



An Examination of Lexical Coherence in Three English Translations of Complementary Oppositions in Surah Al-An'aam

Maliheh Taghavi Baghban¹ , Mohammad Yazdani^{1*} , Omid Akbari¹

1. Department of English Language, Imam Reza International University, Mashhad, Iran

* Corresponding author: mohammadyazdaniets@gmail.com

<https://doi.org/10.22081/ttaais.2025.70251.1043>

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received: 11 November 2023

Revised: 9 February 2023

Accepted: 11 March 2024

Keywords:

al-An'aam,
the Glorious Qur'an
Translation,
Complementary Opposition
(CO),
Lexical Coherence.

ABSTRACT

This study investigates whether complementary oppositions (COs) in the Glorious Qur'an have been accurately translated from Arabic into English. The research is based on Halliday and Hasan's (1976) theory of lexical cohesion, focusing on lexical cohesive devices in three selected translations of COs in Surah Al-An'aam. COs are defined as paired semantic opposites, where the negation of one reinforces the meaning of the other. This qualitative study employs an analytical-documentary method to evaluate the translations. Translators often face challenges, particularly with collocations, as they strive to preserve both meaning and form. The selected theoretical framework by Halliday and Hasan (1976) examines lexical cohesive devices such as repetition, collocations, and sense relations. The primary objective is to assess the lexical coherence of the selected translations and analyze the lexical relationships between English CO equivalents, which function as key cohesive devices. The study uses Arabic CO examples from Seyyedi and Baghojary (2020) alongside their English translations by Arberry (1955), Pickthall (1930), and Qaraa'i (2005), sourced from the online Tanzil Qur'an Navigator. Findings indicate that Arberry's translation demonstrates the highest lexical coherence due to its alignment with the Qur'anic style and frequent use of collocations and contrasting repetition.

How to cite this article: Taghavi Baghan, M., Yazdani, M. and Akbari, O. (2024). An Examination of Lexical Coherence in Three English Translations of Complementary Oppositions in Surah Al-An'aam. *International Journal of Textual and Translation Analysis in Islamic Studies*, 2(2), 172-187. doi: 10.22081/ttaais.2025.70251.1043

© 2024 The Authors. Published by Ākhünd-e Khorāsāni Center for Graduate Studies affiliated with Baqir al-Olum University of Qom.

This is an open access article under the CC BY license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).



1. Introduction

The Noble Qur'ān is both a sacred text and a miraculous scripture. Its divine author, Allah, Jalla Jalaaluh, chose Arabic—renowned for its precision—as the language through which His message would be revealed to the world. Consequently, translating this Final Word into other languages is crucial for making its divine teachings accessible to non-Arabic speakers worldwide. Literary translation studies explore the challenges of transferring aesthetic and meaningful speech from one language to another while ensuring compatibility between linguistic systems and meanings in the target language (TL) (Siddiek, 2018). As the primary and most authoritative source of Islamic teachings, the Qur'ān is not only a religious text but also a profound linguistic and literary masterpiece (Seyyedi & Baghojary, 2020).

The potential of interlanguage translation has been debated for centuries, with discussions focusing on the relationship between language and meaning. Some scholars argue that achieving a fully accurate translation is practically—if not theoretically—impossible due to the deep connection between language and meaning. Others, however, view this relationship as less rigid. While they recognize certain limitations in translation, they maintain that linguistic equivalence is a relative rather than an absolute concept (Palumbo, 2011).

Many translators have rendered the Holy Qur'ān into English, with Arberry, Pickthall, and Qaraa'i standing out as notable figures in this field. Among them, Pickthall (1930) is particularly renowned for his eloquent translation and insightful linguistic perspectives on translating the Glorious Qur'ān. He upheld the theory of the Qur'ān's untranslatability, arguing that the structure, lexicon, and semantics of the English language cannot fully convey the profound meanings and richness of the original Arabic text.

Pickthall acknowledged that his translation was literal. His work was also the first English translation of the Qur'ān by a native English speaker. Arberry's (1955) translation, compared to others, placed greater emphasis on preserving the Qur'ān's style (Shahpari et al., 2014). Qaraa'i, born in 1947, was of Indian and Iranian descent. He served as the editor-in-chief of the English-language *Al-Tawheed* magazine, and his translation of the Qur'ān was published in Qom, Iran, in 2004 (Amery & Hosseini, 2016).

In Arabic, opposition occurs at the word level, involving opposing lexemes and meanings. It is a lexical-semantic phenomenon in which opposite words and meanings are paired within discourse. Arabic rhetoricians and semanticists agree that lexemes are considered opposites when their meanings are directly contrasting. Al-Madani (1968) classified semantic oppositions (antonymy) into lexical and semantic categories, where either two words or two meanings are placed in opposition (Hassanein, 2020). Antonymy is one of the key conceptual relationships between words and serves as a crucial factor in textual cohesion. In some cases, the strong association between opposing words leads to their frequent co-occurrence, as hearing one naturally evokes the other. Examples of such paired opposites include *up and down* or *left and right* (Valiei et al., 2016).

Complementary opposition is a type of semantic opposition and a category of sense relations. In this form of opposition, the existence of one word inherently negates the meaning of the other. A key characteristic of complementary opposition is that it cannot be classified as a gradable opposite (Seyyedi & Baghojary, 2020). Cruse (2004) describes complementariness as a form of oppositeness that exhibits inherent binarity. Similarly, Hurford et al. (2007), Saeed (2005), and Kreidler (1998) refer to these opposites as binary antonyms (Winiharti, n.d.). Understanding complementary opposition is essential, as it

significantly influences the meaning and coherence of translated texts. A thorough analysis of how complementary oppositions are translated can provide valuable insights into translators' strategies and the resulting lexical cohesion in translated works.

Translating religious expressions requires careful attention to preserve their meaning while ensuring alignment between the source and target languages. Overcoming challenges related to equivalence, language differences, and other linguistic issues is essential for achieving accurate translations (Khammyseh, 2015). The translation of the Qur'ān into English has consistently faced various challenges and shortcomings. As a result, researchers have made extensive efforts to identify these issues and analyze lexical cohesive devices in both the source and target texts. Evaluating these challenges through comparison and resolution has been conducted using Halliday and Hasan's (1976) model (Shahpari et al., 2014).

The aim of this study was to address the gap in existing research on the translation of complementary oppositions (COs) in the Holy Qur'ān. Focusing on translations of Surah Al-An'aam by Arberry, Pickthall and Qaraa'i, the research sought to assess how each translator reflected COs in English. Additionally, by Allah's will, the study aims to contribute to a broader understanding of lexical cohesion as a crucial element of effective translation, particularly in religious texts, where preserving the source text's meaning is vital. The study evaluated translation accuracy, cohesion, transparency, and stylistic fidelity to the original Qur'ānic text. To guide the research, the following questions were addressed:

1. What strategies have the translators employed to render COs into English?
2. To what extent do the pairs of COs exhibit lexical coherence in the English translations of Surah Al-An'aam?
3. What is the frequency of acceptable equivalents for COs across the three English translations of Surah Al-An'aam?

2. Literature Review

Safavi (2000) and Chesterman (2016) are notable linguists who have authored influential books on semantics and translation theory. Chesterman's *Memes of Translation* addresses metatheoretical, practical, and theoretical aspects of translation, while Safavi's *An Introduction to Semantics* offers a valuable analysis of semantic concepts. Lotfipour (2000) wrote *An Introduction to the Principle of Translation*, a widely used textbook in universities.

Furthermore, researchers have published articles examining various aspects of semantics. Winiharti (n.d.) analyzed sense relations, focusing on synonymy and antonymy. He categorized sense relations into two primary groups: the first group pertains to relations of sameness, such as synonymy, while the second addresses relations of oppositeness, such as antonymy. The paper highlights both types of sense relations, underscoring their importance in the field of semantics (Winiharti, n.d., p. 100).

The research titled "An Assessment of Lexical Sense Relations Based on the Word Association Test" was conducted by Asghari Nekah, Akhlaghi, and Ebrahimi (n.d.). Gjergo and Delija (2014) examined antonyms in English and Albanian. The study "The Semantic Opposition of Haq in the Qur'ān" is grounded in constructive semantics. Fathi, Ghasempour, and Khorasani (2020) provided an extensive explanation of all the semantic categories of

opposition. In the article “Beyond Semantic Opposition”, Fasasi (2020) also addressed this topic. The findings suggest that contextual oppositions (or pragmatic oppositions) refer to relationships where words, phrases, and larger expressions, which would typically not be contrasted or incompatible, are forced to appear as opposites due to their contradictory semantics and syntactic ordering within context (Fasasi, 2020).

Additionally, numerous articles have examined the meaning of words through Halliday’s (1976) theory of lexical cohesion. A few notable examples include “Traversing the Lexical Cohesion Minefield” by McGee (2009) and “Lexical Cohesion in Multiparty Conversations” by María de los González (2010), which explores 'associative cohesion. Using both quantitative and qualitative methods, González (2010) tested the adequacy of this model against lexical corpora of broadcast discussions from the International Corpus of English.

Another significant study is “Study on Lexical Cohesion in English and Persian Research Articles: A Comparative Study” by Mirzapour and Ahmadi (2011). This research found that the sub-types of lexical cohesion occur in the following descending order: repetition, collocation, synonymy, general noun, meronymy, hyponymy, and antonymy. In the English data, there was a noticeable tendency toward the use of repetition and collocation. This study has implications for teachers and researchers in the field of English as a foreign language, suggesting that teaching the sub-types of lexical cohesion to foreign language learners can enhance their reading and writing skills (Mirzapour & Ahmadi, 2011).

In various fields, including Arabic literature, linguistics, culture, and Qur’ānic studies, numerous articles have been written on the coherence of Qur’ānic surahs. One such article is “Lexical Coherence in Surah al-Sajdah” by Navidi (2023), which demonstrates that Surah al-Sajdah exhibits strong lexical coherence due to repetition and collocation. In particular, antonymy plays a significant role in this Surah, aligning with the central theme of the text, which contrasts the believers and unbelievers (Navidi, 2023). Another significant study is Oraki’s (2016) “Linguistics”, which analyzed the elements of textual coherence in Surah al-Naas based on Halliday and Hassan’s (1976) theory. The research compared the cohesion in the original Arabic text with its Persian translation, revealing both similarities and differences in lexical and grammatical factors. The study concluded that both versions display considerable cohesion, with lexical elements playing a key role in maintaining text coherence (Oraki & Visi, 2016).

3. Methodology

3.1. Corpus

This study adopts a descriptive-analytical approach within a qualitative research design, focusing on the relationship between vocabulary characteristics in terms of meaning. Specifically, it employs qualitative analysis to examine the translation of complementary oppositions (COs) in three English translations of Surah al-An’aam from the Glorious Qur’ān.

3.2. Procedures

To achieve the objectives of this study, the Holy Qur’ān—one of the most revered texts in Islam—was selected as the primary source. A qualitative approach was deemed particularly suitable, as it facilitates an in-depth examination of linguistic features, translator choices, and the inherent complexities of translating religious texts. The Arabic source text

of Surah al-An'aam was extracted from *An Attitude on the Stylistic Features of the Holy Qur'ān in Collocations*, coauthored by Seyyedi and Baghojary (2020). According to the data in this book, Surah al-An'aam contains approximately 30 complementary oppositions (COs), 10 of which are repetitive. The corresponding English translations, as rendered by Arberry, Pickthall, and Qaraa'i, were then collected from the Tanzil website (www.tanzil.net).

3.3. Data Analysis

Using Halliday and Hassan's theoretical framework from *Cohesion in English* (1976), this study examined Surah Al-An'aam from the Holy Qur'ān, comparing it with the selected translations mentioned earlier. These translations were chosen for their significance and the distinct methods each translator employed to convey the meanings of the original Arabic text. The analysis focused on identifying and evaluating cohesive devices in the translations. Following this comparison, the study assessed lexical cohesion using Halliday and Hassan's (1976) theory, particularly examining repetition and summation. The aim was to determine how effectively each translator preserved the coherence and integrity of the original text.

3.5. Theoretical Model

The model used in this study is based on Halliday and Hassan's theoretical framework, as outlined in *Cohesion in English* (1976). This framework comprises the following elements:

3.5.1. Lexical Coherence

The defining characteristic of a text is coherence, as a text cannot exist without it. However, texts may vary in the strength of their cohesion. The vocabulary used in cohesive devices is generally categorized into two main types: repetition and collocation (Kherghani, 2020).

Halliday and Hassan (1976) classified cohesive elements in English texts into three main categories:

- Grammatical cohesion, which includes reference, substitution, and ellipsis.
- Lexical cohesion, which involves repetition and collocation.
- Conjunctive cohesion, which consists of conjunctions that link clauses and sentences (Naghib et al., 2019).

Ultimately, lexical cohesion is established through textual cohesion. Halliday and Hassan (1976) further divided lexical cohesion into two key types: reiteration and collocation (McGee, 2009).

3.5.2. Repetition

In lexical cohesion, repetition refers to the repeated use of concepts or words within a text. Repetition can take various forms, including:

- Repetition of the same word

- Repetition of synonymous words
- Repetition of words that encompass a previous word
- Musical repetition

These types of repetition contribute to the coherence of a text (Taleghani, n.d.). While many words may appear multiple times in a text, cohesion is primarily achieved through the repetition of key content words. Function words, such as prepositions and conjunctions, may frequently occur, but they play a lesser role in establishing cohesion. Instead, content words—such as those related to synonymy, semantic opposition (antonymy), hyponymy, and meronymy—are the primary contributors to textual cohesion (Ghazvini & Eishani, 2015).

Repetition can be categorized into general repetition and partial repetition. In general repetition, two words appear in close proximity, while in partial (or distant) repetition, repeated words are distributed across different sentences (Eghbali et al., 2017).

3.5.3. Collocations

Collocation refers to the natural association of certain words with one another, allowing distinctions in meaning between similar words. The concept was first introduced by British linguist Firth (1950) and later refined by Halliday (1976) and Sinclair (1999), who established it as a fundamental principle in the study of words and their interaction with syntax in forming semantic units (Palumbo, 2011). Collocations represent a type of lexical correlation that arises from the habitual co-occurrence of words, meaning they tend to appear together in specific contexts. This association contributes to textual cohesion by creating connections between sentences. When a particular word frequently appears alongside specific other words within a linguistic unit, its presence can predict the occurrence of those words. As a result, collocated words form recognizable word sets that enhance coherence in a text.

In syntagmatic collocation, a verb or adjective typically appears alongside a noun in a fixed, conventionalized way that is predetermined by linguistic norms. For example, the phrase ‘old man’ is commonly used, whereas ‘ancient man’ sounds unnatural. However, ‘ancient book’ is an acceptable collocation. On the other hand, associative collocation occurs when words are grouped based on shared characteristics that place them within the same semantic domain. For instance, words like ‘moon’, ‘star’, and ‘sun’ all belong to the domain of celestial bodies. Additionally, collocations can be expanded through semantic opposites, synonymy, and hyponymy, which create further connections between words (Kherghani, 2020; Oraki & Visi, 2016). In translation, frequency is also an important cohesive device to ensure consistency and effectiveness. The prevalence of certain words in a language plays a key role in conveying meaning accurately to the target audience. A deep understanding of vocabulary frequency enables translators to produce high-quality translations that faithfully reflect the source text while maintaining linguistic and cultural appropriateness (Vaezian, 2013).

4. Results and discussions

Due to the limitations of academic publications, presenting a detailed discussion of all the data would make this paper overly lengthy. Therefore, a representative sample is provided below, while the full statistical analysis of all data is available in the corresponding tables.

4.1. Translators' strategies

An analysis of the three English translations of Surah al-Anam provided valuable insights into how complementary oppositions (COs) are reflected in English, contributing to the resulting lexical coherence. The following sections will discuss the findings, focusing on the strategies employed by each translator and the implications of these choices on the coherence of the translated text and CO frequency.

The results of the analysis of Arabic complementary oppositions (COs) and their English translations by Arberry, Pickthall, and Qaraa'i are presented in Table 1. This table outlines the Arabic complementary oppositions from Surah Al-An'aam alongside their English equivalents as translated by Arberry, Pickthall, and Qaraa'i. It also highlights the verses where each CO occurs and compares the lexical choices made by the three translators. The use of complementary opposites is vital for maintaining the coherence and meaning of the Qur'ānic text, and the table illustrates the similarities and differences in translation strategies among these three prominent English versions. The study identifies 20 instances of COs in Surah Al-An'aam and compares how each translator approached them:

Table 1. Arabic COs with the English Equivalents of COs Translated by Arberry (A), Pickthall (P) & Qaraa'i (Q)

No	ST	Pickthall's TT	Qaraa'i's TT	Arberry's TT	Verse No.
1	السَّمَاوَاتِ وَالْأَرْضِ	The Heavens /the earth (n)	The heavens /the earth (n)	The heavens /the earth (n)	1-3-12-14- 73-75-79- 101
2	سِرِّكُمْ وَمَجْمَرِكُمْ	Your secret/(n) your utterance) n)	Your secret(n) your overt [matters] (n)	Your secret(n)/you publish(v)	3
3	الْأَرْضِ وَالسَّمَاءِ	The earth/(n) the sky(n)	The land(n)/ the sky(n)	The earth /(n)loosed heaven(n)	6
4	الَّيْلِ وَالنَّهَارِ	The-at night (n) # the- by day(n)	The-by night(n) # the- by day(n)	The -by night (n) # the-by day(n)	13-60
5	بُضْرٍ — يُخَيْرِ	With Affliction(n) / with good(n)	Some Distress (n)/ some good(n)	Whit Affliction(n)/ with good(n)	17
6	بَدَا — يُخْفُونَ	Become Clear(adj)/ to hide(v)	To hide(v)/become evident(adj)	Were concealing(v) /has appeared(v)	28
7	الدُّنْيَا- الْآخِرَةِ	The world(n)/the hereafter(n)	The world(n)/the hereafter(n)	The present (n)life/the Last	32

No	ST	Pickthall's TT	Qaraa'i's TT	Arberry's TT	Verse No.
				Abode(n) collocation (Adj + n)	
8	الأرض و السَّمَاءِ	The earth (n)/the sky(n)	The ground(n) /in to sky(n)	The earth (n)/in heaven(n)	35
9	بِالْعَدَاةِ وَالْعِشِيِّ	Their Lord morn(n)/ evening(n)	At morning(n)/ at evening(n)	At morning(n) /at evening(n)	52
10	الْبَرِّ وَالْبَحْرِ	The land(n) / the sea(n)	In-Of land (n)/in- of sea(n)	In-of land(n) / in-of sea(n)	59-63-97
11	لَا يَنْفَعُنَا وَلَا يَضُرُّنَا	Neither profiteth (n) / nor hurteth (n)	Neither benefit(v) / nor harm(v)	Neither profits (v) /nor hurts(v)	71
12	تُبْدُونَهَا وَتُخْفُونَ	Ye Show(v)/ye hide(v)	You display(v)/ you conceal(v)	Revealing(v)/ hiding(v)	91
13	الْحَيِّ و الْمَيِّتِ	The living(n) #the dead(n)	The dead(n) /the living(n)	The living(n) # the dead (n)	95
14	الْإِصْبَاحِ و الْإِيلَاحِ	The daybreak/ the night(n)	The dawn/the night(n)	Into dawn/the night(n)	96
15	بَنِينَ وَبَنَاتٍ	Sons & daughters(n)	Sons & daughters(n)	Sons & daughters(n)	100
16	ظَاهِرٍ وَبَاطِنٍ	Outwardness (n) /inwardness(n)	Renounce outward(adj)#the inward(adj)	The outward(adj)#the inward(adj)	120
17	الذَّكَرَيْنِ - الْأُنثَيْنِ	Two males(n)#two females(n)	Two males(n)#two females(n)	Two males(n)# two females(n)	144
18	ظَهَرُوا بَطْنًا	Whether open(v)/or concealed(v)	The outward(adj)# the inward(adj)	Any outward(adj)# any inward(adj)	151
19	بِالْحَسَنَةِ وَبِالسَّيِّئَةِ	A good deed /an ill-deed Collocation (adj + n)	Bring Virtue(n)#bring vice(n)	A good deed # an evil deed(n) Collocation (adj + n)	160
20	وَمَعْيَايَ وَمَمَاتِي	My living (n)/ my dying(n)	My life (n)/ my death(n)	My living(n)/ my dying(n)	162

Note. '#' indicates opposites based on Oxford & Longman Dictionary.

Table 1 illustrates the dimensions of CO translation in the three translations of *Surah al-An'aam* by Arberry, Qaraa'i, and Pickthall, classified into the following categories:

- Words whose opposites are listed in the *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English* and the *Oxford Dictionary*, which the three translators selected as equivalents. Examples include 'sons and daughters' or 'light gray'.

- Words with opposites found in the *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English* and the *Oxford Dictionary*, which were also chosen by the three translators as equivalents. Examples include 'inward' and 'outward'.

- Syntactic collocations, including repeated types, selected by the translators as equivalents, such as 'good deed' and 'evil deed'.

As with the phrase 'good deeds', syntagmatic relations are established. When the word 'deed' appears in this context, the subconscious evokes a range of related words, such as bad, dirty, brave, evil, and so on. Therefore, both speaking and writing involve the interplay of these two types of relationships (Kenary & Rahbar, 2022).

- The fourth category concerns equivalents chosen by the translators based on their individual linguistic preferences, which are not found in the *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English* nor used in the *Oxford Dictionary*. These include the following.

4.2. Elaboration and Analysis of the Table Data

In the present section, more important items are selected from Table 1 above to be analyzed:

No	ST	Pickthall's TT	Qaraa'i's TT	Arberry's TT	Verse No.
2	سِرِّكُمْ وَيَحْكُمُكُمْ	Your secret/(n) your utterance) n)	Your secret(n) your overt [matters] (n)	Your secret(n)/you publish(v)	3

When attempting to translate 'يَحْكُمُكُمْ', confronted with a variety of possible, acceptable equivalents, each translator has chosen the equivalent that he deemed more accurate, probably based on the commentary to which he has referred; each has tried to preserve the most out of the form and the meaning by choosing a more specific equivalent. This means that the ST CO has been translated as the more specific CO in the TT.

No	ST	Pickthall's TT	Qaraa'i's TT	Arberry's TT	Verse No.
5	بِضُرٍّ — يَخَيْرُ	With Affliction(n) / with good(n)	Some Distress (n)/ some good(n)	Whit Affliction(n)/ with good(n)	17

As for the TL equivalents provided by the translators for the complementary opposition بِضُرٍّ — يَخَيْرُ, all the translators have used the word 'good', which is a general word, and 'distress/affliction', as more specific words respectively. Affliction is a noun and explains something that causes pain or suffering, especially in medical conditions. It means 'pain'. 'Good' means 'morally right' or making 'healthy and pleasant', which one enjoys. The opposite of 'good' is 'bad', which is a general word. 'distress', however, has been defined as the 'feeling of extreme unhappiness', just as 'affliction' is. Therefore, the more generic CO in the ST has been translated with more specific TL equivalents.

No	ST	Pickthall's TT	Qaraa'i's TT	Arberry's TT	Verse No.
7	الدُّنْيَا- الْآخِرَةُ	The world(n)/the hereafter(n)	The world(n)/the hereafter(n)	The present (n)life/the Last Abode(n); collocation (Adj + n)	32

In search for TL equivalents for the SL CO الدُّنْيَا-الْآخِرَةُ, P and Q have provided the same CO in the TT: the world and the hereafter. A, however, has provided 'the present life/the Last Abode. The former have employed more generic COs, while the latter has done a more specific one. The former is a more common, collocation-like CO, while the latter is a more creative CO, which might be later introduced in the TL.

No	ST	Pickthall's TT	Qaraa'i's TT	Arberry's TT	Verse No.
8	الْأَرْضُ وَ السَّمَاءُ	The earth (n)/the sky(n)	The ground(n) /in to sky(n)	The earth (n)/in heaven(n)	35

As for the ST Co 'الْأَرْضُ وَالسَّمَاءُ', P has used a common collocation, semantically more specific than the ST CO; Q has used a less common collocation, semantically more specific, and less common as a CO in the TL; and finally, A has used a common collocation, yet more frequent in the religious context of the TL. While 'sky' denotes a physical meaning, 'heaven' does a more spiritual meaning.

No	ST	Pickthall's TT	Qaraa'i's TT	Arberry's TT	Verse No.
11	لَا يَنْفَعُنَا وَلَا يَضُرُّنَا	Neither profiteth (n) / nor hurteth (n)	Neither benefit(v) / nor harm(v)	Neither profits (v) /nor hurts(v)	71

The CO 'نفع/ضر' in the ST has been translated as benefit/hurt; benefit/harm; and profit/hurt by P, Q, and A respectively. P's profit/hurt is an archaic CO. In Q's benefit/harm, the former is a noun meaning 'an advantage that something gives you', while the latter is a noun, an old English word meaning 'damage or injury that is caused by a person or an event'. As in A, *profit* is used as a verb and is related to 'money and the money that you make in business or by selling things'; it is a middle English word. And *hurt* is a verb that means 'injure' in Middle English. Thus, P has employed an Archaic CO in the TT, while the other two have used less archaic ones. However, Q's choice seems closer to the SL CO in terms of the degree of generality.

No	ST	Pickthall's TT	Qaraa'i's TT	Arberry's TT	Verse No.
12	تُبْدُونَهَا وَتُخْفُونَ	Ye Show(v)/ye hide(v)	You display(v)/ you conceal(v)	Revealing(v)/ hiding(v)	91

Confronted by the SL CO 'بدى/خفي', the translators have used different equivalents to form different COs in the TL. Pickthall has employed the TL CO 'show/hide', while Q has used 'display/conceal', and A has done 'reveal/hide' as the equivalents for the SL CO تَبْدُونَهَا/تُخْفُونَ. 'Show' is a verb meaning 'to let someone see something and to make something clear', while

'display' is a verb meaning 'to show something to people and provide them with information'. 'Clear', on the other hand, means 'obvious, apparent, evident, plain, and easy to see or understand', and 'hide' is a verb that means 'to conceal, to put or keep somebody in a hiding state; 'hide' and 'conceal' are synonymous. 'Conceal' is a verb, meaning 'to hide somebody or something'. 'Reveal' is a verb, meaning 'show', as the opposite of 'conceal'. It means 'to disclose' and is a late Middle English word. The dictionary-based analysis proves that while P's selection is a non-religious CO, Q's is a religious CO, and A's is somewhere in between.

No	ST	Pickthall's TT	Qaraa'i's TT	Arberry's TT	Verse No.
14	الإِصْبَاحُ وَ الْأَيْلَ	The daybreak/ the night(n)	The dawn/the night(n)	Into dawn/the night(n)	96

As for the SL CO الإِصْبَاحُ وَ الْأَيْلَ, 'daybreak/night' and 'dawn/night' have been used in the TTs as two equivalents by the three translators. 'Night' is a noun, denoting 'the time when it is dark'. 'Dawn' is a noun, meaning 'the time when it is partially dark in the daybreak time'; on the other hand, 'daybreak' has a different meaning: 'the beginning the day, when it begins to become light'. To compare them, it can be said that Q and A's 'dawn/night' is a more common, collocation-like CO that might appeal more to everyday readers, while P's CO is more likely to appeal stylistically to more selective readers.

No	ST	Pickthall's TT	Qaraa'i's TT	Arberry's TT	Verse No.
18	ظَهَرُوا بَطَّنَ	Whether open(v)/or concealed(v)	The outward(adj)# the inward(adj)	Any outward(adj)# any inward(adj)	151

The SL CO ظَهَرُوا بَطَّنَ has been translated in two ways by P on the one hand and Q/A on the other. Pickthall has used equivalents of a more historical style with a formal and literary style. The other two translators have used 'inward' and 'outward'; 'outward' is connected with 'the way people or things seem to be' rather than with 'what is true'. 'Inward' is an adjective, meaning 'what is inside your mind and not visible to others'.

4.3. Summation of the Analyses

To sum up, the analyses above showed that although each translator has employed his own distinct selection of semantic pairs to reflect the ST Cos in each ayah, all of them have both distinguished and transferred the COs in the TTs, though with different stylistic registers and different degrees of generic or specific meanings.

Arberry has demonstrated a stronger desire to preserve the original style of the Qur'ān, using rich lexical choices and the frequent use of repetition. His translation often reflects a deeper interaction with the semantic implications of the ST COs, increasing the cohesion of the text. He has employed words more understandable to English speakers, especially as regards highly literate readership. Pickthall, the same as Arberry, was also diligently committed to the application of a more historical vocabulary. However, his COs can appeal to today's readership less than Arberry's selections do. Finally, Qaraa'i's selected COs reflect little literary or historical styles and address the reading taste of the moder reader in contrast to the other two translators.

From the perspective of the frequency of acceptable COs in the TTs in Surah al-An'aam by Arberry, Pickthall, and Qaraa'i, the summation of the above analyses shows that Arberry's translation contains the highest number of acceptable COs, reflecting a stronger adherence to lexical cohesion as well as the Qur'ānic style, while the translated COs of the other two translators contain fewer acceptable COs in terms of lexical cohesion and the appropriate style for the translation of the Glorious Qur'ān.

5. Findings and Discussion

The analysis of Complementary Opposition (CO) in the English translations of Surah Al-An'aam offers valuable insights into the complexities of translating this linguistic feature. The findings highlight the distinct strategies used by each translator, which play a crucial role in shaping the coherence and depth of the translated text.

5.1. Interpretative Differences in Translation

The collocational range of equivalent words across languages is never identical; it may overlap but will not completely match. Only a native speaker can accurately determine whether a collocation is acceptable, particularly when experimenting with new combinations. Languages are constantly evolving, leading to the expansion or reduction of a word's collocational range (Larson, 2011, pp. 212–213). While some synonyms share the same meaning (signified), they do not always carry the same value. Their significance can vary depending on the context. According to Saussure (1857), the relationship between the signifier and the signified, as well as the concept of value—determined by the interrelation of signs within a linguistic system—must be distinguished (Sojodi, 2003).

Markedness is one of the most significant cognitive processes utilized by the human mind. Much of our knowledge is shaped by comparing phenomena within oppositional relationships. We differentiate between concepts by identifying specific features present in one but absent in the other. The element lacking these distinguishing features is considered unmarked. Additionally, the unmarked component tends to have a broader distribution and appears more frequently than the marked component (Afrash, 2002). In Complementary Opposition (CO) structures, marked words rarely appear alongside unmarked words.

From a frequency distribution perspective, marked categories are generally less frequent than unmarked ones but are more cognitively prominent. The marked category is also cognitively more complex, requiring greater mental effort for processing (Ghaeminia, 2022). Markedness has been linked to frequency, as Greenberg (1966) and Zwicky (1978) observed that the unmarked member of an opposition occurs more often than the marked member. However, while this pattern may hold, Waugh (1982) argued that frequency should not define markedness but rather be a consequence of other underlying principles.

Since the unmarked member can appear in a wider range of contexts and is used when contrast is neutralized, it tends to occur more frequently (Lehrer, 1987, p. 103). A translator must understand the distinction between generic and specific words, as this knowledge can help in finding an appropriate lexical equivalent. However, without this awareness, identifying a suitable equivalent can be challenging. When translating relatively specific words, finding a close equivalent is usually easier, as specific vocabulary is more likely to correspond between two languages. In contrast, translating generic words can be more difficult, as generic vocabulary varies significantly across languages and often lacks exact

equivalents. Simply searching for a direct equivalent of a generic word in the source language will not always yield an accurate translation (Larson, 2011, pp. 102–103).

5.2. Preservation of Lexical Cohesion

The study's emphasis on lexical cohesion underscores its importance in assessing translation quality. Halliday and Hassan's (1976) framework serves as a valuable tool for analyzing how different translators handle cohesion. The findings suggest that greater lexical cohesion leads to a more faithful representation of the original text's meaning, reinforcing the need for translators to carefully consider linguistic features to produce translations that are both accurate and stylistically consistent. Since style emerges within a specific linguistic system, evaluating the styles of both the author and the translator depends on two key factors: the quality of word and expression selection and the way they are combined to maintain cohesion throughout the text. One of the defining characteristics of an effective style is its coherence and uniformity (Khazaeifar, 2018).

Arberry's translation stands out for its high frequency of COs and effective use of lexical cohesion. His approach demonstrates a strong commitment to preserving the Qur'ānic style, utilizing repetition and rich lexical choices to maintain the semantic depth of the original text. This strategy not only enhances the aesthetic quality of the translation but also facilitates a deeper understanding of its theological concepts.

By frequently employing synonyms and antonyms, Arberry enables readers to engage with the text on multiple levels, reinforcing the interconnected meanings inherent in COs. His translation reflects a deep engagement with the semantic implications of these oppositions, contributing to greater textual coherence. Similarly, Qaraa'i's translation adopts a modern interpretative stance, aiming to present the text in a way that resonates with contemporary readers. In contrast, Pickthall's translation, while accurate, often prioritizes clarity over cohesion. This approach may make the text more accessible but risks diminishing some of its original depth. His literal translation of COs, though precise, sometimes results in a less nuanced interpretation of the Qur'ānic message. While committed to accuracy, his more literal approach occasionally leads to reduced textual cohesion.

6. Conclusion

Lexical cohesive devices include repetition and collocation (syntactic and associative collocation), both of which were utilized by all three translators in their translations of Surah Al-An'aam. The acceptable equivalents of cohesive opposites (COs) in this Surah include:

- COs found in the *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English* and the *Oxford Dictionary*: *night/day*, *son/daughter*, *living/dead*, *male/female*, *virtue/vice*, and *good deed/evil deed* (*good/evil* being a syntactic collocation).
- COs repeated in all three translations: *Heaven/earth* and *land/sea*.
- COs repeated twice: *morning/evening*, *outward/inward*, *affliction/good*, *world/hereafter*, and *dawn/night*.

The total number of repetitions of acceptable equivalents across the translations is as follows: Pickthall = 20, Arberry = 23, and Qaraa'i = 21.

This study addresses a gap in research on the translation of COs in the Qur'ān, emphasizing the role of lexical cohesion in preserving the integrity of the text. Arberry's translation stands out for its consistency and adherence to the Qur'ānic style. The findings suggest that translators must carefully consider semantic relationships within the text to maintain the Qur'ān's meaning and stylistic coherence. Overall, the discussion highlights the intricate relationship between translation strategies, lexical cohesion, and meaning preservation in religious texts. The varying approaches of Arberry, Pickthall, and Qaraa'i illustrate the challenges of translating complex linguistic structures and underscore the need for a nuanced understanding of the source text.

Arberry's translation demonstrates a higher degree of lexical coherence due to his meticulous attention to the Qur'ānic style. His translation frequently preserves semantic relationships and the repetition of key words, resulting in a more cohesive rendering. In contrast, Pickthall's translation, while more literal, sometimes lacks the stylistic fluidity found in Arberry's work. Qaraa'i's translation, though accurate, occasionally diverges in lexical choices, affecting overall cohesion. The frequency analysis reveals that Arberry employs COs in a manner that closely mirrors the original Arabic structure, enhancing clarity and flow.

For future research, the lexical coherence of Qur'ānic Surahs in other English translations could be explored further. This would involve analyzing the use of synonyms, antonyms, and other conceptual relationships within a Surah, examining their repetition, and comparing the results across different translations.

References

- Afrashi, A. (2002). *Thoughts in semantics*. Explore Culture.
- Amery, M., & Hosseini, M. (2016). Review of English translations of the Qur'an by Arberry and Shakir and the recitation of the selected verses of Surah al-Ra'ad. *Quarterly Research on the Interpretation and Language of the Qur'an*, 8, 7–24.
- Eghbali, A., Sayadinezhad, R., & Fazeli, M. H. (2017). Analysis of lexical coherence in Surah al-Ankaboot. *Journal of Interpretation and Language of Qur'an*, 11, 91–110. <https://doi.org/10.30473/Qur'an.2017.4711>
- Fasasi, K. A. (2020). Beyond semantic opposition: Contextual opposites in Osun dare's *The Eye of The Earth*. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 11(5), 48–54. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/aiac.all.v.11n.5p.48> (Note: Expanded "ALLS" to full journal name if possible.)
- Ghazvini, M. N., & Eshani, T. (2015). Comparison of the use of cohesion factors in Surah Al-An'aam and its translation by Saffaarzadeh. *Journal of Qur'anic Researches*, 74(1), 120–145.
- González, M. G. (2010). Lexical cohesion in multiparty conversations. *Language Sciences*, 33, 167–179. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2010.08.002>
- Hassanein, H. (2020). Identical twins, different wombs: A literature review on ittibaaq in Arabic and antonymy in English. **International Journal of Arabic-English Studies*,

20*(2), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.33806/ijaes2000.20.2.1> (Note: Added journal title if available.)

Kenari, M. K., & Rahbar, N. (2022). Saussure according to Derrida: Writing as a usurper as ab order. *Basic Western Studies*, 26(2), 169–185. <https://doi.org/10.30465/os.2023.40016.1803>

Khammyseh, D. (2015). The problems in translating Islamic expressions in religious occasions. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 6(35), 103–109.

Khazaeifar, A. (2018). Translator style. *The Translator*, 26(63), 3–12.

Kherghani, H. (2020). Synonyms in Surah Al-An'aam and its role in coherence. *Qur'anic Researches and Tradition*, 52(2), 285–306. <http://dx.doi.org/10.22059/jqst.2020.294696.669433>

Larson, M. L. (2011). *Meaning-based translation: A guide to cross-language equivalence* (2nd ed.). University Press of America. (Note: Added edition if applicable.)

Lehrer, A. (1987). Markedness and antonymy. *Journal of Linguistics*, 21(2), 397–429. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S002222670001032X>

McGee, L. (2009). Traversing the lexical cohesion minefield. *ELT Journal*, 63(3), 212–220. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccn040> (Note: Expanded "Oxford University Press" to journal name.)

Mirzapour, F., & Ahmadi, M. (2011). A study on lexical cohesion in English and Persian research articles: A comparative study. *English Language Teaching*, 4(4), 245–253. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/elt.v4n4p245>

Naghib, S. M., Sazjini, M., & Mosavi, S. M. (2019). A comparative analytical study of Bahrapour's and Safavi's translations of the Qur'an: A case study of Surah al-Naazi'at based on the coherence model of Halliday and Hassan. *Qur'anic Studies and Islamic Culture*, 2(4), 121–143.

Navidi, A. (2023). Lexical coherence in Surah al-Sajdah. *Journal of Literary-Qur'anic Researches*, 1*(11), 32–49. <http://dx.doi.org/10.22034/paq.2023.708861>

Oraki, G. H., & Visi, A. (2016). Examining the application of elements of textual coherence in Surah al-mubarakeh al-Naas and its Persian translation based on the theory of textual coherence by Halliday and Hassan. *Qur'anic Sciences and Interpretation*, 3(1), 129–146.

Seyyedi, M., & Baghojary, A. (2020). *An attitude on the stylistic features of the Holy Qur'an in collocations*. Astaan Quds Razavi. (Note: Italicized as a book.)

Shahpari, A., Mahdavinia, M., & Samavati, A. (2017). The role of cohesive factors in English translations of the Qur'an. *Serajeh Monir*, 8(2), 7–42.

- Siddiek, A. G. (2018). Review of some orientalists' approaches used in the translation of the Holy Qur'an. *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature*, 6(4), 38–53. <http://dx.doi.org/10.20431/2347-3134.0604005>
- Sojudi, F. (2003). *Applied semiotics*. Ghesseh. (Note: Removed "Tehran" per APA 7th unless needed for retrieval.)
- Taleghani, H. A. (n.d.). Lexical cohesion and its role in translation. *Translator*, 32, 64–75. (Note: Removed parentheses around issue number.)
- Vaezian, H. (2013). *Linguistic corpora and translation*. Ghatreh.
- Valiei, Y., Ahosaini, M. M., & Farhadi, M. (2016). Factors of textual coherence in Surah al-Nuh. *Linguistic Research of the Qur'an*, 9(1), 69–86.
- Winiharti, M. (2010). Sense relations in language learning. *Humanora*, 1(1), 100–106.