of the *Philosophy of Qur'ānic Studies*—a field concerned with the methodological and theoretical foundations and approaches of both traditional and modern Western and Muslim Qur'ānic scholarship. The present author has addressed the matter precisely from this vantage point (see Nejati Hosseini 1398SH). In particular, the majority of these issues may be subsumed under what the late Egyptian Qur'ānic scholar Nasr Hamid Abu Zayd termed the *understanding of the meaning of the text*.^{*} This may be regarded as a specific form of religious–theological hermeneutics, namely, **Qur'ānic studies hermeneutics** (see Abū Zayd 1990). According to Abū Zayd—cited by the Arabic-to-Persian translator of his work *The Meaning of the Text: A Study in the Sciences of the Qur'ān*—the most significant theory advanced in this Qur'ānic hermeneutical inquiry is as follows (Abū Zayd 1990, 13):

... Abū Zayd considers the linkage between text and reality to hold true for every eminent text that constitutes a literary, artistic, and cultural masterpiece, such as the Qur'ān. By 'reality,' he refers to the totality of social, cultural, economic, political, and

^{*} Nasr Hamid Abu Zayd, *Maḥmūm al-Naṣṣ: Dirāsah fī 'Ulūm al-Qur'ān* (Beirut: al-Markaz al-Thaqāfī al-'Arabī, 1990).

legal contexts that, before the formation of the text, during its formation, and after its emergence, are in some manner reflected in the language and culture of the specific community addressed by the text. On the basis of this 'hermeneutical theory,' no text comes into being in a vacuum, detached from its time and place. Rather, every text—especially a linguistic text (such as the Qur'ān)—is always a mirror of the language and culture of its author (the Prophet) and its addressees (the followers). The Qur'ān, as a linguistic text, is no exception to this principle.

According to this indigenized interpretation for the Islamic world and for Islamic religious and sacred texts—an interpretation whose general premise is likewise recognized by Western hermeneuticians—it must further be added that:

...The dialectical relation between text and reality is a two-sided relation. Accordingly, if we wish to speak of the Qur'ānic text, we must remember that the Qur'ān is not merely a passive reflection of the reality of its time. First, it actively reconstructs that reality: it discards certain negative elements, accepts others, and introduces new elements into them. Second, once the text becomes the dominant and governing text (and framework) within culture and society, it in turn exerts a powerful influence upon the surrounding reality.

Ultimately, what emerges—and what is of particular relevance for Qur'ānic hermeneutics, including the present article—is reflection upon this socio-ontological reality: that the Qur'ān is, in its initial moment, a form of *being-shaped-by-reality* (a product of reality), yet subsequently manifests as *shaping-reality* (a formative root of reality). The implications arising from these two socio-cultural realities—both connected to the sacred text in Islam—must logically be observed in any hermeneutical textual analysis, including that undertaken here. A substantial body of scholarship has been developed in this regard, particularly within theological hermeneutics (encompassing semantic analysis, interpretive approaches, and exegetical and ta'wīl-oriented methodologies specific to the sacred texts of the Abrahamic traditions, centered upon the divine). Owing to the limitations of space, even addressing the shared core of this literature is not feasible here (for example, see: Bartholomew 2015; Bowald 2007; Jeanrond 1999; Paddison 2005; Kearney 2019; Aly Ismail 2017).

6. The Hermeneutical Construct of Interreligious Dialogue in the Qur'ān

It was previously stated that interreligious dialogue constitutes one dimension of the phenomenon of religious dialogue. From the perspective of religious–theological

hermeneutics, religious dialogues may be analytically examined on three interrelated yet relatively autonomous levels: **A) *Interreligious dialogues*** — the possibility of civilizational dialogues among the Abrahamic and Asian religions; **B) *Intrareligious and intra-discursive dialogues*** — the possibility of cultural dialogues within the Abrahamic religions or within the Asian religious traditions; **C) *Extrarreligious and extra-discursive dialogues*** — the possibility of ideological and discursive dialogues between religionists and secularists or scientific thinkers.

Within the Qur'ān, findings pertaining to all three levels of religious dialogue may be identified. However, the present study focuses exclusively on a particularly significant dialogical genre emphasized in the Qur'ān: namely, the space of interreligious dialogue centered upon Islam, with the participation of Judaism and Christianity within the framework of the *Ahl al-Kitāb* (People of the Book). In total, 54 relevant Qur'ānic verses (distributed across 21 sūrahs) may be identified in this regard. From a hermeneutical perspective, particular attention may be directed toward several key sūrahs—especially Qur'ān chapters commonly classified among the *Suwar al-Ṭiwāl* (the long sūrahs): Surah al-Baqarah, Surah Al Imran, Surah al-Mā'idah, and Surah an-Nisa. These, in our view, constitute primary textual loci for discovering, understanding, and interpreting the meaning of the interreligious dialogical space of the People of the Book. In the schematic representation below, an attempt is made to present a condensed mapping of this Qur'ānic interreligious hermeneutic framework.

Conceptual-Hermeneutic Space of Inter-religious Dialogues in the Qur'ān

Archimedean points of dialogue: [<i>amr-e tawhīdī, amr-e ḥaqq, Ibrāhīm, dīn-e ḥanīf</i>, the text of the Abrahamic scriptures] Anti-dialogical stances: [requesting a miracle instead of dialogue, exaggeration (<i>ghulū</i>) in religion, distorting religion, deviating from religion, rancour and enmity toward the People of the Book, moral corruption, intellectual and doctrinal misguidance, worldliness and materialism, denying the People of the Book and failing to recognise the religious other, lacking well-intentioned regard for the People of the Book, deliberately	Mutual other-religious Jewish-Christian stances: [The Jews say, 'The Christians stand on nothing,' and the Christians say, 'The Jews stand on nothing'] Its discursive meaning: [religious exclusivism – only one religion is true, and only the followers of that religion attain salvation] The Qur'ānic discursive stance: [though they follow the [same] Book. So said those who had no knowledge, [words] similar to what they say. Allah will judge between them on the Day of
--	--

misleading the People of the Book] Anti-dialogical conditions: [preventing the discovery of truth, rebelling against <i>amr-e ḥaqq</i>, replacing dialogue with proselytising and promoting religious exclusivism] Anti-dialogical procedures: [disputation (<i>jidal</i>) instead of dialogue, distortion (<i>tahrīf</i>) instead of interpretation, appealing to falsehood instead to the truth, appealing to historical traditions instead of the text of the scriptures, conflict and antagonism instead of mutual understanding and consensus, deviation (<i>inhirāf</i>) and innovation (<i>bid'ah</i>) in religious interpretations, misguidance (<i>ḍalālah</i>) instead of honesty and sincerity of intention] Emphasised Qur'ānic speech acts: [the necessity of agreement on shared doctrinal principles, the necessity of refraining from cultural and social antagonism, avoiding the distortion of religion, keeping away from religious innovation, refraining from creating challenges, disputes and conflict in religious practice, the necessity of conscious and genuine faith and belief in the matter of divine unity (<i>amr-e tawḥīdī</i>), the necessity of adopting sound and authoritative religious knowledge for the demonstration of proof and the establishment of evidence] Āl 'Imrān (61–66); al-Mā'idah (19, 69, 47); al-Nisā' (153–160 and 171); al-Baqarah (105 and 109); Āl 'Imrān (3, 98,	Resurrection concerning that about which they used to differ: Baqareh: 113] Religious inclusivism 1 – [Both religions are true, and the followers of both religions also have a share of spirituality, faith, and salvation] The Qur'ānic discursive rhetoric: [He has sent down to you the Book with the truth, confirming what was [revealed] before it, and He had sent down the Torah and the Evangel] Religious inclusivism 2 – [The Abrahamic scriptures are full of divine command]. [Abraham was neither a Jew nor a Christian. Rather, he was a Hanif, a Muslim, and he was not one of the polytheists.] Religious inclusivism 3 – [Religious truth lies in the Abrahamic religion and the <i>ḥanīf</i> religion, which is full of divine command, and Judaism, Christianity, and Islam are under its umbrella]. [Indeed the nearest of all people to Abraham are those who follow him and this prophet and those who have faith, and Allah is the guardian of the faithful.] Religious inclusivism 4 – [Religious truth lies in the Abrahamic religion and the <i>ḥanīf</i> religion, which is full of divine command, and the true believing follower must follow this religion for salvation]. [Yet they are not all alike. Among the People of the Book is an upright nation; they recite Allah's signs in the watches of the night and prostrate]. Religious inclusivism 5 – [Each one of
---	--

69, 70); al-Baqarah (109); Āl ‘Imrān (64–76, 78, 68–70, 71); al-Mā’idah (104)	the People of the Book, regardless of their religion, if they are believers and perform righteous deeds, attain salvation] al-Baqarah (111); Āl ‘Imrān (68, 67, 113–114)
--	--

7. Conclusion: Qur’ānic narratives and religious pluralism

Despite the diverse and sometimes contradictory readings of "religious matters, inter-religious matters, the religious other, and the religion of the other," and the inappropriate inferences drawn from "inter-religious dialogues in the Qur’ān" that have been biased toward "religious exclusivism," in this article, by employing the "method of theological-religious hermeneutics of the sacred text" and the "theory of the sociology of theology," and by referring to the text of the Qur’ān, we have shown that the central discursive tendency of the Qur’ān is "Jewish-Christian-Islamic religious inclusivism" and "religious pluralism based on monotheistic faith and believing righteous action." For the modern world, this "discursive doctrine of Qur’ānic religious pluralism" is illuminating, constructive, strategic, and path-opening for the "dialogical lifeworld of intra-religious and inter-religious dialogue."

References

- Abū Zayd, Naṣr Ḥāmid. 1990. *The Concept of the Text: A Study of the Qur’ānic Sciences*. Beirut: The Arab Cultural Center. [In Arabic].
- Aly Ismail, Alsayed M. 2017. *Hermeneutics and the Problem of Translating Traditional Arabic Texts*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Bartholomew, Craig G. 2015. *Introducing Biblical Hermeneutics: A Comprehensive Framework for Hearing God in Scripture*. Grand Rapids: Baker Publishing Group.
- Bowald, Mark Alan. 2007. *Rendering the Word in Theological Hermeneutics: Mapping Divine and Human Agency*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Limited.
- Holub, Robert. 1375 SH. *Jurgen Habermas: Critic in the Public Sphere*. Translated by Ḥusayn Bashīriyya. Tehran: Ney Publication. [In Persian].
- Jeanrond, Werner G. 1999. *Theological Hermeneutics: Development and Significance*.

- Basingstoke: Macmillan Academic and Professional.
- Kearney, Richard. 2019. *The God Who May Be: A Hermeneutics of Religion*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Manūchihri, 'Abbās, and Sayyid Maḥmūd Nejātī Ḥusaynī. 1385 SH. "An Introduction to the Theory of Dialogic Citizenship in Habermas's Political Philosophy." *Journal of Social Sciences Letter (Scientific Research Journal of the University of Tehran - Faculty of Social Sciences)* 29 (Winter): 1–29. [In Persian].
- Nejātī Ḥusaynī, Sayyid Maḥmūd. 1385 SH. "The Origins of the Theory of Emancipatory Dialogic Justice in Habermas's Political Thought." *Nameh-ye Farhang-e Andisheh (Journal of Cultural Thought)* 6 (21): 113–132. [In Persian].
- Nejātī Ḥusaynī, Sayyid Maḥmūd. 1386 SH. "The Methodological Logic in the Political Philosophy of the Historical Socrates: Dialogical Logos and the Problematic of Doubt." *Scientific Quarterly of Political and International Approaches* 9: 155–174. [In Persian].
- Nejātī Ḥusaynī, Sayyid Maḥmūd. 1389 SH. "Habermas: The Political Philosophy of Dialogic Order." *Scientific Quarterly of Political and International Approaches* 24 (Winter): 9–54. [In Persian].
- Nejātī Ḥusaynī, Sayyid Maḥmūd. 1398 SH. "The Problematics of Traditional and Modern Quranic Studies: Some Critical-Strategic Points for the Philosophy of Quranic Studies." *Stylistic Studies of the Holy Quran* 1 (5): 219–241. [In Persian].
- Nejātī Ḥusaynī, Sayyid Maḥmūd. 1400 SH. *Qur'ān, Society, History, Culture: A Collection of Articles on Socio-Cultural Quranic Studies*. Vol. 1. Tehran: Ārmā Publication. [In Persian].
- Paddison, Angus. 2005. *Theological Hermeneutics and 1 Thessalonians*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.