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Abstract: Among Muslims there is a dogmatic belief in the linguistic inimitability of Qur’anic discourse that places limitations on its translatability at different linguistic levels and constitutes a minefield of hurdles when translating it between incongruous and incommensurable languages. One understudied linguistic level is the lexical-semantic level and one unstudied issue is the frames and functions of ancillary antonymy in the Qur’anic discourse. This article explores the translatability of ancillary antonym frames and functions from Qur’anic Arabic into English, using a lexicosyntactic approach to seven English translations available and accessible in the Quranic Arabic Corpus (QAC). Findings demonstrate that the Qur’an translators in focus are at great variance in rendering the syntactic frames and discourse functions of ancillary antonymy into English. There are also noticeable variations in the transatorial syntagmatic chains and paradigmatic choices as a result of adopting different translational strategies, notably explicitation, implicitation, domestication, foreignization, reproduction, substitution, and exonymy. The main conclusion is that ancillary antonym pairs co-occur within syntactic frames and co-perform discourse functions which must be attended and rendered into target texts.
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1. Introduction

Religious translation, a subfield of theolinguistics, has recently witnessed a resurgence of interest in the twenty-first century. Commenting on religious translation between cultures, James (2013: 342) writes:

The treasuring of ancient religious texts links us to the past in quite special ways, which themselves demand exegesis and self-aware commentary. The possibility of their translation, and retranslation, opens a way for the regular redefinition of our sense of how we are placed in the world of others, personally, culturally, and politically, whether we ourselves undertake the translation or receive and respond to it in some new context of religious practice. In translating God’s words, we reorient ourselves to each other. Religious translation is still problematized with such core issues as sacrosanctity and inimitability that serve to contextualize the nature of translation practice in
relation to the three monotheistic religions, Judaism, Christianity, and Islam, alongside their mainstream scriptures, the Talmud (the Torah), the Bible (the Gospel), and the Qur’an (Naudé 2010: 285). Nida (2001) who stands out as a prominent figure in Biblical translation expounds the role of (non)linguistic context in (religious) translation. (Qur’an) translators have to delve into immediate and remote linguistic and situational contexts in rendering and transposing a religious text, strictly a Qur’anic text bounded by narrative and revelatory contexts.

Being God’s verbatim Word revealed through Gabriel to the Messenger Muhammad, the Qur’an is believed by the Muslims to be a mu’jizah (‘a miracle’) and to be mu’jiz (‘inimitably miraculous’). Despite the heated debate over its (un)translatability, there is a wider significance and greater demand among both Muslims and non-Muslims for translations of the Qur’an in this age than at any other time in the past, because of the recent global growth across multicultural communities. A broader spectrum of non-Muslim readership across different parts of the world are constantly obliged to turn to Qur’an translations for a basic or deeper understanding of Islam (Morris 2000: 53). Thus, the Qur’an has been rendered into many foreign languages, most notably English—with more than 30 English translations by Muslim scholars. All the translations, however, are regarded as mere interpretations of the Qur’an’s ma‘āni; i.e. ‘meanings’, since they all fail to reflect the language-dependent character of the Qur’an (Naudé 2010: 290-291) and more often than not contribute to a profound misunderstanding of it. The main problem is the published translators seem to have disregarded the primordial question of the real effects of their versions on their wider audiences (Morris 2000: 53).

The linguistic inimitability of Qur’anic discourse (Abdul-Raof 2019) leads to limits of translatability that cause rhetorical, stylistic, linguistic, semantic, syntactic, and cultural voids into TTs (Abdul-Raof 2004). The Qur’an’s peculiar composition and style constitute a minefield of hurdles when it is translated to languages that are incommensurably different, like from Arabic into English (Abdul-Rauf 2013; Hummadi, Said, Hussein, Sabti and Hattab 2020). Translating a religiously sacred text like the Qur’an is often beset by many quandaries as a result of the nuances that exist between the two languages (Ali 2006; Abdul-Raof 2013). These quandaries figure prominently in the proliferation of PhD and MA theses and research articles often entitled ‘The (problematics of) translating or rendering so-and-so in the Qur’an.’ The (un)translatability of the Qur’an figures not only linguistically but also ideologically because different semiotic practices and discourses are mediated or communicated through translation (DeJonge and Tietz 2015; Hamdan, Naser and Hamdan 2021). Research on Qur’an translation is so extensive that a single Qur’anic linguistic phenomenon may be the subject of multiple investigations. Consider, for example, shift (al-ilīfah, Abdel Haleem 1992; Mir 2017), euphemism (at-talattuf, Farghal 2005; Abdel Haleem 2011; Albarakati 2019; Hassanein 2020b), metaphor (al-istīʿara, Ereksoussi 2014; Sharaf Eldin 2014; Alhusban and Alkhawaldah 2018), metonymy (al-kiya, Al-Salem 2008; Muhammad 2017), pun (at-tawriyya, Al Aqad, Sapar, Hussin, Mokhtar and Mohad 2019; Al-
Kharabsheh and Houji 2019), antonymy (at-tibaː q, Al-Kharabsheh and Al-Jdayeh 2017; Hassanein 2017), and speech acts (Salama 2021), among others.

As Al-Kharabsheh and Al-Jdayeh (2017: 55) describe it, very little research has been conducted on Qur’anic antonymy from a translational point of view. The case of ancillary antonymy is rather lamentable since, to the best of our knowledge and based on review of the literature, no single research has thus far been undertaken on the translatability of ancillary antonymy from Qur’anic Arabic into English. This is the reason why this study sets out to explore the phenomenon of ancillary antonymy in the Qur’an from a translational perspective, hypothesizing that it serves specific discourse functions and favors certain syntactic frameworks that might have gone untended and unrendered into English. The objectives of this research are to (1) compare the discourse functions of ancillary antonymy in SLT with their equivalents in TLTs and (2) compare the syntactic frames that trigger such functions in SLT with their counterparts in TLTs. Alongside these objectives, semantic nuances and lexical relations borne therewith are to be compared in SLT vis-à-vis TLT.

2. Review

Previous studies on Qur’anic antonymy through the prism of linguistics are manifold. Past literature on it in a translational perspective is rather sparse, if not scant. Review of the past literature reveals some indirectly relevant studies on either autoantonymy or contronymy (words carrying two opposite senses) or Qur’anic antonymy (words co-occurring in single opposite pairs) in general. Aubed and Al-Dulaimi (2010) investigated the accuracy of translating Qur’anic antonyms contextually and interpretively. Their approach was merely exegetical and superficially pragmatic. Al-Kharabsheh and Al-Jdayeh (2017) investigated the extent to which Qur’anic antonymy is translatable and showed that antonymy in the Qur’an typifies semantic non-identicality at two levels of inverse semantic duplicity: an overt one at literal level and a covert one at metaphorical level. They concluded by proposing the literal-exegetic translational approach as a solution to the rendering of this semantic duplicity. Hassanein (2017) studied whether the aspects of lexical-semantic opposition in Qur’anic Arabic added to or detracted from the (un)translatability of Qur’anic discourse, revealing multilevel lexicosyntactic nuances which passed untranslated into TTs and which resulted in syntactical, lexical, semantical, and hermeneutical losses therein.

The present review of the literature on state-of-the-art research on Qur’anic antonymy shows a terminological chaos due to the overlap of al-tibaː q ‘antonymy’ and al-tadaː d ‘autoantonymy’. A few thereof mistook the former term for the latter in their titles but then ended up in studying the latter in the bodies of their research, namely, words bearing two opposite senses technically known as al-addaː d ‘autoantonyms or contronyms’. All previous translation-oriented studies but one on Qur’anic antonymy focused on paradigmatic analyses of it in a syntax-free perspective. The one and only translational study that analyzed it from a syntagmatic perspective is Hassanein (2017) who undertook a comparative study
of the syntactic frames and discourse functions of antonymous pairs in the Qur’an. None of the previous researches approached ancillary antonymy in its own due right from a syntagmatically typological view, which leaves a remarkable gap in the Qur’an Translation Studies (QTS). Ancillary antonymy, a top-listed category across languages, incorporates two pairs of antonyms (A-pair and B-pair) whereby the A-pair members play an auxiliary role in signaling or triggering opposition between the B-pair members in noticeable syntactic frames and with remarkable discourse functions. This study seeks to explore and assess how Qur’an translators managed to transpose ancillary frames and functions into English.

3. Background

Of all lexical-semantic relations across languages, antonymy is said to be the most ubiquitous and universal phenomenon with different guises in linguistic communication (Paradis and Willners 2007) and with a special status in language and society not held by any other relation (Jones, Paradis, Murphy and Willners 2007). Traditionally from the time of Aristotle until the 20th century, antonymy was classified on a syntax-independent and context-free basis according to how it paradigmatically looks in text or discourse (Lyons 1977; Cruse 1986, among others). Recently, from the late 1990s to date, antonymy has been categorized on a syntax-dependent and context-based basis according to how it syntagmatically operates in discourse (Mettinger 1994; Jones 2002). Of all the syntax-dependent discourse functions of antonymy developed and categorized in considerable detail by Mettinger (1994) and in more extensive detail by Jones (2002), ancillary antonymy is found to be the most frequent and prevalent in and across languages (e.g., Jones 2002; Jones and Murphy 2005; Murphy and Jones 2008; Muehleisen and Isono 2009; Hassanein 2018).

Ancillary antonymy is defined as a discourse function of antonymy featuring two contrasts: one between a pair of antonyms and the other between another pair of words, phrases, or clauses. The latter pair is a larger and more important contrast closely related to and partly generated by the former. The former pair is designated as an A-pair; the latter as a B-pair. The antonyms of the A-pair are not the focus of primary contrast but play an ancillary role in signaling an instantial and more important opposition between members of the B-pair; as Jones (2002: 60) literally puts it: “The role of ‘opposites’ in Ancillary Antonymy sentences is to augment the contrastive power of B-pairs”. (1) If the B-pair has no innate opposition, the A-pair triggers an instantial contrast. (2) If the B-pair has low opposition, the A-pair augments its latent potential for contrast. (3) If the B-pair has high opposition, the A-pair confirms this contrastive power to the point of antonymity (Jones 2002: 47-55). Figure 1 showcases these three scenarios with examples from Jones’s (2002) corpus.
Jones (2002: 48-52) taxonomizes members of the B-pairs according to register, species, form and relations, as being political, human, quantified, synonymous, meronymous, and (co)hyponymous. The ancillary effect is so strong that it works syndetically and asyndetically as well as paratactically and hypotactically, with both antonymy and parallelism serving as powerful contrastive tools and with B-pairs growing particularly receptive to further research (Jones 2002: 60).

4. Method
This section develops a replicable lexicosyntactic approach to the translatability of a retrievable dataset of ancillary antonyms extracted from the Qur’anic Arabic corpus (QAC).

4.1 Dataset
Due to space and word limits, a representative dataset, a convenience sample, of ancillary antonyms that is amenable to a rigorous lexicosyntactic analysis in a comparative context from Arabic (SL) into English (TL) is selected and retrieved from the online Qur’anic Arabic Corpus (QAC) created by the Language Research Group at the University of Leeds. QAC perfectly suits the aims of this study, being an annotated repertoire of the grammar, syntax and morphology of Qur’anic words, phrases, and clauses, and a reservoir of seven parallel English translations side by side with the original Qur’anic Arabic verses. Such translations include Sahih International (SI), Marmaduke Pickthall (MP), Yusuf Ali (YA), Habib Shakir (HS), Muhammad Sarwar (MS), Mohsin Khan (MK), and John Arberry (JA). Since an exegesis-free translation is considered notorious for unorthodoxy and heterodoxy (see Abdul-Raof 2001: 74), it is necessary to consult Qur’an exegeses to choose the most accurate interpretation and transfer it into the TT. Hence, Al-Kashsha:f (Az-Zamakhshari:, 1998) and At-Tahri:r wa-t-Tanwi:r (Ibn ‘A:shu:r 1984) are used for exegetical reference, since they are linguistically oriented in interpretation (Az-Zahra:ni: 2006; Frolov 2020). The non-probability purposive sample verses which are conveniently selected and sporadically collected from the far larger database close to hand on QAC appear throughout this article as screenshots taken for the comparative analysis.

4.2 Approach
This study draws on Jones’s (2002) taxonomy of the B-pairs of ancillary antonymy and on Hassanein’s (2020a) typology of the discourse functions of ancillary A-pairs and B-pairs according to canonicity and associativity. Jones (2002) logged three configurations of the canonicity of the B-pairs, high innate opposition, low innate
opposition, and no innate opposition, which are respectively affirmed, activated, and triggered by A-pair antonyms. He also categorized these oppositional configurations based on their register, class, and relation. Table 1 outlines such a taxonomy with examples from Jones’s (2002) corpus.

Table 1. Taxonomy of B-pairs in ancillary antonymy (adapted from Jones 2002: 48-52)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B-Pair Configurations</th>
<th>High innate opposition</th>
<th>Low innate opposition</th>
<th>No innate opposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Conservatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Labour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Munich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>six months ago</td>
<td>today</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>many</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>acquaintances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synonymous</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meronymous</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>minnows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>to choose</td>
<td>the queues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jones (2002) put forward a replicable basis for expanding the range and scope of ancillary antonymy but assigned antonymity only to the A-pair whose members have to be antonyms unlike those of the B-pair members. This is the reason why Hassanein (2020a) expanded Jones’s (2002) horizontal taxonomy from three to nine configurations on an interchangeable cline of canonicity and refined the vertical taxonomy from formal classes to logical relations between members of both pairs. Table 2 sketches such a refined typology with instances from Hassanein’s (2020a) dataset.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Canonicity</th>
<th>Coordinated</th>
<th>Negated</th>
<th>Subordinated</th>
<th>Interrogative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canonical Canonical</td>
<td>laugh/cry</td>
<td>death/deaths</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>little/much</td>
<td>one/many</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canonical Semicanonical</td>
<td>open/close</td>
<td>look/not look</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>paradise/hell</td>
<td>inferior/above</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canonical Noncanonical</td>
<td>allow/forbid</td>
<td>not come/come</td>
<td>rescue/drown</td>
<td>night/day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semicanonical Canonical</td>
<td>selling/usury</td>
<td>run/walk</td>
<td>Moses/others</td>
<td>sleep/play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>love/leave</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>life/afterlife</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semicanonical Semicanonical</td>
<td>love/leave</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>affliction/blessing</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>life/Day</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>invoke/forget</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semicanonical Noncanonical</td>
<td>mercy/bad deed</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>rescue/ruin</td>
<td>invoke/leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gladden/desp air</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>him/others</td>
<td>Baal/Creator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncanonical Canonical</td>
<td>you/they</td>
<td>you/We</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>I/he</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>far side/near side</td>
<td>not know/know</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>old man/old woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncanonical Semicanonical</td>
<td>vision/dream</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>God/Satan</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncanonical Noncanonical</td>
<td>one/the other</td>
<td>name/nickname</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>serve/eat</td>
<td>name/nickname</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Besides, Hassanein (2020a) logged duplicates and analogs interchangeably paradigmatised in either pair on the syntagmatic axis. We tend to concur with Hassanein (2020a) who managed to enlarge the range of ancillary antonymy as a cross-categorial discourse function and developed a retrievable taxonomy thereof. The result is a rigorous typology viable to Arabic varieties and presumably to other languages, too. The typology presents the solid argument that just as the B-pair items might feature low innate opposition (non-canonical opposites), middle innate opposition (semi-canonical opposites), and high innate opposition (canonical opposites), so is the A-pair items that do not have to be only antonyms but can be any pair of words (opposites or otherwise) triggering an opposition between the B-pair ones. This study tends to test the typologies devised by Jones (2002) and developed by Hassanein (2020a) on a representative sample of ancillary antonyms within a comparative (A⇒E) translational context.
5. Analysis
This section undertakes a comparative lexicosyntactic analysis of the discourse functions and syntactic frames of ancillary antonyms in the SLT (i.e., the Qur’an) vis-à-vis their counterparts in the TLTs (i.e., the translations). The analysis proceeds systematically from Source Ancillary Antonymy Lexicosyntactic Analysis (SAALA) to Target Ancillary Antonymy Lexicosyntactic Analysis (TAALA). Due to space and word count limits, the data analysis is not intended at all to be exhaustive but to be representative.

5.1 Coordinated ancillaries

5.1.1 Conjunctively conjoined ancillaries
Example (1): (Q 81: 17-18)

Verse: wa-l-\textit{layl} idha: ‘\textit{as} as wa-\textit{subh} idha: \textit{tanaffas}
Gloss: and-the-\textit{night} when \textit{departs} and-the-\textit{morning} when \textit{breathes}
Source. \url{http://corpus.quran.com/translation.jsp?chapter=81&verse=17}
\url{http://corpus.quran.com/translation.jsp?chapter=81&verse=18}

SAALA. Example (1) shows ancillary antonymy in a conjunctively coordinated frame (‘X and Y’), in which a semicanonically antonymous, holomeronymous pair, \textit{al-layl/\textit{as-subh}} (‘night/morning’), activates a semantically latent opposition in a semicanonically antonymous pair, ‘\textit{as}"\textit{as}/\textit{tanaffas} (‘depart/breathe’). Figure 2 schematizes both pairs.

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
\textit{A-pair} & \textit{B-pair} \\
\hline
\textit{wa} & \textit{\textit{as} as}\textit{as} \\
by & (\textit{huwa}) \\
the night & departs \\
when & \textit{tanaffas} \\
\hline
\textit{wa} & \textit{as-subh} \\
by & (\textit{huwa}) \\
the morning & breathes \\
when & \textit{tanaffas} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

Figure 2. Ancillary antonyms in parallel structures conjoined by \textit{wa} (‘and’) (Q 81: 17-18)
Culled from the number of hits searched for in the QAC, the canonical antonym of al-layl is an-naha:r (‘day’). The canonical antonym of ‘as’as is more probably adbar (‘depart’) or less probably aqbal (‘arrive’) since ‘as’as is cross-dialectally assigned two antonymous meanings and thus is considered to be a did (pl. adda:d ‘autoantonyms’, words carrying opposite meanings, as in al-sar-im ‘day/night’) in lexicographical studies (e.g., Ibn-Manzu:r n.d. [V6]: 139), syntactic studies (e.g., Ad-Darwi:sh 1980), and Qur’an translation studies (e.g., Al-Kharabsheh, 2008). In exegetical studies, the lexeme is further reported to be antonymously polysemous, carrying a sense of both ‘departure’ and ‘arrival’ (e.g., Ibn ĆA:shu:r 1984 [P30]: 154; Az-Zamakhshari: 1998 [P6]: 325). Therefore, this verse is multi-interpretable due to the contronymy of the item ‘as’as (adbar/aqbal ‘depart/arrive’). One interpretation is “By the night when it departs and the morning when it arrives” based on the premise that the second wa (‘and’) is a coordinator conjoining the two hemistichs—a context in which the lexeme tanaffas (lit. ‘breathe in’ for ‘arrive’) serves as the selector of ‘departure’ meaning and thus pares the item ‘as’as down to monosemy. Another interpretation is “By the night when it arrives and departs; by the morning when it breathes in”—an interpretation maintaining the polysemous nature of the item ‘as’as based on the grounds that the second wa is an oath particle rather than a conjunctive particle. In Arabic tropological studies, this configuration of ancillary antonymy is known as tiba:q at-tarshi: (‘homoioptotonic antonymy’), being accompanied with rhetorical tropes as the pun of ‘as’as, the animistic metaphor of tanaffas, and the parallelism of the two hemistichs. Figure 3 treebanks the parallel structures of both hemistichs if they are read together as one structural unit.

Figure 3. A treebanking of verse (Q 81: 17-18)
http://corpus.quran.com/treebank.jsp?chapter=81&verse=18

TAALA. Paradigmatically, the University of Leeds Language Research Group (ULLRG) choose the ‘departure’ sense of ‘as’as over the ‘arrival’ sense and
maintain the parallelism and metaphor syntagmatically. Their paradigmatic choice is mirrored in MP, YA, HS, MK, and JA. The ‘arrival’ meaning is reflected in SI and MS whose lexical choices describe the night temporally as it grows dark. Syntactically, the either conjunctive or oath-swearing particle wa (‘and/by’) serves the former function in SI, MS, MK, and JA but the latter function in MP, YA, and HS. The processual dynamicity of the SLT verbs ‘as’as and tanaffas has been explicitatively nominalized in MP and oddly pre-adjectivalized and post-adjectivalized in MS and JA, respectively. The verb ‘as’as, which is said to bear two opposite senses, has implicitly been pared down to one sense at the expense of the other. Lexically, there are notable variations in translating the item as-subh in this verse as ‘dawn’ in SI, YA, MK, and JA and ‘morning’ in MP, HS, and MS and elsewhere in the Qur’an (e.g., 74: 34, 89: 1, among others). This lexical inconsistency in the translations is caused by unawareness of the canonical statuses and semantic nuances between binary oppositions, such as ghasaq/al-fajr (‘dusk/dawn’), as-subh/ad-duha (‘early morning/late morning’), and al-layl/annaha:r (‘night/day’). The Qur’an translators ought to consult dictionaries of synonyms and antonyms to opt for the right lexical choice and consult frames of references in major Qur’anic exegeses to decide on the more appropriate interpretation. They should also pay heed to lexical consistency in their choice of words that can be achieved by a microcontext (linguistic co(n)text) and a macrocontext (situational context). A comparative context may provide a clue to the intended meaning, as in verse (74: 33-34), “By the night when it departs and by the morning when it shines”, which is thematically explicit about the alternation of night and day (Al-Kharabsheh 2008: 26). Each translation above has its own syntactic, lexical, and semantic preferences—an argument supported by explicitation strategies as generalization, specification, addition, extension, transposition, and substitution (Klaudy 2000), which each translator opts for to spell out additional ideational and contextual meanings or interpretations.

5.1.2 Disjunctively conjoined ancillaries

Example (2): (Q 2: 229)


Gloss: Divorce twice then-retainment with-grace or release with-kindness

SAALA. Example (2) shows ancillary antonymy in a disjunctively coordinated frame (X or Y), in which a Muslim husband, after divorcing his wife twice, is given a binarized choice from two exclusively disjunctive alternatives: a canonically antonymous pair, *imsaːk/tasriːh* (‘retention/release’), which is respectively conditioned by a noncanonically, synonymously opposed pair, *maʔruːf/ihsaːn* (‘grace/kindness’). The former A-pair stands to trigger opposition between a pair of synonyms not regarded as opposites in a neutral context but treated here as the point of opposition. As Jones (2002: 47) puts it, if the B-pair items, like *imsaːk/tasriːh*, have no innate opposition, the A-pair antonyms trigger an instantial opposition between them. Hence, it is the B-pair members that catch the eye and stand as the nucleus of contrast. Figure 4 depicts the parallelistic structure of both pairs.

![Figure 4](http://corpus.quran.com/translation.jsp?chapter=2 & verse=229)

The husband given the legal right to divorce has a license to divorce his wife twice. If he divorces her thrice, they are both doomed to separate forever and not to live together again until his divorcée, his ex-wife, gets married to and divorced by another man without prior arrangements on the part of the ex-husband. To avoid
this matrimonial hassle, the divorcing spouse must and has to be circumspect in pronouncing divorce no matter seriously or playfully. Figure 5 treebanks this disjoined-by-or parallel structure.

Figure 5. A treebank of verse (Q 2: 229) disjoined by \textit{aw} (‘or’) into two parallel structures
Source. http://corpus.quran.com/treebank.jsp?chapter=2&verse=229&token=3 TAALALA. Grammatically, the syntactic frame housing the nominal antonymous pairs is rendered as ‘X or Y’ in MP, HS, MS, and JA but as ‘either X or Y’ in SI, YA, and MK—a shift from a coordinate to correlative frame in the last three translations. The shifted framework, ‘either…or’, is a typical equivalent of another common Qur’anic frame, \textit{imma:…wa-imma:}, which may signify binarized permission (Q 47: 4), choice (Q 18: 86, 20: 65), and elaboration (Q 19: 75, 76: 3). The logical connective \textit{aw} (‘or’) takes scope, which can syntactico-semantically be shifted through correlators as ‘either’ and ‘whether’ to be exclusively or inclusively disjunctive.\(^5\) Lexically, the nominal opposite pairs are verbalized in SI, MP, YA, HS, MS, and MK. Only JA retains their nominal form in his translation in a fragmentary attempt to replicate the parallel structure. Two criticisms might be levied against this explicitation-by-verbalization strategy, particularly with the interpolation of ‘either’. First, ‘either’ as left-edge correlator of the disjunction is misplaced, displaced, and distanced from its coordinator ‘or’ due to syntactic movements, hence leaving a gap at the periphery of the second disjunct and involving a controversial gap filler (Schwarz 1999). Compare the differential placements of ‘either’ in SI, YA, and MK where the gap-fillers involve both explicit and implicit subject and object pronouns, as in ‘her’ in SI and MK, ‘them’ in HS, and ‘you’ in MK. Second, a generalized address presumably inclusive of both spouses in the ST is translated as a particularized address to husbands in some TTs. At base a dialectical discourse, a heated debate, has been going over whether wives can legally be entitled to unknot ‘\textit{uqdat an-nika:h}’ (‘the bond of marriage’) and untie the knot if she has the ‘\textit{isma}’ (‘legal right’) to do so in the marriage contract. This
particularization of address features in SI, MP, HS, and MK and may arguably be based on intratextual relation with verse (Q 2: 231) in which God is addressing and commanding husbands in particular to show grace to their wives in case of marriage or divorce (see Ibn ĒA:šu:r 1984 [P2]: 406-422; Az-Zamakhshari: 1998 [P1]: 443-452).  

5.1.3 Correlatively conjoined ancillaries

Example (3): (Q 2: 233)

Verse: la: tudār wa:lida bi-waladiha: wa-la: mawlu:d lah bi-waladīh

Gloss: not be-harmed birth-giver by-child-her and-not born-for by-child-his


SAALA. Example (3) features ancillary antonymy in a correlatively coordinated frame, la:...wa-la: (‘neither...nor’), in which a canonical pair of relationally reversive case-marking antonyms, wa:lida/mawlu:d lah (lit., ‘birth giver/to whom the child is born’, ‘mother/father’) serves to trigger a noncanonical opposition between a pair of (re)duplicates, waladiha/waladīh (‘child/child’), which might be coreferential or referentially versatile (Hurford, Heasley and Smith 2007: 136). There is a trinity of relational antonyms representative of a connubially triangular relationship (mother⇒child⇒father), in which either parent should not shamelessly exploit the child to cause harm to and place pressure on the other for personal advantage and leverage. Figure 6 displays the parallelism of example (3).

Figure 6. Ancillary antonyms in parallel structures conjoined by la:...wa-la: (‘neither...nor’)
Translatability of Ancillary Antonymy

TAALA. Syntactically, a great variation figures prominently in the given translations, in which the correlatively negative framework, \textit{la:...wa-la:}, is varyingly rendered as ‘no X and no Y’ in SI, ‘X not nor Y’ in MP, ‘No X nor Y’ in YA, ‘neither X nor Y’ in HS, ‘none of X/Y’ in MS, ‘no X nor Y’ in MK, and ‘X not neither Y’ in JA. The ULLRG reproduces an eighth frame, ‘not X and not Y’ in addition to the ones above, as Figure 7 shows.

![Figure 7](http://corpus.quran.com/treebank.jsp?chapter=2&verse=233&token=22)


These variable syntactic frames bring syntactic permutations therewith, as follows:

1. No X should be (verb) through Z, and no Y through Z.
2. X should not be (verb) because of Z, nor should Y because of Z.
3. No X shall be (verb) on account of Z. Nor Y on account of Z.
4. Neither shall X be (verb) on account of Z, nor Y on account of Z.
5. None of X/Y should (verb) because of Z.
6. No X shall be (verb) on account of Z, nor Y on account of Z.
7. X shall not be (verb) for Z, neither Y for Z.
8. X is not (verb) because of Z and Y is not (verb) because of Z.

Despite their syntactic permutations, all the translations relatively maintain a syntactic aspect of correlation and ancillariness except for MS who uses a neutral hyperonym ‘parents’ negated by an indefinite pronoun ‘none’. Syntagmatically, the ancillary A-pairs and B-pairs exist in the translations except MS whose communicative translation renders dysfunctional the ancillary role of the A-pair, its correlative framework and discourse function. Cross-categorial entailments occur between the structural frameworks ‘no X and no Y’, ‘not X and not Y’, and ‘neither X nor Y’, the last of which is the best equivalent of the SL framework. Lexically, there is semantic gapping concerning the lexical choices used paradigmatically for the representation of parental roles, thematic or participant roles, in the birth-giving event: \textit{wa:lida} (‘birth giver’, agent benefactor), \textit{mawlu:d lah} (‘to whom the child is born’, beneficiary), and \textit{walad} (‘child’, instrument). These case-marking roles are
explicitly referred to by some exegetes but attended only by MP who, unlike all the other translators, renders the fatherly role as “to whom the child is born.” For instance, Az-Zamakhshari: (1998 [P1]: 455) argues that al-mawlu:d lah (‘to whom the child is born’) is chosen over al-wa:lid (‘father’) because the mother bears the father children that are named after him. Ibn CAshur (1984 [P2]: 432) supports the argument above by mentioning that the father had better be called al-mawlu:d lah as he is the one who benefits from the parturition and the child is sociolegally named after him (e.g., patronymics).

5.2 Negated ancillaries
Example (4): (Q 2: 185)
Verse: yuri:d allah bikum al-yusr wa-la: yuri:d bikum al-’usr
Gloss: want God to-you ease and-not want to-you difficulty

SAALA. Example (4) shows ancillary antonym in an X wa-la: Y (‘X and not Y’) negated framework which hosts a pair of canonical antonyms, yuri:d/la: yuri:d (‘want/not want’) serving as asserters of a canonical opposition inherent in another pair, al-yusr/’usr (‘ease/difficulty’). The ancillary role of A-pair antonyms is to negate the Y-antonym, al-’usr (‘difficulty’), in favor of the X-antonym, al-yusr (‘ease’), and affirm their canonical antonymity. Figure 8 illustrates the parallel frame of example (4).

Figure 8. Ancillary antonyms in parallel structures negated by wa-la: (‘and-not’)
This syntactic frame and its discourse function, as well as ‘X, not Y’, ‘not X, Y’, and ‘not X but Y’, are thematically compatible with the motif of the verse: a
divine commandment to fast in Ramadan on the condition that the fasters must be physically able to do it. If they are not due to illness or a long distant traveling, they are licensed to compensate for it and fast on other healthy days. The license granted by God to the physically excused is to make things easy for them not difficult.

TAALA. Syntactically, the syntagmatic frame, \( X \text{ wa-la: } Y \) (‘X and not Y’), is rendered as such in SI, loosely in HS and MK with an explicit anaphoric reference, awkwardly in MP and JA, reversely as ‘not X, Y’ in MS, and framelessly in YA. The reversibility of the syntactic framework disrupts one of the favorite and frequent factors of ordering ancillary antonyms in Qur’anic discourse, namely, positivity that marks a tendency of positive antonyms to precede negative ones (see also Jones 2002: 124; Hsu 2015: 74; Kostić 2015: 27; Mohamadi, Famian and Aghagolzadeh 2019: 129). Figure 9 diagrams this preferred positivity-based sequence of antonyms.

Figure 9. A treebank of verse (Q 2: 185)

Lexically, a remarkable variation in the lexical choices of would-be canonical antonyms occurs in the translations: ‘intend/not intend’ and ‘ease/hardship’ in SI, ‘desire/desire not’ and ‘ease/hardship’ in MP, ‘intend/not want’ and ‘facility/difficulty’ in YA, ‘desire/not desire’ and ‘ease/difficulty’ in HS, ‘not impose/want’ and ‘hardship/comfort’ in MS, ‘intend/not want’ and ‘ease/make things difficult’ in MK, and ‘desire/not desire’ and ‘ease/hardship’ in JA. The canonical equivalents of the negated volitional pair, \( yuri:d/la: yuri:d \), would be ‘want/not want’ and those of \( al-yusr/al-\overline{usur} \) would be ‘ease/difficulty’. Lexicographically, the item ‘hardship’ has a polysemous character and thus multiple meanings to choose from based on contexts while ‘difficulty’ is “the most widely applicable to any condition, situation, experience, or task which presents a problem extremely hard to solve or which is seemingly beyond one’s ability to
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suffer or surmount" (Webster 1984: 241) and is the more canonical antonym of ease in light of its semantic range (Muehleisen 1997: 59).

5.3 Subordinated ancillaries

Example (5): (Q 2: 98)

fa-inna al-la:h ‘aduw li-l-ka:fi:r:in

Gloss: who was enemy to-the-God and-angels-his and-messengers-his and-Gabriel and-Michael then indeed the-God enemy to-the-unbelievers


SAALA. Example (5) typifies ancillary antonymy in a man X fa-Y (‘whoever X then Y’) framework, hosting a noncanonically opposed A-pair, man/al-la:h (‘whoever/God’), which triggers an opposition between noncanonically opposed B-pair members, ‘aduw li-l-la:h wa-mala:ʔikatih wa-rusulih wa-jibri:l wa-mika:l/‘aduw li-l-ka:fi:r:in (‘enemy of God, his angels, his messengers, Gabriel, and Michael/enemy of the unbelievers’). The syntactic framework is composed of a parallel protasis-apodosis clause structure, being hypotactically headed by man ash-shartiyya (‘conditional man’) which amounts in English to the subordinator ‘who’. Figure 10 depicts the parallel structure of example (5).
Figure 10. Ancillary antonyms in parallel structures subordinated by *man...fa* (‘whoever...then’)
The SAALA given above draws upon the corpus-based analysis conducted by the ULLRG who consider the second clause “Then God is indeed an enemy of the unbelievers” to be the apodosis of the protasis subordinated by the conditional particle *man* “Whoever is an enemy of God, his angels, his messengers, Gabriel, and Michael.” Figure 11 treebanks this corpus-based reading.

Figure 11. A treebank of verse (Q 2: 98)

TAALA. Syntactically, all seven translations are in line with the corpus-based reading above, rendering the verse as including a hypotactic clausal structure falling into a protasis and apodosis. Ad-Darwi:sh (1980: 153-154), a Qur’an-parsing scholar, considers the verse above to be anapodotonically anacoluthic in that it lacks an apodotic clause of a protatic sentence and argues that the sentence “Then God is indeed an enemy of the unbelievers” is coordinated to an ellipted apodosis which must include an anaphoric pronoun referring the reader back to a previously mentioned antecedent. In terms of his argument, to be considered a hypotaxis, the verse must read like “Whoever is an enemy of God, his angels, his messengers, Gabriel, and Michael, God is his or her enemy.” Sa:fi: (1995: 22), another Qur’an-parsing scholar, disagrees to the parsing argument above and considers the clause “Then God is indeed an enemy of the unbelievers” to be the apodosis. Qur’an
exegetes support this very last argument. For example, Ibn CA:shu:r (1984 [P2]: 624) and Az-Zamakhshari: (1998 [P1]: 303) regard the verse including a protatic-apodotic structure whose meaning is “Whoever antagonizes them is antagonized and punished by God”, hence positing a coreference between ‘whoever’ and ‘the unbelievers’. One more point of translational inconsistency revolves around the resultative fa which is rendered as the apodotic ‘then’ in SI, MP, and MK, the abruptive ‘lo’ in YA, the resultative ‘so’ in HS, the phrasal ‘should know that’ in MS, and the punctuational ‘hyphen’ in JA.

Lexically, there is a variation in the domestication-foreignization strategies used for rendering the proper names in the verse. The name al-la:h is foreignized in SI, MP, YA, HS, and MK but domesticated in MS and JA. The names Jibri:l and Mika:ʔi:l are foreignized in HS and MK but are domesticated as exonyms in the remaining translations. Each strategy has its own implications for the overall message. However, more relevant is the foreignization technique that fits the formal features of ancillary antonymy (syntactic frames and discursive functions) and makes the source text and culture more visible in interreligious discourse and intercultural transfer. A so-called divine text, be it Biblical or Qur’anic, necessitates using ST-oriented translational strategies that transpose the source culture to the target audience in an intact and faithful manner without imposing theologically and ideologically sectarian biases.

5.4 Interrogative ancillaries
Example (6): (Q 12: 39)
Gloss: O-inmates-two the-prison are-gods several better or God the-one the-almighty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sahih International</th>
<th>Pickthall</th>
<th>Yusuf Ali</th>
<th>Shakir</th>
<th>Muhammad Sarwar</th>
<th>Mohsin Khan</th>
<th>Arberry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O my two companions of the prison! Are many lords differing among themselves better, or the one Almighty?</td>
<td>O my fellow-prisoners! Are divers lords better, or Allah the One, Almighty?</td>
<td>&quot;O my two companions of the prison! (I ask you); are many lords differing among themselves better, or the One, Supreme and Irresistible?</td>
<td>O my two mates of the prison! are sundry lords better or Allah the One, the Supreme?</td>
<td>&quot;My fellow-prisoners can many different masters be considered better than One All-dominant God?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O two companions of the prison! Are many different lords (gods) better or Allah, the One, the Irresistible?</td>
<td>&quot;O two companions of the prison! Many different lords (gods) better or Allah, the One, the Irresistible?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Say, which is better, my fellow-prisoners -- many gods at variance, or God the One, the Omnispotent?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SAALA. Example (6) features ancillary antonymy in an X am Y (‘X or Y?’) framework that hosts a pair of noncanonical oppositions, arba:b/al-la:h (‘gods/God’), which affirms the canonical opposition between mutafirriqu:n/al-wa:hid al-qahha:r (‘several/Almighty One’). The verse is a rhetorical interrogation constituting ‘interrogative antonymy’ (Jones and Murphy, 2005: 413), ‘disjunctive antonymy’ (Muehleisen and Isono, 2009: 2197), and ‘binarized option’ (Davies, 2012: 89). Irrespective of this polyonymy, the interlocutor is given a choice from two mutually exclusive alternatives, whereby one absents the other. Rhetoricity of the interrogation directed by the prophet Joseph to his prison inmates suffices to persuade them because the reply to the question is already known. Figure 12 displays the parallelism of the disjunctive frame.

Figure 12. Ancillary antonyms in parallel structures disjoined by X am Y? (‘X or Y?’)

As put simply in Figure 12, the interrogative purport of Joseph’s argument is “which of the two is the better: polytheism (many gods) or monotheism (one God)?” TAALa. Syntagmatically, the disjunctive interrogative frame is equivalently maintained in the translations of SI, MP, YA, HS, and MK. MS comes up with a weird rendition of the disjunctively framed interrogation—a yes-or-no question whose answer is yes or no and thus mutates the discourse function of the SL counterpart. JA creates a formally different frame but its discourse function is still centered on binarized optionality, “Which is better: X or Y?”, the reply to which is X or Y not Yes or No. Paradigmatically, a pair of confusable items, mutafirriqu:n and al-qahha:r, manacles and shackles the translators whose renderings are at great variance. On the item mutafirriqu:n, Az-Zamakhshari: (1998 [P3]: 285) confers two basic shades of meaning that are al-cadad (‘number’) and at-taka:thur (‘reproduction’). Ibn C:A:shu:r (1984 [P12]: 275) synthesizes the term with dispersion, corruption, and misdemeanor that are incurred by polytheism—a synthesis in compliance with what the Qur’an mentions about both heaven and earth: “Had there been in both of them gods other than Allah, they would have been ruined” (Q 21: 22). The item al-qahha:r which is one of the nighty-nine sobriquets of God in Islam conflates a unique cluster of descriptions, including triumph, invincibility, irresistibility, supremacy, dominance, and omnipotence. What makes this particular sobriquet translationally problematic is the point that it carries multiple meanings (Searle 1983: 231-261). Newmark (1993: 15) finds proper names a translational problem categorized by the translators—a finding reported in considerable detail by subsequent translational research scholars (Vermes 2003; Van Coillie 2006; Mostafavi and Fumani 2016). Taking cultural sensitivity into account, we would consider ‘several/sundry’ and ‘Almighty’ more appropriate equivalents.
6. Conclusion

The main purpose of this study has been to examine how Qur’an translators lexicosyntactically rendered ancillary antonym pairs from Qur’anic Arabic into English. A rigorous analysis of the conveniently selected sample in the translations under scrutiny reveals translationally problematic areas and issues. One problematic area is the mutation of the syntactic frames hosting ancillary antonyms, the textual functions they perform in discourse, and the sequential order they prefer. The translation conducted by MS in particular is a typical case of mutative explicitation, which takes his translation afar from the original. Another problematic area revolves around lexicality and semanticity—two cases in which Qur’an translators face massive challenges due to lexical-semantic relations held between ancillary antonymous pair members on the paradigmatic axis, including synonymy (meaning similarity), polysemy (meaning multiplicity), and contronymy (meaning duplicity). Ancillary antonyms play semantic roles in Qur’anic discourse, which have gone unnoticed and unattended—a third problematic issue in the translations. Solutions to such issues consist in figuring and digging out relations between lexical items and units in Qur’anic discourse, as in cotexts (in the same verse), intratexts (in the same chapter), intertexts (between chapters), paratexts (on the periphery), and contexts (settings, situations and circumstances). Batchelor (2018) follows Genette in regarding paratexts as thresholds of interpretation through which target readers have access to the core text. Nida (2001) identifies and classifies the types and functions of contexts in understanding texts, the most related of which here are syntagmatic and paradigmatic contexts because ancillary antonyms are based on the two axes of word chain and choice in the ST vis-à-vis the TT.

To Nida’s typology of contexts, we tend to add the narrative context that recounts true historical episodes standing behind the revelation of Qur’anic verses and that must be footnoted as frames of reference essential to core-text interpretation and translation. Qur’anic translation which is void or short of lexicographical, (ep)exegetical and paratextual references is a rather hit-and-miss practice leading to theological paradoxes and epistemological losses visited and blamed by the target audience on the ST rather than on the TT. Although Qur’an translators strive to profess interpretative and translational impartiality when rendering it, they seldom refrain from edging in their doctrinal and ideological biases. This is evident in their lexical and translational choices that are theoculturally bound. Their ideological and doctrinal preferences play a central role in how, for example, entities and objects in theology are named and rendered. In doing so, they choose from a pool of diverse translational strategies, notably explicitation, implicitation, foreignization, domestication, reproduction, substitution, and exonymy. There are typical cases in which general SL units are transferred by specific ones or vice versa, when meanings of SL units are distributed over several units or combined into single units, and when one sentence in the ST is divided into many sentences in the TT or many sentences are joined into one
(Klaudy and Károly 2005). In conclusion, the need arises for a consortium of encyclopedic Qur’an scholars and translators to hang and work together on reproducing one high-quality translation across languages that may serve as a mainstream reference for whichever non-Arabic speaking reader wants to learn about Islam from its main source.
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**Endnotes**

1 See https://corpus.quran.com/translation.jsp.

2 For a quantitative analysis of ancillary antonyms in Classical Arabic, see Hassanein (2020a).

3 Throughout the article A-pair members appear in bold, B-pair ones in bold italics, and syntactic frames in italics.

4 In English studies, the *didd* (pl. *adda:d*) is marked by a case of polyonymy, being terminologically referred to as ‘homo-polysemous opposites’ (Al-Khamash 1991) ‘autoantonymy’ (Al-Kharabsheh 2008), and ‘contronymy’ (Karaman 2008), to name but a few.

5 On the syntax of disjunction scope and of ‘either…or’, see Larson (1985) and Schwarz (1999).

6 The choice between retaining women as wives or divorcing them is conditioned by a waiting period known in Islam as ‘idda, a period of respite during which a divorced or widowed woman has to wait before she is legally entitled to marry another (Esposito 2003: 131).

7 In an email message dated July 25, 2013, Lynne Murphy, a famous scholar of antonyms, acknowledges the ambiguousness of how some Qur’anic antonyms should be categorized. Verse (Q 12: 39) is one typical case thereof that can be seen
as a form of coordination based on the disjunctive ‘or’, comparison based on measuring the two oppositional pairs against the semantic dimension of goodness, or interrogation based on the interrogation particle ( and mark (؟). Interrogativity overrides and hence is prioritized by predecessors (e.g., Jones and Murphy 2005; Muehleisen and Isono 2009; Davies 2012; Hassanein 2018).
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Appendix (1)
Transliteration symbols for Arabic vowels and consonants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic letter</th>
<th>English symbol</th>
<th>Arabic example</th>
<th>English equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>اء</td>
<td>ء</td>
<td>fa?l</td>
<td>omen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ب</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>ba:b</td>
<td>door</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ت</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>tibn</td>
<td>chaff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ث</td>
<td>th</td>
<td>tha’lab</td>
<td>fox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ج</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>jamal</td>
<td>camel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ح</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>hubb</td>
<td>love</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>خ</td>
<td>kh</td>
<td>khubz</td>
<td>bread</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>د</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>dubb</td>
<td>bear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ذ</td>
<td>dh</td>
<td>dhahab</td>
<td>gold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ر</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>rabb</td>
<td>Lord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ز</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>zayt</td>
<td>oil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>س</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>sabt</td>
<td>Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ش</td>
<td>sh</td>
<td>shams</td>
<td>sun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ص</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>sayf</td>
<td>summer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ض</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>dayf</td>
<td>guest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ط</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>ti:n</td>
<td>mud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ظ</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>zuhr</td>
<td>noon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix (2)
Abbreviations and typographical conventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full form</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>Source Text</td>
<td>TTs</td>
<td>Target Texts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL</td>
<td>Source Language</td>
<td>TL</td>
<td>Target Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLT</td>
<td>Source Language</td>
<td>TLTs</td>
<td>Target Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Qur’an</td>
<td>pl.</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lit.</td>
<td>literally</td>
<td>Adv</td>
<td>Adverb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>Noun Phrase</td>
<td>VS</td>
<td>Verbal Sentence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>Prepositional</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Preposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronoun</td>
<td>Noun</td>
<td>PN</td>
<td>Proper Noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Verb</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>CONJ</td>
<td>Conjunction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REM</td>
<td>Resumptive</td>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COND</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>RSLT</td>
<td>Resultative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>