



Vol. 1, Issue. 1 (Serial 1), Summer 2023

Narratological Re-reading of Prophet Yusuf and Zulaikha Story

Ahmad Karimi*, Akbar Shahiditabar**, Farhad Morsali Pavarsi***

*Associate Professor Department of Islamic Theology (Quran and Hadith University Tehran, Iran Email: karimi.ah@qhu.ac.ir orcid.org/0000-0002-5525-2024

** Assistant Professor, Civil Engineering, Faculty of Engineering, Qom University of Technology, Qom, Iran Email: shahiditabar@qut.ac.ir orcid.org/0000-0001-7749-5601

*** Assistant Professor, Department of Foreign Languages, Language Center, Imam Sadiq University, Tehran, Iran Email: f.morsalii@su.ac.ir orcid.org/0009-0009-3965-833X

Abstract

The story of Prophet Yusuf and Zulaikha is one of the fascinating stories of the Holy Qur'an. One of the points of dispute is this section of the Holy Qur'an "... he would have made for her [too] had he not beheld the proof of his God". The significance of the sentence includes two parts: What does "...he would have made for her [too]..." mean? And what is the meaning of "...had he not beheld the proof of his God"? The objective of the current research is shedding enough light upon the true meaning of the afore-mentioned sentence. Accordingly, by utilizing the methodology of content analysis and narratology (White, 1973), verses 23 and 24 of Surah Yusuf have been analyzed thoroughly and meticulously to ultimately clarify the ambiguous points. The result of the study shows that the phrase "...he would have made for her [too]..." could be elaborated on in two ways: it can mean a physical confrontation with Zulaikha and it can also mean an intention similar to Zulaikha's intention and will. The significance of "...had he not beheld the proof of his God" squarely depends on the meaning obtained from "...he would have made for her [too]..." In the first interpretation, the observation of the proof of his God describes Prophet Yusuf as a pious person whom God helps thanks to his steady piety, and in the second interpretation, the observation of the proof of God portrays the infallibility and impeccability of Prophet Yusuf which hinders him to succumb to sordid penchants and intentions.

Keywords: Prophet Yusuf, Zulaikha, God's, Proof, Piety, Infallibility of Prophets, Quranic Narratives

Received: May 30, 2023

Revised: June 5, 2023

Accepted: July 7, 2023

Article type: Research Article

Publisher: Imam Sadiq University



DOI: 10.30497/ISQH.2023.244722.1003

© The Author(s).

How to cite: Karimi, A., Shahiditabar, A. & Morsali Pavarsi, F. (2023). Narratological re-reading of prophet Yusuf and Zulaikha story. *Interdisciplinary Studies of Quran and Hadith*, 1(1), 63-73. <https://doi.org/10.30497/ISQH.2023.244635.1001>

1. Introduction

The story of Yusuf and Zulaikha is one of the most interesting stories in the Holy Qur'an. The story begins with Zulaikha's seduction and ends with Prophet Yusuf's imprisonment. In the current paper, only the part of the story where Prophet Yusuf turns down Zulaikha's request and runs towards the door will be studied. This part of the story is as follows:

After Zulaikha tries to seduce Prophet Yusuf, Prophet Yusuf takes refuge in God and says to her that his God has elevated his status and her deed is indecent and immoral. But Zulaikha does not accept his answer and tries to catch Prophet Yusuf. Observing the proof of his God causes Prophet Yusuf to not pay attention to her so he runs towards the door. As a result, sordor and indecency are averted from him.

This part of the story consists of four smaller parts as following:

The first part shows Zulaikha's request for a relationship with Prophet Yusuf as "The woman in whose house he was, tried to seduce him. She closed the doors and said, 'Come!' ... (12: 23)". This section delineates Zulaikha's indecent and immoral demeanor. The second part represents Prophet Yusuf's reply to Zulaikha as "...He said, 'God forbid! Indeed, He is my God; He has given me a good abode. Indeed, the wrongdoers are not felicitous. (12: 23)" The third part shows the movement of Zulaikha towards Prophet Yusuf and his reaction as "...She certainly made for him; and he would have made for her [too] had he not beheld the proof of his God (12: 24)" and the fourth part shows the repercussion of Prophet Yusuf's behavior in the third part as "...So it was, that We might turn away from him all evil and indecency. He was indeed one of Our dedicated servants" (12: 24).

The above four parts have been the cynosure of different researchers and analyzed in detail. However, the part "...had he not beheld the proof of his God..." in the third section which presents Prophet Yusuf's reaction towards Zulaikha's intention and will is the point of serious dispute among scholars. In this research, the authors seek to delve into this section and extract the true meaning and significance of the sentence. Accordingly, the methodology of content analysis has been chosen.

2. Theoretical Background

In the present research, the story of Prophet Yusuf and Zulaikha is steadily lucubrated into and studied using the methodology of content analysis and narratology, and all through the study, the research questions are answered in full.

Narratology is a novel methodology approaching narratives and their structures so as to uncover new and ulterior layers of narratives. The study of narrative is significant since the ordering of time and space in narrative forms creates one of the major ways meaning is formed in general. As Hayden White puts it, "far from being one code among many that a culture may utilize for endowing experience with meaning, narrative is a meta-code, a human universal on the basis of which transcultural messages about the nature of a shared reality can be transmitted" (White, 1973). As the prevalence and importance of narrative media in our daily lives (television, film, fiction) is ubiquitous, narratology is also a useful base to have before we try to analyze popular cultures such religious texts.

The story of Yusuf and Zulaikha has always been the cynosure of quite many popular cultures such movies and literary criticism. In this article, the authors have approached this story from the vantagepoint of narratology and tried to show how this story could have new and hidden connotations by using linguistic and narratological clues while alluding to other narratives in the Holy Quran. The reader can come to uncover novel layers of Yusuf's and Zulaikha's discrepant intentions by the way they both narrate the things having happened between them from diverse views.

The story of Prophet Yusuf, due to its coherence, has widely been discussed in various articles from literary and story-telling view-points. However, far fewer articles have been published from the aspects of the interpretation and examination of the verses. A number of the pertinent articles published recently are as follows:

The article by Mohseni and Ahmadi Begash has examined the life of Prophet Yusuf from the point of view of interpretive and narrative sources, using mostly quoted opinions of diverse scholars (Mohsani and Ahmadi Beghash, 2019). In another article, the same authors analyzed some parts from Surah Yusuf and have only analyzed the opinions of other scholars and relevant hadiths (Mohsani and Ahmadi Begash,

2017). Moghadam and Safari in their articles have analyzed the phrase "...he would have made..." and examined different opinions, and in the end, Allameh Tabatabai's opinion was considered the best opinion. In the following sections, the result of this article will be pointed at (Moghadam and Sadrifar, 2019). In an article, Shafiee has analyzed three scholars' opinions, Allameh Tabatabai, Rashid Reza and Javadi Amoli, on verse 24 of Surah Yusuf (Shafii Darab, 2019). Examining Prophet Yusuf's statement about Zulaikha and the King of Egypt after Prophet Yusuf got released from prison is another issue discussed by Azghadi and Seyyed Mousavi (Azghadi and Seyed Mousavi, 2017.) Apart from the articles, the research questions are discussed in detail in the commentary books and various scholars have given diverse opinions about them.

The story has been interpreted and elaborated upon in the following sections and every single word is analyzed and examined so that the different aspects of the story and also the prevailing ambience are delineated properly. These studies are in fact the initial introduction to find the true answer to the main question of the research.

2.1. Zulaikha's Request for a Relationship with Prophet Yusuf

In the section related to Zulaikha's confrontation with Prophet Yusuf, the Holy Qur'an has touched upon the details relevant to the true ambience of the story and Zulaikha's request in the section "...the woman in whose house he was, seduced him. She closed the doors and said, 'Come!!'... (12: 23)". Zulaikha is in a position of power and considers Prophet Yusuf according to the phrase "...bought him ..." her bought servant who has been under her orders so she expects him to follow and act according to her wishes and orders. Thus, she requests him to have a relationship with her. The verb "Rawadah" is based on Mofala tonality and stems from "Rawada" which means both "asking" and also "passing" (Mirhosseini and Ranji, *Semantic Analysis of the Word "Marawdeh" in the Holy Qur'an*, 2016). Ragheb Esfahani has translated it into "passing and coming and going slowly in search of something" (1995, p. 371) in which the connotation of repetition is hidden. The verb "Rawadah" has been eight times in the Holy Qur'an, in all of which it has been in the structure of "subject+ verb+ second subject+ about+ object". This is a cooperative-confrontational structure where two subjects are involved with each other over the "object" and

this cooperation is of confrontation and conflict nature (Mirhosseini and Ranji, *Semantic Analysis of the Word “Marawdeh” in the Holy Qur’an*, 2016). Therefore, the meaning of “...the woman in whose house he was, seduced him... (12: 23)” is that Zulaikha and Prophet Yusuf had a quarrel with each other over Prophet Yusuf's soul and Zulaikha demanded Prophet Yusuf's self-surrender before her and he had a conflict and problem with this demand. The verb “Rawadah” signifies that this request has already been made before and since Zulaikha has not obtained the desired result in the previous requests, which were apparently indirect, she decided to lock the doors and expressed her request directly in the phrase “...Come! ...”. Hayata is an imperative verb meaning “come forward” (Qur’an 7:137) and Hayata Lakah signifies “come forward, all is yours”.

2.2. Prophet Yusuf's Answer to Zulaikha

Prophet Yusuf has used several sentences in response to Zulaikha's request. Prophet Yusuf's answers are studied one by one so as to disclose his point of view regarding Zulaikha's request and the predicament in which he is entangled. Prophet Yusuf's answer starts with the sentence “Mu'adhullah” which means “May God help me”. This sentence signifies “seeking refuge in God” which has two presuppositions: firstly, Prophet Yusuf is a monotheist and, secondly, although he is apparently a slave of Zulaikha's and under her command, he is actually under the protection of God.

Then, Prophet Yusuf completes “Mu'adhullah (12: 23)” by saying “...Indeed He is my God; He has given me a good abode ... (12: 23)”. Prophet Yusuf has reacted to Zulaikha's mentality, which she has raised him and, following the order of the King of Egypt, has elevated his status in “...Give him an honorable place ... (12: 21)” so he has to obey her. Prophet Yusuf states in his answer that God is the only teacher and God who has raised him and attributes his elevated position to the Unique and Almighty God and demotes the position of the King of Egypt and Zulaikha to the extent that they only carried out the order of the Unique God. Needless to mention, some scholars have referred the pronoun “him” in “certainly him” to the King of Egypt, which is not correct. Considering the following points justifies such a mistake in the interpretations:

The first point is that the King of Egypt is not mentioned in this conversation, so it is not logical to refer the pronoun to a few verses before, in the meantime, the word “Allah” is mentioned exactly in this verse right in the previous words.

The second point is that in eighteen cases in Surah Yusuf the word “Rabb” is used in the form of “Rabb”, “Rabbi”, “Rabbakah” and “Rabbah” pointing at either the King of Egypt or Unique God. Anywhere Prophet Yusuf addresses the King of Egypt with “Rabb”, it is used in the form of “Rabbakah” or “Rabbah”. The title “Rabbi” has never been used for the King and in the entire cases including the six cases where Prophet Yusuf has used or the one case where Jacop has used, it refers to the Unique God. Therefore, the word “Rabbi” in the phrase in question refers to God, and the reference of the word “Rabbi” to the King of Egypt in the phrase in question has no logical basis according to the linguistic context.

The third point is that the word “Rabb” was used only for the One and Only God during the period of Prophet Moses. In the sentence:” He said, ‘Our God is He who gave everything its creation and then guided it (20: 50)’. Prophet Moses refers to God with the word “Rabb” and in the sentence: “I am your exalted God!’ (79: 24). Pharaoh and those around him address Pharaoh with the word “Rabb”. Because Prophet Moses showed up as a Prophet after Prophet Yusuf among the same people (based on the sentence: “...but you continued to remain in doubt concerning what he had brought you (40: 34)”), therefore, God during the era of Prophet Yusuf is the same as the Pharaoh of his time, and at that time as well as during the era of Prophet Moses, “Rabb” was used only for the One and Only God. The conclusion of the above three points is that the sentence “...Indeed He is my God...” refers to the Only God, and in the Holy Qur’an, the word “Rabb” is never used for the King of Egypt. Therefore, Prophet Yusuf ends his sentence with “...Indeed the wrongdoers are not felicitous. (12: 23)” With this, he implies two points, one about himself and the other about Zulaikha. By describing the unfairness of this act and his monotheism, Prophet Yusuf fathoms such an act against his own safety and God's guidance. The sentence “...those who have faith and do not taint their faith with wrongdoing—for such there shall be safety, and they are the [rightly] guided.’ ... (6: 82)” confirm the above-mentioned point. In this verse, it is stated that those who are believers will always be safe and God will

guide them if they do not taint their faith with oppression. Also, to this idea of Zulaikha, who, in her view, will enjoy this relationship, then will hide this relationship and continue her normal life, he answers. Describing this act as unfair and cruel, Prophet Yusuf indicates that this action is only a fleeting pleasure and ends adversely in a way that it will be disclosed in the future, and once revealed, there will be no way to excuse and explain in front of the King of Egypt. The sentence "...Indeed those who are faithless and do wrong, Allah shall never forgive them, nor shall He guide them to any way... (4: 168)" verifies the afore-mentioned point. According to this verse, those who do wrong, God will divulge their wrongdoing and there will be no way to get away. This way, Prophet Yusuf tries to dissuade the wife of the King of Egypt from her decision.

2.3. Zulaikha's Interest in Prophet Yusuf and His Reaction

The wife of the King of Egypt has not given up and this moment approaches him for seduction. The Holy Qur'an in "She certainly made for him; and he would have made for her [too] had he not beheld the proof of his God. So it was, that We might turn away from him all evil and indecency. He was indeed one of Our dedicated servants. (12: 24)" believes that if Prophet Yusuf had not believed in God's proof, he would have been seduced by Zulaikha so such evil and immorality were averted from him, and he was one of the righteous people. The question is what "...he would have made for her..." and "...had he not beheld the proof of his God..." signify where the Holy Qur'an considers one a precondition for the other. In the following section, initially the meaning of "proof" is delved into in order for the other points to be explained.

2.4. Meaning of Proof

The word proof has been used seven times in the Holy Qur'an (in addition to the verse in question). Five are those verses addressing various groups to justify their actions by providing proof. In these five verses which include "...Whoever invokes besides Allah another god of which he has no proof... (23: 117)", "...Those are their [false] hopes! Say, 'Produce your evidence [proof], should you be truthful.' ... (2: 111)", "... 'Produce your evidence [proof].' Then they will know that all reality belongs to Allah... (28: 75)", "...Say, 'Produce your evidence [proof], should you be truthful (27: 64).'" and "...Have they

taken gods besides Him? Say, ‘Produce your evidence [proof]! ... (21: 24)’ the request for proof (evidence) in these verses is to show that these people's claims are invalid and indeed there is no proof or a legitimate reason to show what they have done is right. Accordingly, proof has been used with the pronoun “your” and the phrase “for him”. In the other two verses, proof refers to the miracle of something. In the sentence “...a proof has come to you from your God... (4: 174)” the presence of the Last Prophet (PBUH) is some proof provided by God and in the phrase “...two proofs from your God... (28: 32)” the two miracles of Prophet Moses have been introduced as proof from the side of God to fight Pharaoh. In the sentence “...With the help of Our signs, you two, and those who follow the two of you, shall be the victors.’ ... (28: 35)” the Holy Qur’an states that by these proof and verses, Prophet Moses will overcome Pharaoh. This shows that “Proof from the God” is a kind of miracle and the effects made by miracles can also be made by “Proof from the God”. Therefore, “Proof from the God” is like a miracle, a cause and a certain cause, the result of which is the revelation of the truth, overcoming, and domination. As “the proof of God” has been explained, it can be stated that “...had he not beheld the proof of his God...” means that by observing the proof of God, this proof got dominated and manifested in the heart of Prophet Yusuf and reassured him that the intentions and wills contrary to what was right, regardless of whether these intentions and wills were contrary to expediency, shall not be done. Needless to mention, the quality of observation of “the proof of God” can be examined and discussed after defining the true significance of “...he would have made for her [too]...”. Thus, the ambience dominant in this case is to be examined and discussed in the following sections so that the true meaning of “...he would have made for her [too]...” is reached.

2.5. Ambience in Zulaikha’s Room

Prophet Yusuf is extremely attractive and Zulaikha has worn enough makeup for her meeting with him. According to “...in whose house he was...”, Zulaikha has raised him under her own supervision. She has fallen in love with him and thinks that since she has raised him, he will not turn down her request and the atmosphere is completely ready for her affair. In the palace of the King of Egypt, the private room is the room, to reach there, one must pass through several doors. Based on

“...she closed the doors...”, the entire doors have been closed. The word “ghallaqat” is in the voice of “tafiel” which connotes exaggeration and hyperbole stressing the entire doors have been closed in full. Therefore, no one else has access to the meeting room and the possibility of disclosure and being witnessed is zero. In this situation, to get rid of this predicament, Prophet Yusuf has to pass through several locked doors, which seems impossible. All these have urged Zulaikha to calmly insist on her request, and at the moment when Zulaikha tries to approach Prophet Yusuf, his reaction can be interpreted in two ways which include:

2.5.1. First Analysis

Prophet Yusuf is in a situation where he cannot find any solutions, so he had no choice but to resort to violence to get out of this impasse. The sentence “... and he would have made for her...” means violence against the wife of the King of Egypt or a similar action he is expected to do. This can be justified by the similarity of the situation of Prophet Yusuf in front of Zulaikha and Prophet Moses is in confrontation with the Pharaoh (who was killed by Prophet Moses) and his reaction there. These two cases are similar to each other in several ways, as explained below:

Firstly, both the Prophets involved are among the sincere ones based on the explicit verses of the Holy Qur’an. Secondly, they lived in palaces and grew up there. According to “...‘This is of Satan’s doing... (28: 15)” and “...that We might turn away from him all evil and indecency. (12: 24)”, what happened was an evil act for both, because both of the Prophets had to react immediately since there was no opportunity to think and find a solution. In the case of Prophet Moses, the sentence “...the one who was from his followers sought his help against him who was from his enemies. (28: 15)” and in the case of Prophet Yusuf, the sentence “...she certainly made for him...” point at this issue. Therefore, both immediately have reacted to this issue. In the case of Prophet Moses, he punched that Pharaoh and he died right away. Although this act in itself cannot be an evil act, since it was done in defense, it has no good consequences for him as he says “...I have wronged myself. (28: 16)” meaning “oppressing oneself”. Oppression means putting something in a wrong place (Dictionary Qur’an, Volume 4: 270) and the Prophet believes that his action made him unable to stay

in his current position, which was the palace of the King of Egypt and the Pharaohs'. Thus, he asks God for forgiveness. Although he is forgiven, as it is emphasized in the sentence "...Forgive me!' So He forgave him... (28: 16)" But since the case of murder is revealed in the second conflict, Prophet Moses is obliged to flee from Egypt and settle in Madinah. Similarity of these two cases show that Prophet Yusuf is likely to resort to violence just like Prophet Moses, as a result of which he will suffer the same consequences as Prophet Moses' and perhaps even worse.

In this case, resorting to violence is against expediency, and seeing God's proof acts as a strong bedrock preventing us from doing actions against expediency. God's proof here is like a light in the darkness that shows the way out of plights and impasses. It is an inspiration from God, who calls running towards the closed door as the solution to save Prophet Yusuf from his predicament. Because the Satan has no control over the sincere people, any sound, image, or light that evokes this solution for Prophet Yusuf, he is completely reassured that it has been provided by God to save him. Therefore, after seeing the proof of God and receiving the inspiration to run towards the locked door, he follows it and runs towards the closed door. The juxtaposition and comparison of the discussed case with the case of Prophet Lot and the close coherence between them as they both touch upon "sexual deviation" justifies this interpretation.

The situation of Prophet Yusuf in confrontation with Zulaikha and the situation of Prophet Lot in confrontation with his people are similar corresponding to each other in six issues. In the story of Prophet Lot, when his guests visit him, based on the sentence "...he was distressed on their account... (11: 77)", he is entangled in a tough situation. According to "...his people came running toward him... (11: 78)", his people rushed to him to let them perform sodomy on his guests. He was unable to support his guests against the illegitimate demands of his people and he wishes he could find an effective solution in order to overcome them. So he was asked to leave at night as mentioned in the sentence "Take your family in a watch of the night... (11: 81)". This solution is certain and provided by God as pointed at in "...we are messengers of your God. (11: 81)", the result of which is the saving of the Prophet Lot as mentioned in "They will never get at you... (11: 81)". The six characteristics afore-mentioned in the case of Prophet

Yusuf and Zulaikha are also present. In the case of Prophet Yusuf, the sentence "...she closed the doors..." signifies confinement and entanglement; the sentence "...Come!" shows Zulaikha's movement towards Prophet Yusuf; the sentence "... 'God forbid!'" indicates his inability to avert Zulaikha and his need for a reliable refuge against her request. Therefore, "...the proof of his God..." like the sentence "...Take your family in a watch of the night..." is "an order to move" made by "God" and the result is "...turn away..." which signifies the saving of Prophet Yusuf from the predicament. Accordingly, the sentence "...he would have made for her..." means physical confrontation with Zulaikha. The following objection has been made to this analysis:

"...She certainly made for him..." and "...he would have made for her..." should signify the same unless it cannot be carried in appearance. When "...he would have made for her..." is interpreted as a physical action to overcome Zulaikha, it has deviated from the apparent meaning of the words. (Sobhani, 11: 371, Tabatabai, 11: 196, Moghadam and Sadrifar, 2019).

In response to this criticism, it should be noted that although the apparent meaning of "...She ... made..." and "...he would have made..." seems the same signifying intention and will, it does not mean that the intention of both is the same. Similar to this concept is the sentence "They raced to the door..." in the next verse. In this sentence, both of them have intended the same action, but their intentions are completely different, Prophet Yusuf ran towards the door to escape, and Zulaikha ran to catch him. Therefore, "...he would have made for her..." is the will and intention for Zulaikha deciphered and understood based on the intention of Prophet Yusuf. Therefore, the true intention of Prophet Yusuf should be discovered utilizing the other clues in the text.

After shedding enough light upon the first analysis, the second analysis will be examined and explicated more in detail.

2.5.2. Second Analysis

In the second analysis, Prophet Yusuf's endeavor is juxtaposed with Zulaikha's will and intention, which, seeing the God's proof, he did not realize and ran towards the door. Thus, the sentence "She certainly made for him; and he would have made for her [too] had he not beheld

the proof of his God.” Signifies that if a woman has intentions with the characteristics mentioned in the verse in question, according to the instincts instilled in a man, a similar intention and will shall certainly occur on the part of the man, provided that the person has not observed the divine proof. In this verse, Prophet Yusuf’s will has gotten attached to a condition and while the condition does not get realized, the will is rejected accordingly. As a result, Prophet Yusuf remains immune and impeccable, even in the stage of will and making any decision. Therefore, this meaning does not contradict the infallibility of Prophet Yusuf (Sabahani, 11: 371, Tabatabai, 11:196, Moghadam and Sadri Far, 2019). In this case, observing the proof of God verifies the infallibility of Prophet Yusuf as explained below:

In “...had he not beheld the proof of his God...”, the word “beheld” has been used instead of “we showed him”. Such an application shows that God's proof is always there and a person only needs to see it. “Seeing” has two presuppositions: firstly, the person is alive and can see, and secondly, the atmosphere is clear enough for him to see. Such a person is well described in “...then We gave him life and provided him with a light by which he walks among the people... (6: 122)”. Also, by observing God's proof, the viewer can either deny or confirm it. For instance, “...Certainly We showed him all Our signs. But he denied [them] and refused [to believe them] ... (20/56)” clarifies that irrespective of the verses and proofs shown to him through Prophet Moses, Pharaoh did not give up and began to deny them. Based on these explanations, beholding the proof of God and his concession to it proves that Prophet Yusuf had a living heart adorned with the Divine light, so he beheld the Divine proof and since the Devil had no part in his soul, he surrendered to it and acted differently from Zulaikha. This trait is the same infallibility implied in “...so he abstained... (12: 32)”. The Divine proof that Prophet Yusuf beheld is explained below:

To elaborate on this, the confrontation between Prophet Moses and the magicians is used. This case is the same as the story of Prophet Yusuf and Zulaikha in terms of structure and way of confrontation. In both cases, one side was a sincere Prophet whereas the other side is a person or people who resorted to “ruse” and in both cases, “God's proof” was the reason for the victory of God's Prophet. Therefore, the function of the staff Prophet Moses has as “God's proof”, it is also

expected to have happened in the story of Prophet Yusuf. In the story of Prophet Moses, God in "...it will swallow what they have conjured. What they have conjured is only a magician's trick, ... (20: 69)" states that the miracle of the staff devoured and razed everything the sorcerers made with their deception. Likewise, it is expected that God's proof will neutralize what Zulaikha has prepared with her ruse. What Zulaikha has prepared includes two parts: adorning oneself and locking the doors. Therefore, it is expected that this proof will depreciate the pulchritude of Zulaikha in the eyes of Prophet Yusuf and open the doors for him. Based on this, the Divine proof can both mean seeing the sordid inner part of Zulaikha's request manifested for him at that moment and it can also be the beauty that people with good hearts can see and against which the beauty and charms of this world is of no worth and value. Therefore, accepting Zulaikha's proposal means moving towards the ugly interior and missing out on those beauties that Prophet Yusuf is fond of and since Prophet Yusuf sees himself at a loss at the moment when the doors are unlocked, with God's permission, he tries to run away to evade the plight.

Based on the above-mentioned explanations, we can conclude that the first analysis that Prophet Yusuf's effort means physical confrontation is unequivocal and can be considered a reliable and valid interpretation. Accordingly, it is assumed that this case has not happened once and immediately, but rather it was done many times before by Zulaikha but indirectly and Prophet Yusuf has tried to adopt piety and sincerity in his actions as "...—those who have faith and are God wary. (27: 53)" Any time, he is entangled in predicaments, God has helped him to avoid them by opening the locked doors. Therefore, this case does not function as a test for Prophet Yusuf for his promotion because there is no evidence in the following verses to prove it, but rather it means the plight in which God helps pious people. However, accepting such interpretation does not necessarily ignore the second interpretation. In the second interpretation, this case functions as a test for Prophet Yusuf ("...they are tried once or twice every year?... (9: 126)") like the tests having been exposed to by Prophet Moses ("...We tried you with various ordeals... (20: 40)") to prepare him for prophethood; or the tests set for Prophet Abraham so that he gets ascended to prophethood ("...When they both submitted [to Allah's command] and Abraham laid him on his forehead... This was indeed a

revealing test... (37: 103)"); or the test set for Prophet Job where he succeeded to pass "...Indeed, we found him to be patient... (38: 44)". The reason for Prophet Yusuf's escape towards the closed door is his belief in the existence of a way out of this plight after he failed to convince Zulaikha. From this perspective, the significance of infallibility in Prophet Yusuf's behavior can be seen well.

2.6. Result of Prophet Yusuf's Behavior

In the following verses, it is indicated that the outcome of beholding the Divine proof by Prophet Yusuf is averting indecency and sticking to virtue instead because, thanks to the proof, he moves away from the setting having been prepared for the act of adultery. In other words, observing the proof, Prophet Yusuf ran away from the setting while the possibility of adultery was eliminated and evil and indecency got away from him. The objective of avoiding and averting is implied in "...turn away..." and "...evil..." stresses Zulaikha's empty room where Prophet Yusuf's presence exposes him to guilt and conviction and "...indecency..." points at adultery averted from Prophet Yusuf. Some scholars have translated "...he would have made for her..." into "physical punishment" and deemed evil and indecency as accusation and killing consequently (Tafsir Majam al-Bayan, Volume 5, p. 345). This interpretation cannot be correct since Prophet Yusuf's objective is to get rid of that setting and all the words Prophet Yusuf uses in the previous verse are told to dissuade Zulaikha. When God says evil and indecency have been averted from him, it means that Zulaikha's intention has not been realized there and the evil and indecency that Zulaikha forces Prophet Yusuf to perpetrate got repelled from him.

At the end of the verse in question, in "...He was indeed one of Our dedicated servants. (12: 24)", Prophet Yusuf has been introduced as one of the dedicated followers. This sentence accounts for Prophet Yusuf's behavior and words. The dedicated followers based on "...I will surely pervert them, except Your dedicated servants among them. (38: 82)" are those who cannot be misled and misguided by Satan. The dedication of a follower signifies that the follower's deeds and demeanor are in line with monotheism and the Satan plays no role in them. Furthermore, in "...he [Satan] indeed prompts [you to commit] indecent and wrongful acts... (24: 21)", Satan urges and prompts people to commit wrong deeds and indecency, so an honest and

dedicated follower is not inclined to perpetrate any kind of indecency and wrongful acts. If a dedicated and pious follower is entangled in a plight where evil and indecency are present, God, according to "...Whoever is wary of Allah, He shall make for him a way out [of the adversities of the world and the Hereafter] ... (65; 2)" will help him/her to avoid them and get out of it. In this case too, undoubtedly under no circumstance would Prophet Yusuf not get involved in adultery because he was one of God's dedicated and pious followers, as a result, in that plight, he was shown the way out of the situation. Accordingly, "... had he not beheld the proof of his God..." is the outcome of Prophet's Yusuf's dedication and piety which can be interpreted as his infallibility or by assuming his infallibility, it can also be seen as the way out of the plight assisting him to avoid evil and indecency.

3. Conclusion

In the previous sections, the case of Prophet Yusuf and Zulaikha was studied. In this story, Zulaikha, with the mentality that because she has raised Prophet Yusuf under her supervision and that Prophet Yusuf's current status is given to him by her, by locking the doors tightly and putting on make-up, she tries to seduce Prophet Yusuf. Prophet Yusuf tells her the phrase "Mu'azallah" signifying he believes in monotheism and is under the protection of Allah in all situations and will not do any wrongful deeds. Then with the phrase "...He has given me a good abode..." he makes her understand that the current status of Prophet Yusuf was bestowed upon him by God, and Zulaikha and her spouse were only the means to fulfill it. In the following sections, Prophet Yusuf, considering Zulaikha's demand as cruel and unfair, points out to her that there is no good ending for such an act.

Zulaikha does not accept Prophet Yusuf's rationale so she tries to seduce him. Then, the sentence "...and he would have made for her [too] had he not beheld the proof of his God..." portrays his possible rely to her request. In order to find the true meaning of the sentence above, the similarity of the story of Prophet Yusuf with the story of the confrontation between Prophet Moses and the Pharaoh, the confrontation between Prophet Moses and the Sorcerers and confrontation between Prophet Lot and his people was taken into consideration. The result of the comparison is as follows:

Comparing the conditions of Prophet Yusuf with the conditions of Prophet Moses in his confrontation with the Pharaoh and the close correspondence of these two stories confirms that the sentence "...he would have made for her [too]..." can be interpreted as his confrontation with Zulaikhah and the comparison of the conditions of Prophet Joseph with the conditions of Prophet Lot in the confrontation with his people, who made an indecent request, verifies the possibility that the phrase "...had he not beheld the proof of his God..." signifies finding the solution to get out of the plight, which is to rush and run to the closed door.

Comparing the story of Prophet Yusuf with the story of Prophet Moses' confrontation with Pharaoh's sorcerers and paying attention to the phrase "proof of God" used for the staff of Prophet Moses justifies the interpretation that "...had he not beheld the proof of his God..." functions like the staff of Prophet Moses. The miracle of the staff shattered and razed whatever the sorcerers had created with deception. Here too, it is expected that God's proof will destroy whatever Zulaikha has prepared with deception, including "putting on make-up" and "locking the door". Therefore, observing the Divine proof also means discovering the sordid nature of Zulaikha's request helping him to ignore the pulchritude and beauties of this, and opening the locked door. Accordingly, "...he would have made for her [too]..." signifies an effort similar to Zulaikha's effort, which did not get realized in Yusuf when he saw "the proof of God".

References

- Holy Qur'an
Dehghanpour, A. & Bakshi, J. (2013). "The Semantics of Benevolence in the Qur'an", *Research Journal of Qur'anic Studies*, 15, pp. 61-82.
Fakhar Noghani, V. (2013). "Semantics Of the Word "Favor" In the Qur'an." *A two-quarter scientific-research journal on Qur'an interpretation and language*, pp. 21.
Mir Hosseini, S. & Ranji, H. (2016). "Semantic Analysis of the Word "Affair" In the Holy Qur'an". *Qur'anic Teachings*, 25, pp. 1-91.
Moghadam, G. & Sadrifar, N. (2019). Answer to Doubts about the Infallibility of Prophet Yusuf (PBUH) Based on the Analysis of the Truth of H. M. Philosophy and Kalam". *Journal of Theological Research*, 31, pp. 24-7.
Mohseni, T. & Ahmadibeighash, K. (2019). "Studying the Life of Prophet Yusuf (PBUH) From the Point of View of the Commentary-Narrative

- Sources of Fariqin and Torah”. *Journal of Comparative Hadith Sciences*, 13, pp. 52-70.
- Mohseni, T. & Ahmed Yabigash, K. (2017). “A Comparative Analysis of The Important Situations in The Life of Prophet Yusuf (PBUH) From the Point of View of The Exegetical-Narrative Sources of Fariqin and The Torah”. *Qur’anic and Hadith Sciences. Research Journal of Interdisciplinary of Tafsir and Kalam*, 1, pp 49-69.
- Qureshi Banabi, A. (2007). *Qur’an Dictionary*. Dar al-Katbal al-Salamieh.
- Ragheb Esfahani, H. (1995). *Vocabulary of Qur’anic Words*. Damascus Dar al-Qalam publication.
- Rahimpour Azghadi, T. & Seyed Mousavi, H. (2017). “Deciphering Active and Passive pronouns “*la akhne*” In the Fifty-Second Verse of Surah Yusuf”. *Approaches in Qur’an and Hadith Sciences*, 2, pp. 29-9.
- Shafii Darabi, S. (2020). “Hermeneutical Reading of The Verse “...*She certainly made for him; and he would have made for her [too] had he not beheld the proof of his God...*” In *Tafseer Al-Manar, Al-Mizan and Tasnim. Qur’anic and Hadith Sciences: Exegetical Studies Journal*, 49.
- Sobhani Tabrizi, J. (2004). *Immortal Charter*. Imam Sadiq Institute (PBUH) Publication
- Tabarisi, F. (1991). *Al-Bayan Complex in The Interpretation of The Qur’an*. Dar A.l-Ma’rifah Publication, Beirut, Lebanon.
- Tabatabai, S. (1984), *Tafsir al-Mizan*, translated by Seyyed Mohammad Baqer Mousavi Hadani, Allameh Practical and Intellectual Foundation Publishing Tabatabai.
- White, H. (1973). *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-century Europe*. John Hopkins University.

