

**The University of Liverpool**

**Huda Yaseen Ali Salim**

**Collocation and other lexical relationships in translations of the Quran: a corpus based application of lexical priming theory to a unique theological text.**

**Thesis submitted in accordance with the requirement of the University of Liverpool for**

**the degree of Doctor of Philosophy by**

**Huda Yaseen Ali Salim**

**October 2012**

## **DECLARATION**

This work is original and has not been submitted previously in support of any degree, qualification or course.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

All praises and thanks are due to Allah, our Lord without whom this work would not have been possible.

I have the fortune to have such a wonderful, great and distinguished corpus linguist – Professor Michael Hoey as my supervisor. He has always provided me with detailed comments, insightful guidance and generous support in spite of his many commitments. Michael Hoey is an outstanding text linguist and his help has been invaluable. It is indeed a privilege to work with a distinguished scholar who is extremely generous with his time and expertise.

I am thankful to my co-supervisor Dr Nelia Scott for encouragement.

I also thank Tony McEnery and Geoff Thompson for their advice on improving the thesis.

From a personal point of view, the love and support of my family has been integral to this work. My warmest thanks particularly go to my parents and generally to my family for encouraging my studies unquestioningly and unfailingly. Most of all, however, I owe a special debt to special people, my beloved sisters Raja and Hayat who listened to me, talked to me, shared times of distress and sadness with me and encouraged me throughout these past years until Raja passed away in Sep 2008 and Hayat died in June 15<sup>th</sup> 2010. My beloved sisters may Allah rest your souls in peace in the highest rank of heaven. Amen!

Special thanks and my gratitude go to Dr Wahbiya Muharam from the University of Taiz in Yemen for encouraging and supporting me throughout. I am grateful to Professor Mohammed Al-sufee, the chairman of the University of Taiz, for understanding, and being very supportive.

I thank George M, my solicitor, for sincere advice and guidance.

## **DEDICATION**

**My dearest sisters Raja and Hayat**

**“The eyes are shedding tears and the heart is grieved, and we will not say except what pleases our Lord. Indeed we are grieved by your separation.”**

**This work is dedicated to my beloved sisters Hayat and Raja and my beloved parents without whom, after the blessings of Allah, this would not be possible.**

## **ABSTRACT**

The purpose of this study was to investigate the way in which key words in the Quran in translations function in terms of collocation, semantic association, pragmatic association, colligation and the like in order to explore specific features of the language of the Quran in translation, comparing the findings with the way such words behave in general English as represented in the British National Corpus and then looking at the religious component of the (BNC) and the Bible in Translation (Authorised version) as a special Holy text to check whether the features being found are true of all religious writing or just the Quran in Translation. Another aim was to discover facts about the relative frequency of these words in the Quran in translation and of their collocations. Finally, comparisons of significant findings across all three corpora took place to find out whether the discoveries found were true of a particular translation or true of all translations under study.

The study has used corpus techniques to explore the patterns and linguistic behaviour of eight key words in three corpora of the Quran in translation. Key words were selected and subjected to various linguistic analyses making use of collocations and other lexical relationships and so provide a more general or more accurate description of language use in the Quran in translations.

Discoveries that were made are considered to be contributions to the field of corpus linguistics in general and to lexical priming theory in particular. A number of new kinds of lexical associations were identified. These included Exophoric Referential Association and Pronominal Semantic Association, both of which are new kinds of priming.

Additionally, priming for figurative language and for punctuations were identified; again both add to the complexity of what is involved in being primed in the uses of a word. Punctuation priming related to the use of rhetorical markers exclamation marks and punctuation marks.

Orthographic priming was also noted. This is the association the reader makes between the physical appearance of a word or a phrase and the meaning, and further adds to the types of priming that might be identified.

The study shows that the discoveries being made are specific features of the Quran in translation and for the most part not general features of the words in the English language as a whole.

The conclusion drawn from the study is that that there is no single language which behaves in the same way in all situations and that it is likely that those who read the Quran in translations will be primed by it in such a way that they associate special collocations, colligations, semantic associations and other kinds of associations with vocabulary in the Quran.

# Table of Contents

## List of Tables

## List of Figures

## Abbreviations

### CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION TO THE THESIS

1.1	Introduction	1
1.2	The Holy Quran	2
1.3	The History of the compilation of the Quran in the lifetime of prophet Mohammed	2
1.4	The First Compilation of the Quran during the life of Abu Bakr	4
1.5	The Quran during the lifetime of Uthman the third caliph (Uthman's Mushaf)	7
1.6	Translation and Translating the Holy Quran	9
1.7	Defining the Study and expectations	14
1.8	Research questions	17
1.9	The contribution the study hopes to achieve to corpus linguistics and translation	18
1.10	Hypotheses	18
1.10.1.	Hypothesis one	18
1.10.2	Hypothesis Two	18
1.10.3	Hypothesis Three	18
1.11.	The structure of the thesis	19

### CHAPTER 2 METHODOLOGY

2.1.	Introduction	21
2.2.	Methodology to be adopted	21
2.3.	Methods of Research	22
2.4.	Concordance tools	23
2.5.	Wordlist	24

2.6.	Keyword list	25
2.7.	Further comparison	26
2.8.	Criteria for identifying collocation, colligation and other lexical relationships.	27
2.9.	Lexical Priming Theory	30
2.10.	Collocation	31
2.11.	Features of priming	32
2.12.	Semantic Association	34
2.13.	The concept of Semantic prosody	36
2.14.	The concept of colligation	37
2.15.	Introducing the BNC	39
2.16.	The Translations used	39
2.16.1.	Pickthall's translation	39
2.16.2.	Irving's Translation	39
2.16.3.	Taqi's Translation	40
2.17.	Research Goals	41
2.18	Chapter Summary	42

### **CHAPTER 3 THE REVIEW OF LITERATURE**

3.1.	Introduction	43
3.2.	History of Translating the Holy Quran	45
3.3.	Views on translating the Quran.	48
3.4.	Problems of Translating the Quran.	50
3.4.1.	Rhetorical problems	50
3.4.2.	The absence of Direct TL Counterparts	51
3.4.3.	Synonyms	52
3.4.4.	Collocations	53

3.4.5.	Similarity in pronunciation	54
3.5.	Style of the Arabic Language	55
3.5.1.	Al-iltifat (shift) from first to second person	56
3.5.2.	From second to First person	57
3.6.	Definition of Corpus and the concept of corpus linguistics	58
3.7	Definitions of corpus linguistics	60
3.8.	The use of corpora in lexical studies	61
3.9.	The use of corpora in discourse analysis	61
3.10.	Corpus linguistics and literary stylistics	62
3.11.	Advantages of using electronic text analysis	63
3.12.	Types of Corpora and what they are used for	64
3.12.1.	Specialised Corpus	64
3.12.2.	Comparable corpora and Parallel Corpora	65
3.13.	Theory of Translation	66
3.14.	Issues causing translation Problems	68
3.14.1.	Non - equivalence at word level	70
3.14.2.	The source language has a culture- specific concept	70
3.14.3.	The source language is not lexicalized in the target language	71
3.14.4.	The source language word is semantically complex	71
3.14.5.	The source and target language make different distinctions in meaning.	71
3.14.6.	The target language lacks a superordinate	72
3.14.7.	Equivalence at word level may not be matched by equivalence above word level	
	collocation	72
3.15.	Role of Translator	74
3.16	Conclusion	75



## CHAPTER 4 THE HOLY QURAN IN THE IRVING TRANSLATION

4.1.	Introduction	76
4.2.	Keyword 1: <i>mercy</i>	77
4.3.	Investigating_collocations and related senses of the lemma <i>mercy</i>	77
4.4.	Instances of <i>at</i> in close proximity to <i>mercy</i> in BNC	88
4.5.	Investigating Semantic Associations of <i>Mercy</i> .	91
4.5.1.	The Semantic Association of <i>Mercy</i> with HOLY BOOKS in QIT.	91
4.5.2.	The Semantic Association of <i>Mercy</i> with BELIEVING/BISBELIEVING HUMANS in QIT and in the BNC	93
4.5.3.	The Semantic Association of <i>Mercy</i> with ACTS OF GRACE in QIT and BNC.	95
4.6.	Exophoric Referential Association: a new kind of Priming Association	97
4.7.	Various Senses of <i>mercy</i>	98
4.8.	Priming for Association with figurative language- the metaphor	99
4.9.	Priming for association with figurative language- personification	100
4.10.	Investigating pragmatic association for <i>mercy</i> in QIT	101
4.11.	Investigating colligations for <i>mercy</i> in QIT and BNC	104
4.11.1.	First Colligational Statement of <i>mercy</i> with possession	105
4.11.2.	Second Colligation of <i>mercy</i> : colligation with reflexive pronouns in QIT.	109
4.11.3.	Third Colligation of <i>mercy</i> : colligation with prepositions in QIT.	112
4.11.4.	Fourth colligation of <i>mercy</i> : colligation with full lexical verbs in QIT.	116
4.11.5.	Fifth colligation of <i>mercy</i> : colligation with coordinators and subordinators	119
4.12.	Keyword 2: <i>Torment</i>	121
4.13.	Investigating collocations and semantic associations for <i>torment</i> in QIT and BNC.	122
4.14.	The collocation of <i>torment</i> with evaluative adjectives in QIT and BNC.	122
4.15.	The collocation of <i>torment</i> with the subject pronoun <i>they</i> in QIT and BNC	125
4.16.	The collocation of <i>torment</i> with <i>taste</i> in QIT.	127
4.17.	A new kind of priming: the <i>Pronominal Semantic Association</i> .	127

4.18.	The Semantic associations of <i>torment</i> in QIT with negative adjectives.	128
4.19.	Pragmatic Association for <i>torment</i> in QIT and BNC	131
4.20.	Priming with figurative language in conjunction with <i>torment</i>	133
4.21.	Textual Semantic Association for <i>torment</i> in QIT.	136
4.22.	Another textual semantic association	138
4.23.	Investigating Colligations of <i>Torment</i> in QIT	140
4.24.	Chapter Summary	145

## CHAPTER 5 THE HOLY QURAN IN THE PICKTHALL TRANSLATION

5.1.	Introduction	148
5.2.	Keyword 1: <i>Say</i>	149
5.3.	Investigation of the collocations of <i>say</i> in QPT	149
5.4.	Investigation of the semantic associations of <i>say</i> in QPT	156
5.5.	The colligations of <i>say</i> in QPT	158
5.6.	Keyword 2: <i>believe</i>	165
5.7.	Investigation of the collocations of <i>believe</i> in QPT	165
5.7.1.	The collocations of the phrase <i>believe in</i>	168
5.7.2.	Collocation of <i>believe</i> with <i>O</i> in QPT	171
5.7.3.	Collocation of <i>believe</i> with <i>not</i> in QPT	171
5.8.	The nested combination of <i>those who believe and do good works</i>	176
5.9.	Investigation of the semantic associations of <i>believe</i> in QPT	179
5.10.	Pragmatic association of <i>believe</i> in QPT	182
5.11.	Colligations of <i>believe</i> in QPT	185
5.12.	Keyword 3: <i>will</i>	186
5.13.	Investigation of the Collocations and Semantic associations of <i>will</i> in QPT	186
5.14.	Pragmatic Association of <i>will</i> in QPT	195
5.15.	Colligations of <i>will</i> in QPT	201

5.16.	The structure <i>whom He will</i>	203
5.17.	Chapter Summary	205
<b>CHAPTER 6 THE HOLY QURAN IN THE TAQI TRANSLATION</b>		
6.1.	Introduction	208
6.2.	Keyword 1: <i>day</i>	209
6.3.	Investigation of the Collocations for the word <i>day</i>	209
6.3.1.	The collocation of <i>day</i> with <i>Resurrection</i> in QTT	209
6.3.2.	The collocation of <i>day</i> with <i>when</i> in QTT	212
6.3.3.	The collocation of <i>day</i> with <i>this</i> and <i>that</i> in QTT	215
6.3.4.	The collocation of <i>day</i> with <i>last</i> in QTT	219
6.3.5.	The collocation of <i>day</i> with <i>night</i> in QTT	222
6.4.	The Semantic Associations of <i>day</i> In QTT	223
6.5.	Colligations of <i>day</i> in QTT	229
6.6.	Pragmatic Associations of <i>day</i> in QTT.	231
6.6.1.	Pragmatic Association of <i>day</i> with negation	231
6.6.2.	Pragmatic Association of <i>day</i> with emphatic expressions in BNC and QTT.	234
6.7.	Keyword 2: <i>deeds</i>	237
6.8.	Collocations of <i>deeds</i> in QTT	237
6.8.1.	The collocation of <i>deeds</i> with <i>and</i> in QTT	237
6.8.2.	The collocation of <i>deeds</i> with <i>good, righteous</i> and <i>evil</i>	240
6.8.3.	The collocation of <i>deeds</i> with <i>do</i> in QTT	245
6.9.	The two structures <i>Allah has forbidden</i> and <i>He has ordained</i> .	247
6.10.	Investigating a colligation of <i>deeds</i> in QTT	248
6.11.	Keyword 3: <i>shall</i>	249
6.12.	Investigation of collocations and semantic associations of <i>shall</i> in QTT	250

6.12.1.	The collocation of <i>shall</i> with negation - <i>not</i> - in QTT	250
6.13.	Pragmatic association of <i>shall</i> in QTT	253
6.14.	Colligations of <i>shall</i> in QTT.	256
6.15	Chapter summary	259

## **CHAPTER 7 COMPARISON OF TRANSLATIONS WITH RESPECT TO PRIMINGS AND FINDINGS**

7.1.	Introduction	261
7.2	Comparisons of distinctive collocations across translations	261
7.3	Comparisons of distinctive colligations across translations	264
7.4	Comparison of semantic and pragmatic associations across translations	266
7.5	Comparisons of exclamation marks and question marks across translations	267
7.6	Question marks and exclamation marks occurring with <i>torment</i> and <i>mercy</i>	270
7.7	<i>Say</i> and <i>believe</i> in association with question marks and exclamation marks	271
7.8.	<i>Day</i> and <i>deeds</i> in association with exclamation marks and question marks	272
7.9.	Orthographic Priming across all three corpora	273
7.10	Conclusion	277

## **CHAPTER 8 CONCLUSIONS**

8.1.	The Implications of Lexical Priming Theory	278
8.2.	The purpose of the thesis/ Reasons for examining the Quran in translations	278
8.3.	Findings of the study	279
8.3.1.	General Findings	280
8.3.2.	Findings which are distinctive for the QinTs only	281
8.4.	Lexical Priming Discoveries	283
8.5.	Implications about Allah and references to Allah in connection with saying	286

8.6.	The high use of <i>shall</i> and <i>will</i> in connection with the word <i>day</i> when used in the phrase <i>Day of Judgement.</i>	286
8.7.	Future Research	287
8.9.	Bibliography	289

## LIST OF TABLES

### TABLES

4.1	Occurrence of <i>mercy from</i> in QIT and BNC	80
4.2.	Occurrences of <i>mercy for</i> in the QIT and the BNC	81
4.3.	Occurrence of <i>from</i> and <i>for</i> in the religious writing component of the BNC and the Bible in the King James translation	82
4.4	The occurrence of <i>and</i> with <i>mercy</i> in QIT and BNC	83
4.5	Occurrence of <i>and</i> with <i>mercy</i> in QIT and BNC/RW	84
4.6	Occurrence of <i>and</i> in QIT and Bible	84
4.7	The occurrence of <i>show mercy</i> in QIT and BNC	87
4.8	The occurrence of <i>show mercy</i> in QIT and WR/BNC	87
4.9	The occurrence of <i>shew mercy</i> in QIT and Bible	87
4.10	The collocation of <i>mercy</i> with <i>as</i> and <i>as well as</i> in QIT and BNC	89
4.11	The occurrence of <i>as</i> and <i>as well as</i> with <i>mercy</i> in QIT and WR/BNC	90
4.12	The occurrence of <i>as</i> and <i>as well as</i> with <i>mercy</i> in QIT and the Bible	90
4.13	The collocation of <i>mercy</i> with <i>book</i> in QIT	91
4.14.	Semantic association of <i>mercy</i> with BELIEVING/ DISBELIEVING HUMANS in QIT and BNC	94
4.15.	Semantic association of <i>mercy</i> with BELIEVING/DISBELIEVING HUMANS in QIT and the Bible.	95
4.16	Semantic association of <i>mercy</i> with ACTS OF GRACE in QIT and BNC	96
4.17.	The association of <i>mercy</i> with rhetorical questions in QIT	104
4.18.	A comparison of QIT and the BNC with regard to the use of possessives with <i>mercy</i>	105
4.19.	Apostrophe possessive structure in QIT and BNC	106
4.20.	Colligation of <i>mercy</i> with possessives in QIT and BNC	106
4.21.	Colligation of <i>mercy</i> with possessives in QIT and WR/BNC	109
4.22.	Colligation of <i>mercy</i> with possessives in QIT and BIT	109
4.23.	Reflexive pronouns in QIT and BNC	110

4.24.	Colligation of <i>mercy</i> with reflexive pronouns in QIT and BNC	111
4.25'	Prepositions immediately after <i>mercy</i> in the QIT and BNC	112
4.26.	Colligation of <i>mercy</i> with prepositions in QIT and BNC	113
4.27.	The difference in proportion of occurrence of certain prepositions in the two corpora	113
4.28:	Colligation of <i>mercy</i> with <i>from</i> in the QIT and BNC	114
4.29.	Colligation of <i>mercy</i> with <i>for</i> in the QIT and BNC	114
4.30.	Colligation of <i>mercy</i> with <i>for</i> in the QIT and the Bible in translation	115
4.31.	Colligation of <i>mercy</i> with lexical verbs in the QIT and the BNC	117
4.32.	Colligation of <i>mercy</i> with lexical verbs in the QIT and the BIT	117
4.33.	Colligation of <i>torment</i> with adjectives in QIT and BNC	124
4.34.	The collocation of <i>torment</i> with <i>they</i> in the QIT and BNC	126
4.35.	Semantic association of <i>torment</i> with negative adjectives in QIT and BNC	128
4.36.	The occurrence of the cluster <i>the torment of</i> in the QIT and the BNC	130
4.37.	Pragmatic association of <i>torment</i> with emphatic expressions in the QIT and BNC	132
4.38.	Colligation with possession in QIT- possessive determiners and the apostrophe structure	142
4.39.	Colligation of <i>torment</i> with possession in QIT and BNC	144
5.1.	Collocation of <i>say</i> with <i>they</i> in QPT and BNC	153
5.2.	The occurrence of <i>they say</i> in the QPT and the BNC	154
5.3.	The occurrence of <i>they say</i> in the QPT and BNC/RW	154
5.4:	The occurrence of <i>they say</i> in QPT and the Bible	154
5.5:	The occurrence of <i>they will say</i> in QPT and BNC	155
5.6:	The occurrence of <i>they will say</i> in QPT and RW/BNC	155
5.7:	The occurrence of <i>they will say</i> in QPT and Bible	155
5.8.	The association of <i>say</i> with Large Number of People in QPT and BIT	157
5.9.	A comparison of <i>say</i> functioning as imperative in QPT and BIT	160
5.10	Association of <i>say</i> with interrogatives in QPT and BIT	161
5.11	Colligation of <i>say</i> with Future Modality in QPT and BNC	164
5.12	Colligation of <i>say</i> with Future Modality in QPT and BNC/RW	164

5.13:	Colligation of <i>say</i> with Future Modality in QPT and the BIT	165
5.14.	The collocation of <i>believe</i> with <i>in</i> in the QPT and the BNC	166
5.15.	The collocation of <i>believe</i> with <i>in</i> in the QPT and the RW/BNC	167
5.16:	The collocation of <i>believe</i> with <i>in</i> in the QPT and the BIT	167
5.17.	The collocation of <i>believe</i> with <i>O</i> in QPT and BNC	171
5.18.	The occurrence of <i>not</i> as a collocate in R1 position in QPT and R1 position in BNC	173
5.19.	The collocation of <i>believe</i> with <i>not</i> in L1 position in QPT and BNC	174
5.20.	The collocation of <i>believe</i> with <i>not</i> in L1 position in QPT and RW/ BNC	174
5.21.	The collocation of <i>believe</i> with <i>not</i> in L1 position in QPT and BIT	175
5.22	The collocates of the nested combinations <i>those who believe and do good works</i> and <i>those who believe</i> in QPT as identified by Wordsmith.	176
5.23:	The collocation of <i>those who believe</i> with <i>in</i> in QPT and BNC	176
5.24	Semantic association with Believing and non Believing people in the BNC and QPT	178
5.25.	Semantic association with Believing and non Believing people in the BNC and QPT	179
5.26.	Expressions showing negation with <i>believe</i> in the BNC	181
5.27.	Pragmatic association with negation in the QPT and BNC in the context of <i>believe</i>	181
5.28:	Pragmatic association of <i>believe</i> with negation in the QPT and RW/BNC in the context of <i>believe</i> .	183
5.29:	Pragmatic association with negation in the QPT and BIT in the context of <i>believe</i>	183
5.30.	Collocation of <i>believe</i> with <i>say</i> in QPT and BNC	184
5.31.	Collocation of <i>believe</i> with <i>say</i> in QPT and RW/BNC	184
5.32.	Collocation of <i>will</i> with <i>not</i> in QPT and BNC	191
5.33.	Collocation of <i>will</i> with <i>not</i> in R1 position in QPT and RW/BNC	192
5.34.	Collocation of <i>will</i> with <i>not</i> in R1 position in QPT and BIT	192
5.35.	Negation expressions in the QPT and the BNC	193
5.36.	Semantic association of <i>will</i> with Negation between QPT and BNC	194
5.37	Semantic association with Negation between the QPT and RW/BNC	194
5.38.	Semantic association of <i>will</i> with Negation between QPT and BIT	194
5.39.	Pragmatic Association of <i>will</i> with emphatic expressions in QPT and BNC	197



5.40.	Pragmatic Association of <i>will</i> with emphatic expressions in QPT and RW/BNC	197
5.41.	Pragmatic association of <i>will</i> with emphatic expressions in QPT and BIT	197
5.42:	Pragmatic association of <i>will</i> with time markers in QPT and BNC	199
5.43:	Pragmatic association of <i>will</i> with time markers in QPT and RW/BNC	199
5.44	Pragmatic association of <i>will</i> with time markers in QPT and BIT	199
5.45	The cluster <i>theirs will be</i> in QPT and BNC	202
6.1.	The collocate <i>when</i> in R1 position in the phrase <i>a day when</i> or the phrase <i>the day when</i> in QTT and BNC	213
6.2.	The collocate <i>when</i> in R1 position in the phrase <i>a day when</i> or <i>the day when</i> in QTT and RW/BNC	213
6.3.	The collocate <i>when</i> in R1 position in the phrase <i>a day when</i> or <i>the day when</i> in QTT and BIT	214
6.4.	The occurrence of <i>that day</i> in L1 position in QTT and the BNC	216
6.5.	The occurrence of <i>this day</i> in L1 position in the QTT and the BNC	217
6.6.	The frequency of <i>that day</i> in L1 position in QTT and RW/BNC	218
6.7.	The frequency of <i>this day</i> in L1 position in QTT and RW/BNC	218
6.8.	The frequency of <i>that day</i> in L1 position in QTT and BIT	218
6.9.	The frequency of <i>this day</i> in L1 position in QTT and BIT	219
6.10.	The collocation of <i>day</i> with <i>last</i> in L1 position in QTT and BNC	220
6.11.	The collocation of <i>day</i> with <i>last</i> in L1 position in QTT and RW/BNC	220
6.12	The collocation of <i>day</i> with <i>last</i> in L1 position in QTT and BIT	220
6.13.	The collocation of <i>day</i> with <i>night</i> in L3 in QTT and in R2 in the BNC	223
6.14.	The collocation of <i>day</i> with <i>night</i> in L3 in QTT and in R2 in BIT	223
6.15.	Semantic association of <i>day</i> with DISBELIEVERS in QTT and BNC.	225
6.16	Semantic association of <i>day</i> with Generality of Mankind in QTT and BNC	226
6.17	Semantic association of <i>day</i> with Generality of Mankind in QTT and BIT.	226
6.18	Semantic association of <i>day</i> with <i>body parts</i> in QTT and BNC.	228
6.19.	Semantic association of <i>day</i> with <i>body parts</i> in the QTT and BIT	228
6.20:	Colligation of <i>day</i> with modal expressions of future in BNC and QTT	230

6.21:	The colligation of <i>day</i> with <i>will</i> and <i>shall</i> in QTT and BNC	231
6.22:	The colligation of <i>day</i> with <i>will</i> and <i>shall</i> in QTT and BIT	231
6.23	Occurrence of negative markers in QTT and BNC in the context of <i>day</i>	233
6.24:	Pragmatic association of <i>day</i> with negative particles in the QTT and the BNC	233
6.25.	Pragmatic association of <i>day</i> with negative particles in QTT and RW/BNC	233
6.26:	Pragmatic association of <i>day</i> with negative particles in QTT and the BIT	234
6.27:	Association of <i>day</i> with emphatic expressions in QTT and BNC	235
6.28:	Pragmatic association of <i>day</i> with emphatic expressions in QTT and BNC	236
6.29:	Pragmatic association of <i>day</i> with emphatic expressions in QTT and BIT	236
6.30:	The collocation of <i>deeds</i> with <i>and</i> in QTT and BNC	239
6.31:	The collocation of <i>deeds</i> with <i>and</i> in QTT and RW/BNC	239
6.32:	The collocation of <i>deeds</i> with <i>and</i> in QTT and BIT	240
6.33:	The collocation of <i>deeds</i> with <i>good</i> in QTT and BNC	241
6.34:	The collocation of <i>deeds</i> with <i>evil</i> in QTT and BNC	244
6.35:	The collocation of <i>do</i> with <i>deeds</i> in QTT and BNC	246
6.36:	Colligation of <i>deeds</i> with future modality <i>shall</i> and <i>will</i> in QTT and BNC	249
6.37	The association of <i>shall</i> with negative markers in QTT and BNC	252
6.38:	The association of <i>shall</i> with negative markers in QTT and RW/BNC	252
6.39:	The association of <i>shall</i> with negative markers in QTT and BIT	252
6.40:	Expressions of certainty in conjunction with <i>shall</i> in QTT and BNC	253
6.41:	Pragmatic association of <i>shall</i> with expressions of certainty in QTT and BNC	254
6.42:	Pragmatic association of <i>shall</i> with expressions of certainty in QTT and BIT	254
6.43	The proportion of emphatic expressions of <i>shall</i> and <i>day</i> in QTT	255
6.44:	Association of <i>shall</i> with time markers in the BNC	256
7.1	Comparisons of distinctive collocations across translations	263
7.2:	A comparison across corpora in terms of findings of colligation	266
7.3:	A comparison across corpora in terms of semantic and pragmatic association	267
7.4a	The number of question marks and exclamation marks across the three corpora	268
7.4b:	Distribution of question marks and exclamations across translations	269

7.5.	Question marks and exclamation marks occurring with <i>torment</i> and <i>mercy</i>	271
7.6.	<i>Say</i> and <i>believe</i> in association with exclamation marks and question marks	272
7.7	<i>Day</i> and <i>deeds</i> in association with exclamation marks and question marks	274
7.8a:	Variation across the three corpora in the use of capitals and lower case	276
7.8b:	Variation across the three corpora in the use of capitals and lower case	277

## LIST OF FIGURES

### FIGURES

2.1.	The top 20 keywords identified in Pickthall translation	26
4.1:	Concordance lines of <i>mercy</i> ^ <i>from</i> in QIT	79
4.2	Concordance lines showing collocates of <i>mercy</i> ^ <i>for</i> in QIT	79
4.3	Concordance lines showing <i>mercy</i> in collocation with <i>and</i> in QIT	83
4.4	Concordance lines showing collocates of <i>mercy</i> with <i>as</i>	89
4.5	Concordance lines showing collocates of <i>mercy</i> with <i>as well as</i> and <i>as</i>	89
4.6	Concordance lines showing semantic association of <i>mercy</i> with ACTS OF GRACE	96
4.7	Concordance lines showing colligation of <i>mercy</i> with -possessive determiner	107
4.8	Concordance lines showing colligation of <i>mercy</i> with the reflexive pronoun <i>Ourself</i> in QIT.	110
4.9	Concordance showing <i>mercy</i> followed by <i>for</i> in the Bible	115
4.10	Concordance lines showing a shift in the function of the word <i>mercy</i>	118
4.11	Concordance lines showing instances of <i>if</i> in the BNC in collocation with <i>mercy</i>	121
4.12	Partial concordance of <i>torment</i> showing the most common collocates in the QIT	123
4.13:	Concordance lines showing <i>severe</i> as common collocate of <i>torment</i> in QTT	123
4.14	Full concordance lines of <i>torment</i> in the Bible.	125
4.15:	Concordance lines showing the collocation of <i>torment</i> with <i>they</i> in L4 position in QIT	126
4.16:	Full Concordance of <i>the torment of</i> in the QIT	131
4.17:	Concordance of <i>torment</i> showing colligation with future modality <i>shall</i> and <i>will</i> in QIT	140
4.18:	Selection of concordance showing colligation of <i>torment</i> with present perfect aspect in QIT	141
4.19.1	Concordance lines showing a colligational association of <i>torment</i> with (possession) <i>God's +torment</i> in QIT	142

4.19.2	Concordance lines showing a colligational association of <i>torment</i> with (possession) <i>My+ torment</i> in QIT	143
4.19.3	Concordance lines showing a colligational association of <i>torment</i> with (possession) <i>Hell's +torment</i> in QIT	143
4.20:	Concordance lines showing the colligation of <i>torment</i> with the possessive pronouns <i>his, her</i> and <i>their</i> in the BNC	144
5.1:	Partial concordance of <i>say O Mohammad</i> in the QPT.	150
5.2:	Partial concordance of <i>Say (Unto them, O Mohammad)</i> in the QPT.	150
5.3:	Sample concordance lines where <i>Allah</i> occurs immediately after <i>say</i>	151
5.4:	Concordance lines showing other right collocates of <i>say</i> referring to Allah	152
5.5:	Concordance lines showing the association of <i>say</i> with <i>large numbers of people</i> in BIT	158
5.6:	Concordance lines showing the association of <i>say</i> with the vocative <i>O</i> in the phrase <i>say O Mohammad</i> .	158
5.7:	Concordance lines showing the association of <i>say</i> with the Vocative <i>O</i> in the phrase <i>say unto them O Mohammad</i> .	159
5.8:	Concordance lines showing the colligation of <i>say</i> with imperatives.	159
5.9:	Concordance lines showing the colligation of <i>say</i> with imperatives in QPT and with interrogatives in reported clauses.	160
5.10:	Concordance lines showing the colligation of <i>say</i> with interrogatives in QPT	161
5.11:	Concordance lines showing the association of <i>say</i> with the exclamation mark <i>Lo!</i> in QPT.	163
5.12:	Concordance lines showing the nested combination of ' <i>believe in</i> ' in QPT	166
5.13:	Concordance lines where <i>not</i> occurs after <i>believe</i> in QPT as immediate collocate	172
5.14:	Concordance lines where <i>in</i> occurs after <i>believe not</i> in QPT as immediate collocate	173
5.15:	Concordance lines showing the collocation of <i>believe</i> with <i>say</i> in QPT	175
5.16:	Concordance lines showing instances of the association of <i>those who believe and 'do good works</i> with <i>Lo</i> '	177
5.17	Concordance lines showing instances of ' <i>those who believe and do good works</i> ' in a relationship with <i>as for</i>	177

5.18	Concordance lines showing the semantic association of <i>believe</i> with Large Numbers of People ( <i>mankind</i> ) in QPT.	180
5.19.	Concordance lines showing the association of <i>believe</i> with Large Number of People ( <i>O ye who believe</i> ) in QPT.	180
5.20:	Concordance lines showing the association of <i>believe</i> with HOLY BOOKS	182
5.20.1	Concordance lines showing the association of <i>believe</i> with HOLY BOOKS.	182
5.21:	Concordance lines showing <i>it</i> as a left collocate of <i>will</i> in QPT	189
5.22:	Concordance lines showing <i>we</i> as a left collocate of <i>will</i> in QPT	189
5.23:	Concordance lines showing <i>ye</i> as a left collocate of <i>will</i> in QPT.	190
5.24:	Concordance lines showing <i>not</i> as a collocate of <i>will</i> in R1 position in QPT	191
5.25:	Concordance lines showing the pragmatic association of <i>will</i> with expressions of certainty in QPT	195
5.26:	Concordance lines showing that <i>day</i> refers to a particular day the <i>Day of Resurrection</i> ,	200
5.27:	Concordance lines showing that <i>hour</i> refers to a particular day the <i>Day of Resurrection</i>	201
5.28:	Concordance lines showing the pattern of passive with <i>they</i> in connection with <i>will</i> in QPT	201
5.29:	Concordance lines showing the structure <i>theirs will be</i> in QPT	202
5.30:	Concordance lines showing the structure <i>theirs will be</i> in the BNC	202
5.31:	Concordance lines showing the structure <i>whom He will</i> in QPT	204
5.32:	Concordance lines showing the only instances of ‘ <i>whom he will</i> ’ found in the BNC.	204
6.1:	Concordance lines showing the only six instances of <i>Resurrection</i> occurring with <i>day</i> in the BNC	210
6.2.	Concordance lines showing the use of capital letters in the phrase <i>Day of Resurrection</i> Occurring with <i>day</i> in the QTT.	211
6.3:	Concordance lines showing the collocation of <i>Day</i> with <i>Resurrection</i> and a colligation of the phrase <i>the Day of Resurrection</i> with prepositions in QTT	212
6.4:	Concordance lines showing the collocation of <i>Day</i> with <i>when</i> in QTT	214
6.5	Concordance lines showing a collocation and referential association with <i>We</i> referring to Allah.	215

6.6	Concordance lines showing the demonstrative <i>that</i> as a common left collocate of <i>day</i> in QTT	216
6.7	Concordance lines showing a collocation of two nested combinations in QTT	222
6.8	Concordance lines showing the association of <i>Day</i> with one expression ( <i>deniers</i> ) expressing disbelief in QTT	224
6.9	Concordance lines showing the association of <i>Day</i> with <i>mankind</i> in QTT	226
6.10:	Concordance lines showing the colligation of <i>day</i> with <i>will</i> in QTT in R1 position	229
6.11	Concordance lines showing the colligation of <i>day</i> with <i>shall</i> in QTT	230
6.12:	Concordance lines showing the pragmatic association of <i>day</i> with negative markers in R1 position in QTT	232
6.13	Concordance lines showing the pragmatic association of <i>day</i> with negative markers in R2 position in QTT	232
6.14	Concordance lines showing collocation of <i>deeds</i> with <i>and</i> in L4 position in QTT	238
6.15	Concordance lines showing collocation of <i>deeds</i> with <i>and</i> in L2 position in QTT	238
6.16:	Concordance lines showing collocation of <i>deeds</i> with <i>and</i> in R1 position in QTT	238
6.17	Concordance lines showing the collocation of <i>deeds</i> with <i>good</i> in QTT	241
6.18:	Concordance lines showing the collocation of <i>deeds</i> with <i>righteous</i> in L2 position in QTT	242
6.19:	Concordance lines showing the collocation of <i>deeds</i> with <i>righteous</i> in L1 position in QTT	243
6.20:	Concordance lines showing the collocation of <i>deeds</i> with <i>evil</i> in QTT	243
6.21:	Full concordance lines showing the collocation of <i>deeds</i> with <i>evil</i> in the BNC	244
6.22:	Concordance lines showing collocation of <i>deeds</i> with <i>do</i> in QTT	245
6.23:	Concordance lines showing the collocation of <i>deeds</i> with <i>do</i> in the BNC	246
6.24:	Concordance lines showing a particular kind of structure in conjunction with <i>deeds</i> in QTT	247
6.25:	Concordance lines showing colligation of <i>deeds</i> with future modality in QTT	249

6.26:	Concordance lines showing most common right collocate of <i>shall</i> in QTT	251
6.27:	Concordance lines showing most common left collocate of <i>shall</i> in QTT	251
6.28:	Concordance lines showing colligation of <i>shall</i> with interrogatives in QTT	257



## ABBREVIATIONS

QIT	The Quran in Irving Translation
QPT	The Quran in Pickthall Translation
QTT	The Quran in Taqi Translation
QinT	The Quran in Translation
QinTs	The Quran in Translations
QT	Quranic Text
BNC	The British National Corpus
RW/BNC	Religious Writing of the British National Corpus
BIT	The Bible in Translation (King James authorised version)

# CHAPTER 1

## INTRODUCTION TO THE THESIS

### 1.1. Introduction

This thesis is an attempt to analyse the linguistic features of translations of the Holy Quran in translation using corpus linguistic techniques. The text I am working with is the Quran in translation, a text in Arabic which has been translated into many languages. In the Muslim's faith the Quran is a message from Allah to humanity, communicated in a sequence initially from Allah Almighty to the angel Gibril to the prophet Mohammad (peace be upon him). It was revealed to the prophet Mohammad in parts on particular occasions and during relevant circumstances over a period of 23 years. The language of the original message was in Arabic; however, it has been translated into numerous languages.

Muslims believe that the Quran is the most sacred text, revealed by Allah (God) to the prophet Mohammad as guidance with instructions and prophecies for the future. It is not only revered but also regarded as an essential reference book in their daily lives. Therefore, understanding and applying the knowledge therein is deemed the number one duty and objective of all practising Muslims. It follows that translation and proper interpretation of the Quran is of paramount importance in the correct promulgation and practice of Islam. Von Denffer (1981: 7) says:

The Qur'an contains the revelations of Allah, the Creator and Sustainer of the Universe, to mankind. It is the message from God to man and therefore of utmost importance to us. To properly grasp a message, one needs first of all to understand its contents exactly, and for this purpose one must study the Qur'an deeply and in detail. Some special knowledge of the circumstances that surround the message is also necessary for fuller understanding of its meaning and implications.

This chapter briefly describes how the Quran came into existence. It briefly describes the status of translations; how useful they are. It talks about how corpus linguistics might help with judging their characteristics and value. So I am going to use corpus linguistic techniques to find first of all how much the translations agree with each other and secondly, where they appear to be interpreting the text in a way differing from the original. In principle, someone who reads the Quran will be primed by those texts so what is the nature of the priming they produce?

## **1.2.The Holy Quran**

In this section I shall briefly introduce the history of the collection of the Quran during the lifetime of prophet Mohammed and during the leadership of caliphs Abu Bakr, Ummar ibn Alkhatib and Uthman.

Abdel Haleem (1999) notes that the first word in the Quran and in Islam is *iqraa* (read) a command to the prophet that characterises the relationship between Allah, speaking through the angel Gabriel and prophet Mohammed and between prophet Mohammed and his followers (audience). The prophet Mohammed is just a recipient who is being addressed *O prophet, O Messenger*, and instructed “*do .....or do not do*”

## **1.3. The History of the Compilation of the Quran in the lifetime of Prophet Mohammed**

Qadhi (1999) declares that one of the greatest blessings that has been given to prophet Mohammed’s *ummah* (nation) is the protection of the Holy Quran from any kind of distortion by the Lord Allah Himself who promised to take the responsibility of protecting His divinely revealed Scripture. Allah says in the Quran

“Verily We! It is We Who have revealed the admonition, and We are its guardian”

15:9 Daryabadi Translation

He notes that the Holy Quran was compiled in three stages, each associated with a different figure. Stage one occurred during the prophet Mohammed’s life and ensured that the Quran was properly preserved. Stage two and three were associated with Abu Bakr responsible for its first compilation and Uthman who was responsible for its definitive compilation.

According to Qadhi, the first record of the Quran being written down was on the sixth year of the prophethood when verses of the Quran were written on a parchment to be read to Omar, with the result that he immediately accepted Islam. At this stage the Quran was written down but it was scattered in pieces not in one book.

Gilchrist (1989) mentions that the prophet Mohammed took great care not to forget the verses that the angel Gibril came down with to the point that Allah consoled him saying:

Move not your tongue therewith that you may hasten. Verily upon Us is the collecting of it and the reciting of it. So when We recite it, follow the reciting thereof.

75: 16-18 Daryabadi Translation

At a later stage the prophet took great care in not just memorising the Quran but writing it down and revising it to check if it was written correctly.

The prophet Mohammed also used to instruct his scribe to place a particular ayah in a particular surah as mentioned by Uthman in his saying:

“Uthman said, that in later days, the Prophet used to, when something was revealed to him, call someone from among those who used to write for him and said: Place these ayat in the sura, in which this and this is mentioned, and when (only) one aya was revealed to him, he said: Place this aya in the sura in which this and this is mentioned'. [Jeffery, A.: 1937] cited in Von Denffer (1981)

Abdel Haleem (1999) points, importantly, the prophet took care to command his companions not to record anything he said except the Quran and ordered ‘Whoever has written anything from me other than the Quran, let him erase it’

Gil Christ (1989). Although the prophet did not himself compile the Quran, he did take care to make sure that everything he had received was accurately written down. The effect was that at his death, everything had been memorised and also written down, but the written form record was that of fragments in the possession of different people.

Abdul Haleem (ibid) says:

The collected written text of the Quran was the first book in the Arabic language. It was also the starting point around which, and for the service of which, the various branches of Arabic studies were initiated and developed. Thus in order to ensure accurate reading of the Quran that Arabic grammar was first developed and written down, especially when Islam began to spread outside the Arabic region. It was the Quran that took Arabic outside the Arabian Peninsula, making it an international language that deeply penetrated important languages like Persian, Turkish, Urdu, Indonesian, Swahili, and others. (P7)

#### **1.4. The First Compilation of the Quran during the life of Abu Bakr**

When the prophet died, Abu Bakr was chosen by Mohammed’s followers as their leader and his first task was to deal with the apostasy of Muslims who had originally accepted Islam for political reasons but now were disloyal to the new Muslim state. When 140 reciters of the Quran died in two separate battles against these rebels, the need to preserve the Quran became increasingly urgent and Mohammed’s companions used whatever came to hand to do so- cloth, stones, date palm leaves, even saddles and the shoulder blade bones of animals – to record the surahs. Importantly, the prophet had taken care to command his companions not to record anything he said except the Quran, and they followed his instructions. However the

loss of the memorizers of the Quran strongly worried Ummar bin Alkhatib and therefore he suggested to Abu Bakr that the Quran must be collected. Zaid reports (Burton 2010)

Abu Bakr sent for me on the occasion of the deaths of those killed in the Yamama wars. I found Umar b. al Khattab with him. Abu Bakr said, " Umar has just come to me and said, " In the Yamama fighting death has dealt most severely with the qurra (memorisers of Quran) and I fear it will deal with equal severity within them in other theatres of war and as a result much of the Quran will perish. I am therefore of the opinion that you should command that the Quran be collected. Abu Bakr added, " I said to Umar, " How can we do what the prophet never did? " Umar replied that it was nonetheless a good act. He did not cease replying to my scruples until God reconciled me to the undertaking." Abu Bakr continued, "Zaid, you are young and intelligent and we know nothing to your discredit. You used to record the revelation for the prophet, so pursue the Qur'an and collect it all together ". By God! Had they asked me to remove a mountain it could not have been more weighty than what they would now have me to do in ordering me to collect the Qur'an. I therefore asked them how they could do what the prophet had not done but Abu Bakr insisted that it was permissible. He did not cease replying to my scruples until God reconciled me to the understanding as He had already reconciled Abu Bakr and Umar. I thereupon pursued the Quran collecting it all together from palm- branches, flat stones and the memories of men. I found the last verse of surat al Tawba in the possession of Abu khuzaima al Ansari, having found it with no one else, "There has now come to you ...." To the end of the sura. (p 118-119)

So many considerations were taken by Abu Bakr and Ummar when Zayd was chosen to collect the Quran. In comparison of the collection of the Quran by Abu Bakr with that of Uthman Burton (2010: 139) says:

"Abu Bakr collected the scattered fragments of the Quran on sheets. "Uthman collected the sheets into a single volume. "Abu Bakr collected the Quran between two covers" Uthman formed but a single text!" ! Uthman united the Muslims on a single text".

Zaid then started collecting pieces of the Quran from different places aiming at putting them all together.

Al-Azami (2003:83) says that Zaid bin Thabit declares: “So I gathered the Quran from various parchments and pieces of bone, and from the chests of men [i.e. their memories]”.Az-Zarakhshi comments<sup>1</sup>,

This statement has led a few to suppose that no one had memorised the Qur'an in its entirety during the prophet's lifetime, and that claims of Zaid and Ubayy bin Ka'b having done so are unfounded. But this is erroneous. What Zaid means in fact is that he sought out verses from scattered sources, to collate them against the recollection of the *huffaz* (memorizers of the Quran). In this way everyone participated in the collection process. No one possessing concern about the verses collected, nor could anyone complain that the text had been gathered from only a select few.

Al-Azami (2003: 80) narrates that Abu Bakr told “Umar and Zaid”

“Sit at the entrance to the prophet's Mosque. If anyone brings you a verse from the book of Allah along with two witnesses, then record it.”

He added the compilation is now complete and is called *Suhuf*.<sup>2</sup> It is a plural word and literally means sheets of parchment. *Mushaf*<sup>3</sup> is the singular form which denotes a written copy of the Quran. All suras and all verses therein were properly arranged using the Madanite script.

---

<sup>1</sup> Az-Zarkhshi, Burhan, i:238-239

<sup>2</sup> *Suhuf* (sg. *sahifa*) means loose pieces of writing material, such as paper, skin, papyrus, etc.

<sup>3</sup> “*Mushaf* (pl. *masahif*) means the collected *suhuf*, brought together into a fixed order, such as between two covers, into a volume. In the history of the written text of the Qur'an, *suhuf* stands for the sheets on which the Qur'an was collected in the time of Abu Bakr. In these *suhuf* the order of the ayat within each sura was fixed, but the sheets with the suras on them were still in a loose arrangement, i.e. not bound into a volume. *Mushaf* in the present context means the sheets on which the Qur'an was collected in the time of 'Uthman. Here both the order of the ayat within each sura as well as the order of the sheets were fixed.” Denffer (1981)

The *Mushaf* which was compiled by Zaid bin Thabit under Abu Bakr's instructions, was kept with Abu Bakr and then when Abu Bakr died it was passed onto Umar ibn Alkhatib (the second caliph) and after Umar's death, it was passed onto Hafsa his daughter who kept it for a while and then gave it to Uthman when the need for one *Mushaf* to unite the Muslim Ummah (nation) emerged.

### **1.5. The Quran during the lifetime of Uthman the third caliph (Uthman's Mushaf)**

Al-Azami says Uthman was chosen as the third caliph. At Uthman's caliphate Muslims from different parts of the community joined the army forces to fight enemies and the problem arose among them when differences in pronunciation and reading the Quran appeared. Muslims from Iraq followed one way of recitation and Muslims of Alsham followed another way and each claimed that his reading was the correct one. Hudaifah got really upset and was concerned about this serious issue. So he wrote to Uthman saying

“ O caliph” “take this Ummah ( community) in hand before they differ about their book like the Christians and the Jews”

He demonstrates that this conflict had appeared during Ummar's caliphate when he sent Ibn Mas'ud to Iraq, and he taught them the Quran in a dialect of Hudhail and when Ummar found that he wrote to him saying:

The Qur'an was revealed in the dialect of Quraish, so teach according to the dialect of Quraish and not that of Hudhail (p.87)

So Uthman gathered the companions and explained the danger of such disagreement and the bad effect that it could leave among Muslims and he asked for their opinions.

Ali bin Abi Talib said:



“I see that we bring the people with a single *Mushaf* {with a single dialect} so that there is neither division nor discord”. And we said “ An excellent proposal”<sup>4</sup>

The suggestion made by the companions was accepted by Uthman and he sent a letter to Hafsa asking her to send him the *suhuf* to make a perfect and a final copy of the Quran. Al. Bara narrates,

So “Uthman sent Hafsa a message stating, “ Send us the *Suhuf* so that we may make perfect copies and then return the *Suhuf* back to you.” Hafsa sent it to “Uthman, who ordered Zaid bin Thabet, Abdullah bin az-Zubair, Sa'id bin al-As and Abdur-Rahman bin Al- Harith bin Hisham to make duplicate copies. He told the three Quraishi men, “Should you disagree with Zaid bin Thabit on any point regarding the Quran , write it in the dialect of Quraish as the Quran was revealed in their tongue.” They did so, and when they had prepared several copies “Uthman returned the *Suhuf* to Hafsa...<sup>5</sup>

Al- Azami (ibid p.89) and Abul Qasim al Khui (ch.13) declare that Uthman decided to make an independent copy of the *Mushaf*. For this great task to be successfully achieved he formed a committee of twelve well-known memorizers of the Quran and gave a speech as reported by Masa'b b. Sa'ad

Uthman stood to address the people and said: 'O people, you are only thirteen years away from the era of the Prophet ('s) and have already begun to dispute about the Qur'an. Some of you talk of the recitation by Ubayy, while others quote the recitation by Abdullah. And one tells the other that his recitation has no value. So I command everyone who has any part of the Qur'an with him to come up with it'. Then people started coming with the Qur'an written on pieces of papers and patches of skin, till most of it was compiled. Then Uthman called them individually, imploring each of them to confirm that he had heard the Prophet ('s) recite for him, and each confirmed. When it was over, Uthman said: "Who is the best scribe?" They said: "The scribe of the Prophet ('s), Zaid b. Thabit". He said: "Who is most proficient in Arabic?" They said; "Saeed b. al-Aas". Uthman said: "Then Saeed should dictate and Zaid should write". So Zaid started writing and made out several copies which were distributed among men. Then I heard a companion of Muhammad say: "He has done well

---

<sup>4</sup> Ibn Abi Dawud, *al-Masahif*, p. 22. See also Ibn Hajar, *Fathul Bari*, x:402.

<sup>5</sup> Ibn Hajar, *Fathul Bari*, ix:11, hadith no. 4987; Ibn Abi Dawud, *al- Masahif*, pp.19-20; Abu Ubaid, *Fadail*, p. 282

The independent copy was compared with the official *Suhuf* which were kept with Hafsa and the definite final copy was produced and then was read to the companions in Uthman's presence. Copies of the new *Mushaf* were distributed. Uthman noticed that there was no need for people to keep fragments of the Quran when they now have a complete *Mushaf* so he decided to burn these fragments. The decision was taken in the presence of the companions who had no objection whatsoever. Ali bin Abi Talib (the fourth caliph) says:

By Allah, he did what he did with these fragments in the presence of us all [i.e. and none of us objected].<sup>6</sup> Al-Azami (p. 94)

In conclusion, the Quran during the life of prophet Mohammed was memorised and written down in different materials as a way of preserving it. Later on at the life time of Abu Bakr there was dire need for it to be compiled in a book and Zaid bin Thabit achieved this great job under Abu Bakr's instructions. During the caliphate of Uthman a new copy emerged and the Muslims were united under this new copy of the Quran which was called *Mushaf*. The Quran that Muslims read every day in the whole world is the same Quran that was revealed to prophet Mohammed 14 centuries ago.

### **1.6. Translation and Translating the Holy Quran**

'An early definition' of translation was given by Catford (1965:20). He states that "translation is the replacement of textual material in one language by equivalent textual material".

Baker (1992) points to the importance of selecting an appropriate equivalent word or a phrase while translating from one language into another and she also states that non-equivalence causes difficulties for the translator.

---

<sup>6</sup> Abu Ubaid, *Fadail*, p. 284: ad- Dani, *al- Muqni*, p. 18

A translator must have in-depth understanding and knowledge of the language from which s/he is translating and the language into which s/he is translating. If he does not have a perfect knowledge and understanding of the source text the result is an inaccurate translation, and one of the major problems arising from inaccurate translations is the possibility of misinterpretation.

The Quran has been translated into many languages; in some of these, including English, there have been more than one translation. In this study I will be dealing with three translations of the Quran. They are amongst the most readily available translations and many English speakers use them. I shall discuss how the Quran has been translated and the different views and opinions of scholars of the Quran in this and the next two chapters, as they become relevant.

“Muslim scholars believe that any translation cannot be more than an approximate interpretation intended primarily as a tool to disseminate the general message of the original text”

Khaleel Mohammad (2005- para1)

The translation of the Quran is a controversial and very important issue for Muslims. As noted above, Muslims believe that the Quran is the absolute Word of Allah revealed in Arabic to His prophet by the archangel Gabriel as a boon and mercy to all mankind. Allah says in the Quran:

Verily it is a revelation of the Lord of the world.

The trusted spirit has brought it down;

Upon your heart, that you may be of the warners

In plain Arabic speech”

26:192-195 quoted from Daryabdi Abdul Majid

For Muslims, it represents God's guidance, which they should follow to enlighten their lives, to find happiness and to lead a good life. Concerning the possibility of translating the Quran, one of the most important fatwa was issued by Rashid Rida who died in 1935 in which he states the following:

The translation of the Quran is an important issue for Muslims. All the debates which have been held concerning the translation of this Glorious Book have not come to conclusion. There are reasons for this: first to translate it fully is impossible because of its inimitability in respect to its style. Second, it includes many words which have no equivalent in the target language, so the translator is forced to use a word which conveys the meaning but with some variation. Then if this translation is translated again into another language there will be some other variation and so on. Third, some signs and ahkam [rulings] can be extracted from the words of the Divine Books by the process of calculation, so the replacement [of these words] by translation prevents this process. <sup>7</sup>

Another fatwa- opinion- is by Sheikh Atiyya Saqr in which he says the following:

Atiya (2006) says: the issue of translating the Quran has been much debated since the first third of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. However, the translation of the Quran can never be considered as a Quran in itself, in its rulings and sacredness. The reason for this is that translation is not the word of Allah which was revealed to the prophet (peace and blessings be upon him); but it is human words offered to explain the Divine Revelation. Besides, through translation, the words of the Quran are conveyed in a language other than Arabic which forms part and parcel of the miraculous nature of the Quran. Allah says, "A Book, whereof the verses are explained in detail; a Quran in Arabic, for people who understand" (41:3). On this basis, the translated copy of the Quran does not enjoy the same lofty standard of the original one.

He also points to the two types of translations- literal and free- and what scholars think of them. He notes of literal translation that it is impossible for it to convey the meanings of the Holy Quran for some reasons as follows:

The foreign language cannot deliver the polysemy of the Quranic style; many words in the Quran have more than one meaning, besides, the foreign language can never convey all these meanings in one word, If the translator chooses one

---

<sup>7</sup> Translated by Mohamed. A.M (2000)

of these meanings according to his methodology in translation, then the translation will be insufficient to deliver the whole message of the verse.” Some Arabic words are used figuratively; message of the Quran might not be conveyed in case of translating the verse literally. Some specific meanings are expressed in general words; if a translator tries to convey these words without referring to the specific meaning, he will not bring the aim of using these words in the Quran. Arabic has its own unique style which is considered as the key to understand the rulings of Shari’ah, the matter which could not be transferred through any other language..

[Sic] (islamOnline.net) Fatwa bank- sciences of the Quran (2003)

The translation of the original Quran from Arabic is accordingly an extremely sensitive undertaking.

As already noted, there have been great efforts to translate the Quran into many languages to meet the needs of Muslims and non-Muslims who do not speak Arabic but want to understand the Quran and grasp the Divine message therein. Most of these translations are in English, which is the pre-eminent world language. Each translation of the Quran is in fact an attempt to present its meanings and implications. Muslim translators have done their best to be as accurate and honest as possible while translating Allah’s words. Pickthall writes in his foreword of 1930.

The Quran cannot be translated ....The book I here have rendered almost literally and every effort has been made to choose befitting Language. But the result is not the Glorious Quran, that inimitable symphony, the very sounds of which move men to tears and ecstasy. It is only an attempt to present the meaning of the Quran and peradventure something of the charm in English. It can never take the place of the Quran in Arabic, nor is it meant to do so....  
Tzortzis (nd)

Giving the unique status of the language of the original Quran, we would expect a faithful translation of the Quran to reflect that uniqueness in each use of language. Furthermore, we would expect the translators to take fewer liberties with the English translation than they might do with any other text. So on both counts the fact that the Quran itself is a unique text and secondly, on the grounds of the need of the translators to stay faithful to the original text, we would predict that the language of translations of the Quran will be quite distinctive compared with the language of ordinary English and what I am going to do is use corpus linguistic techniques to explore that distinctiveness, that arises both from the Quran's stylistic nature, and from the rather special nature of the kind of role that translation is intended to play.

Corpus linguistics makes available a set of techniques that will allow us to explore in greater detail than ever before the linguistic nature of the subtleties of the Quran, even in translation. Obviously there are other subtleties that a corpus linguist will never find (e.g. theological subtleties) but some of the linguistic subtleties are now investigatable. In so doing, we may identify the ways in which the Quran in translation may prime its readers in ways different from the majority of texts that they are likely to encounter.

As part of this study, I am interested in exploring collocations, i.e. frequent combinations of words (Cook, 2003: 73) in the translations selected and check if they are collocations in the original text as well, I am also interested in how key words in the Quran in translation central to the divine message are conveyed in a range of translations, focusing in particular on how they have been translated in the translations of Irving, Pickthall and Taqi. In chapter seven I examine whether the translations convey the same meanings as each other and represent as accurately and sensitively as possible the original Quran.

Corpus Linguistics is a scientific kind of linguistic study and involves investigating particular linguistic features by creating a corpus – a sample or complete collection of texts to be studied in electronic form – and conducting a thorough analysis of the features as they occur in the corpus. The purposes of such investigations can vary greatly. In this thesis the focus will be on identifying the distinctive features of each of the translations I am examining, compared against a reference corpus which in this study is the BNC. To do this I have made a corpus of three popular translations of the Holy Quran, the Irving Translation, the Pickthall translation and Taqi's translation, saved in electronic form for analysis purposes. Each of these translations is described in chapters 4, 5 & 6. As noted, the reference corpus chosen for comparison purposes is the BNC which comprises a hundred million words of written and spoken texts and aims to reflect as accurately as possible the general characteristics of the English language, written and spoken. I compare the translated texts with the British National Corpus and then I look at the Religious Writing component of the BNC and the Bible in Translation (Authorised Version) as a special Holy text to check whether the features I am looking at are true of all religious writings or just the Quran in translation.

### **1.7. Defining the study and expectations**

The unique origin of the Quran and the subtlety of its vocabulary mean that we would expect the language to be distinctive and therefore using the modern methods of corpus linguistics, I intend to explore the ways in which the translations are distinctive and then to check whether the distinctive features found are shared with the other three corpora mentioned earlier or whether they are particular features of the Quran in translation.

There are also a range of other ways in which a word may relate to its linguistic context, including colligation, semantic association, and pragmatic association, all of which will be defined in their place and these features of the texts of the Quran will also be examined. So I will search for the relationships a word has to its context i.e. how it associates semantically and how it associates grammatically. Each word will be analysed in terms of its grammatical form and grammatical function, and in terms of its place in the larger structure.

To sum up, what I am doing is comparing the Quran in translation with the BNC in terms of collocation and other lexical relationships and checking the findings also with other religious corpora – the Bible in translation and the religious component of the BNC. It would be utterly impracticable to identify all the collocations, colligations, and semantic associations of the Quran in translation. It has been necessary therefore to select only a few words. To do this, I used the facility developed by Mike Scott as part of his Wordsmith program to identify words known as key words which are special to a particular corpus. Using this facility I was able to identify that the following words *mercy, torment, say, believe, will, day, deeds* and *shall* are all used much more frequently proportionally in one or more of the translations of the Quran than in ordinary English. I chose these words from the full key word list because they include rare and common nouns and verbs and two grammatical items. My interest was in what purposes appeared to lie behind their frequent choice. The key words under investigation were subjected to analysis in terms of collocation, semantic association and other lexical relationships described in lexical priming theory.

The findings will be compared with the British National Corpus to find out whether the features found are characteristics of the translated Quran text or whether they are features of the language as a whole. Actually there are three possibilities; firstly, the findings (the collocations, the colligations and so on) are common to all varieties of English and the other religious writings. Secondly, they are true of the translated Quran but they are neither true of



English as a whole nor of the other religious writings. Thirdly, they are true both of the English translations of the Quran and the other religious writings but not true of English as a whole.

There will be also a stage where the translations of some verses will be compared against each other to check whether the primings are reflected in the translated text or whether the translators have added elements not present in the original Arabic.

The selected words will be analysed to explore their typical behaviour in the English translations. I am interested in discovering whether we can identify the properties of sensitive language as reflected by Quranic translations. I am also interested in finding extra meanings or confirming recognized distinctive meanings by using the relatively new techniques of corpus linguistics. This study is accordingly intended to be a contribution to the field of corpus linguistics. It will address issues that arise from the translation of a holy text and identify features of the language of such a text as manifested in the translations.

In summary I ask the following questions:

Are there any special extra meanings that we can identify in the English as a result of identifying the collocations, colligations, semantic associations and pragmatic associations of the translated words? Secondly, does the study of such lexis in the Quran in translation lead us to identify new features of the language and new kinds of priming? Thirdly, are those extra meanings in the translated text also there in the Arabic of the Quran as well as in the English or have they been added by the translators?

If they are there, then their extra meanings will be explored but if they are not there then the translations will be distorting the message of the original. I will also conduct a brief comparison across the three different translations.

## 1.8. Research Questions

I am going to identify what characterizes the Quran in translations, then what distinguishes the Quran in translation from the English as reflected in the BNC, the religious component of the BNC and the Bible in translation. So the questions to be investigated are as follows:

(1) The first question is how the selected words (key words) behave in the Quran in translations i.e., how do they function in the QinTs in terms of collocation and other lexical relationships?

(2) The second and perhaps the most important question is to find out whether indeed the facts which will be discovered about those words in QinTs are also true of the BNC and the other religious writings? Some of the features which will be explored might be simply true about the word itself wherever it appears and not necessarily true of only the language of the Quran in translation. They may however still be important facts about the QinTs because the word is being used far more often in the Quran than it is in the BNC even if the features are shared by both QinT and the BNC. If it occurs more often in the QinTs than it does in the BNC, it will prime its readers more strongly because they encounter it more. If they are not true of the BNC then we have something even more important in terms of priming<sup>8</sup> because if the language is different then it will prime the reader differently. Whoever is reading the English translations of the Quran whether a Muslim reader or non Muslim reader will be affected by the language and their language will potentially change in accordance with their encounters with the words of the Quran in translations.

(3) The third question is that, if it is found that the language of QinTs is different from that of the BNC, is it the case with the other two corpora the religious writing of the BNC (RW/BNC) and the Bible in translation (BIT) or not?

---

<sup>8</sup> I will be discussing the notion of priming later on.

### **1.9. The contribution the study hopes to achieve to corpus linguistics and translation.**

Corpus linguistics analysis will be used to investigate the behaviour of words in translations of the Quran and it is hoped that this will lead to deeper understanding of how words operate in religious texts. It is also hoped that it will lead to improvements and additions to lexical priming theory, the corpus linguistic theory used to shape the reported investigation.

### **1.10. Hypotheses**

#### **1.10.1. Hypothesis One**

It is hypothesised that because of the special nature of the Quran as a communication and because of the absolute centrality of the Quran to Islam, translations of the Quran will manifest distinctive patterns of lexical usage that distinguish the English of these translations from ordinary everyday English as reflected in and by the British National Corpus.

#### **1.10.2. Hypothesis two**

A secondary hypothesis is that for a variety of reasons in their efforts to capture the meanings of the original, the translators may have introduced patterns of lexical usage which were not there in the original text.

#### **1.10.3. Hypothesis three**

A third hypothesis is that because of the special nature of the Quran, even in translating, analysis of the patterns of lexical usage may reveal types of lexical association that have not previously been attended to in corpus linguistics.

### **1.11. The Structure of the Thesis**

Chapter two outlines the research methodology adopted and describes the collection and design of the Quran corpus used in this thesis. The first section will introduce the Wordsmith software used, focusing in particular on the concordancing, collocation and keyword facilities and their benefits in conducting the analysis carried out in this thesis. In the second part of this chapter lexical priming theory will be briefly presented and its use of concepts such as collocation, semantic association, pragmatic association, colligation and textual colligation described. The BNC and the three translations under investigation will be introduced as well.

Chapter three begins by briefly reviewing the history of the Quran translations up to the present day. The distinctiveness of the Quranic text and the stylistic features of the Arabic Language in which it is written will briefly be demonstrated. Examples of difficulties that translators encounter during the process of translating the meanings of the holy text will be given. The second part of chapter 3 is devoted to an account of corpus linguistics, and the methods and advantages of this approach to Linguistic investigation. Finally the chapter looks at the style of the Quran in translation and examines previous work if found on religious language from a corpus linguistics perspective.

In chapters four, five and six I choose a set of different key words to investigate in each chapter which are shared by all three translations. My analysis, however, focuses on the use of the key words in just one of the translations. Each chapter addresses a different translation.

Lexical Priming theory will be applied to the three chosen translations, with attention given to lexical items identified as keywords using Wordsmith's keyword facility and chosen to reflect a variety of grammatical and semantic features of the translations.

The key words selected for each translation are subjected to analysis in terms of various kinds of lexical relationships i.e. collocation, semantic association, pragmatic association, colligation etc. The findings of the analysis are then compared with the BNC, the RW/BNC and the BIT in order to identify and distinguish those features that are specific to the Quranic text and those features that are characteristics of modern English in general and other religious texts.

Chapter seven begins by examining whether what has been found for the individual translations are specific to those translations or whether they are true of all the translations. I will also examine whether such features differ across translations in terms of frequency and proportion.

Chapter eight presents the findings and the results of the study, checking them against questions and hypotheses and providing an interpretation of them. Conclusions are drawn for both translation studies and corpus linguistics.

## **CHAPTER 2**

### **METHODOLOGY**

#### **2.1. Introduction**

This chapter is divided into two sections. The first section deals with the various tools involved in corpus linguistics analysis once our research questions have been identified. To answer these questions a suitable corpus has been designed and appropriate key words were chosen for analysis purposes. This section provides a description of the common tools that are used to produce data from concordances, frequency lists and the like.

The second section deals with the lexical priming theory on which the study is based. Different aspects of the theory such as collocation, semantic association, pragmatic association, colligation, and textual colligation will be discussed with explanatory examples from the theory data. The British National Corpus and the translations under investigation will be introduced as well in this section.

#### **2.2. Methodology to be adopted**

Corpus linguistics relies on bodies of texts to arrive at linguistic descriptions, and consequent theories. In fact the development of the computer tools provided in corpus linguistics has facilitated the process of analysing texts and has made the researcher's observations on corpus data more reliable.

As a way of beginning to answer the research questions, key words were selected for the purpose of analysis in order to examine their typical behaviour in the Quran in translation and compare any findings with regard to these key words with their behaviour in the BNC. I have chosen three translations of the Quran and downloaded them; they all are available online so

anyone who is interested can easily access them. The fact that they were written at different times means that they will prime readers in different ways and will have primed different readers though the fact they are all online means that they all now have the potential to prime contemporary readers. In order to use software tools of corpus analysis, it is crucial to hold texts in machine – readable format, i.e. as a file in the computer.

The “Quran in translation” texts were available in a collection on the internet and they came in a variety of formats, made available for downloading. However the software to be used to analyse the corpus required a change of the formatting of the texts into plain text format suitable for the analysis. For this purpose I cleaned up the Quran texts and designed my own corpus from them. The translations used are described in section 2.16.

### **2.3. Methods of Research**

The procedures undertaken to investigate the Quran in translation are those built into Wordsmith Tools (Scott, 1996). The tools that I have used are the Wordlist tool, the Keyword list tool and the Concordance program.

The first step in the analysis was to create a word list for each translation and for the BNC in order to identify the most frequent words in each translation.

The second step was to compare two wordlists for example the QIT wordlist with the BNC wordlist, in order to identify key words.

The third step was the selection of keywords to analyse from each keyword list of the three translations.

As stated above, the text used for this study is the Quran text in three common translations available on the internet. I chose three translations of the Quran written at different times (QIT) because of their availability online, not because of any special merits.

I compared each of the translated texts with the British National Corpus (BNC) and then I looked at the Religious Writing component of the BNC (RW/BNC) and at a corpus consisting of the Bible in Translation (Authorised Version) (BIT) as a special Holy text in order to check whether the features I was identifying in the Quranic translation were true of all religious writings or just these translations. For the purpose of my study I designed a corpus for each translation and then produced a wordlist and keyword list for each translation in order to identify which keywords to investigate in each case. The reference corpus used for comparison was the British National Corpus- BNC-which consists of a hundred million words of written and spoken texts.

#### **2.4. Concordance tools**

I discuss the use of key words in the Quran in translation text in terms of collocation and other lexical relationships. The main point of the analysis is to show that certain words in the Quran translations occur within different collocations and in different grammatical structures. Some of these patterns are compared with data from the BNC corpus of hundred million words of written and spoken English and subsequently with data from the Religious Writing Component of the BNC and with data drawn from the Authorised Version translation of the Bible. The software tool I used most in this study was the concordance program that searches a corpus for a selected word or phrase and enables one to identify regularly recurring words



in the environment<sup>9</sup>. Some words collocate one word to the left or right and therefore immediate collocates were considered in such cases. Other words collocate within two or three words on either side and therefore that was the appropriate boundary when exploring collocations. Sometimes I went beyond that boundary, especially when I looked at the way words related in a whole sentence. I treated seven or eight words on either side as an appropriate boundary when finding out about new kinds of priming such as the primings for punctuation, discussed in chapter 6. An extended text was sometimes required on either side when exploring semantic association, and other lexical relationships. Hunston (2002: 58-60) gives examples to show how important a wider text is to understand the functions of items in discourse and she presents the phrase “I must admit” by way of illustration.

So through the use of the KWIC feature of the concordance program, we were able to investigate the most frequent collocates and many of the semantic associates of each word under investigation; however, examining other features, such as pragmatic association, and textual semantic association, sometimes required the use of a wider window than that offered by the traditional KWIC format. In the presentation of my results I make clear at each stage what boundaries for search were adopted and why.

## **2.5. Wordlist**

The Wordlist program generates wordlists based on one or more text files. It can be used for a variety of reasons such as identifying common word clusters, comparing the frequency of a word in different text files or across genres. It also can be used to compare two lists or carry out consistency analysis for stylistic comparison purposes. The major use I made of the wordlist program was as input to the keywords program which compares the wordlist of a

---

<sup>9</sup> “I think computer searching of corpora is the most useful tool that has been provided to the grammarian since the invention of writing”. (Pullum 2006: 39)

corpus under investigation with a reference corpus (the BNC in this study) in order to generate lists of “key words”. Keyword lists are discussed in the next section. There are other uses that can be made of lists that do not affect us here; Leech (2001) for example, notes how frequency can serve pedagogical purposes.

## **2.6. Keyword list**

This program is used to identify the key words<sup>10</sup> in one or more texts; it compares two pre-existing wordlists which have been created using the wordlist tool. One of these is assumed to be a large wordlist which will act as a reference file and here in my study it is the BNC wordlist. The other wordlist is based on the text or texts which we chose to study which were the translation texts. I identified key words for each translation. Scott (2006) identifies a key word as a word which occurs with unusual frequency in a given text, which does not mean that it occurs with high frequency but unusual frequency. The procedure for identifying a key word has several stages. First, a word list is computed, containing all the different types in the reference corpus and the frequencies of each. Next, the same sort of word list is computed for the text whose key words are under investigation, which in my study was each of the translations in the Quran Corpus. So I created a wordlist for each translation and a word list for the reference corpus, the BNC. From these I made keyword lists to identify the key words in each of the translations in the corpus under analysis. I selected a few key words from each translation on grounds that will be given in the chapters of analysis associated with each translation. I followed most other analysts, however, in focusing on keywords with positive keyness, rather than those with negative keyness.

---

<sup>10</sup> Using “keywords” software (Scott 1997), we can check which words are both frequent in the QIT and also significantly more frequent in a reference corpus

Following it an example of the kinds of words identified as key by these means. Figure 2.1.gives the first twenty of the (500) key words of Pickthall text as identified by Wordsmith Tools.

N	Key word	Freq.	%	Freq.	RC.	%	eyness	P
1	ALLAH	2,659	1.57	113			,412.37	000000
2	UNTO	1,868	1.10	389			,053.94	000000
3	YE	1,861	1.10	1,623			,228.34	000000
4	LO	1,364	0.81	518			,400.41	000000
5	HATH	780	0.46	284			,835.84	000000
6	THOU	760	0.45	787			,669.61	000000
7	THEE	635	0.38	635			,438.50	000000
8	THEM	2,322	1.37	171,000	0.16		,889.13	000000
9	LORD	986	0.58	16,259	0.02		,223.52	000000
10	VERILY	364	0.22	26			,507.26	000000
11	THEY	2,883	1.70	386,568	0.36		,423.81	000000
12	THY	440	0.26	653			,207.99	000000
13	WHO	2,031	1.20	202,368	0.19		,092.30	000000
14	THOSE	1,201	0.71	89,389	0.08		,017.40	000000
15	O	572	0.34	9,823			,985.06	000000
16	MUHAMMAD	277	0.16	346			,720.24	000000
17	#	6,237	3.69	930,586	1.80		,608.94	000000
18	AND	7,886	4.66	716,096	2.54		,486.33	000000
19	HIM	1,324	0.78	157,153	0.15		,281.61	000000
20	WE	1,868	1.10	306,842	0.29		,279.86	000000

**Figure 2.1. The top 20 keywords identified in Pickthall translation**

## 2.7. Further comparison

Ultimately, we have three individual distinctive separate corpora which are in chapters 4, 5 and 6 separately analysed. In chapter seven therefore we compare the three corpora with each other and then compare them with the original text to check if the primings that may be supposed to be created by the Arabic text have their parallels in the translations and to decide which translation is the most accurate and close to the original text. In order to investigate whether translators have maintained the primings associated with the original Arabic or introduced new ones, I have looked at a selection of words in their contexts. I investigate

whether the collocations, semantic associations and other primings of the search words in the English translations reflect the likely primings of a reader of the original Arabic of the Quran text or whether the English primings are different from those of the original Arabic. In the event of their being different I then examine whether they have any implications for the way in which the text might be read by English readers. My concern in each translation is to describe the data and then compare it with the BNC, relating it to the original Arabic where appropriate. I first start by looking at collocation, and then look at semantic association, pragmatic association, colligation and finally textual semantic association as appropriate. Once I have formed a picture of the primings characteristically associated with the search words in the Quranic text in translation, I will then be able to see whether there have been shifts in conveying the meaning behind the collocations.

## **2.8. Criteria for identifying collocation, colligation and other lexical relationships.**

I am treating as a collocation any word identified by Wordsmith as a collocate particularly words with comparatively high frequency. For example, *painful* is a common immediate collocate occurring 65 times to the left of *torment* in the Irving translation. When we talk about the criteria for a collocation or a colligation, a judgement has to be made on what is significant in terms of frequency so if a collocate appears in a particular position more frequently than in other positions, then I focus on that position in my analysis and my calculations. If there is a reasonable spread across the range of positions then I take account of the full range in my calculations. For example the verb *show* as a left collocate of *mercy* in QIT occurs 15 times in total; seven of these occurrences appear in L1 position and seven appear in L2 position, with the 15 left collocates accounting for 10.1% of the instances of *mercy* in QIT.

If two positions have nearly the same number of occurrences; I look at both positions. Again the criterion is what is significant in terms of high frequency; I also examine cases where certain positions have got vastly more instances than the others. For example, the collocation of *torment* with the subject pronoun *they* occurs 69 times in total, 27 of which occur in L4 position accounting for 8.8% of all instances of *torment* in QIT. In such a case I would want to examine carefully the L4 position of the collocate because of its greater frequency. If however, the total occurrence of a particular collocate in any particular position is small, then I consider the whole range of positions in accounting for the collocate's use. For instance *taste* as a collocate of *torment* as identified by Wordsmith occurs 25 times in total; 18 of these occur in L2 position, six occur in L1 position and one occurs in L3 position. The collocation of *torment* with *taste* in total accounts for 8.2% of the instances of *torment* in the QIT. In this case, despite the fact that there are 18 instances of the collocate, I consider the full range because the total number of occurrences is not large. My analytical procedure therefore differs from one word to another depending on how the collocates are spread across the different positions of a word.

Sometimes the key factor is grammatical as in the case of *they* as a collocate of *torment* where *they* is the subject of the clause which contains *torment* in every case. So the relationship is with the subject *they* of the clause with *torment* as object. Whereas in cases such as *painful torment*, *severe torment* and the like attention is given to the word immediately to the left. In the case of *they will have torment* the crucial factor is not position but grammatical relationship. The implication then is that the way a collocation is recognized and analysed differs to some extent from one word to another.

When it comes to colligation I analyse the environment of the word in question to see whether any particular grammatical pattern occurs with an above average frequency. I identify grammatical patterns that are strikingly more common in a particular context than

they seem to be in the language as a whole. For example, in the case of the colligation of *mercy* with possessives, it is noted that *mercy* occurs often with possessive determiners and then this co-occurrence is considered in comparator corpora.

When it comes to semantic association I identify in the environment words or phrases that belong to the same semantic set or which share a clear common sense such that we can say there is a shared semantic quality. In this case, unlike collocation and unlike colligation, there is room for disagreement but I cautiously try to identify only those instances of common semantic sharedness that would attract a general measure of agreement. I actually identify two kinds of semantic associations. The first is where words that belong to a semantic set are typically in the same position in relation to the search word. For example if one found in a corpus the pattern *I bought myself a green coat/blue coat/ red coat* etc, the semantic association with *coat* would clearly be tied to L1 position. This kind of association has an element of colligation about it too because each instance is made up of indefinite article + colour adjective + N. Typically semantic associations will have one or more collocations which are central to it, e.g. *green coat/ blue coat/ black coat*, but there will typically be other colours that will occur with *coat* that do not meet the criteria for treatment as collocates but do belong to the same semantic set.

The other kind of semantic association is not associated with a particular position. Often this kind of semantic association requires us to consider co-occurrence within the boundaries of the sentence or extend the range of words on either side. Where this happens, I note the criterion in use for each case.

The criteria used to identify pragmatic associations are the same as those used to identify semantic association. The difference lies not in the criteria for identification but in the use to

which the association is put. Again, the presence of key collocations may be a clue as to the existence of a larger pragmatic association.

In the case of Textual Semantic Association I have of course to cross the sentence boundary on occasion and the focus is given to the larger context in which the search word occurs.

## **2.9. Lexical Priming Theory**

Corpus linguists frequently argue that words do not have meaning by themselves but get their meaning by being a part of a large context. (e.g. Teubert and Cermakova 2007). In other words it is part of our knowledge of the word that it co-occurs with other words. So we learn words when we hear them and read them in the context in which they appear. We do not learn words as isolated items; we do not learn the grammar and then separately learn the words as the traditional view of language believes. But we learn them as groups, as collocations, and then from these we learn the colligations and semantic associations and other aspects of the language. Hoey looks at this in terms of lexical priming theory, which argues that language is acquired by means of storing the words we encounter in our minds together with their contexts and that acquisition involves us in processing the context and detecting patterns within the context. Suppose we acquire the word *mercy* through reading the Quran; as we read the Quran, we will be storing all the instances of *mercy* in our heads together with the context in which they appear. From this store we will come, as we shall show later, to associate it with compassion, forgiveness etc. The more *mercy* co-occurs with such terms, the more the meaning of the word is the product of the whole range of words with which it contains.

Sinclair (2004) argues that the meaning comes as a chunk, not as single words, and that is why a word such as *mercy* has so many meanings. *Mercy* by itself has a potential meaning

and then when it is linked up with words it is primed to co-occur with, it acquires extra or more specific meanings.

## 2.10. Collocation

The concept of collocation has been defined by many linguists and all focus on the greater than expected co-occurrence of a word. Many also focus on the way that part of the meaning of a word relates to the words that accompany it.

Sinclair (1991: 170) defines collocation as “the occurrence of two or more words within a short span of each other in a text.”

Clear (1993: 277) has studied collocations as a “recurrent co-occurrence of words”

Collocation is fundamentally a psychological concept. What has to be accounted for is the recurrent co-occurrence of words. In lexical priming theory Hoey (2005:8) accounts for collocation as we have seen, by assuming that we are primed by our repeated encounters with the words in combination and that we learn or acquire a word through encounters with it, that is by storing words with their contexts in our mind, and then processing the contexts and detecting patterns within the context.

Any particular collocation will occur only in certain genres. For example the word prophet co-occurs with the vocative *O* in the phrase *O prophet* in translations of the Quran. It does not occur with this collocation in ordinary conversations, nor in academic writing, but does occur in religious writing; it is primed to occur in that domain.

To sum up, collocation occurs when two words occur together with a greater frequency than would be expected on the basis of the simple random occurrence of words in the language.



The notion of collocation will be investigated in detail through analysis of selected words from the Quran corpus and the BNC.

But the theory of priming (Hoey. 2005) accounts for more than just collocations, it accounts for other features of the language which will be discussed in this chapter. They are as follows:

Every word is primed to occur with particular semantic sets; these are its semantic associations.

Every word is primed to occur in association with particular pragmatic functions; these are its pragmatic associations.

Every word is primed to occur in (or avoid) certain grammatical positions, and to occur in (or avoid) certain grammatical functions; these are its colligations

Every word is primed for use in one or more grammatical roles; these are its grammatical categories.

When a word is polysemous, the collocations, semantic associations and colligations of one sense of the word differ from those of its other senses. (p.13)

## 2.11. Features of priming

Hoey (2005: 9) argues that collocation priming is not a permanent feature of a word, but that each use we make of the word, and each new encounter, either reinforces the priming or loosens it. If the latter happens and to the extent that it happens, the lexical items shift slightly in meaning and function. This is what Hoey labels a *Drift in the priming*.

One important point about collocational priming is that part of our knowledge of a lexical item is that it is used in certain kinds of context, in certain kinds of genre. He gives the example of the phrase *in winter*, which, he says, is:

primed for use in travel writing whereas the phrase *during the winter months*, which means more or less the same, is primed for use in gardening writing. (Hoey 2005: 10)

This is what he names *contextual limitation*. It is a collocation limited to a particular genre. Another example is the contextual limitation of *recent* and *research* to academic writing only.

Another feature of priming is *nesting*; Hoey (2005: 8-9) says that this occurs when a word which is loaded with co-text that helps us understand the meaning of it combines with other particular words in particular kinds of context to create a combination that itself primed differently from the individual words. For example, *winter* collocates with *in*, producing the phrase *in winter* and the phrase *in winter* collocates with a number of forms of the word BE (Hoey, *ibid*). Another example is the word *hearing* in Pickthall's translation of the Quran which collocates with *and* (nine occurrences). Five of these occurrences of *hearing and* co-occur with *sight* (*their sight, your sight, the sight, sight*), and three of the instances of *hearing and* (the, their, your, 0) *sight* occur with *and* (*the*) *heart* (*s*). In this way, lexical items are nested, combined and created.

The notion of priming constitutes a claim that the mind has a mental concordance of every word that has been acquired in a particular context and we use this mental concordance to process the contexts and infer patterns from the contexts a word appears in (Hoey *ibid*).

To sum up, it can be said that the lexical priming theory accounts for collocation and challenges traditional views of language. This takes us to the first claim or hypothesis of the theory that every word is primed to occur with particular other words; these are its collocates. In chapter four we consider the collocates of key words of the Quran in translations.

The second concept that I refer to is the concept of semantic association.

## 2.12. Semantic Association

Hoey associates the concept of Semantic Association with Sinclair and his work on semantic prosody and semantic association. He calls it semantic preference. When Sinclair (1991) talks of prosody, he notes that:

Many uses of words and phrases show a tendency to occur in a certain semantic environment. For example, the verb *happen* is associated with unpleasant things accidents and the like. (112)

He also shows that the subject of the phrasal verb *set in* mostly refers to unpleasant states of affairs, for example, *rot, decay, malaise, despair, ill* etc.

Stubbs (1995) confirms Sinclair's claim that *sets in* is mainly associated with "unpleasant" things, finding only one "pleasant" example. Stubbs extends the notion of semantic prosody in his study of the lemma *cause* in a 1 million word corpus (LOB) showing that negative collocates account for nearly 80% of instances of *cause*, with 18% being neutral and only 2% being positive.

Collocates which occurred as subject of the verb CAUSE or as prepositional object of the noun CAUSE include: abandonment, accident, alarm, anger, annoyance, antagonism, anxiety, concern, confusion, crisis, damage, death, doubt, danger, disaster, frustration

Stubbs (2001: 47)

On the same lines, Louw (1993) points out that *bent on* usually collocates with unpleasant items such as *harrying* and *mayhem*.

Hoey (2005: 24) mentions that semantic association "exists when a word or word sequence is associated in the mind of a language user with a semantic set or class". What this means is that our minds group words into certain kinds of sets together; the implication is that speakers may differ in the way they do this. To illustrate this, we could say that one person might put

the words *guidance*, *forgiveness*, *compassion* and *warning* into one set (acts by God) but another person might put them all in the same set except for the word *warning* because *guidance*, *forgiveness*, and *compassion* are positive whereas *warning* is negative.

Semantic association occurs when a word occurs with an above average frequency with members of a semantic set. A good example might be the word *cook* which occurs quite often in combination such as *cook rice*, *cook meal*, *cook supper*, *cook dinner*, *cook lunch* etc so we have here a semantic set of all kinds of meal. Some of the members of any particular set will also be collocates.

One can study linguistic phenomena either as they appear in a particular text or as they apply in the use of a particular word. Hoey considered the operation of semantic association of the noun *consequence* in its meaning of *result* as a continuation of Stubbs' work on the verb *cause*. From a concordance of 1,817 lines drawn from the Guardian corpus and from a small spoken corpus, he found 456 instances of *consequence* premodified by an adjective. He then classified the adjectives according to their semantic similarities.

The first semantic association found in his corpus was with a set of logical adjectives and this 'logical' association accounted for 59 % of all the premodifying adjectives in his data.

The next strongest association was that with negative adjectives; this supported Louw's claim (1993) that *consequence* has a semantic association with negativity. This association accounted for 15% of the cases examined and included items like *awful*, *dire*, *appalling*, *sad*, and *regrettable*.

The third semantic association found in the data indicates the seriousness of the consequence and this category accounts for 11% and include items such as *serious*, *important*, *significant* and *modest*.

The final association observed in the data were adjectives that referred to the unexpectedness of the consequence, represented by words such as *unintended*, *odd*, and *strange* and this accounted for 6% of the examples examined.

### **2.13. The concept of semantic prosody**

Separately there was the idea of semantic prosody. Early work on semantic prosody was associating words with negatives or positives. Then both Stubbs and Hoey separately tried to extend the notion so Hoey (1997) argues that one can use prosody both for negatives or positives and also for other relationships. Stubbs (1995) does the same. When he talks about *cause* he talks about causing negatives, the traditional use of prosody, but he also talks about them being medical—causes medical things (e.g. cancer, heart attacks) and that is an extension that goes beyond positives and negatives. Sinclair defined it in terms of the outcome for the reader or the listener of all the lexical choices made and co-occurrences selected and he used the term semantic preference for the kind of situation described by Stubbs. That forced both Hoey and Stubbs to change their terms. Stubbs now uses the phrase discourse prosody and Hoey uses the phrase semantic association; semantic association for Hoey is almost the same as semantic preference but includes the positives and negatives of semantic prosody. The complication to this picture is that people have started to argue about the validity of the claims made about semantic prosody and about whether it exists and, if so, what it is (e.g. Stewart 2010).

Briefly, we can say that there has been a change in the nature of the terms and that semantic association is most like semantic preference.

## 2.14. The concept of colligation

The concept of colligation goes back to Firth ([ 1951] 1957) who says:

The statement of meaning at the grammatical level is in terms of word and sentence classes or of similar categories and of the inter-relation of those categories in colligation. Grammatical relations should not be regarded as relations between words as such- between ‘ watched’ and ‘ him’ in ‘I watched him’– but between a personal pronoun, first person singular nominative, the past tense of a transitive verb and the third person singular in the oblique or adjective form. (13)

In his definition Firth talked about the relationship of whole class to another whole class whereas for Halliday a particular word may associate with a grammatical class. For example the verb *smell* has an association with the grammatical class of (evaluative) adjectives – *it smells tasty, it smells delicious, it smells sweet, it smells nice, it smells spicy.*

Halliday (1976) is also concerned with the position of the word, noting, for example, that certain words associate with the end of sentences.

The notion of colligation was revived by Sinclair (1991) and Hoey (2005). Indeed Sinclair (1991: 112) points to the notion of colligation implicitly when he notices that ‘many uses of words and phrases show a tendency to co-occur with certain grammatical choices. For example the phrasal verb *set about*, in its meaning of something like ‘inaugurate’, is closely associated with a following verb in the-*ing* form, for example, *set about leaving*...What is more, the second verb is usually transitive, for example, *set about testing it*’.

Hoey (2005) defines colligation as

A lexical item may be primed to co-occur with another lexical item, it also may be primed to occur in or with a particular grammatical function. Alternatively, it may be primed to favour or avoid appearance in or co-occurrence with a particular grammatical function. (43)

He describes colligation as follows:

The grammatical company a word or word sequence keeps (or avoids keeping) either with its own group or at a higher rank. The grammatical functions preferred or avoided by the group in which the word or word sequence participates. The place in a sequence that a word or word sequence prefers (or avoids). (43)

So we can talk about colligation in terms of form, structure, and function. Colligates may be positive or negative, so, for example, a particular word may have a strong positive colligation with the grammatical function of object but a negative colligation with the grammatical function of Subject (i.e. it does not occur as Subject as often as would be expected on the basis of random distribution). A collocation or colligation can be strong or weak. This gives rise to the possibility that a word might have a strong colligation in English and a weaker one in Arabic.

An important addition that Hoey makes to the definition of colligation is that he includes within colligation the position of a word in a sentence. So a word may prefer to occur at the beginning of a sentence or may avoid occurring in initial position. He labels this *Textual colligation*.

Textual colligation concerns the larger context in which the word occurs. For example, when we look at the phrase *in the name of Allah, the most merciful the most compassionate* in the Quran, we find that this phrase is always recited at the beginning of a Quran chapter. It appears at the beginning of a chapter 100 % of the time; that is an example of an extremely strong textual colligation. Another example of textual colligation is that in Islam as well as in Christianity we have the word *Amen* and it occurs 95% of the time at the end of a text. It does not have to; there are other places it can occur; but it has a very strong textual colligation for occurrence at the end of a text which will itself be a particular kind of text (a prayer).

## **2.15. Introducing the BNC**

The British National Corpus is a widely used and publicly available 100 million word general corpus designed to reflect in a reasonably balanced way the ways English was used in speech and writing at the time it was compiled (though the written word predominates). It consists of over 4,000 files and the written texts which comprise 90% of the corpus were selected to reflect a range of genres, domains and subject matter, though the corpus contains unpublished as well as published material. The spoken part for the most part is made up of the ordinary language of families, friends and work colleagues (Thomas & Short 1996)

Apparent features found in the Quran in translation were checked against the British National Corpus to find out whether they were actually real features of the Quran in translation or whether they were features of the language in general.

## **2.16. The Translations used**

### **2.16.1. Pickthall's translation**

Mohammed Marmaduke Pickthall agrees with other scholars on the untranslatability of the Quran. He wrote "The Quran cannot be translated" and named his translation "*The meaning of the Glorious Quran*", published in 1930 in New York. Pickthall stated that his translation is only a translation of the message of the Quran and not the words of the Quran reflected in the original Arabic text. Translating the message of the Quran was his main concern once he embraced Islam and he consulted Arab scholars from Alazhar in Egypt. His translation was accepted by the Council of Pakistan and received satisfactorily (Hadhrami, 2002). Pickthall's translation can be found on the following website: [www.mlivo.com/english.htm](http://www.mlivo.com/english.htm).



### **2.16.2. Irving's Translation**

Dr. Irving was educated in Toronto and embraced Islam in the 1930's in Toronto. He never liked the word convert because of its connotations. He defines himself as a native- born Muslim. He wanted to make the Quran accessible to the youth in North America so he published in 1985 a translation of the holy Quran in American English. In the introduction of his translation he strongly emphasized the importance and urgency of a translation in modern English. His translation was accepted by Muslims and some of them have declared that his translation still sounds new and fresh in spite of the many translations that have appeared since then. Irving's translation of the holy Quran can be found on the same website as Pickthall's.

### **2.16.3. Taqi's Translation**

Taqi's interpretation of the meaning of the Noble Quran, as he refers to it, was made by an Arabic speaker, Dr Mohammad Taqi, and assisted by Khan. It is widely spread among Muslim non-Arabic speakers and has been accepted as satisfactory by the majority who read it. However, some Muslims have criticized the translation because of the many commentary notes that it uses (Sheila, 2006) This translation with the Arabic text can be viewed online on <http://www.fatawa-online.com>. It is also available online at <http://quranline.tripod.com/Qur-Khan.htm>. A revised edition of this translation, "*Interpretation of the Meanings of the Noble Quran*", was published by Darussalam, in Riyadh, in the year 1997 (Nassimi, 2008: 87). The translation is not without its critics, Nassimi claims:

The translation of Hilali and Khan is more popular among the Muslims who prefer to understand the meaning of the Qur'an with a literal and traditional approach only based on the understanding of early Muslims. While this is a useful and appropriate approach for many verses and teachings of the Qur'an (e.g., Muhkamat and injunctions), many other verses of the Qur'an can be better understood and appreciated when they are explained in the light of the current

events and issues of the world, the recent advances in the various means of human's life, the familiar terminology and language of the societies, and so forth. This is based on the fact that the Qur'an is the book of guidance for humanity for all times and places until the Day of Judgment.

## **2.17. Research Goals**

The targets of this study are as follows:

1-To find out the distinctive characteristics of selected words in the Quran in translation lexically, grammatically and in terms of their general meanings.

2-To explore the collocations, colligations, and semantic and pragmatic associations of the words investigated in the three translations.

3-To find out whether the identified words are used with any other kinds of association in the Quran in translation and compare that with their associations in other genres (BNC).

4-To see whether a distinctive pattern for a word indicates a different meaning and explore the most and least frequent meanings.

5- To compare the frequency of a word in the Quran in translation with its frequency in the BNC or across genres.

6- To compare the frequency of a word in the Quran in translation with its frequency in religious texts or in a translation of the Bible.

7-To compare our findings with usage in the BNC to find out whether they are special features of the Quran in translation or are general features of the language and to investigate how the selected words behave in different contexts or genres.

8-To compare the findings with usage in the Bible in translation (the King James Authorised Version) and with religious writing in general as represented by the religious writing components of the BNC.

9- To check whether translators are accurately reflecting the primings associated with the original text.

### **2.18. Chapter Summary**

In this chapter we have looked at the kinds of data I am using and the kinds of corpus methodology I shall be employing. In the coming chapters I put this methodology to use. The next chapter will be the review of literature.

## **CHAPTER 3**

### **THE REVIEW OF LITERATURE**

#### **3.1. Introduction**

This is a study of the Quranic text which I believe as a devoted Muslim to be the world's most important text and it has been translated many times. My concern is how the translations can be studied in such a way that interesting features of the Quran in translation can be discovered. I have therefore created three corpora made up of three translations chosen from versions on line. These translations were written at different times and together form three separate corpora. So they together represent an example of a parallel corpus except that there is no source text in my corpus (although I am familiar with that source text). The question then is what corpus linguistics can tell us about these three corpora. There are a range of ways of looking at texts from a corpus linguistic perspective such as comparing word counts but I am not interested in word counts. We also could look at grammatical patterns but that would mean that we would probably need a larger number of translations, though we do make some grammatical observations in the course of this thesis (when we look at colligations). Alternatively, we could look at whether the lexis chosen is appropriate in the translation, whether the translations differ from each other in the use of lexis and whether the lexis used in the translations has been used differently from the way it is used in the language as whole. And this is what we have done.

Muslims believe that the Quran is the most important text of all time. It is the very heart of Islamic worship; it is the very heart of Islamic Practice. Every Muslim consults and treats the Quran with veneration. Because of this there are issues about its translations. It is an inherent belief of every Muslim that it was given to Mohammed as a text; therefore, it has a divine origin. The Arabic is by any standard exceptional Arabic and quite different from day to day Arabic. There are therefore all sorts of problems about its translations and there are those who

believe that its translations should not exist. There are those who believe its translations should exist but should be seen as teachings about the Quran rather than English equivalents of the Quran and there are a variety of other positions regarding its translation. These issues come to our head when we look at translation theory because translation theory makes it clear that there is no possibility of an exact translation. But we have choices between word to word translation and translation that tries to get the sense of the whole structure. Either way we still are going to encounter a range of problems. For example Mona Baker (1992) identifies a number of problems that translators face, which we will examine later.

We find that there are some items which have a different status in the target language. We have expressions which do not have equivalents in the target language. This kind of problem would seem to support the view that a translation is an interpretation and a commentary on the original rather than a true translation. Nevertheless for it to be effective as a translation it has to be as clear as possible. So one of my concerns is how accurately do the sample translations of the Quran that I have selected represent the language of the Quran. With this in mind, we will explore the differences between the translations. Given the special nature of the Quran as a unique text delivered in a very different context for a very different people in entirely different language, we would expect a faithful translation or commentary translation to reflect features of the language of the original Quran in such a way that they would differ from today's language of English. And this thesis (in subsequent chapters) is interested in exploring the ways in which translations of the Quran represent English differently from the way English is normally used. The implication in terms of lexical priming theory would be that readers would be primed differently by such texts and this would actually mean that they would use the language differently in their religious discourse. It is in the lexis that one would expect such priming differences to lie, and this thesis therefore focuses on differences in the behaviour of selected lexical items. In the following section, however, I briefly review

the history of Holy Quran translations up to the present day. Scholars' and authors' views on translating the Quran will be presented. I will also consider issues introduced in translating the Quran into foreign languages and draw attention to the stylistic distinctiveness of the language of the Holy Quran.

### **3.2. History of Translating the Holy Quran**

Abou Sheishaa (2003:1-2) described the issue of translating the meaning of the Quran as follows:

The translation of the Quran has always been a debatable issue which has brought up many questions related to the permissibility of translating the Quran , and other relevant issues. Muslims believe that the Quran is the Divine literal Word of God, revealed to the prophet Mohammed in the 7<sup>th</sup> century CE. They also believe that the message of the Quran is a universal one, for the prophet was sent as mercy to all mankind. Therefore, the people to whom the Quran was sent understood the Quran comprehensively and undertook the task of transmitting it to the rest of mankind throughout the world.

Abou Sheishaa (2003) points out that the prophet of Islam advised messengers to other countries to master the languages of foreign countries which implies that Quranic instructions would be imparted in those tongues to enable a close understanding of the teachings of the Quran by non-Arabs. There is however no basis for assuming that there existed a direct translation of the whole Quran in the lifetime of the prophet. However, a companion of the prophet, Salman the Persian, did translate chapter 1 into Persian. If translations were to be forbidden, it is arguable that the prophet would have unequivocally advised him to desist from translating the Quranic message. This can be backed up what Tibawi (1962: 4) says that 'other companions of the prophet translated certain verses pertaining to the prophet Jesus and Mary'. Here it is clear that translation into native languages was a matter for serious consideration. Abou Sheishaa also states that the earliest translation of the Quran into Persian

was made in 345 AH/ 956 AC. Another translation was made some time around the year 127 A.H. One wonders though, why it took almost 300 years for a complete translation of the Quran to appear.

God's message was for mankind so it is logical to assume that people who do not speak Arabic need to have the Quran in another language. Tabawi (1962) reports that, Abu Hanifa's suggestion was actually only referring to (reciting) certain short chapters from the Quran in the use of prayers but he nevertheless points to the possibility of the Quran being translated for other purposes. Many of his followers applied the advice to the whole of the Quran.

Khalifa (1995) states that in the mediaeval age non Muslims showed great interest in translating the Quran. The kindness which Muslims showed in treating people and the way they practiced the teachings of the Quran influenced many Europeans, especially these who simply, out of curiosity or otherwise, wanted to know the content of the Quran. Hence Robert Kelton translated the Book into Latin in 1143, although it was 400 years before his work was finally published (in 1543). A paraphrase by Andrea Arrivabere of this book appeared in 1547 and 1647. Andre du Reyer translated the Quran into French. His translation formed the basis for subsequent translations of the 16<sup>th</sup>, 17<sup>th</sup>, and 18<sup>th</sup> centuries. Both the Latin and French versions were found to be inadequate by later translators. In 1698, Father Ludovic Maracci who got his Arabic education from a Turk produced a version which became the basis of many later translations of the Quran.

Trandil (2006) states that the first translation into English from a French version took place in 1688 by Alexander Ross. The Quran was also translated into English from other translations such as the Latin version by George Sale in 1734. The English version of Sale was regarded as the primary source for the translations at that time. He makes an important point that these translations into English were undertaken by non Muslims and non Arabic speakers whose

knowledge of the Arabic language was imperfect. In consequence, these translations include misinterpretations and misunderstandings of the original text.

Khalifa (1995) notes that although Sale spent nearly 25 years in Arabia and gained knowledge and skills in the Arabic language, he depended mostly in his translation on Maracci's Latin version. In spite of the many years which he spent in Arabia, his translation was not accurate and full of defects which indicate that he did not fully understand the Arabic language. Nevertheless his translation went through nearly thirty editions in the course of which it was modified, revised and rewritten many times. It was also retranslated into Dutch in 1742, German in 1764, French in 1750, Russian in 1792, Swedish in 1814 and Bulgarian in 1902.

El-Rakhway (2006) notes that in the 20<sup>th</sup> century, many other Christian missionary translators such as Henry Palmer (in 1880), Richard Bell (in 1939), and Dawood (in 1956) translated the Quran into a range of languages (European and non European). A. J. Arberry's translation of the original Arabic was published in 1955 and was described by Watt, Williams and others as having the "greater literary distinction".

Because of the importance of English as a world language in the 20<sup>th</sup> century Muslims felt that there was a dire need for a faithful translation of the Quran that communicated the meanings of the original text into English with complete accuracy and clarity and they tried their best to communicate the meanings of the Holy Quran in such a way as to help those who were interested grasp the intended meanings of the verses of the Quran accurately and faithfully. Consequently, many translations appeared such as those by Abdul Hakim in 1905.<sup>11</sup>

Another translation of the Quran is by Muhammed Marmaduke Pickthall an English scholar who had accepted Islam. His translation was published in 1930 in London and is one of the

---

<sup>11</sup> Source of the quote was not supplied in the original



translations selected for investigation in this thesis. A translation by Abdullah Yusuf Ali appeared in 1934-1937 followed by many other translations.

### 3.3. Views on translating the Quran.

Hosni (1990: 93) says:

Because of the inimitable style of the Quran and its subject matter, the Orthodox argued that the Quran is untranslatable. They maintain that the book is inimitable and that a believer should learn the original Arabic to be able to understand and comprehend its meanings.

Abu Hurairah and Ibn Hajar<sup>12</sup> imply however that interpreting the meaning of the sacred Quran into other languages is permissible. Tibawi (1962) writes that Abu Hurairah “relates that the people of the Book<sup>13</sup> (which in this case refer to the Jews only) used to read the Torah in Hebrew and interpret it to the Muslims in Arabic and that the prophet did not disapprove”.

Another point of view is that of Badawi (2008) who argues that rendering the Quran into other languages is not an easy task to undertake in that the multiplicity of the meanings of the verses will not be reflected accurately and will not be communicated fully. He states that

The Quranic words are considered sublime. Allah challenged the Arabs to produce a literary work of a similar calibre like the Quran. The Arabs found it an unapproachable task despite their well-known eloquence and literary prowess.

---

<sup>12</sup> Information of *when* and *where* is missing in the article.

<sup>13</sup> “People of the Book” Those whom the Quran cites as having received revealed scriptures: “Surely they that believe, and those of Jewry, and the christians, and those Sabians, who believe in God and the Last Day, and work righteousness- their wage awaits them with their Lord, and no fear shall be on them, neither shall they sorrow” Quran (2: 58 and similar to 5:69) quoted from the new encyclopedia in Islam (2001) Glasse, Cyril). “People of the Book” [i.e. Scripture] is the literal translation of *ahl al-kitab*, a quranic term used to designate both Jews and Christians as believers in a revealed book. McAuliff (2004:36) Vol. 4

If this was the case with the native –speakers of Arabic in the Arabian Peninsula, then we can safely assume that translation of the Quran is an extremely difficult endeavour in trying to reflect the shades of meaning in another language. This inevitably changes the original text. (p.1)

Badawi states that it is well known, as emphasised by many jurists, that literal translation does not convey the exact meaning of the original texts, and therefore it has been forbidden in the case of the Quran, because it is the word of God as passed down through the medium of angel Gabriel to the prophet. Even if translations of God’s word cannot be considered the direct words of God, they are attempts at giving the intended meanings of the message of God.

El-Farran (2006) states that the “translation of the Quran cannot be considered as the Quran itself” and he suggests that it is best considered as an interpretation of the Quran from the translator’s point of view, because any translator will come across difficulties in translating and errors might be committed regardless of his intention. If translations are to be regarded as interpretations, the question arises of whose interpretations are to be judged to be acceptable. The very nature of the Quran, its sublime eloquence, multiplicity of meanings, implicit meanings which are almost impossible to translate the connotations of its vocabulary and nobility of its construction, preclude the possibility of providing equivalence for it in any language, including modern Arabic.

Tibawi (1962) cites Al-Ghazali (b,450 AH) as saying that the Quran is untranslatable and insisting that a Muslim believer must not translate it into Persian or Turkish. Al-Ghazali is quoted as saying:

“Some Arabic words have no equivalent Persian words, and some have equivalents, but the Persian are not accustomed to use them metaphorically as Arabs do...” (p.8)

Tibawi emphasizes Al-Ghazali's view that the Arabic wording must remain the same with no changes as it has been transmitted. He says:

To the mind of Al- Ghazali, the danger from change of wording or translation affects the divine attributes, a danger which must be avoided by strict adherence to the Arabic. (p.8)

Murata and Chittick (2004: 1) support the view that the outcome of the translation is not something that can be called the Quran but is only the author's view of the Quran. They say:

A translation of the koran is not the Koran.. but an interpretation of its meaning. The Koran has been translated dozens of times into English. Each translation represents one person's understanding of the text, each is significantly different from the others, and none is the Koran itself. There is but one Word, but there are as many interpretations of that Word as there are readers.

### **3.4. Problems of Translating the Quran.**

We now turn to consider the problems that might occur in translating the Quran. (Badawi 2008: 1) connects general problems of translation to the problems of translating Arabic:

Many problems are likely to occur when translating between any two languages. Some aspects of translation are quite difficult regardless of which language one is translating to or from. However, we should draw attention to the fact that the Arabic language has certain characteristics that make it even more difficult to translate, in addition to other characteristics that are peculiar to the Quran itself as a standard of the Arabic language.

The sections that follow explore some of the characteristics of Arabic that are difficult to translate.

#### **3.4.1. Rhetorical problems**

The Arabic language has a rich vocabulary in which words are used to convey many meanings and in which the same words may have different shades of meaning, depending on

context.. This feature is called Eejaaz (Brevity) where a word or expression expresses more than one meaning. A translation can easily miss the multiplicity of significance attached to such a word in the Quran because the target language does not have an equivalent word or expression or because the translator is not aware of the multiple meanings of a particular word. This is illustrated in Qadhi's words (1999: 365) as follows:

Jeffery translates 17:60 as, "Verily thy Lord is round about the people," and Rodwell has a similar, "Verily thy Lord is round about mankind." The word that they translated as 'round about' in reality means 'encompassed', meaning that Allah has full control over His creatures and none of them can evade His Judgement.

Another feature is that sometimes it is the case that we have multiplicity of words with subtle differences in meaning so that they all get translated as the same word. To illustrate this we have the divine attributes of Allah the Almighty such as "*Khaliq- Khalaq- Fatir, Badia- Bari*. are all usually translated as 'Creator' or 'Originator'. However, each one of them has a particular meaning and connotations that are not the same as those for the others. Badawi (2008: 3)

Abdulwali (2007: 1-15) says that "part of the difficulty in translating the Quran is the presence of huge number of difficult and Quran specific words with a wide range of contextual meanings"

### **3.4.2. The absence of Direct TL Counterparts**

Sadiq (2008) argues that a lexical problem a translator encounters is a lack of direct vocabulary equivalents in the TL. In this case the meaning of the SL word can be paraphrased or interpreted by another word or phrase that has a similar meaning. Take for example, 44:54 which can be roughly translated as "We shall wed them to maidens with large, dark eyes" In the text of the original Quran we have the phrase *hurun een* which has no counterpart in the

TL but can be paraphrased more fully as “extremely beautiful females of bright complexion and lovely eyes.” Even in this paraphrase, though, the meaning is still not conveyed as accurately as it should be.

### 3.4.3. Synonyms

Al-Said Mustafa (1989) states that Al-Suyuty (911 A.H. p92) reports that Al-Mubbarid denied the existence of synonyms in the Quran. Palmer<sup>14</sup> (1976: p89) maintains that

There are no real synonyms, that no two words have exactly the same meaning. Nevertheless subtle differences in meanings of synonyms seem to be overlooked when translating the Quran into English.

In support of Al-Mubbarid’s position, the Arabic words *matar* and *gaith* can both be rendered as ‘rain’ in English but cannot be regarded as synonyms since the word *matar* has negative connotations and the word *gaith* has positive connotations. Such subtle differences are usually not reflected in translations and therefore the outcome is inaccurate translation.

Consider the following examples quoted from Pickthall’s translation

“And We **rained a rain** upon them . See now the nature of the consequences for evildoers!” 7:84

“So when Our commandment came to pass ; We overthrew (that township) and **rained upon** it stones of clay; one after another.” 82: 11

“And We utterly confounded them, and We **rained upon** them stones of heated clay.”74: 15

“And We **rained on** them a **rain**. And dreadful is the **rain** of those who have been warned.” 173: 26

“And when they said: O Allah! If this be indeed the truth from You, then **rain down** stones on us or bring on us some painful doom.” 32: 8

In all of these, the phrase **rained a rain** is used as an equivalent to the Arabic words *amtarna matara*.

---

<sup>14</sup> No bibliographic details were supplied

Consider, now, how the word *algaith* has been rendered in the following verses.

“He sends down *the rain*, and knows that which is in the wombs.” 31: 34

“And He it is Who sends down *the saving rain* after they have despaired, and spreads out His mercy.” 42: 28

“Know that the life of the world is only play, and idle talk, and pageantry, and boasting among you and rivalry in respect of wealth and children; as the likeness of vegetation after *rain*,” 57:20

Note that the connotations and subtle differences between *gaith* and *matar* are missing in these translations, except in so far as they are provided by the context.

#### 3.4.4. Collocations

Alsaid (ibid) comments:

Though literal translation of Arabic collocations is possible in English, it is unlikely that English collocations function as equivalents of the Arabic ones.

He gives the following example.

يَوْمَ تَبْيَضُّ وُجُوهٌ وَتَسْوَدُّ وُجُوهٌ

Yawma Tabyaddu Wujūhun Wa Taswaddu Wujūh

This verse can be translated as follows:

“On the Day when some faces will become whitened and other faces will become blackened”. 106. 3.

Daryabadi translation (2002)

“On the Day [some] faces will turn white and [some] faces will turn black”. 106.3

Saheeh International translation (2009)

“ On the day when faces are whitened and faces are blackened.

Abdulhaqq &Bewley (1999)

The literal translations above are almost the same, using similar words: “whitened” “blackened” “turn white” “turn black” or “whiten” “blacken” as equivalents to the Arabic words *tabyaddu* and *taswaddu*. None of them, however, convey the intended meaning of the verse. The collocation in English does not reflect the Arabic collocation where, for example, *white* has a positive meaning when it associates with *face* in Arabic but it has a negative meaning when it associates with *face* in English.

### 3.4.5. Similarity in pronunciation

Badawi (2008) states that “confusion between two Arabic words can also occur”. He gives the example of two words which have the same letters and the same vowels but in which one vowel is longer than the other. For example, in chapter 6 Allah Almighty says that He has *Mafateh Al- Ghaib* i.e. the clues of the Unseen:

وَعِنْدَهُ مَفَاتِحُ الْغَيْبِ لَا يَعْلَمُهَا إِلَّا هُوَ

Wa `Indahu Mafātihū Al-Ghaybi Lā Ya`lamuhā 'Illā Hu<sup>15</sup>

“And with Him are the clues of the Unseen”. 6: 5

But the following translations use *keys* instead of *clues*

“And with Him are the keys of the invisible.” Pickthall translation (2002)

“And with Him are the keys of the Unseen; none knows them but He.” Daryabadi Translation (1981)

“And with Him are the keys of the unseen; none knows them except Him.” Saheeh International Translation (2009)

---

<sup>15</sup> The text is not a substitute of the original Arabic Holy Quran.

The keys of the Unseen are in His possession. No one knows them but Him.”

Abdalhaqq & Bewley Translation (1999)

The translators above have confused the Arabic word *mafateh* (clues) with the Arabic word *mafateeh* (keys). The word *mafateh* which means *clues* has a short vowel (e) whereas the word *mafateeh* which means *keys* has a long vowel (ee) so the words look and sound almost the same but the difference in vowels makes a big difference in meaning. In other words a change of a vowel in the Arabic language entirely changes the meaning. This is problematic especially for translators who lack knowledge of Arabic grammar and phonology.

### 3.5. Style of the Arabic Language

Elsayed (1988) notes that the language of the Quran<sup>16</sup> is distinctive in a number of ways; it is not poetry for it does not observe the metre and rhyme of poetic scansion; nor is it prose as contemporary custom in writing prose was quite different. Verses in the Quran are of varying lengths depending on theme and the context of their revelation, and one notices that different parts demand different speeds of reading for effectiveness.

Another linguistic feature which is not easily translated is cohesion. The following linguistic analysis is a good example of the distinctiveness of cohesion of the Quranic style.

وَالذَّاكِرِينَ اللَّهَ كَثِيرًا وَالذَّاكِرَاتِ

Wa Adh-Dhākirīna Al-Laha Kathīrāan Wa Adh-Dhākirāt

“Men who remember Allah much and women who remember” 33:36

---

<sup>16</sup> Although Arabic as a language and a literary tradition was quite well developed by the time of Mohammad’s prophetic activity, it was only after the emergence of Islam with its founding scripture in Arabic that the language reached its utmost capacity of expressions, and the literature its highest point of complexity and sophistication. (McAuliff. 2003: 213 Vol: 3)



This verse is translated as below, but it does not produce the desired effect

“Men who remember Allah much and Women who remember Allah much”

The reason why the Quran has two clauses is that it emphasizes the importance of remembering Allah for both men and women, but the whole sentence is not repeated again; just the word ‘remember’ is repeated. So the original has an elegance about it which is not available in the English.

One important stylistic feature of the Arabic language of the Quran is what is called Al-iltifat (shift). Alsaïd (1989: 97-98) states:

A peculiar though very important feature of the the Quranic language is the rhetoric device known as al-iltifat. Here the speaker or writer begin a discourse by a pronoun and suddenly has recourse to a different pronoun, grammatically discordant in English, but perfectly acceptable in Arabic. Translation, therefore, become almost impossible because of its uniqueness in the original language.

### 3.5.1. Al-iltifat (shift) from first to second person

One type of Al-iltifat is from first person to second person as in surah 36:22

Verse 22 might be literally translated as:

وَمَا لِي لَا أُعْبُدُ الَّذِي فَطَرَنِي وَإِلَيْهِ تُرْجَعُونَ

Wa Mā Liya Lā 'A`budu Al-Ladhī Faṭaranī Wa 'Ilayhi Turja`ūn

“Why should I not worship Him who created me and to Him you shall go back”

There is a lack of agreement between the pronoun in the second clause and the pronoun in the first clause. of “why shouldn’t you worship the one who created you and unto Him you shall return”. The rhetorical effect is not reflected in the English; however, the use of the pronoun *you* in the second clause is of high importance to the meaning of the ayah The reason is that

the pronoun *I* in the first clause in the verse above refers to the speaker who is the prophet Mohammed who is in this context addressing the disbelievers of the Quraish by the use of the pronoun *you* in the plural meaning. So the language distinguishes Mohammed's experience of Allah from the likely different fate of his disbelieving audience.

### 3.5.2. From second to First person

Another verse where this unusual switch of pronouns occurs is verse 90: 11. Verse 90 can be translated literally as:

وَاسْتَغْفِرُوا رَبَّكُمْ ثُمَّ تُوبُوا إِلَيْهِ إِنَّ رَبِّي رَحِيمٌ وَدُودٌ

Wa Astaghfirū Rabbakum Thumma Tūbū 'Ilayhi ۞ 'Inna Rabbī Rahīmun Wadūd

“And ask forgiveness of your Lord and turn unto Him in repentance. Verily, my Lord is Most Merciful, Most Loving.” Taqi Translation (1996)

Note here that *my* in the second clause does not go with *your* in the first clause. Other ways in which the cohesion and rhetorical organization of the Quran differs from that of other texts are that it repeats certain verses and themes at times, shifts topics, and often relates narratives in summarized form.

The point here is that literal translations are hard to understand rather than inaccurate because of textual possibilities in Arabic that are not available in English.

Another Quranic stylistic feature is the frequent use of *qul* (*say, speak*). More than two hundred passages begin with the Arabic word *qul* (*say*) addressing prophet Mohammad to say what follows in reply to a question, to explain a matter of faith, or to announce a legal ruling.

Wansbrough, J (2004: 13) shows that *qul* has a number of Quran specific purposes appearing after statements beginning *yas'alunaka* (they ask you). *Qul* often identifies prayer, as well as

other aspects of liturgy. However, importantly, *qul* is not restricted to statements made by Allah. Statements not made by Allah usually contain a finite verb form.

We have looked at the problems involved in translating the Quran. Now we turn to a brief introduction to corpus linguistics and to a consideration of the advantages of using corpus linguistics techniques in analysing data of the kind we are considering. We also look again at the nature of translation, but this time from a linguistic and more general prospective.

### **3.6. Definition of Corpus and the concept of corpus linguistics**

In order to study the questions outlined in the first section, we need a computer held corpus. Teubert and Cermakova (2007: 62) defines a corpus as “a collection of texts chosen to characterize a particular use of language”

Here it is important to note that corpus data need to be interpreted by the researcher; it is up to researchers to find reasons and interpretations for their discoveries within a corpus. Explanations for findings which are found may weaken or strengthen the claims made by the researcher on a particular linguistic issue.

Kennedy (1998) states the purpose of designing a corpus and the importance of comparing a corpus with other corpora, noting that “a corpus can be analysed and compared with other corpora or parts of corpora to study variation”.

McEnery and Wilson (2004: 1-2) describe the origins of the term corpus and how it is linked to linguistics saying:

The term corpus refers to any body of text written or spoken and when it is used in the context of modern linguistics it tends to have more specific connotations or implications including: sampling and representativeness, finite size, machine-readable form and a standard referent.

Thomas (2008: 19) defines corpus linguistics and corpus linguists as:

The systematic study of linguistic phenomena using machine readable collections of authentic language use i.e. corpora. And corpus linguists are interested in describing and accounting for how language really works in real life, as evidenced by actual linguistic output, both spoken and written. In answering questions about language, corpus linguists will have to look at language in use- actual samples of language as used by speakers and writers of the language in order to verify the validity or invalidity of a linguistic phenomenon.

Another definition of a corpus by Gries (2009: 7) is as follows:

A machine-readable collection of (spoken or written) texts that were produced in a natural communicative setting, and the collection of texts is compiled with the intention to be representative and balanced with respect to a particular linguistic variety or register or genre and to be analyzed linguistically.

From the above definitions of a corpus we can conclude that a corpus is a collection of texts designed for linguistic analysis purposes and characteristically represents a particular variety of language. It is the linguist's duty to explore and find interpretations for any findings, whether with respect to frequencies of occurrences or with respect to the co-occurrence of words with other words i.e. collocations.

Teubert & Cermakova (2007: 67) point to further areas that corpus linguists are interested in:

The change of frequency of words or units of meaning which means a change in meaning and sometimes a change in the domain in which a word is used. The occurrence of new words and the occurrence of new larger units of meaning

We shall see later examples of words where the change of frequency and change of domain coincide with a change in meaning.

### 3.7. Definitions of corpus linguistics

Corpus linguistics has been defined by McEnery & Wilson (1996:1) as:” the study of language based on examples of real life language use”. Kennedy (1998: 7-8) defines corpus linguistics as the:

Description and explanation of the nature, structure and use of language and languages and with particular matters such as language acquisition, variation and change. Corpus linguistics uses bodies of text as the source of evidence for linguistic description and generalisations.

The analysis of corpus linguistics allows us to see patterns in the language which are invisible to the naked eye. It also allows us to either confirm or refute intuitions we have about the language. In addition, we have a corpus of nearly half a million words and there is no practical way of examining the data manually.

Previous to the use of computers linguists had to rely on their intuitions but the corpus linguist has been given the opportunity to have enough data to prove whether such intuitions are true or not. Because of the absence of large quantities of data ordinary linguistics has often concerned itself with questions of what is possible rather than what actually is happening, resulting in considerable number of articles about unlikely sentences. Chomsky’s famous discussion (1965: 21) of the sentence *flying planes can be dangerous* in which he argued that the sentence’s ambiguity had a structural basis is an example. Chomsky was interested in human competence and not human performance whereas corpus linguists are interested primarily in human performance. Chomsky was interested in what we are capable of doing, not in what people have chosen to do. Corpus linguists on the other hand are interested in why certain original sentences do occur and others never occur. Some sentences in the view of corpus linguists are natural and other sentences are unnatural.

Chomsky's (1957) explanation of the fact that language is productive was that with limited vocabulary and a set of rules, our language faculty allows us to generate an infinite number of utterances. The complaint of linguists in the Chomskyan tradition about corpus linguistics is that it will only tell us what people have said so far. It will not tell us what people are going to say tomorrow. That is certainly true because corpus linguistics cannot predict language change. However, it can tell us more about the meaning of words than standard or Chomskian linguistics. It extracts from large numbers of discourses evidence for how words are characteristically used and what they mean.

Corpus linguistics has also converted linguistics into a true science in that a true science creates hypotheses which are then tested using experimental methods. The experiment makes assumptions about what kind of outcome might be achieved.

### **3.8. The use of corpora in lexical studies**

The use of computers in corpus linguistics helps researchers to find out more up to date information about the function of a particular lexical item from millions of words of text in a few seconds. McEnery (2004: 106-7)

So corpus data are reliable, useful and accurate because the collection of texts being investigated represents a sample of the real language.

### **3.9. The use of corpora in discourse analysis**

Baker (2006:15) argues that discourses never remain the same over a period of time and that what was acceptable discourse in the 1960 might not be acceptable discourse in the 1990s.

The examples that he gives are evidence of discourse change reflected in language use. In the first example he shows the changing frequency of a word use in a diachronic corpus, saying:

If we compare two equal sized corpora of British English containing written texts from the early 1960s and the early 1990s we see that in the 1990s corpus there are various types of words which occur much more frequently than they did in the 1960s corpus: e.g. lexis which reflect the rise of capitalist discourse: *initiative, strategies, capitalist, customer, resources, privatisation, market* and lexis which reflect green discourses: *environmental, global, environment, worldwide, conservation*.

He adds as a further example that nowadays titles of people such as Mr or Mrs are no longer used as they were in the 1960s and suggests that addressing people formally has altogether become less common. He argues that comparing texts over different time periods may show variation in terms of frequency so what used to be a frequent word may no longer be so. Also, the meanings of words change over time. For instance in the 1960s corpus the word *blind* literally used to mean a person who cannot see and it was not a frequent word at that time. However, in the 1990s corpus the word *blind* is frequently used metaphorically and the majority of instances of *blind* are associated with negative words such as *the blind lead the blind, blind panic, turn a blind eye, blind to change*. He notes:

What the corpus data has shown, however, is that the negative metaphorical meaning of *blind* appears to have increased in British English over time. (p.15)

### **3.10. Corpus linguistics and literary stylistics**

The application of corpus linguistic techniques to the study of literature is known as corpus stylistics. Corpus stylistics studies the relationship between meaning and form. Mahlberg (2007) uses the notion of “local textual functions” as a descriptive tool to describe meaning and to show how words cooperate in particular texts. For her work, she uses a corpus of

Dickens' words. The approach that she follows is different from that of others who have investigated clusters in one specific text such as Stubbs (2005). She looks at clusters in more than one text by the same author (Dickens, in this case) and her comparative data is not from a general corpus, but from a closely related 19<sup>th</sup> century fiction corpus. For Mahlberg the identification of clusters is the first step towards discovering a range of characteristics of Dickens texts and giving interpretations to such characteristics.

Biber et al (1999: 992) point out that “three word clusters are extremely common because they are a kind of extended collocational association” but that longer clusters are less common and they tend to be specific to particular texts. In her study of Dickens, Mahlberg finds that some clusters are more frequent in Dickens but never occur in the 19<sup>th</sup> century fiction corpus. In her classification of clusters she talks about ‘label clusters’ and their association with concepts and characters; these are mainly found in individual Dickens’ texts and often never occur in the 19<sup>th</sup> century fiction corpus.

Longer clusters are of some relevance to the present study in that there are cases (which will be discussed in their proper place) of clusters of some length that occur only in translations of the Quran.

### **3.11. Advantages of using electronic text analysis**

Jenny Thomas and Mick Short (1996:112) point to the importance and the benefits of the corpus approach saying “it enables us to test out hypothesis in an explicit, empirical way, and to quantify the presence of categories across text-types”. A point not made so far is that a computerised corpus also forces us to deal with the whole text and not to ignore any part of it that is not convenient to our argument.



### **3.12. Types of Corpora and what they are used for**

Corpora vary in kind according to the uses to which they are to be put. Three kinds of corpora are relevant to my research.

#### **3.12.1. Specialised Corpus**

The first kind is the *specialised corpus*, which is used to study a particular aspect of a language. The collection of texts here depends on the topic chosen for study, so one might want to study the language of magazines or newspapers or the conversations of youth in clubs or as here, the language of holy books. Baker (2006) points to the importance of being selective in choosing our texts when building such a corpus. The size of the corpus here is not as important as the consistency of the corpus. In other words quality is more important than quantity in building a specialised corpus.

Specialised corpora are built in order to address research questions on a particular phenomenon in which a researcher is interested (Teubert and Cemakova 2007: 68). My own corpus is not actually a parallel corpus (see the next section) but is a specialised corpus of translated text. My purpose is to look at the way translations into English have attempted to represent the meanings of the most important text in the Islamic faith. Three corpora of the Quran in translation have been constructed; the keywords of these corpora have been calculated and a small number of words have been selected for analysis. The keywords will be investigated in terms of collocation, semantic association and various other lexical relationships used in Lexical Priming Theory and then the findings of the Quran Corpus analysis will be compared with the BNC to decide whether the linguistic features found are specific to the Quranic text or whether they are simply features of the language as a whole. The findings also will be compared with two other sets of religious writings; the Bible in translation and the religious section of the BNC, in order to find out whether discovered

features of the Quran in translation are features of religious writings in general or whether they are Quran specific features.

### **3.12.2. Comparable corpora and Parallel Corpora**

Ludeling and Kyto (2008: 276-281) mention that

a comparable corpus does not contain translations but consists of texts from different languages which are similar or comparable with regard to a number of parameters such as text type.

On the other hand, they note,

Parallel corpora consist of a source text and its translation into one or more languages.

A parallel corpus is sometime called a translation corpus. Sinclair (1996) describes translation corpora as

Large repositories of the decisions of professional translators, supplied together with the evidence they had for those decisions. Sinclair (1996: 174)

Noel (2003: 739) cited in Ludeling and Kyto, (2008) points to parallel corpora as “ a collection of informants”.

My own corpora are small collection of informants and represent a small repository of the decisions of professional translations, but, as noted above, they are not strictly parallel corpora, since parallel corpora also contain the source text. On the other hand, my corpora are more closely related than the texts found in most specialised corpora.

One more point about parallel corpora is that they may be used to discover and illustrate the similarities and differences found between languages, though they can only do so to the extent that the translations are both accurate representations of the original and natural examples of the target. We turn to such issues in the next section.

### 3.13. Theory of Translation

Now we move on to discuss some important points about the theory of translation starting with Catford's definition of translation. One theory of translation deals with a certain type of relation between languages and therefore is considered a branch of comparative Linguistics. Catford (1967) states that, although the relation between languages is not always symmetrical, it can always be regarded as two-directional. However, translation as a process is always uni-directional: it is always performed in a given direction, from a *Source Language* into a *Target Language*.

Catford (ibid) defines translation as:

The replacement of textual material in one language (SL) by equivalent textual material in another language (TL). (p. 20)

He points to a problematic issue in translation theory which is that of translation equivalence and notes that the translation theory's task is to identify the nature and the conditions of translation equivalence. He argues that it is not everything about the text that is translated but that there may be a simple replacement of grammar and lexis of SL by equivalent TL grammar and lexis; this is not regarded as translation equivalence. There also may not be a replacement at all of SL grammar and lexis but simple transference of SL material into the TL text.

Catford's definition brings up the problem of equivalence between items in SL and their equivalents in TL (Hatim B, and Munday J, 2004: 7). Another definition of translation that comprehensively and accurately addresses the issue of equivalence is that of Hartmann & Stork (1972: 713) as following (cited in Bell, 1991):

Translation is the replacement of a representation of a text in one language by a representation of an equivalent text in a second language.

This definition suggests that the content, i.e. meaning and style, of the original text must be kept in the target language.

They add

Texts in different languages can be equivalent in different degrees (fully or partially equivalent), in respect of different levels of presentation (equivalent in respect of context, of semantics, of grammar, of lexis, etc) and at different ranks (word-for-word, phrase-for-phrase, sentence-for-sentence)

This definition indicates that partial equivalence between two languages might occur but total equivalence between two languages is impossible because two different languages mean that there would be linguistic differences in many aspects between any two languages. Bell (1991: 6-9) confirms this claim, saying that the translation process means changing the form of a language and that in the process it is possible that something will be lost or added to the original text and that translators might find themselves producing faithless translations. He says:

There is no absolute synonymy between words in the same language, so why should anyone be surprised to discover a lack of synonymy between languages.

He continues that the translator has the choice to go either for the free translation in which s/he will maintain the meaning of the original text as accurately as possible or s/he can go for literal translation word -for- word translation. In either case he/she will be criticized for producing inaccurate translation.

The suggestion above is confirmed by Bassnett's two terms *loss* and *gain*. (2002: 36). She comments that sameness does not exist between two languages and that *loss* and *gain* in the

ST and the TT are likely to happen. She also states that much importance is given to discussions on what is missed or lost during the translation process of the ST and that we do not consider that what has been omitted in the ST context may be replaced in the TL context. Another key distinction in translation is that of process and product. Meetham and Hudson (1969) use the terms *process* and *result* and Bell (1991) uses the terms *process* and *product*. Bell points to the importance of these related concepts to a comprehensive and useful theory of translation. He goes on to say that if we agree that the translation process is a mental process, then we must investigate the psychology of perception, information processing and memory. Given that the process involves language and that we need to know how the mind perceives the source text, then we need to investigate in fields which are concerned with both aspects of linguistics and mental issues, namely in the two fields of language: psycholinguistics and sociolinguistics.

The starting point of understanding a text, as he demonstrates, is decoding a signal or a text or an utterance and then encoding the message of that utterance or text. For this we need (1) a *psycholinguistic explanation* and (2) a *text –linguistic or sociolinguistic explanation*

The model of translation shows the transformation of a source language text into a target language text by means of processes which take place within memory: (1) the *analysis* of one language – specific text (the source language text, the SLT) into a universal (non- language–specific) semantic representation and (2) the *synthesis* of that semantic representation into a second language –specific text (the target language text, the TLT).

### **3.14. Issues causing translation problems**

Catford (1967: 94-96) mentions that the failure of translation might be the result of either linguistic or cultural factors. He says:

Translation fails or untranslatability occurs, when it is impossible to build functionally relevant features of the situation into the contextual meaning of the TL text.

So if the source text possesses specific linguistic features and the target language text has no corresponding features then untranslatability or ambiguity takes place. If also a SL item is polysemous and the equivalent item in the target language lacks this feature, then linguistic untranslatability occurs. Linguistic untranslatability also means that the TL has no equivalent collocation which is another way of reflecting difficulty in translation. An example which illustrates the linguistic category is reflected in the ambiguity of a polysemous lexical item. He sees polysemy in terms of context so he describes it saying:

The term polysemy is misleading. It is not a case of one item having several meanings, but of one item having a wide or general contextual meaning, covering a wide range of specific situational features. In any given situation, only one out of this wide range of potentiality, or linguistically relevant features is functionally relevant (Catford 1967: 95-96).

One example of a polysemous lexical word which covers a wide range of contextual meanings in the Quran is *فتنة* *fitnah*; as a noun it can mean a *trial, disbelief and oppression, dissension, a test, punishment*. The translator needs to refer to the context to decide the correct sense for the word in question. This linguistic problem (of polysemy) has been recognized by Nida and Taber (1969: 58-59) as a problem related to *referential meaning*. They give an example of the word *chair* as a polysemous word with multiple meanings; so it can refer to a piece of furniture, a university position or the chairperson at a meeting. The same word has several meanings as a verb and it is the translator's task to examine the environment of the word, i.e. the co- text, to determine the correct sense of the word under investigation. Nida also points to words which have figurative meanings and how it is important for the translator to differentiate all possible meanings of a word in a source text to be able to find an appropriate target text equivalent of the word in question.

The problem of non-equivalence has been fully demonstrated by Baker M, (1992) at different levels and many strategies have been suggested to overcome such problems. I here briefly refer only to some of the issues which cause translation problems.

### **3.14.1. Non - equivalence at word level**

Given that any two languages will differ in many ways, it is particularly important to select an appropriate word in the target language that expresses as much of the meaning as possible of the word in the source language. With respect to this issue Baker M, (1992: 20) says:

Non-equivalence at word level means that the target language has no direct equivalent for a word which occurs in the source text. The type and level of difficulty posed can vary tremendously depending on the nature of non-equivalence. Different kinds of non-equivalence require different strategies, some very straightforward, others more involved and difficult to handle.

She also points to the role of the context and of the purpose of translation in determining the kinds of strategies that one should follow to deal with non- equivalence at the lexical level and identifies the following types of non - equivalence (Baker, 1992).

### **3.14.2. The source language has a culture- specific concept**

The source language may have a concept or a phrase which is left unspecified in the target language. Religious concepts are likely to fall into this category if the source language is associated with a faith that is poorly represented in the culture of the target language.

Newmark (1988, p 82-3) talks about cultural equivalence as a procedure that a translator can use to translate a SL cultural word using a TL cultural word that may be very limited in terms of its use in the culture of the TL or may have other non - equivalent uses.

### **3.14.3. The source language is not lexicalized in the target language**

The source language has a word or a concept which is easy to understand in the target language but has not been given a lexical item or a word to express it, i.e. it is not lexicalized. The example given by Baker (1992) is the word *savoury* which is not lexicalized in many languages, although it is easily understood by many people.

### **3.14.4. The source language word is semantically complex**

The source language may have a word which possesses implications and multiple meanings which are not reflected in the target language.

### **3.14.5. The source and target language make different distinctions in meaning.**

The target language may make more distinctions in meaning than the source language. If one was translating from English into Arabic this problem would arise with the word *rain*. As already mentioned the Arabic of the Quran makes a very big and important difference between the two words *algaith* and *almatar* which can be translated as rain. *Algaith* is the rain that comes down from the sky as a blessing from God for the benefit of human beings, plants and animals. So the word *gaith* or *algaith* has good connotations. However, although *almatar* is also *rain*, when it comes down from the sky it is always a punishment and takes many forms. The word *matar* has bad connotations and indicates a punishment. The English language does not make a difference and has only one word, i.e. *rain*, as an equivalent for both *gaith* and *matar*. There are two overlapping problems here; a lack of equivalent word and a lack of a distinction between two words which have different connotations.



### **3.14.6. The target language lacks a superordinate**

Baker M, (1992: 22) says:

The target language may have specific words (hyponyms) but no general word (superordinate) to head the semantic field.

The opposite can be true as well in that a target language may have only a general word for a particular entity/ thing but not have specific words or expressions, and this too may create a problem in the translation process.

### **3.14.7. Equivalence at word level may not be matched by equivalence above word level - Collocation**

Baker (1992: 55) discusses the collocational meaning of a word and notes that when we want to find the meaning of a particular word we must put it in a context from which we can infer the meaning of that word. This suggests that a word on its own, i.e. in isolation, does not tell us everything about its meaning and that the collocates that accompany the word under investigation give important clues as to its meaning. The point here is that when a translator is criticised for being inaccurate, that criticism may reflect on his/her inability to select a collocational pattern that agrees with the elements of a phrase or a word in terms of meaning. What the translator may actually be doing is translating words as separate elements rather than looking at the words in combination. A translator must take into consideration the importance of finding an appropriate collocation in the target language for a particular collocation of the source language. A major problem that translators experience in translation is misinterpreting/ misunderstanding the meaning of a source language collocation, as noted by Baker (1999: 55)

A translator can easily misinterpret a collocation in the source text due to interference from his/ her native language.

This may happen when a collocation in the source language appears to be equivalent/ similar to a collocation in the target language in terms of form. The translator's task is to find an appropriate collocation in the target language that accurately conveys the meaning of the source language collocation and this may require a change in form. Newmark (1988: 213) agrees with this view saying:

Translation is sometimes a continual struggle to find appropriate collocations, a process of connecting up appropriate nouns with verbs and verbs with nouns, and, in the second instance, collocating appropriate adjectives to the nouns and adverbs or adverbial groups to the verbs; in the third instance, collocating appropriate connectives or conjunctions (the prepositions are already in the adverbial groups). If grammar is the bones of a text, collocations are the nerves, more subtle and multiple and specific in denoting meaning, and lexis is the flesh.

In fact, Newmark (2001) focuses on the meaning of meaning rather than the meaning of equivalence. He refers to partial meaning and not the whole meaning of the source text because it is impossible for all features of a source text to be transferred into a target text. The crucial point here is whether the translator transfers the meaning intended by the writer or whether he makes slight changes to the meaning of the source text for the reader. Newmark labels this kind of meaning as *cognitive*, *communicative*, and *associative* and notes that these varieties of meaning are normally involved in any translation. He also notes that every variety of meaning can be conveyed in the source text but that this does not mean that every aspect of meaning of a source text is transferred into the target text. Everything depends on the nature of the text and on what the translator intends to convey.

Now we move on to the translator's role.

### **3.15. Role of Translator**

Bell describes a translator as a communicator dealing with written communication. He makes very clear how different a communication between two people speaking the same language is from a communication in which one speaker has to handle two languages in order to communicate with the other. He notes that to understand how the latter is possible, we need a proper account of the communication process

Lefevere (1975: 99 cited in Gentzler 2001: 95) summarises the translator's task as follows:

The translator's task is precisely to render the source text, the original author's interpretation of a given theme expressed in a number of variations, accessible to readers not familiar with these variations, by replacing the original author's variation with their equivalents in a different language, time, place and tradition. Particular emphasis must be given to the fact that the translator has to replace *all* the variations contained in the source text by their equivalents.

Nida (1976: 58), on the other hand, points to other features that a translator must have in addition to competence and skills in verbal communication. He says: "a translator must have sincerity in conveying all features of the source text; otherwise a full accurate and adequate translation cannot be successfully produced". He also must keep the content complete and clear and try not to reduce it in a way that affects its message. And he should take advantage of his creativity.

Dolet (1540/1997 cited in Munday 2002: 26) defined five principles for a successful translation to take place as follows:

- 1- The translator must perfectly understand the sense and the material of the original author; although he [sic] should feel free to clarify obscurities.
- 2- The translator should have a perfect knowledge of both SL and TL, so as not to lessen the majesty of the language.
- 3- The translator should avoid word-for-word renderings.
- 4- The translator should avoid Latinate and unusual words.

5- The translator should assemble and liaise words eloquently to avoid clumsiness.

### **3.16. Conclusion**

We have seen that translations of the Quran are best seen as interpretations of the meaning of the Quran but they are necessary to communicate to people who do not speak Arabic. We have seen that corpora can be used to find patterns of use in texts and to see whether or not the translations differ from each other and also the ways the language they have used differs from that found in the BNC. Tied up with this are the difficulties involved in the translation process described in the last part of the chapter.

## CHAPTER 4

### THE HOLY QURAN IN THE IRVING TRANSLATION

#### 4.1. Introduction

In this chapter we are going to look at one of the translations of the Quran, the Irving translation, and we are going to explore the way in which this translation makes use of key words in the text. The reason we are doing this is first of all to identify which features of the language of translations of the Quran are different from those of ordinary English and we want to find out the ways in which a translation of the Quran might prime a reader differently from other kinds of linguistic encounter. Secondly, we are interested in discovering whether these features are particularly characteristic of Quranic translations or whether they are shared by religious writings or by the Bible in translation. Thirdly, we are interested in how Irving's translation may differ from other translations of the Quran: in chapter seven we will look at the different words that have been looked at in the three translations and will examine the extent to which each translation is like and unlike the other translations. Obviously we cannot look at all the words that Irving uses- that would take a life time- so a selection of key words in this translation have been identified firstly because of the strength of both their keyness and their lexicality and secondly because it was felt that they might have theological implications. The first word under investigation is *mercy* which appears as the eleventh most key word in the Irving translation. As a theological term, I predicted that its use would differ in a religious text such as the Holy Quran from that in other kinds of text. So given the purposes of this thesis, the choice of the term *mercy* seemed appropriate as a word for study.

The next word that will be analysed in terms of various lexical relationships in this chapter is *torment*. Again it is a key word and it appears near the top of the keyword list at number 8. *Torment* is a rare word in the English language as a whole, where it is neither a theological

word nor an ethical word like *mercy* but simply a description of pain. *Torment* is an objective state of pain that can be seen, caused, given etc. Since *torment* is common in one kind of text i.e. the Quran in Irving's translation and uncommon in other kinds of text as represented by the BNC I expect it to function differently in the two corpora. Again, its use in Irving's translation will be compared with those in the religious sub component in the BNC and with the Bible in translation.

In this chapter the words that I have selected for study are subjected to various forms of analysis in terms of

Collocation

Semantic association

Pragmatic association

Colligation

Textual Semantic Association

In order to identify significant linguistic patterns, Irving's translation of the Quran is compared with the BNC as a whole and with the religious sub component of the BNC in particular. It is also compared with the Bible in the King James translation. As noted elsewhere the size of the British National Corpus is 100 million words; the Quran in the Irving translation is 149,111 words long. The Bible in the King James translation is 828,948 words long and the religious writing component of the BNC is 1,184,062 words long.

#### **4.2. Keyword 1: *mercy***

#### **4.3. Investigating collocations and related senses of the lemma *mercy***

The first point to note with regard to *mercy* is a matter of the simple frequency of the instances of *mercy* in the BNC compared to the number of instances in the Quran in Irving's translation (henceforth QIT). We have 1122 instances of *mercy* in the BNC, approximately

1.1 occurrences every 100,000 words. However, we have 314 instances of *mercy* in QIT, approximately 215 instances every 100,000 words. This means that *mercy* occurs almost 195 times more often in QIT than in the BNC as a proportion of the whole corpus. If a word proportionally is infrequent in QIT compared with the BNC, then this would not necessarily tell us much but the fact that it is almost 200 times more frequent proportionally is of interest because it points to *mercy* being an important theme of the Quran. Of the 314 instances of *mercy* in QIT, however, 113 were excluded from analysis because they were instances of the same expression repeated. This expression was *In the name of God, the Mercy-giving, the Merciful* which begins each section of the Quran and must be recited before reading the Quran. 52 other examples were also excluded because they were likewise instances of a repeated expression. This expression was *the Mercy-giving* (two of them are *the Mercy-granting*) and in all senses/cases the expression *the Mercy-giving* refers to God. Therefore, the expression is more likely to share linguistic features with the word *God* than with the word *mercy* on its own. In fact, of course, this is one of the uses of *mercy* in QIT, the use in combination with *giving* to refer to God's attributes at the same time as referring to God. There is not a single example of *Mercy-giving* in the BNC. However, there is one expression in the BNC that is also repeated. The expression is *Lord in your mercy hear our prayer* which is quite similar to *Amen* used in Christian churches. There are 36 cases of this repeated expression and these are also excluded from my analysis. Once these expressions are excluded from QIT and the BNC, there are still 90 times more instances of *mercy* in QIT proportionally than in the BNC.

We first look at the collocates and related senses of the word *mercy* in QIT

#### Figure 4.1: Concordance lines of *mercy* ^ *from*

N Concordance

44 believed with him through mercy from Ourselves, while  
45 We have been sending mercy from your Lord. He is  
46 my Lord? He has sent me mercy from His presence,  
47 or die, forgiveness and mercy from God are better  
48 Us with it except for some mercy from your Lord, His  
49 before God. However since mercy from God does exist,  
50 along with him through mercy from Ourselves – , We  
51 be rescued except as a mercy from Us and to enjoy  
52 We ever let man taste any mercy from Us, then  
53 as them besides, as a Mercy from Our presence  
54 We let man taste some mercy from Ourselves, he acts  
55 a sign for mankind and a mercy from Ourselves." It is a  
56 a lightning as well as mercy from your Lord.  
57 If We let him taste some mercy from Ourselves after  
58 folk! Save us through Your mercy from such dis-  
59 stood with him through mercy from Ourselves, and We  
60 He lets them taste some mercy from Himself, a group

#### Figure 4.2: Concordance lines showing collocates of *mercy* ^ *for*

N Concordance

22 as a guideline and mercy for folk who believe.  
23 Or if He wants some mercy for me, will such  
24 have merely sent you as a mercy for [everybody in] the  
25 [offered] as guidance and mercy for those who act  
26 expect to receive God's mercy, for God is Forgiving,  
27 breasts, plus guidance and mercy for believers. SAY:  
28 any ill for you or wants mercy for you?" They will  
29 [to serve] as healing and a mercy for believers, while  
30 and as a guidance and mercy for folk who believe.  
31 contained guidance and mercy for those who revere  
32 Your Lord has prescribed mercy for Himself so He will  
33 serves as guidance and a mercy for believers. Your  
34 your Lord has shown mercy. For that reason did  
35 does. He has prescribed mercy for Himself so He  
36 as well as guidance and mercy for folk who believe.

The above concordance lines from QIT illustrate the most common collocates to the right of *mercy*, which are the preposition *from* that occurs 26 times and the preposition *for* that occurs 18 times. Together these constitute 44 of the 149 instances of *mercy*. The occurrence of *from* accounts for 17.4% of the instances of *mercy* and the occurrence of *for* accounts for 12.1% of



the instances of *mercy*. What this pattern of collocation in R1 appears to point to is that *rahmah* (the Arabic word for *mercy*) is a gift from the Lord to his servants and that this gift, which can be the sending of a messenger or a book of guidance such as the Quran, the Gospel or Torah, is for the purpose of guiding people.

There is then a large drop to the next most common right collocates, which are *to* and *on*, each of which occurs five times, and *towards* which occurs four times; all other prepositions, *between*, *among*, *over* and *in*, occur only once each.

By contrast, the most common collocates to the right of *mercy* in the BNC are *of*, *the* and *to*. *From* is the twentieth most common, occurring nine times in R1 position (and 37 times in total in the environment of *mercy*). Proportionally, *mercy from* is 21.8 times more common in QIT than in the BNC. To determine whether there is a significant difference between the use of *from* in the phrase *mercy from* in QIT and in the BNC, the chi-squared test was used and p-value for chi-square is shown in the table below.

	QIT- <i>mercy</i> 149	BNC- <i>mercy</i> 1086
<i>mercy from</i>	26	9
Other uses of <i>mercy</i>	123	1077
Chi-Sq = 131.445, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.000		

Table 4.1: Occurrence of *mercy from* in QIT and BNC

A probability of  $p = 000$  is a strong evidence of significant difference and not likely to be due to chance.

*For* is the seventh most common collocate in the BNC, occurring 145 times in all positions but only 21 times in R1 position. This means that it is 6.4 times more common in R1 position

in QIT than in the BNC. The point here is that in both corpora there is a colligation with prepositions and this colligation is differently manifested. It is not the case that a reader of the Quran will be primed differently from the BNC reader as regard the colligation; they both will be primed to expect *mercy* to be followed by prepositions but they will be differently primed in terms of the expectation as to which prepositions.

The above finding suggests that the frequency of *mercy for* differs between QIT and BNC. To test whether this difference is real or due to chance I used the chi -squared test as shown in the table below:

	QIT	BNC
	<i>mercy</i> 149	<i>mercy</i> 1086
<i>mercy for</i>	18	21
Other uses of <i>mercy</i>	131	1065
Chi-Sq = 44.111, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.000		

Table 4.2: Occurrences of *mercy for* in the QIT and the BNC

The p-value =0.000 is small which shows that there is a significant difference between the frequency of *mercy for* in the QIT and the frequency of *mercy for* in the BNC.

We now turn to other religious writings such as the Bible in translation and the religious writing component of the BNC to find out if the phrases *mercy from* and *mercy for* are also collocates in other religious writings.

	BNC/RW	Bible
	<i>mercy</i> 77	<i>mercy</i> 276
<i>mercy from</i>	1	1
<i>mercy for</i>	0	5

Table 4.3. Occurrence of *from* and *for* in the religious writing component of the BNC and the Bible in the King James translation

We can see from the table that the data are too small to compare with the QIT corpus and therefore we conclude that *from* and *for* in the phrase *mercy from* and the phrase *mercy for* are Quranic specific features.

If we look now at the collocates to the left of *mercy* in QIT, we find that the most common immediate left collocate is the coordinator *and* which occurs 22 times and that this accounts for 14.8% of the instances of *mercy*. This is perhaps surprising; the implication is that *mercy* in the Quran is always coupled with other gifts from God, which in QIT include *guidance*, *bounty*, *forgiveness*, *compassion* and *affection*. This is a theologically important point but it is also a linguistically important point; it suggests that QIT's use of *mercy* is different from that of ordinary language.

Theologically in QIT *mercy* receives its value from its being coupled with the other good things God offers us. In every case we find that *mercy* combines with something good and very positive. Examples of *mercy* in association with *and* are displayed below.

**Figure 4.3: Concordance lines showing *mercy* in association with *and* in QIT.**

N Concordance  
 279 been for God's bounty and mercy towards you, all but a  
 280 without God's bounty and mercy towards you (all)?  
 281 been for God's bounty and mercy towards you, not one  
 282 has planted affection and mercy between you; in that  
 283 as a guideline and mercy for folk who believe.  
 284 as well as forgiveness and mercy. God is Forgiving,  
 285 as well as guidance and mercy for folk who believe.  
 286 as well as guidance and mercy. Who is more in the  
 287 and as a guidance and mercy for folk who believe.  
 288 contained guidance and mercy for those who revere

Turning now to the BNC, *and* is the fourth most common collocate of *mercy* and occurs 130 times as a left collocate in total. 34 instances of *and* occur in L1 position. This occurrence accounts for 3.1% of the instances of *mercy* in the BNC. If *and* occurs as a left collocate 3.1% of the time in BNC and 14.8% of the time in QIT, this means that the coordinator *and* as a left collocate is 4.8 times more common in the QIT than in the BNC. The table below shows the statistics for the collocate *and* in the QIT and the BNC.

	QIT- <i>mercy</i> 149	BNC <i>mercy</i> 1086
<i>And mercy</i>	22	34
Other uses of <i>mercy</i>	127	1052
Chi-Sq = 40.970, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.000		

Table 4.4: The occurrence of *and* with *mercy* in QIT and BNC

Since the p-value is 0.000 we can be confident that there is a significant difference between the use of *and* as an immediate left collocate in QIT and the use of *and* in BNC.

	QIT- <i>mercy</i> 149	BNC/RW <i>mercy</i> 77
<i>And mercy</i>	22	7
Other uses of <i>mercy</i>	127	70
Chi-Sq = 1.461, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.227		

Table 4.5: Occurrence of *and* with *mercy* in QIT and BNC/RW

Turning now to the religious writing component of the BNC, we find here a picture closer to that of QIT. The p-value here is 0.227, so we are unable to claim that there is a significant difference between the frequency of *and* in QIT and the frequency of *and* in the religious writing.

	QIT- <i>mercy</i> 149	Bible- <i>mercy</i> 276
<i>And mercy</i>	22	9
Other uses of <i>mercy</i>	127	267
Chi-Sq = 18.938, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.000		

Table 4.6: Occurrence of *and* in QIT and Bible

However this is not the case when we compare QIT and the Bible (See table 4.6). The p-value here shows a significant difference between the frequency of *and* in the QIT and the frequency of *and* in the Bible.

The next most common collocates to the left of *mercy* identified by Wordsmith in QIT is *guidance* which occurs 11 times in L2 position and the collocate *bounty* which occurs 11 times as well. With regard to the latter collocation, *bounty* occurs in different positions in relation to *mercy*. It occurs six times immediately to the left of *mercy*, twice as a general collocate to the left of *mercy* in other positions and three times as a general collocate to the

right. If the collocation is between *guidance* and *mercy* it tends to be followed by *for* in 8 cases but if the collocation is between *bounty* and *mercy* it tends to be followed by *towards* in three cases.

This leads us to the idea of nesting. Primings nest and combine (Hoey, 2005. 10). In this instance *guidance* collocates with *mercy* producing the combination *guidance and mercy* and this combination has its own collocate (*for*) which is not the same as that for the combination *bounty and mercy*. In this way, lexical items are created (Sinclair 1999, 2004). So *guidance* and *bounty* both collocate with *mercy* in QIT; this appears to be mirrored by equivalent collocations in the Arabic of the Quran.

From these data we can predict that readers of QIT will be primed to associate *mercy* with wonderful gifts from God such as *guidance*, *bounty* and other words indicating God's blessings. These are not primings that would occur as a result of encounters with the word *mercy* in general English. *Guidance* and *bounty* are not listed as collocates of *mercy* in the BNC by the Wordsmith collocation facility, which means that if the words co- occur at all in the BNC, they co- occur less than five times.

The collocate *bounty* is a rare word in English and when it does occur, it does not occur with *mercy*. There are 199 occurrences of the word *bounty* in BNC; nine of these are duplicates and none occurs with *mercy*. We can conclude that the collocations we have found for *mercy* in QIT are not a general feature of the word.

This does not however tell us whether the collocations in question are specific to QIT or features of religious writing in general. We therefore examined whether *guidance* and *bounty* were collocates of *mercy* in the sub-section of the BNC covering religious writing. Examining the collocates of *mercy* in the religious writing sub-section of the BNC revealed that *guidance* and *bounty* are not listed by Wordsmith as collocates. Nor are *guidance* and

*bounty* listed as collocates of *mercy* in the Bible in the King James translation. This means that this collocation is unique to the QIT.

Another common collocate to the left of *mercy* in QIT is the verb *show* which occurs 15 times in total; seven of these collocates occur in L1 position and seven occur in L2 position, accounting for 10.1% of the instances of *mercy* in QIT. Other common collocates identified are the verbs *taste*, *grant*, and *receive*. The collocate *taste* occurs seven times in total, *grant* six times in total and *receive* five times in total.

In the BNC on the other hand *show* occurs 19 times in total; 18 of these collocates occur to the left of *mercy* and only one occurs to the right; of the 18 left collocates eight occur in L2 position. This collocation (in total) accounts for 1.7% of the 1086 instances of *mercy* in the BNC making it 5.9 times more common in the QIT.

The corpus data for the Bible show that *mercy* collocates with *shew* (a variant of *show*) and that it occurs 11 times in total; 10 of these collocates are in left position and only one occurs in right position. Of the 10 left collocates six occur in L1 position. This collocation (in total) accounts for 4% of the (276) instances of *mercy* in the Bible in translation which means that it is a weaker collocation in the Bible than in QIT, occurring 2.5 times more often in the latter than the former. Examining the concordance list for *mercy* BNC/RW shows that *show* and *shew* are not listed by Wordsmith as collocates. The tables below compare the frequency of the collocation of *show mercy* in QIT with its frequency in the BNC, RW/BNC and the Bible in translation.

	QIT- <i>mercy</i> – 149	BNC <i>mercy</i> - 1086
<i>Show</i>	15	19
Other uses of <i>mercy</i>	134	1067
Chi-Sq = 33.857, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.000		

Table 4.7: The occurrence of *show mercy* in QIT and BNC

	QIT <i>mercy</i> 149	BNC/RW <i>mercy</i> 77
<i>Show</i>	15	1
Other uses of <i>mercy</i>	134	76
Chi-Sq = 5.933, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.015		

Table 4.8: The occurrence of *show mercy* in QIT and WR/BNC

	QIT- <i>mercy</i> 149	Bible- <i>mercy</i> - 276
<i>Show/shew</i>	15	11
Other uses of <i>mercy</i>	134	265
Chi-Sq = 6.231, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.013		

Table 4.9. The occurrence of *shew mercy* in QIT and Bible

The implication is that there is considerable difference between the QIT and general language in the use of *show mercy* because the p-value is =0.000 as table 4.7 shows. Furthermore, if we look at the religious writing of the BNC (table 4.8) there is a slight tendency for *show mercy* to occur in the RW/BNC but table 4.9 likewise suggests that there is significant difference in the collocation *show mercy* between the QIT and the Bible in translation.



The conclusion is that both the QIT and the Bible had *show mercy* to a greater extent than the language as a whole although the difference is less marked in the latter case.

*Grant* and *taste* do not show as collocates in the BNC, or the sub-section component of the BNC or the Bible despite being collocates in QIT.

*Find* on the other hand is a collocate in the BNC and occurs nine times in total; of these, six occur to the left and three occur to the right. *Find*, however, occurs only once in QIT and does not occur at all in BNC/RW or the Bible.

In short, *find* is a weak collocate of *mercy* in general English but is not identified as a collocate by Wordsmith in QIT, whereas *receive*, *taste*, and *grant* are identified as collocates of *mercy* in QIT but not in general English as represented by the BNC.

#### **4.4. Instances of *at* in close proximity to *mercy* in BNC**

Before we look at other aspects of *mercy* in QIT, it is worth noting that there are 314 instances of *at* in close proximity to *mercy* in the BNC, 296 of them occurring to the left. This reflects the fact that '*At the mercy of*' is a very common expression in the BNC. Interestingly, this expression is only a specific feature of the BNC. It never occurs in the QIT, in the RW/BNC or the Bible in translation.

*Mercy* is on the other hand primed for readers of QIT to collocate with *as* (a) and *as well as* and the nested combinations of *mercy* with *as* (a) and *as well as* are typically primed to associate semantically with holy books (see figures 4.4 and 4.5 below).

**Figure 4.4: Concordance lines showing collocates of *mercy* with *as well as* in QIT.**

N Concordance  
 20 as well as guidance and mercy. Who is more in the  
 21 as well as forgiveness and mercy. God is Forgiving,  
 22 as well as guidance and mercy for folk who believe."  
 23 as well as guidance and mercy for folk who are  
 24 as well as guidance and mercy for folk who believe.

**Figure 4.5: Concordance lines showing collocates of *mercy* with *as* in QIT.**

N Concordance  
 17 as them besides, as a Mercy from Our presence  
 18 but [have been sent] as a mercy from your Lord so  
 19 have merely sent you as a mercy for [everybody in] the  
 20 claim their treasure as a mercy from your Lord. I did  
 21 like of them besides, as a mercy from Us and a  
 22 to you except as a mercy from your Lord. Do

The collocation of *mercy* with *as* occurs 20 times as general left collocate accounting for 13.4% of the instances of *mercy* in QIT and the combination *as well as* occurs 8 times as general left collocate in total in QIT and accounts for 5.4% of the instances of *mercy*. In the BNC, however, *as* occurs 39 times in total in conjunction with *mercy* and this accounts for 3.6% of the instances of *mercy* in the BNC. So the claim is that both *as* and *as well as* are strong collocates in QIT and weak collocates in BNC. Let us examine this statistically.

	QIT	BNC
	<i>mercy</i> 149	<i>mercy</i> 1086
<i>as/ as well as</i>	28	39
Other uses of <i>mercy</i>	121	1047
Chi-Sq = 59.006, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.000		

Table 4.10. The collocation of *mercy* with *as* and *as well as* in QIT and BNC

	QIT- <i>mercy</i> 149	RW/BNC <i>mercy</i> 77
<i>as/ as well as</i>	28	1
other uses of <i>mercy</i>	121	76
Chi-Sq = 13.889, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.000		

Table 4.11: The occurrence of *as* and *as well as* with *mercy* in QIT and RW/BNC

	QIT- <i>mercy</i> 149	Bible <i>mercy</i> 276
<i>as/ as well as</i>	28	2
Other uses of <i>mercy</i>	121	274
Chi-Sq = 48.145, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.000		

Table 4.12: The occurrence of *as* and *as well as* with *mercy* in QIT and the Bible

The p-value= 0.000 in the three tables above shows a big difference between the QIT and the BNC, the RW/BNC and the Bible in translation respectively in the use of *as* and *as well as*. Here we have strong evidence that *as* and *as well as* are significant specific collocates to the QIT. A collocate of a different kind is *book*. Although *book* is not a strong collocate within the normal window of five words on either side, if we extend the window up to 10 words on either side as allowed by Wordsmith, it becomes so. The claim is that there is a collocation with *book* that occurs within sentence boundaries, however long the sentence.

The word *book* in this context in particular refers to either the Quran or the Torah. The collocation between *mercy* and *book* occurs 13 times and accounts for 8.7% of the instances of *mercy* in the QIT.

The collocation of <i>mercy</i> with <i>book</i> in QIT	
Book	13
<i>mercy</i> without book	136
book without <i>mercy</i>	13
The rest of the corpus	148949
Chi-Sq = 6486.480, DF = 1	

Table 4.13. The collocation of *mercy* with *book* in QIT

The chi-square is large and this is a strong evidence that *book* is a collocate of the word *mercy* in QIT within a window of 10 words.

The situation in the BNC is quite different. The Wordsmith facility does not identify *book* as a collocate of *mercy* in the BNC even in the wider window. Nor is it identified as a collocate in the religious writing component of the BNC or in the Bible in translation. *Book* as a collocate can accordingly be identified as a QIT specific feature. However, *book* is the tip of a more general semantic association including the titles of specific books and we therefore now turn to our analysis of the semantic associations of *mercy*.

#### 4.5. Investigating Semantic Associations of *Mercy*.

##### 4.5.1. The Semantic Association of *Mercy* with HOLY BOOKS in QIT.

*Mercy* in the QIT is associated with HOLY BOOKS namely the Quran, the Torah and the Gospels, of which the overwhelming majority of examples refer to the Quran. Here *book*, *instructions*, *these*, and *it*, where this pronoun refers to the Quran, are often more than 10 words away from *mercy* (or even *guidance* and *mercy*) and therefore, the claim here is, again, that this association occurs within sentence boundaries, however long the sentence. All the

instances of *mercy* in association with the Holy Quran occur as part of *guidance and mercy* so this is an instance of nesting. In the case of references to the Torah and the Gospel the expression is not always *guidance and mercy*, the expressions *token and mercy*, *model and mercy*, *compassion and mercy* also occur. Here the nesting is one of NOUN and *mercy* and this nesting is primed for association with HOLY BOOKS; it is noted that in every single case *mercy* follows *and* rather than preceding it. So the priming here is not for the word *mercy*, the priming here is for the nesting NOUN *and mercy*. Consider the following examples where *mercy* refers to the Quran.

- 1- We have merely sent the *Book* down to you so you may explain to them what they are differing over, and as *a guidance and mercy* for folk who believe. 16: 64
- 2- O mankind, *instruction* has been given you by your Lord, and healing for whatever is in your breasts, plus *guidance and mercy* for believers. 10: 58
- 3- We have sent the *book* down to you to explain everything, and for *guidance and mercy*, and as good news for Muslims. 16: 89
- 4- There is a lesson in their stories for prudent persons. It is not some report which has been invented but confirmation of what has existed previously and an analysis of everything, as well as *guidance and mercy* for folk who believe. 13- 111
- 5- [These] are insights from Your Lord as well as *guidance and mercy* for folk who believe. 7: 203
- 6- A.L.M '[These] are verses from the *Wise Book*. [Offered] as *guidance and mercy* for those who act kindly? 31:2
- 7- [These] are *insights* for mankind, as well as *guidance and mercy*.. 45:20

As noted, however, *these* refers to parts of the Quran and are instances of a more general semantic association with HOLY BOOKS/ HOLY LANGUAGE. We also have, for example, the following references to the Torah.

- 1- What about someone who has [received] an explanation from his Lord and to whom a witness from Him is reciting while *Moses' book* lies before him as a *token and a mercy*. Such person believes in it. 11: 17

- 2- Before it, *Moses' book* served as a *model and a mercy*, while this is a book which confirms such in the Arabic tongue, so as to warn those who do wrong. And [it forms] an announcement to those who act kindly. 46: 12
- 3- Then we gave *Moses the Book* as a fulfilment for someone who acts kindly, and an analysis of everything, as well as for *guidance and mercy* so they may believe about meeting their Lord. 6: 154
- 4- We gave Moses *the book* after We had wiped out the earliest generations [to serve] as insights for mankind, and for *guidance and mercy* so that they might bear it in mind. 28:43
- 5- When his anger had subsided, Moses picked up the *Tablets* whose text contained *guidance and mercy* for those who revere their Lord.
- 6- Then We made Our messengers follow along in their footsteps and We followed them up with Jesus the son of Mary. We gave him the *Gospel* and placed *compassion and mercy* in the hearts of those who have followed him, as well as monkhood; yet they initiated it. 57:27

So the first point here is that the nested combination is NOUN + *mercy* and secondly interestingly, in the references to the Quran, *guidance* is the particular noun.

There is no evidence of a semantic association of *mercy* with HOLY BOOKS in the BNC; there is also no evidence of it in the BNC/RW or the Bible. There is no mention of the Torah, of the Quran, of the Gospel, or the Bible in connection with *mercy* in them and therefore we conclude that this association is specific to the Quranic text in translation.

#### **4.5.2 The semantic associations of *Mercy* with BELIEVING/DISBELIEVING HUMANS in QIT and in the BNC.**

*Mercy* in QIT also has strong semantic association with BELIEVING/ DISBELIEVING HUMANS. This association is realised in the positive form of words such as *believers*, *Muslims*, and *granters*, and also as phrases such as *any of you who do believe*, *such persons believe in it*, *folk who believe*, *those who revere their Lord*, and *the pious or heedful who believe and perform honourable deeds*. The negative form of the association, referring to humans who reject the opportunity of *mercy*, is expressed by the use of words and phrases

like *disbelievers* and *those who disbelieve*. Altogether there are twenty six examples of this semantic association referring to BELIEVING/ NON-BELIEVING HMANS and accounting for 17.4% of the instances of *mercy* in QIT.

*Mercy* also has a semantic association with BELIEVING HUMAN BEINGS in the BNC. This association is introduced by the phrase *the sisters of mercy* which occurs 20 times and *Christians* which occurs three times. This association accounts for 2.1% of the instances of *mercy* in the BNC. So this semantic association is true of the word in general English but it is a very weak association in the BNC. Furthermore, the form of the association in the QIT is more precise in the sense that the nominal groups typically contains a post-modifying clause with *who* e.g. *any of you who do believe*, and *those who revere their Lord*.

	QIT	BNC
	<i>mercy</i> 149	<i>mercy</i> 1086
BELIEVING/ DISBELIEVING PEOPLE	26	23
Other	123	1063
Chi-Sq = 80.833, DF = 1, P-Value =0.000		

Table 4.14. Semantic association of *mercy* with BELIEVING/ DISBELIEVING HUMAN BEINGS in QIT and BNC.

The p-value=0. 000 suggests that there is a significant difference in the association of *mercy* with BELIEVING/ DISBELIEVING HUMANS since it is much more common in the QIT than in the BNC.

There is no association with BELIEVING/ DISBELIEVING PEOPLE in the religious writing component of the BNC. However, there are 12 instances in the Bible in translation where *mercy* is associated with believing people.

	QIT	Bible
	<i>mercy</i> 149	<i>mercy</i> 276
BELIEVING/ DISBELIEVING PEOPLE	26	12
Other uses of <i>mercy</i>	123	264
Chi-Sq = 20.401, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.000		

Table 4.15. Semantic association of *mercy* with BELIEVING/DISBELIEVING HUMANS in QIT and the Bible.

The p-value= 0.000 shows a significant difference in the association of *mercy* with believing humans in the QIT and the Bible. The conclusion is that though there are signs of the relationship in the QIT, BNC and the Bible in translation, it is significantly more frequent in the QIT.

#### 4.5.3. The Semantic Association of *Mercy* with ACTS OF GRACE in QIT and BNC.

The next semantic association shown in the data is that of *mercy* with ACTS OF GRACE. ACTS OF GRACE are defined for the purposes of my analysis as ‘unmerited kindness from God’ using this definition, I identified the following as realising ACTS OF GRACE: *guidance, bounty, forgiveness, compassion, affection and healing*. This semantic association occurs in combination with a colligation of NOUN *and* NOUN and it accounts for 18.1 % of the instances of *mercy* in QIT. Examples are:



**Figure 4.6: Concordance lines showing semantic association of *mercy* with ACTS OF GRACE.**

N Concordance  
 15 sake or die, forgiveness and mercy from God are better than  
 16 not been for God's bounty and mercy towards you, not one of  
 17 it be without God's bounty and mercy towards you (all)? God is  
 18 vice. If God's bounty and mercy had not lain upon you, a  
 19 SAY: "In God's bounty and mercy, therein let them rejoice.  
 20 not know. If God's bounty and mercy had only rested on you;  
 21 He has planted affection and mercy between you; in that are  
 22 and placed compassion and mercy in the hearts of those  
 23 not been for God's bounty and mercy towards you, all but a  
 24 as well as guidance and mercy for folk who are  
 25 as well as guidance and mercy for folk who believe. 13.  
 26 Lord, as well as guidance and mercy for folk who believe."  
 27 breasts, plus guidance and mercy for believers. SAY: "In  
 28 and for guidance and mercy so they might bear it in  
 29 as well as forgiveness and mercy. God is Forgiving,

*Mercy* has a semantic association with ACTS OF GRACE in the BNC too (*forgiveness*, for example, occurs 6 times). We are therefore looking at a general property of the word and not a feature of its specific use in QIT; it is however a property that is more strongly manifested in QIT as table 4.16 shows.

	QIT	BNC
	<i>mercy</i> 149	<i>mercy</i> 1086
ACTS OF GRACE	27	6
Other uses of <i>mercy</i>	122	1080
Chi-Sq = 155.498, DF = 1, P-Value =0.000		

Table 4.16: Semantic association of *mercy* with ACTS OF GRACE in QIT and BNC

The p-value= 0.000 suggests a significant difference between the BNC and the QIT in the association of *mercy* with ACTS OF GRACE. So this is clear evidence that this association is more strongly and clearly manifested in the QIT than in the BNC. The case in the RW/BNC and the Bible is that *mercy* has no semantic association with ACTS OF GRACE in either.

#### **4.6. Exophoric Referential Association: a New kind of Priming Association**

In all the given examples *mercy* is however, not just referring to the Quran, the Torah or the Gospel but also refers to something in particular that exists in the Quran such as stories, insights and verses; examples 18, 23 and 24 show this kind of association. The same is true of examples referring to the Torah as in example 20 in which the context of *mercy* refers to the tablets in the Torah.

A special case of this kind of reference can be seen in examples 22 and 24, however, where *these* refers to verses in the Quran, in other words to the actual text in front of the reader and in the reader's hand. Other instances of the same can be seen in examples 23 and 51. In one sense, then, the relationship between *mercy* and the *Quran* is not simply, or primarily, one of a relationship between two words; it is a relationship between the word *mercy* and an actual solid object within the discourse, the holy text, present in the form of this solid object. Such a situation might be compared with other possible situations. If we refer to Moses' book or to Moses' tablets or if we refer to the Quran they either are or could in principle be somewhere else. It would be possible to say 'We send out something from the Quran to serve healing and mercy for believers and not have a copy of the Quran at hand; in the present situation we are actually referring to the actual act of reading and interestingly, *these* is a word that has either an anaphoric or exophoric function (Biber et al., 1999).

The fact that the word *mercy* is associated not just with a set of words with a shared semantic set but with a set of entities in the real world goes beyond what we would normally think of as semantic association because semantic association is the relationship between (sets of) words in a particular text, whereas what we are looking at here is the association of the word with a set of things. Whether this is best treated as a special kind of semantic association or not, it is undoubtedly a new kind of association and one that extends the possibilities of lexical priming and I shall call it **Exophoric Referential Association**.

#### 4.7. Various Senses of *mercy*

Let us now consider examples where the word *mercy* refers to either paradise or forgiveness. The data have been sorted into two groups- one where *forgiveness* appears to be meant and one where *paradise* seems to be meant. These two meanings are associated with particular collocates. For example where *mercy* is believed to mean forgiveness it is associated with particular collocates such as *forgive* , *forgiving*, and *merciful* and where *paradise* seems to be meant, *mercy* is associated with phrases like *admit into* and *live in*.

##### A- Examples where *forgiveness* appears to be meant by *mercy*.

- 1- Those who have believed and who have migrated and striven for God's sake may expect to receive God's **mercy**, for God is *Forgiving, Merciful*.
- 2- SAY: "My servants who have acted extravagantly against themselves still do not despair of God's **mercy**. God forgives all offences; He is the *Forgiving, the Merciful*.
- 3- Who is so prayerful during the small hours of the night, bowing down on his knees [in worship], standing on his guard about the Hereafter, and *hoping* for his Lord's **mercy**?

##### B- Examples where *paradise* is meant by *mercy*.

- 1- While those whose faces are whitened will live for ever in God's **mercy**.
- 2- God will show anyone He wishes into His **mercy**.
- 3- God will admit them into His **mercy**.
- 4- God will single out anyone He wishes for His **mercy**.
- 5- He claims anyone He wishes for His **mercy**.
- 6- But He admits anyone He wishes into His **mercy**.
- 7- He will admit anyone He wishes into His **mercy**.
- 8- Their Lord will admit those into His **mercy**.
- 9- We admitted him into our **mercy**.
- 10- We admitted them to Our **mercy**, they were honorable

In examples 1 and 2 (group A) *mercy* is used in the sense of *forgiveness* and this can be observed from the context where the words *forgiving* and *merciful* occur in parallelism. It is noticeable that where *mercy* appears to refer to *paradise* we find the nested combination '*admit into His mercy*' and where it means *forgiveness* there is a different nested combination

*wish/hope for His mercy*. In examples 1 3, 8, and 9 (Group B), *mercy* is best understood as referring to *paradise* given that the context (*live ....in* e.g.1 and *admit ....into* ) meaning ‘allow in’ or ‘let in’ requires a place.

A further sense of *mercy* appears perhaps unexpectedly on the basis of its typical uses in everyday English to be that of *rain*. The association of *mercy* with *rain* is not something that would occur in normal English at all; this is an unusual use. This sense is found in the following examples:

- 1- Among His signs is [the fact] that He sends the winds to bring news so He may let may let you taste some of His *mercy*, and so ships may sail at His command, in order that you may seek some of His bounty and so that you may act grateful. 30:46
- 2- He is the one who sends winds to announce His *mercy* directly, so that whenever they lift up heavy clouds, we drive them along to a dead countryside and send down water from them; and thus we bring forth every kind of fruit. 7:57
- 3- Who guides you through darkness on land and sea, and Who sends out winds as heralds for His *mercy*? 27:63
- 4- He is the One who has sent the winds as heralds announcing His *mercy*. We send pure water down from the sky, so We may bring life to a dead land, and let everything We have created drink from it, such as livestock and men aplenty. 25:48-49

This use occurs with a particular combination of words such as *clouds*, *winds*, *water*, *ships*, and a *dead land* or *countryside* and also with verbs and phrases such as *send down*, *drink* and *bring life*. To summarize, *mercy* in the QIT has several meanings, which is not the case for the BNC where *mercy* apparently has a meaning related to *forgiveness*.

#### **4.8. Priming for Association with figurative language- the metaphor**

Some words in the Quran are used both literally and figuratively. Both *mercy* (discussed in this section) and *torment* (discussed in the next section) are examples of words which have

both literal and figurative use. Consider the following data for *mercy* (Fig 4.7).

**Figure 4.7: Concordance lines showing association of *mercy* with *figurative language*.**

- 1- If We ever let man taste any mercy from Us, then snatched it away from him, he would become despondent,
- 2- Whenever We let man taste some mercy from Ourselves, he acts overjoyed by it,
- 3- If We let him taste some mercy from Ourselves after some hardship has afflicted him, he is sure to say:...
- 4- Then when He lets them taste some mercy from Himself, a group of them will associate others with their Lord...
- 5- Whenever We let mankind taste mercy, they are glad about it; yet if any evil should.....
- 6- Whenever We let mankind taste mercy after some adversity has afflicted them,
- 7- He sends the winds to bring news so he may let you taste some of His *mercy*,

The examples above show that *mercy* in association with *taste* is used metaphorically to indicate something different from its literal meaning. We have seven examples out of 149 instances of *mercy* in QIT that show this kind of association. This represents another addition to the ways in which a word or a phrase may be primed for a language user, and is here referred to as priming for association with figurative language. Obviously in the case of *mercy* the priming is more particular: the words *taste* and *mercy* are together primed for just one kind of priming i.e. *metaphor priming*.

Note that *mercy* never occurs with *taste* in the BNC, in the BNC/RW or the Bible.

#### **4.9. Priming for association with figurative language- personification**

Another figure of speech is used in the examples below in which inanimate objects and abstract notions are spoken of as having life. This is called personification first identified by Sayed Qutb as a stylistic feature in the Quran. Examples are:

- 1- Look at the traces of God's mercy, how he revives the earth following its death. Such is the Reviver from the dead; He is capable of everything!
- 2- Among His signs is [the fact] that He sends the winds to bring news so he may let you taste some of His mercy, and so ships may sail at His command, in order that you may seek some of His bounty and so that you may act grateful.
- 3- He is the One Who sends winds to announce His mercy directly, so that whenever they lift up heavy clouds, We drive them along to a dead countryside and send down water from them;
- 4- How seldom do you reflect [on this]! \* Who guides you through darkness on land and at sea, and Who sends out winds as heralds for His mercy? Is there any deity alongside God?
- 5- \* He is the One Who has sent the winds as heralds announcing His mercy. We send pure water down from the sky, \* so We may bring life to a dead land, and let everything We have created drink from it, such as livestock and

On the basis of such data we can claim that *mercy* has an association with figurative language expressed by personification. We have five instances where words and phrases such as *revives the earth following its death*, *sends the winds to bring news* occur in the context of *mercy*. Priming for association with figurative language accounts for 8.1% of the instances of *mercy* in QIT. This is a new kind of priming which is not covered by the category of semantic association and it is an extension of the way we normally think of semantic association.

#### 4.10. Investigating pragmatic association for *mercy* in QIT

Just as a word or word sequence may be primed for semantic association, so it may be primed pragmatically as well. Pragmatic association occurs when a word or word sequence is associated with a set of features that all serve the same or similar pragmatic function. Hoey (2005: 37)

An example of the operation of pragmatic association in connection with QIT is that in addition to being typically primed for semantic association with *acts of grace* from God, *mercy* is typically associated with rhetorical questions; to show this, it is necessary to examine extended collocation lines. Sample instances are given below. It will be noticed that *mercy's* association with rhetorical questions takes two forms. In the first manifestation,

*mercy* occurs as part of the rhetorical question; in so doing, of course, it also forms a colligation with interrogatives. In the second, it occurs in the context of rhetorical questions. It can be argued that this is another new kind of priming effect. In that the association is with a pragmatic strategy, it appears to belong to pragmatic association, but none of Hoey's examples in Hoey (2005) are of this kind. Hoey (2005) talks of textual semantic association in his discussion of the textual dimensions of his theory; symmetry might suggest the existence of a textual pragmatic association, in which case this behaviour of *mercy* might be an instance.

Here we have two lists of examples – the first list is of examples where *mercy* occurs inside the rhetorical question and the other where *mercy* occurs alongside it.

#### **Examples where *mercy* occurs inside the rhetorical question.**

- 1- What about someone who has [received] an explanation from His Lord and to whom a witness from Him is reciting while Moses' book lies before Him as a token and *a mercy*? 13:17
- 2- How would it be without God's bounty and *mercy* towards you (all)? God is the receiver of Repentance, Wise. 24:10
- 3- 'How did all your storing things up and how proud you acted benefit you? Are you those who swore that God would not confer any *mercy* on them? 7:49
- 4- If God wanted [to cause] me any trouble, would such females ever remove His trouble? Or if He wants some *mercy* for me, will such females hold back *His mercy*? "SAY: "God is [the Means] by which I reckon; on Him do the reliant rely." 39: 38
- 5- They said: "we have brought you word of the Truth, so do not act so discouraged " He said: " Who despairs of His *Lord's mercy* except those who are lost?" 15:55-56
- 6- Who is so prayerful during the small hours of the night, bowing down on his knees [in worship], standing on his guard about the Hereafter, and hoping for his *Lord's mercy*? 39:9
- 7- Are they dividing up your *Lord's mercy*?

### Examples where *mercy* occurs alongside the rhetorical questions.

- 1- We have given them the book; we have spelled it out knowingly as a guideline and *mercy* for folk who believe. Are they only waiting for it to be interpreted? 7:52
- 2- Evidence has now come to you from your Lord, as well as guidance and *mercy*. Who is more in the wrong than someone who rejects God's signs and even evades them? 6:157
- 3- She said: It's too bad for me! Shall I bear a child while I am an old woman and this husband of mine is elderly? That would be an amazing thing! They said: 'Do you marvel at God's command? *God's mercy* and blessings are on all you people in [this] house, He is praiseworthy, Glorious!' 11:72-73
- 4- Yet are they indeed not such an access for them? God will admit them into his *mercy*; God is Forgiving, Merciful. 9: 99
- 5- Who guides you through darkness on land and at sea, and Who sends out winds as heralds for *His mercy*? Is there any deity alongside God? Exalted is God over anything they may associate [with Him]!27:63
- 6- Is it not sufficient for them that We have sent you down the book to be recited to them? In that lies *mercy* plus a reminder for folk who believe. 29:51
- 7- He said: " my folk, have you considered whether I bring any explanation from my Lord? He has given me *mercy* from Himself. Who will support me against God if I were to disobey Him? You would make me loser even more. 11: 63
- 8- He said: " How dare I trust you with him except I entrusted you with his brother long ago? God is the best Guardian and the most Merciful of *Mercy-granters*. 12:64

This pragmatic association accounts for 13.4 % of the instances of *mercy*. From these data it can be predicted that readers of QIT would be primed to pragmatically associate the word *mercy* with rhetorical questions. It is important to note here that this kind of pragmatic association appears to be also true of the Arabic of the Quran and to be a feature of the Quran's style. This will be investigated further in Chapters 5 and 7.



The association of <i>mercy</i> with rhetorical questions in QIT.	
Number of Question marks	20
<i>Mercy</i> without questions	129
Questions without <i>mercy</i>	996
The rest of the corpus	147966
Chi-Sq = 357.802, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.000	

Table 4.17. The association of *mercy* with rhetorical questions in QIT

The p-value is very small and shows that *mercy* has a strong association with rhetorical questions in QIT.

#### 4.11. Investigating colligations for *mercy* in QIT and BNC

The last concept to be investigated in connection with *mercy* is that of the colligations it forms. As noted in chapter 3, the basic idea of colligation is that a word may occur either with a particular grammatical form or as part of a grammatical structure more often than would be expected on the basis of random distribution.

Just as a lexical item may be primed to co-occur with another lexical item, so also it may be primed to occur in or with a particular grammatical function. Alternatively, it may be primed to avoid appearance in or co-occurrence with a particular grammatical function.

Hoey (2005: 61)

In other words, colligation is the grammatical association or the grammatical company that a word or word sequence keeps or avoids.

#### 4.11.1. First Colligational Statement of *mercy* with possession

The first observation to note about *mercy* in QIT is that it has a positive colligation with possession. This is indicated by the use of possessive determiners *his*, *my*, *your*, *our* and the apostrophe ('s) structure as shown in *Lord's mercy* and *God's mercy* (Biber et al., 1999: 340). Examination of the data for *mercy* shows that *mercy* likes to occur as a noun head in a noun phrase with possessive determiners. Statistics for the possessive with *mercy* in QIT are given below, with the BNC used for purposes of comparison,

BNC- <i>mercy</i> 1068		QIT- <i>mercy</i> 149	
His	56	His	19
her	8	-----	-----
its	4	-----	-----
my	2	My	2
our	7	Our	5
your	10	Your	3
87		29	
8.0 % of instances of <i>mercy</i>		19.5 % of instances of <i>mercy</i>	

Table 4.18. A comparison of QIT and the BNC with regard to the use of possessives with *mercy*

Table 4.18 shows that 8.0 % of the instances of *mercy* in the BNC have one of the set *his*, *her*, *its*, *my*, *our*, *your* immediately to its left. In QIT the proportion is 19.5 % of the instance of *mercy* which makes the occurrence of this colligational pattern over twice as common as in the BNC, despite the fact that fewer types of pronominal possessives are used in QIT. We

now turn to the apostrophe structure in QIT and the BNC, as reflected in the phrases *God's mercy* and *Lord's mercy*.

BNC- 1086-		QIT- 149-	
<i>God's mercy</i>	14	<i>God's mercy</i>	6
<i>Lord's mercy</i>	1	<i>Lord's mercy</i>	6
15		12	
1.4 % of instances of <i>mercy</i>		8.0 % of instances of <i>mercy</i>	

Table 4.19. Apostrophe possessive structure in QIT and BNC

From table 4.19 we can see that *mercy* occurs with the apostrophe possessive structure 5½ times more frequently in the QIT than in the BNC. Putting the results of the two tables together, we find that 27.5 % of the instances of *mercy* in the QIT are preceded by a possessive. Furthermore, all the possessives refer to God, whereas in the BNC only 9.4 % of instances of *mercy* are preceded by a possessive and not all of the pronominal possessives refer to God. Let us examine this statistically in order to verify the findings above.

	QIT <i>mercy</i> 149	BNC <i>mercy</i> 1086
Possessives	41	102
Other uses of <i>mercy</i>	108	984
Chi-Sq = 42.039, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.000		

Table 4.20: Colligation of *mercy* with possessives in QIT and BNC

The p-value is small which suggests that the QIT has a stronger colligation with possessives than in the BNC. Logically, since all the QIT possessives refer to God and only some of the

BNC possessives do, there is also a significant difference in the priming for the reference of possessives followed by *mercy*.

We can therefore claim that readers of the QIT will become primed to associate *mercy* with either *God* or referents to God. The claim is that this is a particular characteristic of the QIT and that it is not the case in the language as a whole. Furthermore, the claim is that possessive determiners accompanying this word in the particular text (QIT) are always used to refer to God and not to human beings, even though the possessives would normally refer to people.

**Figure 4.7: Concordance lines showing colligation of *mercy* with possessive determiners.**

### **Concordance *His* + *mercy***

#### N Concordance

56 towards you, as well as His mercy in this world and the  
57 lost hope, and scatters His mercy aboard. He is the  
58 sends winds to announce His mercy directly, so that whenever  
59 out winds as heralds for His mercy? Is there any deity  
60 out anyone He wishes for His mercy; God possesses splendid  
61 as heralds announcing His mercy. We send pure water  
62 to nearest. They hope for His mercy and fear His torment.  
63 give you double shares in His mercy and grant you a fight to  
64 God will admit them into His mercy; God is Forgiving,  
65 [these things]? "Out of His mercy He has granted you night  
66 anyone He wishes into His mercy. If they had dispersed,  
67 Lord will spread some of His mercy over you and make fitting  
68 Lord will admit those into His mercy who believe and perform  
69 anyone He wishes for His mercy; God possesses  
70 and if God's bounty and His mercy had not [rested] upon  
71 anyone He wishes into His mercy while wrongdoers will

### **Concordance *Our* + *mercy***

#### N Concordance

91 him as a prophet through Our mercy. Mention Ishmael in the  
92 way he wished. We confer Our mercy on anyone We wish to  
93 We admitted him into Our mercy; he was such an  
94 We admitted them to Our mercy; they were honorable.  
95 We bestowed some of Our mercy on them and granted

### **Concordance *Your +mercy***

#### N Concordance

312 folk! Save us through Your mercy from such disbelieving  
313 of it. Admit me through Your mercy among Your honorable  
314 and let us enter Your mercy! You are the most

### **Concordance *My +mercy***

#### N Concordance

86 meeting Him despair of My mercy; those will have painful  
87 with My torment while My mercy embraces everything; I

### **Concordance *God's +mercy***

#### N Concordance

47 still do not despair of God's mercy. God forgives all  
48 Look at the traces of God's mercy, how he revives the  
49 at God's command? God's mercy and blessings are on  
50 fear and expectation; God's mercy lies close to those  
51 will live for ever in God's mercy. Those are God's  
52 expect to receive God's mercy, for God is Forgiving,

### **Concordance *Lord's mercy***

#### N Concordance

77 the treasures of my Lord's mercy, you would still hold  
78 despairs of his Lord's mercy except those who  
79 a Reminder of your Lord's mercy towards his servant  
80 and hoping for his Lord's mercy? SAY: "Are those  
81 of others. Your Lord's mercy is better than what  
82 dividing up your Lord's mercy? We divide up their

We now look at whether the colligation of *mercy* with possessives is a specific property of the QIT or a property of religious language in general.

	QIT	BNC/RW
	<i>mercy</i> 149	<i>mercy</i> 77
Possessives	41	9
Other uses of <i>mercy</i>	108	68
Chi-Sq = 7.382, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.007		

Table.4.21. Colligation of *mercy* with possessives in QIT and WR/BNC

Since the p-value is still less than 0.05 this suggests that there is stronger colligation of *mercy* with possessives in QIT than in the BNC/RW.

Table 4.22 compares the use of possessives with *mercy* in the QIT with that in the King James translation of the Bible.

	QIT	BIT
	<i>mercy</i> 149	<i>mercy</i> 276
Possessives	41	59
Other uses of <i>mercy</i>	108	217
Chi-Sq = 2.027, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.154		

Table 4.22. Colligation of *mercy* with possessives in QIT and the BIT

The p-value is greater than 0.05 and this suggests that there is no significant difference between the QIT and the Bible in the use of possessive determiners. We conclude that the colligation is particular to Holy texts.

#### 4.11.2. Second Colligation of *mercy*: colligation with reflexive pronouns in QIT.

*Mercy* also colligates with reflexive pronouns (Biber et al., 1999: 342). This colligation occurs six times with *himself* and eight times with *Ourself* and accounts for 9.4 % of the instances of *mercy* in QIT. The examples below show this colligation; the object or the

indirect object again always refers to *God* with the reflexives used apparently to emphasize that the action of mercy is undertaken by Him alone with no interference from anyone.

**Figure 4.8: Concordance lines showing colligation of *mercy* with the reflexive pronoun *Ourself* in QIT.** <sup>17</sup>

N Concordance  
 201 disgrace of that day through mercy fro Ourself. Your Lord is  
 202 if We let him taste some mercy from Ourself after some  
 203 We let man taste some mercy from Ourself, he acts  
 204 to whom We had given mercy from Ourself and taught  
 205 along with him through mercy from Ourself – , We  
 206 believed with him through mercy from Ourself, while the  
 207 as a sign for mankind and a mercy from Ourself." It is a  
 208 who stood with him through mercy from Ourself, and We

The question then is again whether it is a finding about the word *mercy* in general or a finding about the word *mercy* in QIT. This is explored in the following two tables.

BNC - 1086-		QIT - 149	
himself	10	Himself	6
herself	7	-----	
themselves	6	-----	
myself	5	-----	
yourself	5	-----	
ourself	0	Ourself	8
33		14	
3.0 % of instances of <i>mercy</i>		9.4% of instances of <i>mercy</i>	

Table 4.23. Reflexive pronouns in QIT and BNC

<sup>17</sup> Example number 1 (fro) which should be *from* as found in the original instances of *mercy* in QIT.

Table 4.23. shows the reflexive pronouns which occur with *mercy* in the BNC and in the QIT. The first thing we can immediately notice is that the reflexive pronoun *Ourselves* occurs 8 times with *mercy* in QIT, but does not occur at all in the BNC in association with *mercy*. Conversely, *herself*, *themselves*, *myself*, and *yourself* all occur in the BNC but do not occur in QIT. In total all the *self* and *selves* words amount in the BNC to 33 out of 1086 accounting for 3.0 % of the instances of *mercy*. However, 9.4 % of instances of *mercy* occur with just two reflexive pronouns - *Himself* and *Ourselves* - in the QIT which means that the colligation is 3.1 times as common in QIT.

Secondly, there are 10 instances of *himself* proportionally in the BNC in conjunction with *mercy* which account for 0.9 % of instances of *mercy* in BNC; in QIT however, there are 6 instances of *Himself* comprising 4.0 % of all the instances of *mercy*. This means that the colligation is four times as common in the QIT than in the BNC and this is very significant as the p- value is less than 0.05.

	QIT	BNC
	<i>mercy</i> 149	<i>mercy</i> 1086
Reflexive pronouns	14	33
Other uses of <i>mercy</i>	135	1053
Chi-Sq = 14.465, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.000		

Table 4.24. Colligation of *mercy* with reflexive pronouns in QIT and BNC

Comparing the colligation in general, the p value shows that there is a significant difference in the use of the reflexive pronouns between the QIT and the BNC.

There is no association with reflexive pronouns in the BNC/RW or the Bible and therefore we conclude that this feature is a distinctive feature of QIT. We also can claim that the



reflexive pronoun *Ourself* is a QIT feature only and that *mercy* in QIT has a strong tendency to colligate with only two reflexive pronouns both of which refer to God and are capitalized.

#### 4.11.3. Third Colligation of *mercy*: colligation with prepositions in QIT.

The next colligational statement is that *mercy* tends to colligate with postmodifying Prepositional phrases. 34.3% (table 4.25) of the instances of *mercy* in the BNC occur with a preposition immediately to the right. In the QIT, 39.6% occur with a preposition immediately after, which means that the colligation is 1.2 times more in the QIT, and that is not a significant difference as is demonstrated in Table 4.26.

Prepositions			
BNC- 1086		QIT- 149	
At	7	From	26
By	6	For	16
For	18	In	2
From	9	On	5
In	9	Of	1
Of	245	To	5
On	44	Towards	4
To	17		
Than	2		
Upon	11		
With	4		
372		59	
34.3%		39.6%	

Table 4.25. Prepositions immediately after *mercy* in the QIT and BNC

	QIT <i>Mercy</i> 149	BNC <i>Mercy</i> 1086
Prepositions	59	372
Other uses of <i>mercy</i>	90	714
Chi-Sq = 1.646, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.199		

Table 4.26. Colligation of *mercy* with prepositions in QIT and BNC

The p-value is greater than 0.05 and this tells us that the QIT and the BNC both contain the colligation of *mercy* with prepositions. What we have discovered here therefore is that this is a colligation that is true of the language as a whole.

If however we look at the actual prepositions that are used in this colligation we find that *from* occurs 9 times in the BNC and 26 times in the QIT. Likewise *for* occurs 18 times in the BNC and 16 times in the QIT which is a major difference proportionally, given the number of instances of *mercy* in the two corpora.

1086 - <i>Mercy</i> instances in BNC			149 - <i>Mercy</i> instances in QIT			
For	18	1.7%	For	16	10.7%	6.3 times more common in QIT
From	9	0.8%	From	26	17.4%	21.8 times more common in QIT.
Of	245	22.6%	Of	1	0.7%	One example only.
		32.3 times more common in the BNC				

Table 4.27: The difference in proportion of occurrence of certain prepositions in the two corpora.

There are too few data to allow us to comment on the proportional frequencies of certain prepositions in the corpora. The Preposition *of* on the other hand occurs vastly less often in the QIT than in the BNC: there is just one instance in the Quran versus 245 in the BNC.

Now let us examine the above findings statistically to find out if they are significant and then compare the colligation in QIT with that in other religious texts i.e. the Bible and the religious writing of the BNC in order to determine whether the specific features of the QIT are unique to the translation or are part of a larger style of religious writing. We begin with the colligation of *mercy* with *from* in the QIT and the BNC.

	QIT	BNC
	<i>mercy</i> 149	<i>mercy</i> 1086
From	26	9
Other uses of <i>mercy</i>	123	1077
Chi-Sq = 131.445, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.000		

Table 4.28: Colligation of *mercy* with *from* in the QIT and BNC

The low p-value gives evidence that there is a stronger colligation of *mercy* with *from* in the QIT than in the BNC.

	QIT	BNC
	<i>mercy</i> 149	<i>mercy</i> 1086
For	16	18
Other uses of <i>mercy</i>	133	1068
Chi-Sq = 40.356, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.000		

Table 4.29: Colligation of *mercy* with *for* in the QIT and BNC

The p-value again shows that the difference in strength of the colligation of *mercy* with *for* in the QIT and in the BNC is significant.

The case in the BNC/RW is that there is only one example of *from* followed by *mercy* so the number is too small to compare statistically with the QIT and there is no instance of *for* at all after *mercy*. The only example in the BNC/RW is as follows:

1- social spirituality. Receiving <w NN1>mercy from God can only mean that

However, in the Bible we have five instances of *for* following *mercy* but no instance of *from* following *mercy*.

**Figure 4.9: Concordance showing *mercy* followed by *for* in the Bible**

N Concordance  
 117 that keepeth covenant and mercy for them that love him  
 118 4 But God, who is rich in mercy, for his great love  
 119 unto thee, O Lord, belongeth mercy: for thou renderest to  
 120 I will be glad and rejoice in thy mercy: for thou hast considered  
 121 goodness and truth, 7 Keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving

Two of these (119 and 120) use an entirely different sense of *for*, which means *because*.

	QIT	Bible
	<i>mercy</i> 149	<i>mercy</i> 276
<i>For</i>	16	5
Other uses of <i>mercy</i>	133	271
Chi-Sq = 16.416, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.000		

Table 4.30. Colligation of *mercy* with *for* in the QIT and the Bible in translation

The p-value presents the fact that there is a significant difference in the use of *for* after *mercy* in the QIT as compared with the Bible in translation. So the claim here is that the prepositions

*for* and *from* in the phrase *mercy from* and *mercy for* are QIT specific features. What this actually shows is that *mercy* in QIT is about *mercy* coming *from* God *for* the people He has mercy on, whereas *mercy* in the BNC is more commonly *mercy on* or *mercy of* in the idiomatic expressions *have mercy on* and *at the mercy of*. The use of *mercy* in the Bible in translation is almost the same as that of *mercy* in the BNC occurring commonly in expressions like *have mercy upon me/ her/us* etc or *have mercy on me/ her/us* etc or in the repeated expression *for his mercy endureth for ever* which occurred 43 times.

#### **4.11.4. Fourth colligation of *mercy*: colligation with full lexical verbs in QIT.**

*Mercy* colligates with full or lexical verbs Biber et al (1999: 63-64) (there are 40 instances of full lexical verbs occurring with *mercy*) such as *find, grant, scatters, taste, send, prescribe, proclaim, receive, show, want, and enter*. This accounts for 26.8% of instances of *mercy* in QIT. It is noted that *mercy* occurs only once with the verb *have*, in example number 54-*Our Lord, we believe, so forgive us and have mercy on us; You are the best One to show mercy!* and it occurs twice with the verb BE in examples 4-*..and believes for the believer's sake, and is a mercy for any of you who do believe. and 7-..He said, this is a mercy from my Lord*. This evidence suggests that *mercy* strongly colligates with lexical verbs but does not colligate with the verbs BE or HAVE in the QIT.

The question then is whether this is especially true of the QIT or whether it is true of the word in general. Examination of the BNC showed that 67 of the 1086 lines in the BNC have full lexical verbs in L1 position; mainly *have* which occurs 57 times. So 6.2 % of instances containing *mercy* in the BNC have full lexical verbs immediately preceding the nominal group functioning as object with *mercy* as its head. On the other hand, in the QIT 26.8% of instances of *mercy* are immediately preceded by full lexical verbs under the same conditions.

This means that it is over four times more common as a structure in the QIT than in the BNC.

(See table 4.32 for a statistical comparison)

	QIT	BNC
	<i>Mercy</i> 149	<i>Mercy</i> 1086
Lexical verbs	40	67
Other uses of <i>mercy</i>	109	1019
Chi-Sq = 70.783, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.000		

Table 4.31. Colligation of *mercy* with lexical verbs in the QIT and the BNC.

The low p-value suggests a significant difference in the use of lexical verbs in the QIT and the BNC. In the RW/BNC there are only six examples of lexical verbs occurring with *mercy*. Although in the Bible in translation there are 72 instances of lexical verbs occurring with *mercy*; 50 of them occur with *have* in the phrase *have mercy upon me/on me /on us* etc. The colligation of *mercy* with lexical verbs in the Bible in translation accounts for 26.1% of the 276 instances of *mercy* in the Bible in translation. A statistical comparison of QIT and BIT in respect of this colligation is given in table 4.32.

	QIT	BIT
	<i>mercy</i> 149	<i>mercy</i> 276
Lexical verbs	40	72
Other uses of <i>mercy</i>	109	204
Chi-Sq = 0.029, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.865		

Table 4.32: Colligation of *mercy* with lexical verbs in the QIT and the BIT.

Although there is a clear relationship between the frequency of occurrences of collocations, colligations, and other associations in the translations we have been considering and the original Arabic of the Quran, this relationship is not simple or automatic. A word may belong to a particular class in a language (e.g. a verb) and be changed to a different class in the translations (e.g. a noun). Sometimes this does not affect the meaning but in some cases the meaning is affected depending on the elements that have had to be added in the translations. For example, there are circumstances in the Arabic of the Quran where the word *mercy* is strictly functioning as a verb and is being translated as something like *receive mercy*, *show mercy*, *have mercy*. This means we have more instances of the word *mercy* as noun in the English version than we do in the original text. The addition of elements like *receive*, *show*, *grant*, to the word *mercy* has changed the class of the word from verb into a noun functioning as object and has brought into being a key colligation (with lexical verbs) and key collocation. This shift in some cases distorts the meaning of the original. Figure 4.10 gives some examples.

**Figure 4.10: Concordance lines showing a shift in the function of the word *mercy*.**

N Concordance  
 303 not forgive us and grant us mercy, we'll be losers." He  
 304 said: "Our Lord, grant us mercy from Your presence  
 305 have guided us; grant us mercy from Your presence,  
 306 forgive us, and show us mercy! You are our P  
 307 our Lord does not show us mercy and forgive us, we  
 308 so pardon us and show us mercy; You are the best  
 309 or whether He will show us mercy? Still who will shelter

The inaccuracy in translation lies in the fact that in the original Arabic God is performing an action which we are receiving, so God is actually doing something to us. He is acting on us rather than giving us something, whereas English treats *mercy* as if it was a gift (which it is) but also as if it was an object that God passes. So God gives us *mercy* and we receive *mercy*

from Him. So *mercy* becomes like an object, something that is passed or given. In the Arabic of the Quran it is a more powerful notion with different implications. English translations probably cannot do it differently, but still there is a kind of distortion, and the linguistic effect is that *mercy* has a stronger tendency to be an object in English than in Arabic, and as earlier noted the Verb Object colligation created produces new collocations.

#### **4.11.5. Fifth colligation of *mercy* : colligation with subordinators**

The last colligational pattern to be discussed here is *mercy*'s colligation with subordinator clauses (Biber et al., 1999: 134-135). The word *mercy* occurs with a large number of purpose clauses introduced by *so that*, *so*, *in order that* *for*, and *to*. This also can be an example of textual semantic association. There are 30 instances of purpose clauses, which accounting for 20.1 % of the instances of *mercy*.

- 1- We gave Moses the Book as a fulfilment for someone who acts kindly, and an analysis of everything, as well as guidance and mercy so they may believe about meeting their Lord.
- 2- -Obey God and the messenger so you may find mercy!
- 3- \*He is the One Who sends winds to announce His mercy directly, *so that* whenever they lift up heavy clouds , We drive them along to a dead countryside and send down water from them; and thus We bring forth every kind of fruit. [Thus We bring forth the dead too so you may bear this in mind. 57: ]
- 4- \* Among His signs is [the fact] that He sends the winds to bring news so He may let you taste some of His mercy, and so ships may sail at His command, in order that you may seek some of His bounty and so that you may act grateful\*
- 5- Are you surprised that a Reminder should come to you from your Lord through one of your men, so He may warn you and you will do your duty, and in order that you may receive mercy?" 63:7

Based on this evidence we can claim that *mercy* has a very strong colligation with subordinator clauses. This colligational statement is also an instance of *a textual semantic*



*association* (Hoey.2005a,b), in which *mercy* is involved in a textual semantic relationship with expressions of purpose.

Another textual semantic association (which also can be colligation) combination that *mercy* forms is with conditional clauses of all types. The crucial point about purpose clauses and conditional clauses is that with regard to both of them, *mercy* has two relationships to them. *Mercy* can either appear within the clauses or it can appear alongside them. This kind of relationship occurs in 28 cases of the instances of *mercy* and accounts for 18.8% of the instances of *mercy* in QIT.

In the first example *mercy* is inside the conditional but in example 4 it is alongside it.

Some examples are:

- 1- If God's bounty and mercy had not lain upon you, a faction of them would have worried about how to lead you astray....
- 2- If it had not been for God's bounty and mercy towards you, not one of you would have ever been pure,
- 3- If We ever let man taste any mercy from Us, then snatched it a way from him, he would become despondent, ungrateful.
- 4- If God so wished, He would have set them up as a single community, but He admits anyone He wishes into His mercy...
- 5- SAY": Even if you controlled the treasures of my Lord's mercy, you would still hold them back in dread of overspending...
- 6- If You do not forgive me and show me mercy, I may become a loser.
- 7- IF God wanted [to cause] me any trouble, would such females ever remove His trouble? Or if He wants some mercy for me, will such females hold back His mercy?
- 8- If we let him taste some mercy from Ourselves after some hardship has afflicted him he is sure to say: "This is mine..."
- 9- If you only sought forgiveness from God, You might find some mercy.
- 10- SAY: "If the Mercy-giving had a son, I would be the first to worship [him].
- 11- If our Lord does not show us mercy and forgive us, we will be losers.
- 12- If You do not forgive us and grant us mercy, we will be losers.
- 13- If He wishes, He will show you mercy, while if He wishes, He will punish.

Examination of the BNC showed that there are only 9 instances of conditional sentences as shown in figure 4.11 and therefore this relationship is weak in the BNC. In the Bible there are no conditional clauses associating with *mercy*. So again the claim that *mercy* has a textual semantic association with conditional clauses is only true of the Quranic text in translation and is not a feature of the word itself in the general language or in other religious texts.

**Figure 4.11. Concordance lines showing instances of *if* in the BNC in collocation with *mercy*.**

N Concordance

- 1 mischief in him or <w NN1>mercy: &quot;if you need me,
- 2 don't expect any <w NN1>mercy if you're a complete
- 3 If we experience the <w NN1>mercy of Jesus, we will
- 4 and scream for <w NN1>mercy. &quot;if you bleed me
- 5 if she showed any <w NN1>mercy. And she was thinking
- 6 die first. He'll show <w NN1>mercy on him, if he'll plead for
- 7 on the cab-driver's <w NN1>mercy: &quot;if you know
- 8 &mdash; if you ask <w NN1>mercy for Sidacai, he must
- 9 also believe if these <w NN1>mercy missions continue it

#### 4.12. Keyword 2: *Torment*

The second word among the keywords in the Irving translation that I chose to investigate is *torment*. *Torment* is an uncommon word in English occurring 312 times in the BNC after the removal of duplicates. In the BNC it is most commonly used in such expressions as in, *in torment*, *to torment*, *the torment of*, and *to torment the*. On the other hand, the word *torment* is proportionally very common in the QIT where it occurs 306 times. Thematically, what is important about this frequency is that it tells us that God is not just the God of *mercy* but He is also the God of justice. God may love us, He is merciful to us, but He may also punish us. However, interestingly the data show the association of *torment* with evil actions, and not with God.

#### **4.13. Investigating collocations and semantic associations for *torment* in QIT and BNC.**

Before we look at the collocations and semantic associations of *torment* in QIT, there is one very important colligation to be noted. For English speakers, *torment* is primed to function either as a noun or a verb. In the BNC, over a quarter of instances of *torment* are verbs: 73 instances are verb uses and 246 are noun uses. For readers of QIT, on the other hand, there is no choice: it is always a noun with only two exceptions (i.e. verb use) as shown below.

- 1- On that day, no one will torment [anyone] with torment like His,
- 2- Send the Children of Israel away with us and do not torment them.

The Arabic language is capable of using the word *torment* as a verb but the QIT has not chosen to use it in the same way as in the Arabic of the Quran because of the differences between the two languages. So in the Arabic of the Quran we have instances where *torment* is used as a verb and this is changed into a noun in the QIT.

#### **4.14. The collocation of *torment* with evaluative adjectives in QIT and BNC.**

*Torment* collocates with a range of evaluative/emotive adjectives (Biber et al., 1999: 509-515), the most common of which is *painful* which occurs 65 times in L1 position. This collocation is a collocation in the QIT and matches a similar collocation in the original text. There is then a large drop to the next most common left collocates, among the adjective collocates, which are *severe* which occurs 14 times, *the worst* which occurs 10 times, *humiliating* which occurs 6 times and *shameful* and *serious* which each occur 5 times. The data follow for the more common collocates.

**Figure 4.12: partial concordance of *torment* showing the most common collocates in the QIT**

N Concordance  
114 Yet you will taste painful torment and only be rewarded for  
115 them who disbelieved with painful torment. While those who  
116 who turns away with painful torment. God was pleased with  
117 Heaven on us, or give us painful torment!" God is not apt to punish  
118 harm touch her lest some painful torment should overtake you.  
119 from them; they will have painful torment. They may want to leave  
120 it wrongfully, taste some painful torment. Thus We settled  
121 and protect you from painful torment." Anyone who does not  
122 wealth, We have reserved painful torment for those among them who  
123 a scornful and proud with painful torment; they will not find any  
124 He will punish you with painful torment." There is no objection for  
125 boiling water and suffer painful torment because of how they have  
126 shelter disbelievers from painful torment?" SAY: "It will be the  
127 saying what they say, painful torment will afflict those among  
128 defiant later on, will have painful torment. You who believe, do not  
129 that will save you from painful torment? You should believe in  
130 sat around (at home). Painful torment will afflict those of them  
131 water to drink and painful torment because they have been

**Figure4.13: Concordance lines showing *severe* a common collocate of *torment* in QIT**

N Concordance  
186 a covering; they will have severe torment. Some people say: "We  
187 We will let them taste severe torment because of how they have  
188 there will be both severe torment and forgiveness as well as  
189 know it. God has prepared severe torment for them; with them,  
190 in God's signs will have severe torment - God is Powerful, the  
191 God has prepared severe torment for them, so heed God,  
192 while disbelievers will have severe torment. If God were to expand  
193 those who disbelieve taste severe torment; We will reward them for  
194 a gate for them leading to severe torment, why they were

Altogether there are 105 instances of adjectives in the position immediately to the left of *torment*, which account for 34.3 % of the instances of *torment*. This brings up the question of how such adjectives might be grouped. There are two points here; the first point is that, by looking at the concordance data for *torment*, *torment* occurs with adjectives more often than is the case for many nouns. The adjectives are all qualitative.

Secondly, it can be seen from the data that the adjectives that the word *torment* collocates with comprise a set of negative words which can be classified into two categories. The first set contains words which describe the level of *torment*. So we have *great torment*, *harsh torment*, *terrible torment*, *serious torment*, *awful torment*, *painful torment*, *severe torment* and *the worst torment*. The other set of words describe the feeling that a person will experience as a result of the *torment* (a psychological feeling): *shameful*, *humiliating*, and *disgraceful*. These adjectives are not about pain, but describe a separate kind of punishment.

In the BNC, however, we have 65 adjectives. Though this means that the colligation with adjectives is true of the BNC as well as the QIT, it represents just over a quarter of the instances of the noun in the BNC, whereas in the QIT, as we have seen, 34.3% of the nouns occur with adjectives. The table below tests for the significant difference.

	QIT	BNC
	<i>torment</i> 306	<i>torment</i> 312
Adjectives	105	65
Other uses of <i>torment</i>	201	247
Chi-Sq = 14.078, DF = 1, P-Value 0.000		

Table 4.33: Colligation of *torment* with adjectives in QIT and BNC

The p-value shows that the difference between the QIT and the BNC in terms of the colligation with adjectives is very significant.

*Torment* occurs only once in the religious writing of the BNC. It occurs 11 times in the Bible but there is no occurrence of *torment* with adjectives as shown below.

**Figure 4.14: Full concordance lines of *torment* in the Bible.**

N Concordance

- 1 afar off for the fear of her torment, weeping and wailing,
- 2 afar off for the fear of her torment, saying, Alas, alas,
- 3 lived deliciously, so much torment and sorrow give her:
- 4 11 And the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever
- 5 their torment was as the torment of a scorpion, when
- 6 five months: and their torment was as the torment
- 7 out fear: because fear hath torment. He that feareth is
- 8 also come into this place of torment. 29 Abraham saith
- 9 most high? I beseech thee, torment me not. 29 (For he
- 10 thee by God, that thou torment me not. 8 For he
- 11 art thou come hither to torment us before the time?

In the language as a whole *torment* has both nominal and verbal uses, but in QIT we find only two instances of the verbal use, as shown in 4.11.

#### **4.15. The collocation of *torment* with the subject pronoun *they* in QIT and BNC**

The second collocation the concordance data show is the collocation of *torment* with the subject pronoun *they* which occurs 69 times in total, 27 occurring in L4 position and accounting for 8.8% of all instances of *torment* in QIT. The word *they* has an association with different groups of people, but the majority are evil in some way, in particular, disbelievers, evil doers, losers, hypocrites, etc.

**Figure 4.15: Concordance lines showing the collocation of *torment* with *they* in L4 position in QIT.**

N Concordance  
 74 be accepted from them; they will have painful torment. They may want to leave the Fire, yet  
 75 for some other skins so they may taste the torment [again]. God is Powerful, Wise. We will  
 76 to triumph over torment. They will have painful torment! God holds control over Heaven and  
 77 them in this world. They shall have the torment of Fire in the Hereafter. That is because  
 78 their [share of] malice. They will have painful torment because they have been lying. Whenever  
 79 world and the Hereafter. They will have severe torment on a day when their tongues, their hands  
 80 word to hypocrites that they shall have painful torment. Do those who enlist disbelievers as  
 81 has cursed them, and they will have constant torment. Just as those before them were firmer  
 82 in this world, while they will have serious torment in the Hereafter, except for those who  
 83 God in any way, while they will have painful torment. Let not those who disbelieve consider  
 84 will not purify them while they will have painful torment. A group of them twist their tongues  
 85 nor will He purify them; they will have painful torment! Those are the ones who have purchased  
 86 yet they will not answer them. They will see the Torment-if only they had accepted guidance!  
 87 there hangs a covering; they will have severe torment. Some people say: "We believe in God

All the examples above refer to straightforwardly bad people and also have general reference. This is again what I refer to as referential association. In the BNC however, *they* occurs as a collocate of *torment* 12 times in total and only two of these instances occur in L4 position, accounting for 0.6% of the instances of *torment* in the BNC. Furthermore, the great majority of the uses of *they* in the whole BNC (i.e. not in connection with *torment*) are not general uses but are particular uses referring to specific people. The use of *they* to refer to a general group of people is relatively rare in the BNC, whereas in QIT most of the instances of *they* are used in this general way.

	QIT	BNC
	<i>torment</i> 306	<i>torment</i> 312
<i>They</i>	27	2
Other uses of <i>torment</i>	279	310
Chi-Sq = 23.127, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.000		

Table 4.34. The collocation of *torment* with *they* in the QIT and BNC

Since the p-value is so small, this means that the difference in the collocation of *torment* with *they* in QIT and BNC is very significant. There is no occurrence of *they* in the Bible as a collocate for *torment*.

#### **4.16. The collocation of *torment* with *taste* in QIT.**

The third collocation the concordance data show is the collocation of *torment* with *taste* which occurs 25 times in total as a left collocate, 18 of them occur in L2 position, six of them occur in L1 position and one occurs in L3 position. The collocation of *torment* with *taste* in total accounts for 8.2% of the instances of *torment* in the QIT.

*Taste* is not identified as a collocate in the BNC or the Bible in conjunction with *torment* and therefore it is a QIT specific feature.

#### **4.17. A new kind of priming: the *Pronominal Semantic Association*.**

In principle, what we have been demonstrating is a clear evidence of a semantic association, but it is different from semantic association as usually defined. *Torment* has a relationship with *they*, which in turn has a relationship to a semantic set. This is not direct semantic association. On the other hand, this kind of semantic association is also different from the referential association that I have elsewhere identified, where there is a use of pronoun and that pronoun uniquely refers to *God*. The difference lies in the fact that *God* was not the only designation that appeared. Sometimes it was *He*, sometimes it was *God*, *Almighty*, other times *Lord*, so we had a set of words or expressions all referring to *God* and that is one form of relationship.

But in the case under consideration, the relationship is the other way around. We do not have a set of words; we only have a single word *they*, which neither refers to unlimited range of



referents (as in English in general) nor to one specific referent (as in the use of *He* to refer uniquely to God) but refers to different members of a particular semantic set. We will name this kind of association *Pronominal Semantic Association* and use it to describe the situation where a word forms a relationship with a pronoun which itself refers to members of a specified set.

#### 4.18. The Semantic associations of *torment* in QIT with negative adjectives.

The largest of the semantic associations suggested by the data in QIT is the association with negative adjectives. Whereas in QIT *torment* has strong negative semantic associations, in the BNC there is no clear pattern. Many of the adjectives in the BNC are not inherently bad such as *private*, *prolonged*, *settled*, *strange*, *sweet* etc, and the only adjectives with which *torment* collocates in the BNC are *mental* (which occurs seven times) and *continued* (which occurs six times). Although there are a number of negative adjectives (such as *awful*, *brutal*, *complicated*, *cruel*, and *disgusting*) in the BNC, it is still a weaker semantic association in connection with *torment*. In the BNC we only have 8 negative adjectives which means that it is 2.6% vs. 34.3% proportionally.

	QIT <i>torment</i> 306	BNC <i>torment</i> 312
Association of <i>torment</i> with negative adjectives	105	8
Other uses of <i>torment</i>	201	304
Chi-Sq = 104.225, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.000		

Table 4.35: Semantic association of *torment* with negative adjectives in QIT and BNC

The p-value of 0,000 confirms the finding above that there is a big significant difference between the QIT and the BNC in the association of *torment* with negative adjectives.

Hoey (2005) shows that primings nest and combine producing different clusters which have their own separate collocations.

The nested combination *the torment of* occurs 35 times accounting for 11.4% of the instances of *torment* in QIT. This combination (*the torment of*) has its own collocates which are different from the typical collocates of *torment* as a single word. More specifically the nested combination *the torment of* collocates with the word *day* that refers to a particular day which is the *Day of Judgment* and has a semantic association with *fire* within which semantic association, certain words are collocations. In other words in 35 of all instances of the phrase *the torment of*, 14 i.e. 40% of the instances of the phrase have that word explicitly expressing burning or fire. In the BNC however, the cluster *the torment of* occurs only 12 times accounting for 3.8% of the instances of *torment* in the BNC which means that it is three times more common in the QIT than in the BNC. The cluster *the torment of* does not occur in the Bible in translation. Furthermore, the phrase *the torment of* in the BNC does not collocate with *day*, which it does in QIT and which there always refers to a particular day – the day of Resurrection. Note that the word *days* occurs only once in the BNC in association with the nested combination *the torment of* as seen in the example below taken from the BNC.

Urge to the title, reveals the <w NN1>torment of his days at Old Trafford

	QIT <i>torment</i> 306	BNC <i>torment</i> 312
<i>The torment of</i>	35	12
Other uses of <i>torment</i>	271	300
Chi-Sq = 12.671, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.000		

Table 4.36. The occurrence of the cluster *the torment of* in the QIT and the BNC

The p-value shows a significant difference in the frequency of the cluster *the torment of* in the QIT and the BNC.

**Figure 4.16: Full Concordance of *the torment of* in the QIT.**

N	Concordance
1	you are doing." So they rejected him, and the torment of a gloomy day gripped them;
2	ay with your souls! Today you are awarded the torment of shame because you have b
3	nd children, gardens and springs. Yet I fear the torment of a terrible day for you!" The
4	ight. I see you enjoy well-being while I fear the torment of an overpowering day for you
5	e]; you have no other deity than Him. I fear the torment of an awful day for you!" The el
6	ce. Do not be an associator!" SAY: "I fear the torment of an awful day if I should diso
7	bounty. If you should turn away, then I fear the torment of a great day for you. Unto G
8	worship nobody except God [Alone]. I fear the torment of a painful day for you!" The
9	ter him): "Will you worship only God? I fear the torment of an awful day for you!" They
10	committed to [live in] peace. SAY: "I fear the torment of an awful day if I should diso
11	g fine in the Hereafter, and shield us from the torment of Fire!" Those will have a por
12	ent and follow Your path: shield them from the torment of Hades. Our Lord, show the
13	t death [they had]. He will shield them from the torment of Hades as a boon from your
14	n them. Their Lord has shielded them from the torment of Hades: 'Eat and drink at lei
15	his in vain! Glory be to You! Shield us from the torment of Fire! 'Our Lord, anyone Yo
16	has compensated us and shielded us from the torment of [Hell's] scorching breath. W
17	forgive us our offences and shield us from the torment of Fire!" [They are] the patient
18	ent, will have Hell's torment; they will have the torment of burning. The ones who belie
19	unished them in this world. They shall have the torment of Fire in the Hereafter. That is
20	Do not touch her so that you hurt her, lest the torment of an awful day may seize you
21	ah's people. Once they believed, We lifted the torment of shame from them during wo
22	til the Hour comes upon them suddenly or the torment of a desolate day reaches the
23	lieve, striking their faces and backs: "Taste the torment of the Blaze! That is because
24	e who have done wrong will be told: "Taste the torment of eternity. Have you not been
25	] gloom, they will be sent back to it: "Taste the torment of burning!" God will show th
26	ut any right to [do so]. We will say: "Taste the torment of bumng." That [has happene
27	ll be returned to it. They will be told: "Taste the torment of the Fire which you have bee
28	urs! We have likewise forgotten you. Taste the torment of eternity because of what yo
29	will tell those who have done wrong: "Taste the torment of Fire which you have been d
30	e in this world while We shall let him taste the torment of burning on Resurrection Da
31	sastrous days, so We might let them taste the torment of humiliation during worldly lif
32	that he shall mislead him and guide him to the torment of the Blaze. O men, if you h
33	ven though Satan has been inviting them to the torment of the Blaze? Anyone who c
34	gs for a while then drive him along towards the torment of Fire. How awful is goal!" T
35	ment of a gloomy day gripped them; it was the torment of a terrible day! In that is a s

#### 4.19. Pragmatic Association for *torment* in QIT and BNC

A pragmatic association that *torment* has is with expressions of emphasis, such as *even*, which occurs 30 times, *indeed* which occurs 6 times and *really* and *at all* which each occur 4 times. When all these occurrences are grouped together, they account for 14.4 % of the 306 instances of *torment*.

Examples are:

- 1- Such is *torment*, although *torment* in the Hereafter will be *even* greater if they only realized it.
- 2- Theirs will be *torment* during worldly life, while *torment* in the Hereafter will be *even* more heartrending
- 3- *Indeed* they are in doubt about My reminder; rather they have not yet tasted any *torment!*
- 4- "*Indeed* you have no welcome either. You have prepared it for us; what an awful plight!" They will say: "Our Lord, whoever prepared this for us? Give him double *torment* in the Fire!"
- 5- 'We believe in some and disbelieve in others;" wanting to adopt a course in between, are *really* disbelievers. We have reserved humiliating *torment* for disbelievers.
- 6- Has he probed the Unseen or made a pled [Sic] with the Mercy-giving? *Not at all!* We shall write down anything he says and extend a chance of *torment* to him;

This strong association indicates the seriousness of the situation described in the context. The term *even* is the most commonly used to draw attention to an element of surprise in the text. The case in the BNC is that only three emphatic expressions occur in association with *torment*. These are *even*, *surely* and *really* which each occur one time. There are no emphatic expression in the Bible in association with *torment* which means that this kind of relationship is much stronger in QIT than in the BNC and is a QIT specific feature in comparison with the

BIT.

	QIT <i>torment</i> 306	BNC <i>torment</i> 312
Emphatic expressions	44	3
Other uses of <i>torment</i>	262	309
Chi-Sq = 39.580, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.000		

Table 4.37. Pragmatic association of *torment* with emphatic expressions in the QIT and BNC

The p-value= 0.000 confirms the result above that pragmatic association of *torment* with expressions of emphasis is much stronger in the QIT than in the BNC.

#### 4.20. Priming with figurative language in conjunction with *torment*

We saw that *mercy* had an association with figurative language. The same proves to be true of *torment*. The second instance of pragmatic association with *torment* is that of figures of speech, such as *metaphor*, *irony* and *sarcasm*.

Examples once again illustrate the new kind of priming that we call priming for figurative language.

- 1- Those are the ones who *have purchased error instead of guidance, and torment instead of forgiveness*
- 2- Those who *purchase disbelief at the price of faith* will never injure God in any way, while they will have painful torment.
- 3- Some day *torment* will cover them from both above and from underneath their feet, and He will say: "*Taste what you have been doing!*"
- 4- God lets them *taste disgrace* during worldly life while torment in the Hereafter will be even greater if they only realized it!
- 5- *Announce painful torment* for those who disbelieve in God's signs and kill prophets without any right to, and kill those people who order fair play. \*[sic]
- 6- *Announce* some painful *torment* to him! \* [sic] Whenever he learns anything about Our signs, he takes them as a joke.
- 7- *Announce painful torment* to those who hoard gold and silver and do not spend them for God's sake
- 8- *Announce painful torment* to those who disbelieve, \* [sic] except for those associators with whom you have already made a treaty;

What we are finding here is actually an overriding of more general priming because the word *announces* has a good news association and is often used in a positive context. It is however, not used for the same purpose within QIT. The Quran text overrides that

priming and substitutes something truly negative instead of the positive. By overriding the typical priming for *announce*, we get a shocking message. A study of the table of collocates of *announce* in the BNC suggests no figurative use of *announce*.

### Examples of Irony:

- 1- Anyone who kills a believer deliberately will receive as his *reward* [a sentence] to live in Hell for ever. God will be Angry with him and curse him, and prepare dreadful torment for him.
- 2- What *reward* has anyone of you who does so, except disgrace during worldly life, while on Resurrection Day they will be driven off to the harshest torment? God does not overlook anything you do!
- 3- The ones who disbelieved will have Hell fire. It will be neither finished off for them so that they may [really] die; nor will its torment be lightened for them. Thus *We reward* every ingrate.
- 4- Yet you will taste painful torment and only be *rewarded* for what you have been doing, \*\* [sic] except for God's sincere servants.
- 5- We will let those who disbelieve taste severe torment; *We will reward* them for the worst which they have done. Such will be the reward for God' enemies: the Fire! They will find a home there for ever as a reward because they have repudiated Our signs.
- 6- He will say: "Thus did Our signs come to you, and you forgot them; that is why you have been forgotten today." Thus *We reward* anyone who overdoes things and does not believe in his Lord's signs. Torment in the Hereafter will be even more severe and everlasting.
- 7- Then those who have done wrong will be told: "Taste the torment of eternity. Have you not been *rewarded* merely with something you have earned?"
- 8- They will conceal their regret once they see the torment; *We will place* fetters around the necks of those who disbelieve. Will they not be *rewarded* for just what they have been doing?
- 9- Evidence has now come to you from your Lord, as well as guidance and mercy. Who is more in the wrong than someone who rejects God's signs and even evades them? *We will reward* those who evade Our signs with the worst torment because they have acted so evasive. \* [sic] Are they only waiting for angels to come to them or for your Lord to arrive, or for some of your Lord's signs to come?

The examples above illustrate a new kind of priming that is *priming with figurative language*.

This kind of priming is apparent in 25 instances and accounts for 8.2 % of instances of

*torment*. The two points that I want to make here is that *reward* is associated with abstract statements as can be seen from the examples;

The *reward* for God's enemies: the fire.

What *reward* has anyone of you who does so, except disgrace during worldly life, while on Resurrection Day they will be driven off to the harshest *torment*?

Usually one is rewarded with something good and not something really bad; this is an unusual use of the word *reward*. *Reward* with *torment of fire* is figurative because it is abstract but it is also odd because it is negative. In the BNC on the other hand, it is less figurative, and is used in conjunction with good things. An inspection of a concordance of 2045 instances of *reward* in the BNC suggests that *reward* is normally used positively. Most of the time *reward* is used in the BNC for something quite specific, but also for other kinds of concrete or tangible good. So we have *a large ice-cream as a reward, extra days given as a reward, or an amount of money*. With regard to the word *torment* in QIT, it is associated with *taste* and that is an unusual use of the word because normally it is food that can be *tasted*, not *torment*. The case here is that *torment* in association with *taste* is treated figuratively and the reader of the Quran in translation is primed to associate *torment* with this kind of language i.e. figurative language. From the point of view of understanding the language of the Quranic Text, when, for example, we read in the Quran *taste torment*, it tells us something about the way in which the Quran conceives of *torment*: *torment* is something that can be handled, it can be given, it can be tasted, it can be warded off and it can be seen. In fact *torment* in the QIT has a reality to it which is separate from the person, whereas in the BNC, when speakers say we are *in torment*, the speakers are really not separating the *torment* from them and not really thinking of *torment* as a different entity from them. So *torment* in the QIT is used like *mercy*, it is something real that God can give. Likewise *torment* is something that God has,



and can use. He can either protect us from it, or He can give it to us. The important point is that it is there as a separate entity from us.

#### **4.21. Textual Semantic Association for *torment* in QIT.**

The final point to which I would like to draw attention is that whenever something bad is mentioned in the text in connection to *torment*, there is equally always something good. For example, if the text happens to mention what will happen to bad people, it then also mentions what will happen to good people. Consider the following set of examples where *torment* is associated with both negative and positive associations in such a way that in a sense one of them reduces the impact of the other.

- 1- They said: "It's too bad for us; we have been so arrogant. \* Perhaps our Lord will exchange it for something even better than what we already have. We will plead with our Lord!" \* Such is torment, although torment in the Hereafter will be even greater if they only realized it. (ii) \* The heedful will have gardens of bliss alongside their Lord
- 2- One day some faces will turn white while other faces will turn black. Those whose faces are blackened [will be asked]: "Did you disbelieve after your [profession of] faith? Taste torment because you have disbelieved!" \* While those whose faces are whitened will live for ever in God's mercy.
- 3- You will live there for ever. \* Such is the Garden which you will inherit because of what you have been doing. \* You will have plenty of fruit to eat in it. \* Yet criminals will remain in Hell's torment; \*\* it will not be eased for them and they will feel confounded in it.
- 4- Those who harass believing men and women, then do not repent, will have Hell's torment; they will have the torment of burning. \* The ones who believe and perform honorable deeds will have gardens through which rivers flow; that will be the great Achievement

- 5- And those who believe and perform honorable deeds will be in the gardens of Bliss. \* Those who disbelieve and deny Our signs will have humiliating torment.
- 6- Those who disbelieve keep on rejecting \* while God is quite Aware of how they are holding back. \* Give them news of painful torment, \*\* except for those who believe and perform honorable deeds; they will have payment which will never be withheld
- 7- This Quran guides one to something that is more straightforward and reassures believers who perform honorable actions; they shall have great earnings. \*\* Nevertheless We have reserved painful torment for those who do not believe in the Hereafter.
- 8- So He may reward the ones who believe and perform honorable deeds. Those will have forgiveness and generous provision, \*\* while the ones who work against our signs in order to defeat them will have painful torment from a blight.
- 9- He will show anyone who obeys God and His messenger into gardens through which rivers flow, while He will punish anyone who turns away with painful torment.
- 10- As for those who believe and perform honourable deeds, He will pay them their earnings and even more for them out of His bounty. He will punish those who are scornful and proud with painful torment; they will not find and sponsor themselves nor any supporter besides God.
- 11- Wrongdoers will have painful torment." \*<sup>18</sup> Those who believe and perform honorable deeds will be shown into gardens through which rivers flow, to live there with their Lord's permission
- 12- Those who mistreat [other] people and behave outrageously on earth without having any right to do so. Those will have painful torment. \* Yet anyone who acts patiently and forgives [shows] perseverance in [handling] matters.
- 13- Those who mistreat [other] people and behave outrageously on earth without having any right to do so. Those will have painful torment. \* Yet anyone who acts patiently and forgives [shows] perseverance in [handling] matters.

---

<sup>18</sup> Inverted commas, space and the asterisks as found in the original Irving Translation.

So in the above examples, there is a comparison or a contrast between two different groups of people who act or are separated differently.

#### 4.22. Another textual semantic association

According to Winter (1982) there are two basic kinds of relationship that hold between clauses of groups of clauses: matching relationship and sequence relationships. Hoey (2005) argues that certain words are typically associated with certain kinds of matching relationship; others are typically associated with certain kinds of sequence relationship. We will now test this claim by exploring the kind of relationships that the word *torment* is typically associated with. Consider the following data.

- 1- Had it not been for a writ from God that had come previously, awful torment might have afflicted you *because of* what you have taken;
- 2- They have awful torment! \* That is *because* they cherish worldly life rather the Hereafter. God does not guide disbelieving folk.
- 3- When they forgot what they had been reminded of, We rescued those who had forbidden evil while We seized those who were doing wrong with dreadful torment *because* they had been acting so immorally.
- 4- We shall inflict torment upon torment on those who have disbelieved and obstructed God's path, because of how abusive they have acted.
- 5- Their hearts contain malice so God has increased their [share of] malice. They will have painful torment *because* they have been lying.
- 6- Those who disbelieve will have scalding water to drink and painful torment *because* they have been disbelieving.
- 7- They tasted the effect of their action and [experienced] painful torment. \* That was *because* their messengers had brought them explanations and yet they said: "Will human beings ever guide us?" So they disbelieved and turned away.

- 8- those were liars before God. \* If it had not been for God's bounty towards you, as well as His mercy in this world and the Hereafter, some serious torment might have afflicted you *because of* the talk you had indulged in.
- 9- Those who stray from God's path will have severe torment *because* they have forgotten the Day of Reckoning!
- 10- God is quite aware as to where He should place His message; belittlement by God and stern torment will strike those who commit crimes *because of* what they have been plotting.
- 11- We will write down whatever they say and how they killed the prophets without any right to [do so]. We will say: "Taste the torment of burning." That [has happened] *because of* what your hands sent on ahead.
- 12- If you could only see when wrongdoers are in their death throes and the angels stretch forth their hands: "Away with your souls! Today you are awarded the torment of shame *because* you have been saying something that is not true about God. You have acted too proud for His signs".
- 13- So have a taste, since you have forgotten about meeting on this day of yours! We have likewise forgotten you. Taste the torment of eternity *because of* what you have been doing."
- 14- Who is more in the wrong than someone who rejects God's signs and even evades them? We will reward those who evade Our signs with the worst torment *because* they have acted so evasive.

As can be seen, the word *torment* appears to have a strong relationship with REASON CLAUSE. The clause in which the word *torment* occurs is characteristically followed by a reason clause marked by *because* or *since* which describe the reason the *torment* is to take place. This reason always has a link with people's behaviour and their evil actions in that they bring *torment* on themselves. The Reason Clauses are indicated by the use of *because* in 27 cases and by the use of *since* in 7 cases. Altogether therefore there are 34 instances of reason clauses in association with *torment* in QIT and these account for 11.1% of the 306 instances of *torment*. In passing we note that this also provides support for Hoey's claim.

#### 4.23. Investigating Colligations of *Torment* in QIT

We turn now to the colligations of *torment*. The first colligational association we note is that *torment* has a very strong tendency to colligate with future modality. There are 56 instances of *torment* which appear in sentences containing future modality where *will* occurs as a collocate in L3 position, 45 of these also occur with *have* in its lexical use *will have* rather than its perfective use. There are six instances of *torment* which appear in sentences containing *shall* as a collocate in L3 position. So the claim here is that *torment* colligates with future modality presented by *will* and *shall* and collocates with the word *have*. This nested combination *will have* and *shall have* accounts for 20.3% of the 306 instances of *torment* and this means that roughly one in five of the instances containing *torment* are instances of *will have* or *shall have* i.e. instances associated with future modality. The main reason for this strong colligation with the future tense is that *torment* is described as an outcome for criminals rather than as part of an account of past or present conditions. In the BNC however, there are only two instances containing future modality expressed by *will*. There are no instances containing future modality in the Bible. So this kind of colligation is a QIT specific feature. Examples are presented below.

#### Figure 4.17: Concordance of *torment* showing colligation with future modality *shall* and *will* in QIT

N Concordance  
153 Those shall have shameful torment. Whenever Our  
154 after that shall have painful torment. You will find  
155 while they shall have painful torment. We have merely  
156 that they shall have painful torment. Do those who enlist  
157 Those shall have shameful torment: beyond them there  
158 world. They shall have the torment of Fire in the

N Concordance

227 those will have painful torment. There was no  
 228 while they will have painful torment. Let not those who  
 229 this will mean painful torment: "Our Lord, remove  
 230 My torment will be painful torment. Advise them about  
 231 messenger will have painful torment. They swear by God  
 232 defeat them will have painful torment from a blight. Those  
 233 and will prepare shameful torment for them. Those who  
 234 where they will have terrible torment. Those who p  
 235 they will have lingering torment except for someone  
 236 will have shameful torment. Whenever someone  
 237 so they will have painful torment. It is just as Satan  
 238 They will have severe torment on a day when their  
 239 God's path will have severe torment because they have  
 240 and they will have severe torment. For anyone who has

*Torment* in QIT is accompanied by different verb patterns but the most common is future modality, followed by present perfect aspect. 17 of the instances of *torment* in QIT appear in sentences with present perfect aspect which accounts for 5.6% of the instances of *torment*. In the BNC there are 7 instances with present perfect aspect which accounts for 2.3% of instances of *torment* which means it is a weaker colligation. In the Bible however, there are no instances occurring with present perfect aspect. So instances of *torment* with present perfect aspect is more common in the QIT than in the BNC.

**Figure 4.18: Selection of concordance showing colligation of *torment* with present perfect aspect in QIT.**

N Concordance

59 that your Lord's command has come, and torment which cannot be averted has been  
 60 was perdition. God has prepared severe torment for them, so heed God, you prudent  
 61 into His mercy, while He has prepared painful torment for wrongdoers. 77. [Winds] Send  
 62 their sincerity. He has prepared painful torment for disbelievers! You who believe,  
 63 for yourselves. God has prepared humiliating torment for disbelievers. Once you have  
 64 while they know it. God has prepared severe torment for them; with them, anything they do

The third colligational statement is that in QIT *torment* has a positive colligation with possession. This is introduced by the use of the possessive determiners and the apostrophe s structure. The table below illustrates this kind of association. There are 32 instances which have a colligational association with possession, accounting for 10.5% of instances of *torment* in QIT

Colligation with possession in QIT	
My torment	9 times
Your torment	2 times
His torment	2 times
Our torment	2 times
15	
The possessive apostrophe structure	
God's torment	8 times
Hell's torment	5 times
Lord's torment	4 times
17	
Total	32

Table 4.38: Colligation with possession in QIT- possessive determiners and the apostrophe structure.

All the possessive determiners refer to God with the only exception being where *torment* is linked with Hell in the phrase *Hell's torment*. This is another instance of what I am terming *referential association*. The examples below display this relationship.

To sum up, *mercy* and *torment*, though they are very different, share the properties of being either things God gives or things that people experience (for good or ill).

**Figure 4.19.1: Concordance lines showing a colligational association of *torment* with (possession) *God's +torment* in QIT**

N Concordance

43 to say: "Bring us God's torment if you are so truthful!"  
44 that a sample of God's torment may not come to  
45 in any way against God's torment?" They will say: "if  
46 considered whether, if God's torment should come to you  
47 been drinking. However God's torment is severe! Some men  
48 by mankind are like God's torment. If any support should  
49 whether, once God's torment comes to you (all) or

**Figure 4.19.2: Concordance lines showing a colligational association of *torment* with (possession) *My*+ *torment* in QIT.**

N Concordance  
93 palm trunks. How were My torment, and My warnings! We  
94 bear it in mind? How were My torment, and My warnings?  
95 [her]. How were My torment, and My warnings?  
96 if you are thankless, then My torment will be severe." Moses  
97 afflict anyone I wish with My torment while My mercy  
98 Ad rejected it. How were My torment, and My warnings?  
99 their eyes. "Taste My torment and My warnings!"  
100 Merciful One, although My torment will be painful torment.  
101 upon them. "Taste My torment and My warnings!" We

**Figure 4.19.3: Concordance lines showing a colligational association of *torment* with (possession) *Hell's*+*torment* in QIT.**

N Concordance  
57 in their Lord will have Hell's torment; it is such a wretched  
58 do not repent, will have Hell's torment; they will have the  
59 criminals will remain in Hell's torment; it will not be eased for  
60 say: "Our Lord, ward off Hell's torment from us! Its torment is

In the BNC we find three possessive determiners; these are *his* occurring six times with different referents, *their* occurring five times and *her* occurring four times. This colligation accounts for 4.8% of all instances of *torment* in the BNC which means that it is 2.2 times more common in the QIT than in the BNC. So the colligation with possessive pronouns is also true of the BNC but only restricted to three possessive pronouns which makes it a weaker colligation.



**Figure 4.20: Concordance lines showing the colligation of *torment* with the possessive pronouns *his*, *her* and *their* in the BNC.**

N Concordance

80 added to her <w NN1>torment of mind and spirit.  
 81 oblivious of her <w NN1>torment. &quot;Well,  
 82 leering over her <w NN1>torment. She groaned  
 83 talks of her <w NN1>torment. But the lovey-d  
 84 wine glass in his <w NN1>torment. But don't worry,  
 85 Frodo from his <w NN1>torment and ended his  
 86 the dawn Of his <w NN1>torment &mdash; and  
 87 At the end of his <w NN1>torment, Ensor was to be  
 88 hood and his <w NN1>torment intensifies as a  
 89 of Sigmar. His <w NN1>torment is that he is forced

N Concordance

239 saviour and their <w NN1>torment, the pawnbroker  
 240 He voiced their <w NN1>torment at knowing their  
 241 of calories. Their <w NN1>torment is kept hidden, but  
 242 day of their <w NN1>torment. &quot;We both  
 243 to accept their <w NN1>torment as good martyrs

	QIT	BNC
	<i>torment</i> 306	<i>torment</i> 312
<i>Torment</i> with possessives	32	15
Other uses of <i>torment</i>	274	297
Chi-Sq = 7.018, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.008		

Table 4.39. Colligation of *torment* with possession in QIT and BNC

The p-value shows significant difference in the use of possessive determiners in the QIT and the BNC. However, the concordance list of *torment* in the Bible contains only ten lines and shows no colligation with possessive determiners.

#### 4.24. Chapter Summary

This chapter addresses the Irving translation of the Quran. The words *mercy* and *torment* in QIT were investigated in terms of their characteristic collocations, semantic associations, and other lexical primings and the results were compared against the BNC, the RW/BNC and the Bible in translation. We have shown that the collocates of the word *mercy* with prepositions are shared with the BNC in general but differ in respect of the particular prepositions used as collocates of *mercy* in the two corpora. It also differs proportionally in that a collocate such as *from* in the phrase *mercy from* is 21.8 times more common in the QIT than in the BNC and the collocate *for* in the phrase *mercy for* is 6.4 times more common in QIT than in the BNC. These differences are statistically significant and therefore these features are QIT specific features.

Another significant difference is the frequency of *and* as an immediate left collocate of *mercy* in the QIT as opposed to that in the BNC and the BIT.

We also have shown that some collocates of the word *mercy* such as *guidance*, *bounty* and *book* are specific features of QIT and not a general feature of the language as represented in the BNC, the BIT or the RW/BNC. It has also been argued that although the semantic association of *mercy* with believing/ disbelieving human beings is true of *mercy* in the BNC and the BIT, the association is more precise in the QIT than in the BNC or the BIT. Other specific collocates of *mercy* in QIT are *grant*, *taste* and the use of *as* and *as well as* with *mercy*.

There is no evidence of a semantic association of *mercy* with HOLY BOOKS in the BNC, the BIT or the RW/BNC but this is an association attested in QIT and is therefore a QIT specific feature. However, the association with ACTS OF GRACE is shared with the BNC, though with a variation in the proportion of occurrences; there is a statistically significant difference

between the corpora with respect to this variation. This association is not attested in the BIT or the RW/BNC.

We also have discussed a third semantic association of *mercy* with BELIEVING/DISBELIEVING HUMANS in QIT and found that though there are signs of this association in the QIT, BNC and the BIT, it is significantly more frequent in the QIT.

We have identified a new kind of priming- the exophoric referential association- that is association not just with a set of words in a semantic set but with a set of entities in the real world. Another discovery is the association of *mercy* and *torment* with figurative language. We also have identified another kind of priming which is priming for association with figurative language.

We also have shown how *mercy* occurs inside rhetorical questions and alongside rhetorical questions and noted that this feature is distinctive in QIT. In addition to this association we also have discovered that the colligation of *mercy* with possessives is particular to Holy texts. We have noted that the word *mercy* in QIT is preceded by possessives, all referring to God; there is also a significant difference between QIT and BNC (etc) in the priming for the reference of possessives followed by *mercy*. The implication behind this association is that *mercy* in the QIT comes from God to human beings. In QIT we have identified a colligation of *mercy* with the reflexive pronouns *Himself* and *Ourselves*. A comparison with the BNC showed a significant difference with regard to this usage and that *Ourselves* is a unique feature of QIT. We also have seen that the BNC and QIT corpora both use prepositions with *mercy* but that the prepositions are distributed differently in the two corpora.

We have examined the textual semantic association of *mercy* with conditional clauses in the three corpora the BNC, the RW/BNC and the BIT and found that this association is a QIT unique feature.

We then examined *torment*, which is much more common in the QIT than in the BNC. There are only 11 instances of *torment* in the BIT, and only one of these in the RW/BNC. The colligation of *torment* with adjectives is shared in both corpora but it is stronger in the QIT than in the BNC and represents a semantic association with negative degree and negative experience. Another collocation of *torment* is *taste* and was only identified in QIT; this is therefore another QIT unique feature. We have noted a semantic association of the phrase *the torment of* with FIRE in QIT.

A new kind of priming that has been identified is Pronominal Semantic Association in which the word under investigation associates with a single word which refers to different members of a particular semantic set. We also have identified a pragmatic association of *torment* with expressions of emphasis; this association was found to be stronger in the QIT than in the BNC. We have explored in QIT a strong relationship of *torment* with REASON CLAUSE marked by *because* or *since*; this is an instance of textual semantic association.

We have also found that *torment* in QIT has strong colligation with future modality but that this colligation is very weak in the BNC and does not occur at all in the two religious comparator corpora; therefore this is another QIT specific feature. The colligation with possessives is likewise very strong in the QIT whereas in the BNC it is weak. The statistics showed significant difference in the use of possessives between the QIT and BNC.

## CHAPTER 5

### THE HOLY QURAN IN THE PICKTHALL TRANSLATION

#### 5.1. Introduction

Up to now we have looked at nouns. In this chapter I am going to examine the collocations, semantic associations and colligations of the words *say*, *believe*, and *will*, all of which are usually verbs. These words were selected for three main general reasons; firstly they are all members of the keyword list, secondly, unlike the words chosen in chapter 4, *say* and *will* are not theological words though *believe* obviously will have theological implications under some circumstances and thirdly they all are common words in the language both in the Quran in translation and also in the BNC, unlike both *mercy* and *torment*.

It is interesting to look at key words which one would not expect to be there in the keyword list. Any keyword list displays words that are unexpectedly frequent; given that *say* and *will* are amongst the commonest words in the language and given that *believe* is also very common, it is odd that they are key. This contrasts with the situation for *mercy* and *torment*. It is not odd for *mercy* and *torment* to be in the keyword list because these are both theological notions and they also are relatively rare words in the language.

*Say* is a very common word in all the Quran translations examined; it is neither a theological word like *mercy* nor it is a rare word like *torment*. Indeed there is no apparent theological implication at all, in that anyone can “say”. Nevertheless we will see that *say* forms important relationships which show that the Quran’s Pickthall translation (QPT) has a quite distinct set of primings.

In this chapter I will provide further evidence that even with common words like *say*, *believe* and *will*, the language of the QPT is still different from the BNC. I will also examine whether

their usage is similar to their usage in religious texts as represented in the religious section of the BNC or the Bible in translation. I will also be looking for features of the QPT that are unique to the Quranic translation only.

## **5.2. Keyword 1: *Say***

### **5.3. Investigation of the collocations of *say* in QPT**

The two most common collocates to the right of *say* in translation of QPT are the collocates *Muhammad* and *Allah* and these collocates differ markedly from the normal patterns of English as reflected in the BNC in two ways. In the first place, these collocates rarely ever occur with *say* in the BNC in the RW/BNC or the BIT and in the second place, the names have specific referents in the QPT, whereas in the BNC or the BIT although the same names may be used, no specific referent has anything approaching the same frequency. *Muhammad* as a collocate in QPT refers to a particular person, i.e. the messenger of Allah, occurring 43 times immediately to the right of *say* in the phrase *say (O Muhammad)*. The same collocate *Mohammad* occurs 27 times in R3 position coming in the phrase *say unto them O Muhammad*. These occurrences of the phrases *say O Mohammad* and *say Unto them O Mohammad* account for 9.9 % of the 706 instances of *say* in QPT.

### Figure 5.1: Partial concordance of *say O Mohammad* in the QPT

N Concordance  
386 (to be fulfilled) if ye are truthful ? 30. Say (O Muhammad): Yours is the promise  
387 Allah is Full of Pity for (His) bondmen. 31. Say, (O Muhammad, to mankind): If ye love  
388 with him: they are the successful. 158. Say (O Muhammad): O mankind! Lo! I am  
389 Himself. Unto Allah is the journeying. 29. Say, (O Muhammad): Whether ye hide that  
390 in the morning and the evening hours. 16. Say (O Muhammad): Who is Lord of the  
391 sent down upon him from his Lord! Then say, (O Muhammad): The Unseen  
392 will be paid their wages without stint. 11. Say (O Muhammad): Lo! I am commanded  
393 And Allah guideth not wrongdoing folk. 6. Say (O Muhammad): O ye who are Jews! If  
394 say: Seven, and their dog the eighth. Say (O Muhammad): My Lord is Best  
395 - such are they who are the losers. 64. Say (O Muhammad, to the disbelievers): Do  
396 be to Allah, the Lord of the Worlds! 66. Say (O Muhammad): I am forbidden to  
397 Say: Bring your proof, if ye are truthfull! 65. Say (O Muhammad): None in the heavens

### Figure 5.2: Partial concordance of *Say (Unto them, O Mohammad)* in the QPT.

N Concordance  
200 from that wherof they are warned. 4. Say (unto them, O Muhammad): Have  
201 48. And also our forefathers ? 49. Say (unto them, O Muhammad): Lo!  
202 and Allah is Aware of evil-doers. 8. Say (unto them, O Muhammad): Lo!  
203 a reminder for folk who believe. 52. Say (unto them, O Muhammad): Allah

After the phrase *say O Muhammad* there is always a message and a receiver of the message or an addressee. The message varies, and depends totally on the context. The addressees also vary; they can be *the Muslims, mankind, disbelievers, the people of the scripture, slaves* (as in the phrase *O my slaves*) and so on. In the original Arabic *Muhammad* is addressed in the majority of instances of *qul - say* - though the translator does not choose to mention the name of *Muhammad* on every occasion, presumably because it is clear from the context that the addressee is *Muhammad*.

The other significant collocate of *say* in QPT is *Allah* which co-occurs both to the right and to the left of the node word. I will however here only consider the occurrences to the right of *say*. The name of *Allah* occurs 133 times to the right of *say* in my data. Out of these instances, 32 occur immediately after *say* and 22 occur after *say* with only one word between

(e.g. *say by Allah*). The remaining occurrences of *Allah* occur (generally) three or four words after *say*. This collocation (i.e. the collocation of (with) *Allah* in all its forms (positions) after *say*) accounts for 18.8 % of the instances of *say*, which means that nearly one in five instances of *say* occurs with *Allah*.

Interestingly, although *Allah* is in fact the sayer of the message, the word *Allah* frequently is used as Theme and/or Subject of the message.

**Figure 5.3: Sample concordance lines where Allah occurs immediately after say:**

N Concordance

16 after its death ? they verily would say: Allah. Say: Praise be to Allah!

17 heaven an angel as messenger. 96. Say: Allah sufficeth for a witness

18 it and Allah hath enjoined it on us. Say: Allah, verily, enjoineth not

19 (to their appointed work) ? they would say: Allah. How then are they turned

20 if disaster overtook you, he would say: Allah hath been gracious unto me

21 portents for a folk that heed. 68. They say: Allah hath taken (unto Him) a son

22 Thou art no messenger (of Allah). Say: Allah, and whosoever hath

23 Allah, such will be wrong-doers. 95. Say: Allah speaketh truth. So follow

24 the doom of a tremendous Day. 14. Say: Allah I worship, making my

25 Allah) one that leadeth to the Truth ? Say: Allah leadeth to the Truth. Is He

26 His creation) seemed alike to them ? Say: Allah is the Creator of all things,

27 some plot against Our revelations. Say: Allah is more swift in plotting. Lo!

28 hundred years and add nine. 26. Say: Allah is Best Aware how long

29 if they tum away (O Muhammad) say: Allah sufficeth me. There is no

30 They ask thee for a pronouncement. Say: Allah hath pronounced for you

So, as stated above there is a strong collocation with *Allah* (The key point is that the imperatives can only be assigned to *Allah* since only *Allah* would be able to tell *Muhammad* to say...) and the speaker of the message is always *Allah*. This collocation raises the question as to whether *say* might also co-occur with attributes (names) of Allah. After investigating the concordance data for *say*, it was indeed found that *say* also collocates with other names or with attributes referring to Allah. So here we have another instance of the new kind of priming, *referential association*, posited in chapter 4. For instance, the word *Lord* occurs with *say* 36 times, made up of 13 occurrences in combination with the possessive pronoun *my* in



the phrase *My Lord* and 23 occurrences in combination with the possessive pronoun *Our* in the phrase *Our Lord*. This (i.e. the occurrence of *Lord* with *say*) accounts for 5.1 % of instances of *say*. From this we can predict that *say* could also occur with other words or phrases that refer to Allah.

**Figure 5.4: Concordance lines showing other right collocates of *say* referring to Allah.**

N Concordance  
 290 of the heavens and the earth, (and say): Our Lord! Thou createdst not this in  
 291 if they give the lie to thee (Muhammad), say: Your Lord is a Lord of  
 292 raise thee to a praised estate. 80. And say: My Lord! Cause me to come in with  
 293 fear of Allah or with greater fear, and say: Our Lord! Why hast Thou ordained  
 294 successful. 118. And (O Muhammad) say: My Lord! Forgive and have mercy,  
 295 who came (into the faith) after them say: Our Lord! Forgive us and our  
 296 ye used to deny them ? 106. They will say: Our Lord! Our evil fortune conquered  
 297 obeyed His messenger! 67. And they say: Our Lord! Lo! we obeyed our princes  
 298 have sent before (them), they might say: Our Lord! Why sentest Thou no  
 299 thee of the mountains (on that day). Say: My Lord will break them into  
 300 of that which they allege. 97. And say: My Lord! I seek refuge in Thee from  
 301 hang their heads before their Lord, (and say): Our Lord! We have now seen and  
 302 of their recognition of the Truth. They say: Our Lord, we believe. Inscribe us as  
 303 us from the wrongdoing folk! 29. And say: My Lord! Cause me to land at a  
 304 Now hapless is the plight. 61. They say: Our Lord! Whoever did prepare this  
 305 wing of submission through mercy, and say: My Lord! Have mercy on them both  
 306 will be no second thereto. 16. They say: Our Lord! Hasten on for us our fate  
 307 hath been perfected unto thee, and say: My Lord! Increase me in knowledge.

Another important collocation of *say* is with the word *they*, which occurs immediately to the left of *say* 137 times and as part of the structure *they will say* 25 times. Together they account for 22.9% of instances of *say*. This combination occurs in the QPT proportionally more often than it does in the language as a whole as represented by the BNC. *They say* is key in the QPT whereas it is comparatively rare in the BNC. Table 5.1 below shows the comparative frequency of *they say* and *they will say* in the two corpora.

QPT 160.275 words	N	%	BNC 100 million words	N	%
<i>Say</i>	706		<i>Say</i>	68,765	
They say	137	19.4%	They say	3199	4.7%
They will say	25	3.5%	They will say	45	0.07%
They say= 19.4% of instances of <i>say</i> in QPT			They say= 4.7% of instances of <i>say</i> in BNC		

Table 5.1: Collocation of *say* with *they* in QPT and BNC

The data show that the BNC contains 68,765 uses of the word *say*, of which 3199 occur within the phrase *they say*. The QPT contains 706 instances of the word *say*, of which 137 occur within the phrase *they say*. The analysis shows that 19.4 % of all instances of *say* in the QPT occur within the phrase *they say* whereas only 4.7 % of instances of *say* in BNC occur as part of this phrase. This means that the phrase *they say* is proportionally four times as frequent in the QPT as in the BNC.

A comparison of the statistics of the phrase *they say* is shown in the tables below in the QPT, BNC, the RW/BNC and the Bible in translation (BIT) to examine whether the above findings are true only of comparisons with general English or distinguish QPT from other kinds of religious writings including the Bible in translation (BIT)

	QPT- <i>say</i> 706	BNC <i>say</i> 68765
They say	137	3199
Other uses of <i>say</i>	569	65566
Chi-Sq = 332.721, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.000		

Table 5.2. The occurrence of *they say* in the QPT and the BNC

	QPT <i>say</i> 706	BNC/RW <i>say</i> 970
They say	137	31
Other uses of <i>say</i>	569	939
Chi-Sq = 119.032, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.000		

Table 5.3. The occurrence of *they say* in the QPT and BNC/RW

	QPT <i>say</i> 706	BIT <i>say</i> 1045
They say	137	55
Other uses of <i>say</i>	569	990
Chi-Sq = 86.313, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.000		

Table 5.4: The occurrence of *they say* in QPT and the Bible.

The p-value in the three tables above shows a significant difference between the QPT and the BNC, the RW/BNC and the BIT respectively in the frequency of the phrase *they say*.

The data also show that 45 instances of the word *say* (0.07%) in the BNC occur as part of *they will say* and that 25 instances of *say* (3.5%) in the QPT occur as part of the phrase *they will say*. This means that *they will say* is proportionally 50 times more frequent in the QPT.

	QPT	BNC
	<i>say</i> 706	<i>say</i> 68765
<i>They will say</i>	25	45
Other uses of <i>say</i>	681	68720
Chi-Sq = 838.650, DF = 1		

Table 5.5: The occurrence of *they will say* in QPT and BNC

	QPT	RW/BNC
	<i>say</i> 706	<i>say</i> 970
<i>They will say</i>	25	4
Other uses of <i>say</i>	681	966
Chi-Sq = 23.523, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.000		

Table 5.6: The occurrence of *they will say* in QPT and RW/BNC

	QPT	Bible
	<i>say</i> 706	<i>say</i> 1045
<i>They will say</i>	25	5
Other uses of <i>say</i>	681	1040
Chi-Sq = 23.469, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.000		

Table. 5.7: The occurrence of *they will say* in QPT and Bible

The p-value in the above three tables gives evidence of a huge difference between the QPT and the other corpora in frequency of *they will say*. On this evidence we can claim that *they will say* is a significant collocation in QPT. When the QPT uses *they will say*, it is not a general statement about what someone will say, but refers to a particular group of people. As evidence for this, it should be noted that *they will say* cannot be replaced by *it will be said* in QPT whereas in the BNC this is sometimes possible.

Another collocation of *say* in QPT identified by Wordsmith is with *O* and it occurs 62 times in R1 position in two contexts, either with a large number of people such as “*O mankind*”, “*O my people*”. “*O slaves of Allah*”, “*O people of the scripture*”, and “*O ye who believe*” (which itself occurs 19 times) or with the name *Muhammad*. The combination *Say O Mohammad* itself occurs 43 times in QPT. The collocation of *say* with *O* occurs 62 times in R1 position in QPT and accounts for 8.8% of the 706 instances of *say*. The vocative *O* is being used in two ways here; the first use occurs when *Mohammad* is being addressed or is being requested to convey a message on behalf of God. The second use occurs when the vocative marker *O* is part of the message that *Mohammad* is required to give. Note that *O* is an extremely unusual word in modern English, hardly ever occurring and always associated with vocatives. In the BNC there are only two vocatives that make use of *O* and neither is followed by names. There are no instances of *O* associated with *say* in the RW/ BNC or the Bible in translation which means that this collocation is unique to the QPT.

#### **5.4. Investigation of the Semantic associations of *say* in QPT**

Turning now to the semantic associations of *say*, we can begin by noting that in addition to the collocations noted, *say* has a semantic association with *people*, more specifically an association with *large numbers of people*; that is to say, within the vocatives, large

populations are being addressed (*mankind, people of the scripture, slaves, and so on*). This association occurs in 45 cases and accounts for 6.4% of the 706 instances of *say* in QPT. Theologically this is interesting because it indicates that the Quran is addressed to the world. If we compare this with the stories of Jesus in the New Testament, Jesus almost never addresses the whole world. He almost always addresses the people he is talking to, often particular individuals. This difference is actually of importance both in terms of theology and in terms of language. Examining samples of instances of *say* in the BNC revealed that there is no association with large number of people within the vocative *O*. The case in the BIT is shown statistically in the following table

	QPT <i>say</i> 706	Bible <i>say</i> 1045
Association of <i>say</i> with large number of people	45	12
Other uses of <i>say</i>	661	1033
Chi-Sq = 36.534, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.000		

Table 5.8. The association of *say* with *large number of people* in QPT and BIT

The p-value= 0.000 shows a very significant difference in the association of *say* with *large numbers of people* in QPT and BIT. There are 12 instances of *say* in the BIT associated with large numbers of people accounting for 1.1% of the instances of *say* in the BIT but still none of these are within vocatives. This difference is statistically and theologically very significant. Theologically it confirms that Jesus addressed his own people and not all mankind as is the case in the Quran. The following are instances of *say* taken from the BIT in association with large number of people.

**Figure 5.5: Concordance lines showing the association of *say* with large numbers of people in the BIT.**

N Concordance  
 494 your words. 27 The first shall say to Zion, Behold, behold  
 495 saying, 2 Again, thou shalt say to the children of Israel,  
 496 that your children may not say to our children in time to  
 497 that he sinneth. 13 When I shall say to the righteous, that he shall

The semantic association with *large numbers of people* within vocatives can also be represented as a colligational statement. The next section looks at the colligations of *say* as represented in QPT.

### 5.5. The colligations of *say* in QPT

Predictably in the light of the collocation with *O* that we observed, another colligation of *say* is with the vocative marked by *O* in the phrase *say O Mohammad* (43 times in R1 position) or *say unto them O Mohammad* (27 times in R3 position) This association (R1+R3) occurs 70 times and it accounts for 9.9 % of all the instances of *say* in QPT. Examples are:

**Figure 5.6: Concordance lines showing the association of *say* with the vocative *O* in the phrase *say O Mohammad*.**

N Concordance  
 372 Allah guideth, so follow their guidance. Say (O Muhammad, unto mankind): I  
 373 is that for which ye used to call. 28. Say (O Muhammad): Have ye thought:  
 374 them for that they used to disobey. 50. Say (O Muhammad, to the disbelievers):  
 375 and He is the Wise, the Knower. 19. Say (O Muhammad): What thing is of  
 376 save in one who followeth your religion - Say (O Muhammad): Lo! the guidance is  
 377 in allies and less in multitude. 25. Say (O Muhammad, unto the  
 378 say: Seven, and their dog the eighth. Say (O Muhammad): My Lord is Best  
 379 (again) ? 17. And our forefathers ? 18. Say (O Muhammad): Ye, in truth; and ye  
 380 8. Or say they: He hath invented it ? Say (O Muhammad): If I have invented it,  
 381 with you in the presence of their Lord. Say (O Muhammad): Lo! the bounty is in  
 382 taketh note of all things. 22. Say (O Muhammad): Call upon those  
 383 is Full of Pity for (His) bondmen. 31. Say, (O Muhammad, to mankind): If ye  
 384 it ? Lo! for Allah that is easy. 20. Say (O Muhammad): Travel in the land  
 385 a Lecture other than this, or change it. Say (O Muhammad): It is not for me to  
 386 children. We are not the punished! 36. Say (O Muhammad): Lo! my Lord  
 387 with him: they are the successful. 158. Say (O Muhammad): O mankind! Lo! I

**Figure 5.7: Concordance lines showing the association of *say* with the vocative *O* in the phrase *say unto them O Mohammad*.**

N Concordance  
 365 then was My abhorrence (of them)! 46. Say (unto them, O Muhammad): I exhort  
 366 our fathers. then, if ye are truthful. 26. Say (unto them, O Muhammad): Allah  
 367 that they will not be raised again. Say (unto them, O Muhammad): Yea,  
 368 48. And also our forefathers ? 49. Say (unto them, O Muhammad): Lo!  
 369 say: Lo! in both we are disbelievers. 49. Say (unto them, O Muhammad): Then  
 370 The wandering Arabs say: We believe. Say (unto them, O Muhammad): Ye  
 371 from that whereof they are warned. 4. Say (unto them, O Muhammad): Have ye  
 372 walketh upright on a straight road ? 23. Say (unto them, O Muhammad): He it is  
 373 and Allah is Aware of evil-doers. 8. Say (unto them, O Muhammad): Lo! the  
 374 by us they would not have been slain. Say (unto them, O Muhammad): Then  
 375 accounted equal with a disbeliever) ? Say (unto them, O Muhammad): Are  
 376 naught but fables of the men of old. 69. Say (unto them, O Muhammad): Travel

One of the commonest uses of a vocative is with imperatives (Biber et al., 1999: 219) so here we have a further colligation where *say* functions as imperative. This colligation occurs 343 times and accounts for 48.6 % of the instances of *say*. We also note that among the 343 instances of *say*, 34 instances of *say* i.e.10% also are followed by imperatives. So here we have *say* functioning as imperative and followed by imperative. The concordance lines below show this type of association.

**Figure 5.8: Concordance lines showing the association of *say* with imperatives.**

N Concordance  
 63E they chosen other gods beside Him ? say: Bring your proof (of their godhead).  
 63E earth ? Is there any God beside Allah ? Say: Bring your proof, if ye are truthful!  
 637 and the earth ? they will say: Allah Say: Bethink you then of those ye  
 63E it by (successive) revelation. 107. Say: Believe therein or believe not, lol

A comparison of the occurrences of *say* in the QPT and in the BNC shows that in the BNC *say* is rarely used as an imperative but is often part of a question e.g. *would you say that?*, whereas in QPT it is only used twice as part of a question. The theological point here is that where *say* is used as imperative in the QPT it is always an instruction from God to the



messenger. If *say* is in the reporting clause, there is also a strong tendency for the reported clause to be interrogative.

**Figure 5.9: Concordance lines showing the association of *say* with imperatives in QPT and with interrogatives in reported clauses.**

N Concordance

303 because they disbelieved. 71. Say: Shall we cry, instead of unto  
 304 of Praise. 7. Those who disbelieve say: Shall we show you a man who  
 305 Him is a more excellent abode. 15. Say: Shall I inform you of something  
 306 who surrender (unto Him). 164. Say: Shall I seek another than Allah  
 307 recite Our revelations unto them. Say: Shall I proclaim unto you  
 308 believe as the people believe, they say: shall we believe as the foolish

Examining the concordance lines for the Bible reveals that *say* in the BIT is used as an imperative and there are 105 instances where *say* functions as imperative. These occurrences account for 10.0% of the instances of *say* in the BIT. Of these instances 40 out of 105 instances of *say* are also followed by imperative. Although *say* functions as imperative in the BIT the p-value shows a significant difference in the function of *say* as imperative in QPT (Table 5.9).

	QPT	BIT
	<i>say</i> 706	<i>say</i> 1045
<i>Say</i> as imperative	343	105
Other uses of <i>say</i>	363	940
Chi-Sq = 328.633, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.000		

Table 5.9: A comparison of *say* functioning as imperative in QPT and BIT

There are three kinds of interrogatives (Biber et al., 1999: 215) with which *say* is associated in QPT, There are rhetorical questions e.g. *would you teach Allah your religion?* Then we have questions which are not directly answered but are implicitly answered, e.g. *shall I*

*inform you of the losers?* The text in such a case assumes that the reader has said “yes”, please inform me. The interrogative is not a question but it prepares the reader for the information to be given. Having assumed the implicit answer yes, the text then goes on to talk of those who are the greatest losers by their works. Finally we also have interrogatives which are real questions. So in total we have 175 interrogatives associated with 706 instances of *say*. The proportion of *say* with this kind of relationship -with interrogatives- accounts for 24.8% of the instances of *say*. 100 interrogatives follow *say* and 75 precede *say*. In two cases *say* is part of the interrogative: these two cases are excluded from the figures above.

	QPT <i>say</i> 706	Bible <i>say</i> 1045
<i>Say</i> with interrogatives	175	94
Other uses of <i>say</i>	531	951
Chi-Sq = 80.816, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.000		

Table 5.10: Association of *say* with interrogatives in QPT and BIT

The p-value=0.000 shows a significant difference in the association of *say* with interrogatives in the QPT and the BIT. Examples below illustrate the relationships of *say* with interrogatives and question marks.

**Figure 5.10: Concordance lines showing the association of *say* with interrogatives in QPT**

**N Concordance**

- 31 32. And those who disbelieve say: Why is the Qur'an not
- 32 look not for a meeting with Us say: Why are angels not sent
- 33 not a verse for them they say: Why hast thou not chosen
- 34 those who have no knowledge say: Why doth not Allah speak
- 35 loveth not the prodigals. 32. Say: Who hath forbidden the
- 36 in comfort but a little while. 17. Say: Who is he who can
- 37 those who scoffed at them. 42. Say: Who guardeth you in the
- 38 is the Messiah, son of Mary. Say: Who then can do aught

#### N Concordance

303 because they disbelieved. 71. Say: Shall we cry, instead of  
304 7. Those who disbelieve say: Shall we show you a man  
305 is a more excellent abode. 15. Say: Shall I inform you of  
306 who surrender (unto Him). 164. Say: Shall I seek another than  
307 Our revelations unto them. Say: Shall I proclaim unto you  
308 as the people believe, they say: shall we believe as the  
309 for the disbelievers. 103. Say: Shall We inform you who  
310 is the Hearer, the Knower. 14. Say: Shall I choose for a

#### N Concordance

586 than what they hoard. 59. Say: Have ye considered what  
587 ye will be brought back. 71. Say: Have ye thought, if Allah  
588 ? Will ye not then hear ? 72. Say: Have ye thought, if Allah  
589 Allah, Lord of the Worlds! 46. Say: Have ye imagined, if Allah  
590 off an hour, nor hasten (it). 50. Say: Have ye thought: When  
591 for a certain number of days. Say: Have ye received a

*Say* also has (unsurprisingly given the data just described) a very strong tendency to occur with question marks. This applies to 180 instances of *say*, accounting for 25.5% of the data, which means that one in four is associated with a question mark. The relationship between *say* and question marks is of course intimately connected to its colligation with questions, but nevertheless illustrates a new kind of priming possibility (in writing), the association of a word or cluster with a particular punctuation device.

It is also noted that *say* in QPT is associated with an exclamatory (Biber et al., 1999: 219) expressed by *Lo!* This association occurs 34 times immediately to the right of *say* and accounts for 4.8% of the instances of *say* in QPT. Here we also have an instance of nesting where *Lo* has punctuation priming with *!* and *Lo!* is primed to occur with *say*.

Exclamation marks associate with a range of utterances in conjunction with *say*; in some cases they associate with imperatives, in other cases with declaratives, and in yet other cases with exclamation marks.

Examining the instances of *say* in the BNC showed that there were only 6 instances of *Lo!*, all of them in R5 position out of 86765 associated with *say*. There were no instances of *Lo!* in

the RW/BNC associated with *say* and in the BIT there was just one instance of *Lo!* associated with *say* in R1 position as shown below.

Neither shall they *say*, *Lo* here! or, lo there! for, behold, the kingdom of God is within you

So this is a specific feature to the QPT. Indeed a similar punctuation relationship to that between *help* and the exclamation mark in general English occurs between *say* and exclamation marks in the QPT where the exclamation mark ends the piece of language that immediately follows *say*. The concordance below illustrates this kind of priming which we will call *punctuation priming*.

**Figure 5.11: Concordance lines showing the association of *say* with the exclamation mark *Lo!* in QPT.**

N Concordance  
 479 indeed have disbelieved who say: Lo! Allah is the Messiah,  
 480 cometh from thy Lord, will say: Lo! we were with you (all  
 481 their Lord ? The disbelievers say: Lo! this is a mere wizard.  
 482 73. They surely disbelieve who say: Lo! Allah is the third of  
 483 is Witness over all things. 48. Say: Lo! my Lord hurleth the  
 484 47. So go ye unto him and say: Lo! we are two  
 485 72. They surely disbelieve who say: Lo! Allah is the Messiah,  
 486 (thy kinsfolk) disobey thee, say: Lo! I am innocent of what  
 487 (The same are) those who say: Lo! Allah hath charged us  
 488 (saying): Come unto us ? Say: Lo! the guidance of Allah  
 489 till thou follow their creed. Say: Lo! the guidance of Allah  
 490 not hurt nor benefit for you. 22. Say: Lo! none can protect me  
 491 hear the Reminder, and they say: Lo! he is indeed mad; 52.  
 492 unto Him no partner. 21. Say: Lo! I control not hurt nor  
 493 best what He revealeth - they say: Lo! thou art but inventing.

To sum up, *say* in QPT strongly colligates with vocatives, imperatives, and interrogatives. We have also identified a new kind of relationship with *say*: a new kind of priming which might be termed *punctuation association* or *punctuation collocation* (because it co-occurs with a specific mark). In the case of *say* in QPT, the priming is for question and exclamation marks.

We also note that *say* colligates with future modality *will* and *shall* in the QPT. So there are 62 instances of *will* in L1 position occurring with *say* and 8 instances of *shall* in R1 position occurring with *say* in QPT. Altogether there are 70 cases of future modality occurring with *say* in QPT accounting for 9.9% of instances of *say* in the QPT. In the BNC, however, 591 instances of *will* in L1 position occur with *say* and 230 instances of *shall* in L2 position occur with *say* which makes 821 instances of future modality in association with *say* in the BNC, accounting for 1.2% of instances of *say* in the BNC. This means that the colligation is 8.25 times more common in the QPT than in the BNC. Statistical tests which show this relationship are given below:

	QPT	BNC
	<i>say</i> 706	<i>say</i> 68765
<i>Say with will and shall</i>	70	821
Other uses of <i>say</i>	636	67944
Chi-Sq = 419.800, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.000		

Table 5.11. Colligation of *say* with *future modality* in QPT and BNC

	QPT	BNC/RW
	<i>say</i> 706	<i>say</i> 970
<i>Say with will and shall</i>	70	31
Other uses of <i>say</i>	636	939
Chi-Sq = 32.574, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.000		

Table 5.12: Colligation of *say* with *future modality* in QPT and BNC/RW

	QPT <i>say</i> 706	BIT <i>say</i> 1045
<i>Say with will and shall</i>	70	140
Other uses of <i>say</i>	636	905
Chi-Sq = 4.840, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.028		

Table 5.13: Colligation of *say* with *future modality* in QPT and the BIT

The p-value = 0.000 in tables 5.11 and 5.12 shows that there is a significant difference in the colligation of *say* with *will* and *shall* between the QPT and both the BNC and the RW/BNC. But the difference is less strongly significant between the QPT and the BIT as the p-value = 0.028 proves.

## 5.6. Keyword 2: *believe*

### 5.7. Investigation of the collocations of *believe* in QPT

The next word in Pickthall's translation to be investigated is the key word *believe* which is 43 in the keyword list and is a word with both religious and non religious meanings. The concordance listing shows that the most common right collocate for *believe* in the translation is *in*, producing the phrase *believe in*. The collocation of *believe* with *in* occurs 133 times in total; 13 of these occur to the left of *believe* and will not be discussed and 120 occur to the right. Of the 120 right collocates 87 occur immediately to the right of *believe* and these (collocates in R1 position) account for 20.0% of the 434 instances of *believe*. The phrase *believe in* in turn participates in different nested combinations, for instance the nested combinations *believe in Allah and His messenger* and *those who believe in*. Examples of *believe in* are displayed below.

**Figure 5.12: Concordance lines showing the nested combination of *believe in* in QPT.**

N Concordance  
 176 transgression. 62. Lo! Those who believe (in that which is revealed  
 177 the People of the Scripture but will believe in him before his death, and  
 178 messenger and you because ye believe in Allah, your Lord ? If ye  
 179 bestowed upon them; 4. And who believe in that which is revealed  
 180 know the liars ? 44. Those who believe in Allah and the Last Day  
 181 of their Lord. 58. And those who believe in the revelations of their  
 182 the needy and the wayfarer, if ye believe in Allah and that which We  
 183 though they love you not, and ye believe in all the Scripture. When  
 184 and forbid indecency; and ye believe in Allah. And if the People of  
 185 and Aaron. 123. Pharaoh said: Ye believe in Him before I give you

There are 20370 instances of *believe* in the BNC after duplicates are removed. The collocation *believe in* occurs in the BNC 2,569 times with *in* to the right; of these 1,619 occur with *in* in R1 position. These occurrences account for 7.9% of the instances of *believe* in BNC, as opposed to 20.0% in QPT. This means that the phrase *believe in* is proportionally between twice and three times as common in QPT as in the BNC.

	QPT	BNC
	<i>believe</i> 434	<i>believe</i> 20370
<i>Believe in</i>	87	1619
Other uses of <i>believe</i>	347	18751
Chi-Sq = 82.622, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.000		

Table 5.14. The collocation of *believe* with *in* in the QPT and the BNC

The p-value = 0.000 confirms the claim that *believe* collocates with *in* in the QPT more frequently than it does in the language as a whole so there is a significant difference between the QPT and the BNC in the frequency of *believe in*.

	QPT	RW/BNC
	<i>believe</i> 434	<i>believe</i> 703
<i>Believe in</i>	87	154
Other uses of <i>believe</i>	347	549
Chi-Sq = 0.556, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.456		

Table 5.15. The collocation of *believe* with *in* in the QPT and the RW/BNC

However, when we compare QPT with the RW/BNC (Table 5.15) we find no significant difference in the frequency of the association of *believe* with *in* in the QPT and the RW/BNC. Interestingly, as Table 5.16 shows the same is not true of a comparison of QPT with BIT.

	QPT	BIT
	<i>believe</i> 434	<i>believe</i> 143
<i>Believe in</i>	87	13
Other uses of <i>believe</i>	347	130
Chi-Sq = 9.010, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.003		

Table 5.16: The collocation of *believe* with *in* in the QPT and the BIT

The p-value is 0.003 so the difference is still quite significant. It is also noted that in the BNC the word *God* occurs 94 times after *believe in* out of 1619, as opposed to QPT where *Allah* occurs 37 times after *believe in* out of 87 instances of the phrase. So *Allah* appears after *believe in* 42.5% of the time in QPT whereas *God* appears after *believe in* 5.8% of the time in BNC. Here it is worth mentioning that *Allah* and *God* are not synonymous. For a Muslim, there are many connotations to *Allah* and associations with the term *Allah* which are not present in the same way for those who use the word *God*. Nevertheless, for the purposes of comparison between QPT and the BNC, it seems appropriate to compare the proportions of



use of *Allah* in QPT and *God* in the BNC. If we do compare the uses, we find that apart from any differences there are in the words themselves, there are also differences in the proportions of use of the two words; as already noted, *Allah* (an expression referring to God) is used after *believe* 42.5% of the time in QPT whereas *God* is used only 5.8% of the time in the BNC.

### **5.7.1. The collocations of the phrase *believe in***

The fact that *believe* collocates with *in* more frequently in QPT than it does in the language as a whole is a consequence of its being a feature of religious language. It is reasonable to suppose that in Christian writings also, we would find *believe in* occurring as frequently and that is presumably why Table 5.15 shows no significant difference. But what distinguishes the language of the QPT in this context from any other religious text is the occurrence of the words *Allah*, *Him*, *Me*, *Our Lord* referring to *Allah*, and *that* referring to the Quran after *believe in*. A crucial point here is that *Him* in the context of *believe in* is going to be cohesive with the term *Allah* and that *it* is going to be cohesive with the term Quran and therefore that *Him* and *it* are exclusively co-referential with these other terms because they are part of the cohesive chain including these above terms. These features exist only in the QPT and they also tell us that even though *believe* collocates with *in* in religious texts in general, the nested phrase *believe in* in QPT collocates differently. There is also nesting in the phrases that collocate with *believe in*; these include *Allah and His messengers*, *Allah and the last day*, *that which is revealed unto Mohammad* etc.

In addition to the above, we need to mention a very important point with regard to another case of *Referential Association*, which is more complicated than those we have found before. Consider the following data:

- 1- And those who believe and do good works and *believe* in that *which is revealed* unto Muhammad
- 2- 3-But those of them who are firm in knowledge and the believers *believe* in that *which is revealed* unto thee, and that which was *revealed* before thee,
- 3- O ye unto whom the Scripture hath been given! *Believe* in what We *have revealed* confirming that which ye possess...
- 4- -Hast thou seen those who pretend that they *believe* in that which is *revealed* unto thee and that, [sic] which was *revealed* before thee?
- 5- Our Lord! We *believe* in that which Thou hast *revealed* and we follow him
- 6- We *believe* in that which hath been *revealed* unto us and *revealed* unto you;
- 7- Save those who *believe* in *Our revelations* so that they surrender (unto Him).
- 8- And when those who *believe* in *Our revelations* come unto thee,
- 9- And those who *believe* in the *revelations* of their Lord,
- 10- Only those *believe* in *Our revelations* who, when they are reminded of them, fall down prostrate and hymn the praise of their Lord, and they are not scornful,
- 11- And those who *believe Our revelations*;
- 12- Save those who *believe Our revelations* and who have surrender
- 13- *believe* in Allah and that which We *revealed* unto Our slave on the Day of Discrim
- 14- of the People of the Scripture there are some who *believe* in Allah and that which is *revealed* unto you and that which was *revealed* ....
- 15- Say (O Muhammad): We *believe* in Allah and that which is *revealed* unto us and that which was revealed
- 16- Say (O Muslims): We *believe* in Allah and that which is *revealed* unto us and that which was revealed
- 17- Say: O People of the Scripture! Do ye blame us for aught else than that we *believe* in Allah and that which is *revealed* unto us and that which was *revealed*

In the first place these data illustrate a collocation of *believe in* with *revealed* and *revelation*; the collocation with *revealed* and *revelation* occurs 24 times and accounting for 5.5% of the (434) instances of *believe* in the QPT. This collocation then refers to (four) kinds of scriptures (the Quran, the Gospel, the Torah, and the Psalms of David). That set creates a semantic association in that they all belong to the category of Holy Scriptures. The point here is that we have quite a range of different expressions (mainly using the word *reveal* but sometimes using other words like *sent down*, *came to us*) which have been used to refer to a limited number of Holy Scriptures, none of which are named here; even the Quran is not referred to as the Quran but is referred to as *revelations* and the same is true of all the other Holy scriptures.

Secondly the Quran is being referred to in a number of ways (an instance of referential association with *believe*) but in addition to having a range of expressions referring to the Quran we also have a broader referential association where all the references are to the semantic set of Holy Scriptures already referred to. This is a sophisticated and complicated kind of referential association as the referential association and the semantic association are interlocked. It is another new kind of priming where a range of expressions refer to a much smaller set of items but that set nevertheless is a set not a single thing. As just noted, the result is a mixture of referential association and semantic association.

One problem is actually that one cannot tell from the words of the expression, which scripture is being referred to and who is being addressed. One infers, though, that if Mohammad is being addressed, then it is the Quran. In other words, the associated words alone are not enough; we have to have the full context to determine which scripture is being referred to.

To sum up, there is a collocation with *revealed* and *revelation*.

-There is a referential association, with the reference mostly being to one particular text i.e. the Quran.

-There is a semantic association tied in with a referential association with a particular set i.e. Holy Scriptures.

Examination of the collocation of *believe* with *revealed* or *revelations* in the BNC shows that only *revealed* appears as a collocates, occurring four times in R5 position but neither *revealed* nor *revelation* are listed as collocates in the RW/BNC or the BIT. Therefore the collocation of *believe* with *revealed* or *revelations* is strong in the QPT, very weak in the BNC and non-existent in BNC/RW or the BIT.

### 5.7.2. Collocation of *believe* with *O* in QPT

The next most common collocate of *believe* as identified by Wordsmith is the vocative *O* which occurs 99 times in total, 93 of which occur in L3 position. This collocation in L3 position accounts for 21.4% of the instances of *believe* in QPT. The collocation of *believe* with *O* comes about as a result of the phrase *O ye who believe* which occurs 89 times; we will talk about this phrase later when we turn to colligations of *believe*. In the BNC, *O* occurs 18 times in total; 13 occur in R5 position. In the RW/BNC and the BIT *O* is not identified as a collocate.

	QPT	BNC
	<i>believe</i> 434	<i>believe</i> 20370
The collocation of <i>believe</i> with <i>O</i>	93	13
Other uses of <i>believe</i>	341	20357
Chi-Sq = 3826.389, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.000		

Table 5.17. The collocation of *believe* with *O* in QPT and BNC

The p-value shows a big difference between the QPT and the BNC in the collocation of *O* with *believe*. The implication is that *O* is a significant feature of QPT.

### 5.7.3. Collocation of *believe* with *not* in QPT

Another common collocate of *believe* identified by Wordsmith is *not*, which occurs 81 times in total: of the instances of *not* 29 occur to the left of *believe* and 52 occur to the right. The key point here is that 45 of them occur immediately to the right of *believe* producing the phrases *believe not* or *believe not in* and the phrase *believe not in* itself

collocates with the phrase *those who* to the left producing the nested combination *those who believe not in*. This collocation accounts for 10.4% of instances of *believe*. The collocate *not* is of course in an unusual position in QPT. Typically, in everyday English we would say *those who do not believe*, making use of the normal position of *not* in English before the lexical verb, and *believe not* is uncommon and *believe not in* is even more uncommon.

The majority of instances of *not* with *believe* in the BNC (1,225) occur before the verb in L1 position. I examined the existence of *not* in R1 position after the verb *believe* in the BNC and found that there were only 11 instances in which *not* occurred after the verb, two of which occurred in the phrases *believe not only in* and *believe not just in*.

Christians *believe not only* in celibacy outside....

I *believe not just* in Germany.

**Figure 5.13: Concordance lines where *not* occurs after *believe* in QPT as immediate collocate.**

N Concordance

136 believers. 121. And say unto those who believe not: Act according to your power.  
 137 who deny Our revelations, those who believe not in the Hereafter and deem  
 138 them not it is all one for them; they believe not. 7. Allah hath sealed their  
 139 I have forsaken the religion of folk who believe not in Allah and are disbelievers  
 140 cursed them for their disbelief, so they believe not, save a few. 47. O ye unto  
 141 is mentioned, the hearts of those who believe not in the Hereafter are repelled,  
 142 thyself (O Muhammad) because they believe not. 4. If We will, We can send  
 143 105. Only they invent falsehood who believe not Allah's revelations, and (only)  
 144 but a lie. 6. Yet it may be, if they believe not in this statement, that thou  
 145 them not, it is alike for them, for they believe not. 11. Thou warnest only him  
 146 those who do wrong: that they believe not. 34. Say: Is there of your  
 147 proved true of most of them, for they believe not. 8. Lo! We have put on their  
 148 and harden their hearts so that they believe not till they see the painful doom.  
 149 20. What aileth them, then, that they believe not 21. And, when the Qur'an is  
 150 are in a state of carelessness, and they believe not. 40. Lo! We, only We, inherit  
 151 the hearts of the guilty: 13. They believe not therein, though the example  
 152 in Allah and the Last Day, when they believe not. 9. They think to beguile Allah  
 153 be that the Hour is nigh. 18. Those who believe not therein seek to hasten it,  
 154 them for their disbelief, so that they believe not save a few - 156. And

**Figure 5.14: Concordance lines where *in* occurs after *believe not* in QPT as immediate collocate.**

N Concordance  
 197 who have been given the Scripture as believe not in Allah nor the Last Day, and  
 198 say: Lo! Allah hath charged us that we believe not in any messenger until he  
 199 great reward. 8. What aileth you that ye believe not in Allah, when the messenger  
 200 45. They alone ask leave of thee who believe not in Allah and the Last Day,  
 201 is their judgment. 60. For those who believe not in the Hereafter is an evil  
 202 face averted! 106. And most of them believe not in Allah except that they  
 203 God is One God. But as for those who believe not in the Hereafter their hearts

The occurrence of the combination *believe not* in QPT does not mean that *not* does not occur as a left collocate of *believe*. As noted, the data show that *not* also occurs as a left collocate in a normal position and it occurs with *believe* in 21 cases such as *will not believe*, *would not believe*, *could not believe*, *shall not believe* etc. This accounts for 4.8% of the 434 instances of *believe*. However, as also noted earlier, *not* as immediate right collocate after the verb *believe* accounts for 10.4% of instances of *believe* in QPT and this proportion of L1 to R1 is very different from that in the language as a whole as reflected in the BNC. Table 5.17 represents a check of whether this difference is statistically significant.

	QPT	BNC
	<i>believe</i> 434	<i>believe</i> 20370
<i>Believe not</i>	45	11
Other uses of <i>believe</i>	389	20359
Chi-Sq = 1684.121, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.000		

**Table 5.18. The Occurrence of *not* as a collocate in R1 position in QPT and R1 position in BNC**

The p-value = 0.000 confirms that the difference in the presence of *not* as immediate right collocate in QPT is very significant. In the RW/BNC, we have only one instance in R1

position as opposed to 59 in L1 position and in the Bible in translation no instances at all are listed as collocates in R1 position but 18 instances occur in L1 position. So the point here is that the collocation of *believe* with *not* as immediate right collocate is effectively unique to the QPT.

*Not* occurs as a left collocate of *believe* 20 times in L1 position. Comparing that with the BNC we find that *not* occurs 1,225 times in L1 position in the BNC, 59 in L1 position in the RW/BNC and 18 times in L1 position in the BIT. So the majority of instances of *not* as a collocate of *believe* in those corpora occur immediately to the left of *believe* and not to the right as it is the case in the QPT. The statistical test below shows how significant this collocation is in the four corpora.

	QPT	BNC
	<i>believe</i> 434	<i>believe</i> 20370
<i>Not Believe</i>	20	1225
Other uses of <i>believe</i>	414	19145
Chi-Sq = 1.492, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.222		

Table 5.19. The collocation of *believe* with *not* in L1 position in QPT and BNC

	QPT	RW/ BNC
	<i>believe</i> 434	<i>believe</i> 703
<i>Not Believe</i>	20	59
Other uses of <i>believe</i>	414	644
Chi-Sq = 5.944, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.015		

Table 5.20. The collocation of *believe* with *not* in L1 position in QPT and RW/ BNC

	QPT	BIT
	<i>believe</i> 434	<i>believe</i> 143
<i>Not Believe</i>	20	18
Other uses of <i>believe</i>	414	125
Chi-Sq = 11.131, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.001		

Table 5.21. The collocation of *believe* with *not* in L1 position in QPT and BIT

We note that there is no significance to the difference between QPT and BNC with respect to the collocation of *believe* and *not* (table 5.19). Table 5.20 shows, however, that there is a significant difference between QPT and RW/BNC with respect to this collocation and table 5.21 shows even stronger statistically significant difference.

Another collocation identified by Wordsmith of the word *believe* is with *say* which occurs 40 times in total, 15 of which occur in L2 position. This collocation in total accounts for 9.2% of the 434 instances of *believe* in QPT.

Figure 5.15: Concordance lines showing the collocation of *believe* with *say* in QPT.

N Concordance

320        because they say: We believe, and will not be tested  
321        unto them, they say: We believe in it. Lol it is the Truth  
322 path. 47. And they say: We believe in Allah and the  
323 who believe, they say: We believe; but when they go  
324 who believe, they say: We believe. But when they go  
325 (Muslims), they say: We believe; but they came in  
326 hath revealed, they say: We believe in that which was  
327 wandering Arabs say: We believe. Say (unto them, O  
328 fall in with you they say: We believe; but when they go  
329        are some who say: We believe in Allah and the Last

In the BNC, *say* occurs 204 times in total; 47 of which occur in L3 position. This collocation in total accounts for only 1.0% of the 20370 instances of *believe* in the BNC. In the RW/BNC



*say* occurs 12 times in total, five of which occur in L3 position, accounting for 1.7% of the 703 instances of *believe* in the RW/BNC. In the BIT, the contrast is even stronger; Wordsmith does not identify *say* as a collocates of *believe* at all.

	QPT <i>believe</i> 434	BNC <i>believe</i> 20370
Collocation of <i>believe</i> with <i>say</i>	40	204
Other uses of <i>believe</i>	394	20166
Chi-Sq = 247.424, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.000		

Table 5.22. Collocation of *believe* with *say* in QPT and BNC

	QPT <i>believe</i> 434	RW/BNC <i>believe</i> 703
Collocation of <i>believe</i> with <i>say</i>	40	12
Other uses of <i>believe</i>	394	691
Chi-Sq = 34.674, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.000		

Table 5.23. Collocation of *believe* with *say* in QPT and RW/BNC

The p-value =0.000 in table 5.30 and table 5.31 suggest that the difference in the collocation of *believe* with *say* between the QPT and BNC and the RW/BNC is significant.

### 5.8. The nested combination of *those who believe and do good works*

We turn now to the nested combination *those who believe and do good works*. This nested combination of collocations occurs 40 times and accounts for 9.2 % of instances of *believe*.

In these examples, *those* collocates with *who*, producing the phrase *those who*, which in turn, collocates with *believe* producing the phrase *those who believe*. This phrase in turn collocates with the conjunction *and* (12.9 % of the time) so we have *those who believe and*, which in turn collocates with the phrase *do good works* which occurs in 9.2% of instances of *believe*. So here we have one nested combination which collocates with another nested combination; the two nested combinations combined together produce one big expression, which is *those who believe and do good works*.

13 cases of ‘*those who believe and do good works*’ are associated with the exclamation mark *Lo!* ; this accounts for 32.5% of the instances of *those who believe and do good works*. 10 of the 40 cases of *those who believe and do good works* occur in a relationship with *as for* and *but for*. The instances below illustrate these points.

**Figure 5.16: concordance lines showing instances of the association of *those who believe and do good works* with *Lo*.**

N Concordance  
 380 friend! 14. Lo! Allah causeth those who believe and do good works to enter  
 381 Resurrection, alone. 96. Lo! those who believe and do good works, the  
 382 23. Lo! Allah will cause those who believe and do good works to enter

**Figure 5.17: Concordance lines showing instances of *those who believe and do good works* in a relationship with *as for*.**

N Concordance  
 301 ye used to do. 9. And as for those who believe and do good works, We verily  
 302 creatures. 7. And as for those who believe and do good works, We shall

However, the two separate phrases i.e. *those who believe* and *do good works* are likely to have separate collocations and separate colligations and it is this possibility that we now investigate.

The phrase *those who believe* occurs 133 times and collocates with *and* 44 times. It collocates with the preposition *in* 14 times and with the negation particle *not* 13 times. Finally it has a weak collocation with the preposition *with* which occurs only 5 times. So based on this, we can argue that the collocations and the colligations of *those who believe* are different from *those who believe and do good works*. The table below is evidence that the two phrases have different collocates.

Those who believe and do good works (40)			Those who believe (133)		
And as for	L: 4	Weak	And as for	L: 0	Non-existent
As for	L: 9	strong	As for	L: 4	Weak
Allah*cause*	L: 3	weak	Allah*cause*	L: 0	Non-existent
Lo	L: 10	strong	Lo	L: 7	Weaker
And	L: 3	weak	And	L: 18	Strong
Of	L: 0	non existent	Of	L: 9	Strong
Say unto	L: 0	non existent	Say unto	L: 5	medium
For them	R: 5	medium	For them	L: 0	Non-existent
To enter Garden	R: 3	weak	To enter Garden	L: 0	Non-existent
We shall	R: 4	weak	We shall	L: 0	Non-existent
Unto	L: 0	non-existent	Unto	L: 7	Strong

Table 5.24: The collocates of the nested combinations *those who believe and do good works* and *those who believe* in QPT as identified by Wordsmith.

From table 5.24 we can conclude that the collocates that occur with the phrase *those who believe and do good works* differ from those that occur with the phrase *those who believe*.

Examination of the concordance list for the BNC, the RW/ BNC, and the BIT reveals that the expression *those who believe and do good works* does not occur at all in these corpora. Therefore, we can say that it is unique to QPT. On the other hand the phrase *those who believe* occurs 110 times in the BNC starting in L2 position (excluding the duplicates), accounting for 0.5% of the 20370 instances of *believe*. *Those who believe* in the BNC collocates with *that* 57 times and it collocates with *in* 30 times. So the main two collocates of the phrase *those who believe* in the BNC are *that* and *in*.

Interestingly, the phrase *those who believe* in QPT occurs 133 times and collocates with *in* 14 times but Wordsmith does not identify *that* as a collocate of the phrase.

	QPT	BNC
	<i>believe</i> 434	<i>believe</i> 20370
<i>Those who believe + in</i>	14	30
<i>Those who believe – in</i>	420	20340
Chi-Sq = 190.825, DF = 1		

Table 5.25: The collocation of *those who believe* with *in* in QPT and BNC

In the RW/BNC the phrase *those who believe* occurs only 7 times in L2 position and in the BIT the phrase does not occur at all.

### 5.9. Investigation of the semantic associations of *believe* in QPT.

We now move from collocation to semantic association (though we have necessarily touched upon the latter in our discussions so far); the first and largest of the semantic associations of *believe* suggested by the data is an association with LARGE NUMBERS OF PEOPLE such

as *believers* (in the phrase *O ye who believe*), *mankind*, *men*, and *bondmen*. This semantic association accounts for 28.6% of instances of *believe* in different positions.

**Figure 5.18: Concordance lines showing the association of *believe* with large numbers of people (*mankind*) in QPT.**

N Concordance  
 394 9. That ye (mankind) may believe in Allah and His  
 395 thy Lord, so that they may believe therein and their  
 396 Lord; but most of mankind believe not. 18. Who doeth  
 397 yet most of mankind believe not. 60. And your  
 398 Truth, but most of mankind believe not. 2. Allah it is

**Figure 5.19: Concordance lines showing the association of *believe* with large number of people (*O ye who believe*) in QPT.**

N Concordance  
 187 of hell-fire. 87. O ye who believe! Forbid not the good  
 188 and maids. 6. O ye who believe! Ward off from  
 189 doom. 95. O ye who believe! Kill no wild game  
 190 Merciful. 119. O ye who believe! Be careful of your  
 191 give thanks. 90. O ye who believe! Strong drink and  
 192 used to do. 106. O ye who believe! Let there be  
 193 their trust. 11. O ye who believe! when it is said unto  
 194 what ye do. 12. O ye who believe! When ye hold  
 195 only knew. 104. O ye who believe, say not (unto the  
 196 thought. 267. O ye who believe! Spend of the good  
 197 wronged. 282. O ye who believe! When ye contract a

In the BNC however we appear to have just two words that represent this kind of association. The first is *Christians* which occurs 37 times immediately to the left of *believe* with *Christian* occurring 7 times in R1 position (although it is singular I include it in the association). In the RW/BNC likewise we have *Christians* which occurs 31 times in L1 position, *Christian* which occurs four times in L3 position and *sister* which occurs four times in R3 position. There are no instances of large numbers of believing/ disbelieving humans in the BIT.

	QPT	BNC
	<i>believe</i> 434	<i>believe</i> 20370
Semantic Association with <i>belief/disbelief</i>	124	44
Other uses of <i>believe</i>	310	20326
Chi-Sq = 4265.453, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.000		

Table 5.26. Semantic association with *believing* and non *believing* people in the BNC and QPT.

	QPT	RW/BNC
	<i>believe</i> 434	<i>believe</i> 703
Semantic Association with <i>belief/disbelief</i>	124	39
Other uses of <i>believe</i>	310	664
Chi-Sq = 115.828, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.000		

Table 5.27. Semantic association with *believing* and non *believing* people in the BNC and QPT

The difference in the association of *believe* with large numbers of people (believing/non believing) between the QPT, BNC and the RW/BNC is very large and therefore this association is much stronger in the QPT than in the BNC or the RW/BNC.

The next most common semantic association is the association with holy books expressed by words such as *scriptures*, *revelations* and phrases like *what has been revealed*. This semantic association accounts for 6.2% of instances of *believe*. This is a semantic association and referential association too as we have seen, because of words like *revelations*, phrases like *that which I reveal* and *that which is revealed* referring to Holy books.

**Figure 5.20: Concordance lines showing the association of *believe* with Holy books.**

N Concordance

145 none to hear save those who believe in Our revelations so  
146 they invent falsehood who believe not Allah's revelations,  
147 ? 54. And when those who believe in Our revelations  
148 used to do. 15. Only those believe in Our revelations who,  
149 Lord. 58. And those who believe in the revelations of

**Figure 5.20.1: Concordance lines showing the association of *believe* with HOLY BOOKS.**

N Concordance

253 the Scripture hath been given! Believe in what We have revealed  
254 who believe and do good works and believe in that which is revealed unto  
255 bestowed upon them; 4. And who believe in that which is revealed unto  
256 seen those who pretend that they believe in that which is revealed unto  
257 firm in knowledge and the believers believe in that which is revealed unto  
258 transgression. 62. Lo! Those who believe (in that which is revealed unto  
259 Allah hath revealed, they say: We believe in that which was revealed

Examination of the concordance data for the BNC, the RW/BNC and the Bible reveals that there is no mention of scriptures or Holy Books in the context of *believe* and there are no expressions such as *that/which is revealed* that might indicate that a revelation through Holy Books is being described and therefore we conclude that this semantic association is not shared with the BNC, the religious writing of the BNC or the Bible and that it is therefore unique to the QPT.

### 5.10. Pragmatic association of *believe* in QPT

As can be inferred from the collocation with *not*, *believe* is pragmatically associated with negation. In total there are 81 instances where *not* is used as a general collocater within the context of *believe*. This occurrence accounts for 18.7% of the instances of *believe* in QPT. If

we compare this occurrence to that of the BNC we find that there are variety of words which express negation as appears in the table below

Expression of negation in the BNC in the context of <i>believe</i> in total	
Not	2214
No	394
Never	167
Nor	46
Nobody	38
Neither	18
<b>Total</b>	<b>2877 = 14.1%</b>

Table 5.28. Expressions showing negation with *believe* in the BNC

This association accounts for 14.1% of the instances of *believe* in the BNC. A comparison of QPT with the BNC with regard to their use of negation with *believe* is shown in the table below.

	QPT <i>believe</i> 434	BNC <i>believe</i> 20370
Pragmatic association of <i>believe</i> with negation	81	2877
Other uses of <i>believe</i>	353	17493
Chi-Sq = 7.181, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.007		

Table 5.29. Pragmatic association with negation in the QPT and BNC in the context of *believe*



The p-value shows difference in the use of negation with *believe* between the QPT and the BNC.

If we compare negation in QPT with that in the RW/BNC we find that there are only two negative markers: *not*, which occurs 100 times in total, and secondly, *no*, which occurs 20 times in total. Altogether we have 120 instances of negation associated with *believe* in the WR/BNC accounting for 17.1% of the instances of *believe* in the RW/BNC. In the Bible however, we have only one negative expression, namely *not* which occurs 35 times in total in association with *believe*. The tables below explore whether there is a real difference in the association of *believe* with negation in the WR/BNC, the BIT and the QPT.

	QPT	RW/BNC
	<i>believe</i> 434	<i>believe</i> 703
Pragmatic association with negation	81	120
Other uses of <i>believe</i>	353	583
Chi-Sq = 0.468, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.494		

Table 5.30: Pragmatic association of *believe* with negation in the QPT and RW/BNC in the context of *believe*.

	QPT	BIT
	<i>believe</i> 434	<i>believe</i> 143
Pragmatic association with negation	81	35
Other uses of <i>believe</i>	353	108
Chi-Sq = 2.262, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.133		

Table 5.31. Pragmatic association with negation in the QPT and BIT in the context of *believe*

The p-value in tables 5.26 and 5.27 shows no significant difference in the use of negation with *believe* between the QPT and the other two corpora the RW/BNC and the BIT.

### 5.11. Colligations of *believe* in QPT

We noted earlier a collocation with *O*, which occurs 99 times in total; 93 of these occur in L3 position and account for 21.4% of instances of *believe* in QPT. This points of course to a colligation with the vocative in the phrase *O ye who believe* which accounts for 21% of the data of *believe*.

We also note that 50 instances of the phrase *O ye who believe* out of 89 occur with imperatives, all of which are used for moral instructions. This colligation accounts for 11.5% of instances of *believe*.

Examples are:

- 1- *O ye who believe!* Ask blessings on him and salute him with a worthy salutation.
- 2- *O ye who believe!* Be careful of your duty to Allah, and be with the truthful.
- 3- *O ye who believe!* Be not as those who slandered Moses, but Allah proved his innocence of that which they alleged, and he was well esteemed in Allah's sight.
- 4- *O ye who believe!* Be not friendly with a folk with whom Allah is wroth,
- 5- *O ye who believe!* Be ye staunch in justice, witnesses for Allah, even though it be against yourselves or (your) parents or (your) kindred, whether (the case be of) a rich man or a poor man,
- 6- *O ye who believe!* Be mindful of your duty to Allah and put faith in His messenger. He will give you twofold of His mercy and will appoint for you a light wherein ye shall walk, and will forgive
- 7- *O ye who believe!* Be Allah's helpers, even as Jesus son of Mary said unto the disciples: Who are my helpers for Allah? They said: We are Allah's helpers.
- 8- *O ye who believe!* Be not as those who disbelieved and said of their brethren who went abroad in the land or were fighting in the field: If they had been (here) with us they would not have died.

- 9- *O ye who believe!* Be steadfast witnesses for Allah in equity, and let not hatred of any people seduce you that ye deal not justly. Deal justly, that is nearer to your duty.
- 10- *O ye who believe!* Be mindful of your duty to Allah, and seek the way of approach unto Him, and strive in His way in order that ye may succeed.
- 11- *O ye who believe!* Be not forward in the presence of Allah and His messenger, and keep your duty to Allah. Lo! Allah is Hearer, Knower.
- 12- *O ye who believe!* Lift not up your voices above the voice of the prophet, nor shout when speaking to him as ye shout one to another,

*Ye* is never used in standard modern English except in religious writing and the reason for its use there is that the King James Bible, for several centuries the only readily available English translation, used *ye* because that was normal in English at the time of its production. This means that the instances of *ye* in the QPT actually come in part from the association of *ye* with a different holy work.

### **5.12. Keyword 3: *will***

The third word under investigation in the QPT is *will* which is number 24 in the keyword list. The reason for selecting the word *will* is that it is a grammatical term which therefore might have been expected not to be key in the data. *Will* occurs 1679 times in QPT and it occurs 262,234 times in the BNC. So the frequency of *will* in QPT is 1 in 97 words as opposed to 1 in 381 in the BNC which means that it is almost 4 times more common in the QPT than in the BNC.

### **5.13. Investigation of the Collocations and Semantic associations of *Will* in QPT.**

The most common collocate to the left of *will* is the subject pronoun *He*. *He* occurs 266 times immediately to the left of the word *will*. Out of these, 231 instances refer to Allah and 35 have other references.

In addition to that, we have 100 instances of the word *Allah* immediately to the immediate left of *will*. The word *Allah* occurs 100 times in L1 position in addition to the 231 instances of *He*. Altogether therefore, we have 331 references so far to *Allah* to the left of *will* which account for 19.7 % of the instances of *will* in QPT (nearly one in five of all the instances of *will* in QPT).

Furthermore, we have 53 instances of *and* in L1 position of which 31 are clauses where *He* or the word *Allah* is understood to be subject being carried over from the previous clause. We also have 50 instances of *We* immediately to the left of *will*; 16 of these instances refer to *Allah*. There are 34 instances of *I* immediately to the left of *will*; 12 of these also refer to *Allah*. Finally there are 26 instances of *the Lord* immediately to the left of *will* which also refer to *Allah* as do two instances of *Who* with a capital letter. In total, then, we find a further 87 instances of reference to *Allah* as a Subject. This means that in total there are 418 references to *Allah* in the context of *will* and these account for almost a quarter (24.9%) of the instances of *will* in QPT. So 24.9% of the instances of *will* are references to *Allah*. This is very different from the BNC and is important theologically because it is a linguistic expression of the belief of Muslims that the future is in Allah's hands. This is another important example of what I have called Referential Association.<sup>19</sup>

When the word *Allah* is Subject, *will* is associated with active clauses not passive clauses. We do not have instances of expressions like *Allah will be surprised*, *will be hurt* or *will be rejected* etc. The formulation is always along the lines of *Allah will cause*, *Allah will gather*, *Allah will punish*, *Allah will forgive*; it is always active.

In connection with the previous point, if we take the Subjects associated with *will* and examine how many of them are Actors, we find that we have 399 Actors out of 418. So

---

<sup>19</sup> - This does not exhaust the uses of *Allah* in connection with *will* which also occur in other positions.

nearly 95.5 % of all the Subjects are Actors referring to *Allah*,<sup>20</sup> which represents a strong claim that *Allah* is an active God. That *He* is a great and active God. A further 26 out of 418 are Sayers, so 5% of all the Subjects referring to *Allah* in the context of *will* are Sayers. This means that 99% of all the clauses with referents denoting *Allah* as Subject are either Actors or Sayers.

This is quite different from ordinary English where the pronouns *he, we, I* etc used to refer to ordinary people in the BNC. *Lord* occurs 82 times in L2 in the BNC and *God* occurs 120 times in L1 position; both are subjects. In the RW/BNC pronouns are used to refer to ordinary people; *God* occurs 55 times in L1 position and *the Lord* occurs 9 times in L1 position too. The same applies to the BIT where many of the subjects in the Bible in connection with *will* are not referring to *God* as Subject.

In the BIT *Lord* occurs 114 times in L1 position and *God* occurs 52 times immediately to the left of *will* acting as subjects.

The next most common left collocate of *will* in QPT is *they*, occurring 251 times in L1 position. This accounts for 14.9 % of the instances of *will*. However, the word *they* has different referents depending on the context, and there appears little to distinguish the uses of this collocation from those in ordinary English as represented by the BNC. *They* occurs 9,324 times immediately to the left of *will* in the BNC accounting for 3.6% of the 262,234 instances of *will* in the BNC.

Among the other left common collocates to the left are the other two other pronouns: *it* and *we*. *It* occurs 77 times in L1 position and *we* occurs 50 times in L1 position as the corpus data shows below.

---

<sup>20</sup> Every single instance of actor is also a reference to *Allah*.

**Figure 5.21: Concordance lines showing *it* as a left collocate of *will* in QPT.**

**N Concordance**

736 come unto them (ere now). And verily it will come upon them suddenly when  
737 and no soul knoweth in what land it will die. Lo! Allah is Knower, Aware. (The  
738 He shall gather them together, (when it will seem) as though they had tarried but  
739 that it may come unto his mouth, and it will never reach it. The prayer of  
740 us they never worshipped. 64. And it will be said: Cry unto your (so-called)  
741 lo! they verily will burn in hell, 17. And it will be said (unto them): This is that  
742 be a vain proceeding. 13. Surely it will need but one shout, 14. And lo! they  
743 cometh (on the Day of Judgment) it will be judged between them fairly, and  
744 when it cometh home to them, then it will be a hapless morn for those who  
745 thy hand into the bosom of thy robe, it will come forth white but unhurt. (This will  
746 and lend unto Allah a goodly loan, it will be doubled for them, and theirs will  
747 truthful than Allah in utterance ? 123. It will not be in accordance with your

**Figure 5.22: Concordance lines showing *we* as a left collocate of *will* in QPT.**

**N Concordance**

1,408 In goodness; 10. Surely We will ease his way unto adversity. 11. His  
1,409 strengthened their frame. And when We will, We can replace them, bringing  
1,410 prostrate, and say: "Repentance." We will forgive you your sins and will  
1,411 55. And when ye said: O Moses! We will not believe in thee til we see Allah  
1,412 and ourselves and yourselves, then we will pray humbly (to our Lord) and  
1,413 unto thee, say (unto him): Come! We will summon our sons and your sons,  
1,414 cause of Allah ? The disciples said: We will be Allah's helpers. We believe in  
1,415 that we (should leave off) doing what we will with our own property. Lo! thou art  
1,416 We hasten for him therein what We will for whom We please. And afterward  
1,417 because they believe not. 4. If We will, We can send down on them from  
1,418 household by night, and afterward we will surely say unto his friend: We  
1,419 No-one is to eat of them save whom we will - in their make-believe - cattle whose

*Will* also has a strong collocation with the pronoun *ye* in which occurs 120 times in L1 position and accounts for 7.1% of the instances of *will* in QPT.

**Figure 5.23: Concordance lines showing *ye* as a left collocate of *will* in QPT.**

N Concordance	
1,641	it will be repaid to you in full, and ye will not be wronged. 273. (Alms are) for
1,642	and giveth death, and unto Him ye will be returned. 57. O mankind! There
1,643	you willeth to walk straight. 29. And ye will not, unless (it be) that Allah willeth,
1,644	complete dispersal still, even then, ye will be created anew ? 8. Hath he
1,645	for him who wardeth off (evil); and ye will not be wronged the down upon a
1,646	power. Lo! I too am working. Thus ye will come to know for which of us will be
1,647	guided or in error manifest. 25. Say: Ye will not be asked of what we committed,
1,648	will surely meet you, and afterward ye will be returned unto the Knower of the
1,649	in the Garden and eat from whence ye will, but come not nigh this tree lest ye
1,650	will be owners of the Fire. 44. And ye will remember what I say unto you. I
1,651	yourselves against a day in which ye will be brought back to Allah. Then every
1,652	in the name of Allah that ye will bring him back to me, unless ye are
1,653	property and in your persons, and ye will hear much wrong from those who
1,654	His is the command, and unto Him ye will be brought back. (The Spider) The
1,655	comfort of illusion. 186. Assuredly ye will be tried in your property and in your

More generally, *will* has a strong colligation with subject pronouns in QPT, which accounts for 45.5% of instances of *will*, the most common pronoun being *He*. This is an example where the pronominal colligation is the same in the BNC and the QPT but with significant differences. Firstly in QPT we have the use of *He* with a capital H (and sometimes *We* with a capital W) where in all such cases there is a reference to Allah. Secondly, we have got the use of *ye* which is not used in modern English at all.

This leads us to the prediction that the reader of the Quran in translation will not only be primed in the usual way to associate *will* with subject pronouns in general but will also be primed to associate it with the subject pronoun *He* in particular which he or she will associate with the name of *Allah*.

Among the most common collocates of *will* in QPT is the negation particle *not*. In total, it occurs 215 times out of 1679 occurrences of *will* and this accounts for 12.8% of instances of *will*; of these, 26 occur to the left of *will* and 189 occur to the right. Of these 189 instances

136 occur in R1 position and account for 8.1 % of the instances of *will*, which means that one in every 12 instances of *will* in QPT occurs with *not* immediately to its right.

**Figure 5.24: Concordance lines showing *not* as a collocate of *will* in R1 position in QPT.**

**N Concordance**

550 disbelieve (and who then will believe) will not avail them, neither will they be  
 551 which speaketh the truth, and they will not be wronged. 63. Nay, but their  
 552 right guidance, still Allah assuredly will not guide him who misleadeth. Such  
 553 you willeth to walk straight. 29. And ye will not, unless (it be) that Allah willeth,  
 554 it will be repaid to you in full, and ye will not be wronged. 273. (Alms are) for  
 555 choose a way unto his Lord. 30. Yet ye will not, unless Allah willeth. Lo! Allah is  
 556 Then they will cry unto them, but they will not hear their prayer, and We shall  
 557 from Him Who is in the heaven that He will not let loose on you a hurricane ?  
 558 Those who disbelieve assert that they will not be raised again. Say (unto them,  
 559 in full what it hath earned; and they will not be wronged. 162. Is one who  
 560 be repaid what it hath earned. And they will not be wronged. 23. Hast thou seen  
 561 Such will enter the Garden, and they will not be wronged in aught - 61.

*Not* is also identified by Wordsmith as a collocate in the BNC; however, here it occurs 15,911 times out of 262,234 occurrences of *will* and these instances accounts for 6.1% of the instances of *will*; of these, 2,489 collocates occur to the left of *will* and 13,422 collocates occur to the right. Of the right collocates (i.e. the 13,422) 11,472 occur in R1 position, which means that only 4.4 % of the instances of *will* in the BNC are accompanied by *not* in R1 position.

	QPT	BNC
	<i>will</i> 1679	<i>will</i> 262, 243
Collocation of <i>will</i> with <i>not</i>	136	11472
Other uses of <i>will</i>	1543	250771
Chi-Sq = 55.068, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.000		

Table 5.32. Collocation of *will* with *not* in QPT and BNC



The p-value shows a significant statistical difference in the collocation of *not* between the QPT and the BNC in association with *will*.

	QPT <i>will</i> 1679	RW/ BNC <i>will</i> 3150
Collocation of <i>will</i> with <i>not</i>	136	207
Other uses of <i>will</i>	1543	2943
Chi-Sq = 3.879, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.049		

Table 5.33. Collocation of *will* with *not* in R1 position in QPT and RW/BNC

However, when we compare QPT with the religious writing component of the BNC, the p-value suggests no difference in the collocation of *will* with *not* between the two corpora.

	QPT <i>will</i> 1679	BIT <i>will</i> 3831
Collocation of <i>will</i> with <i>not</i>	136	342
Other uses of <i>will</i>	1543	3489
Chi-Sq = 1.008, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.315		

Table 5.34. Collocation of *will* with *not* in R1 position in QPT and BIT

The same is true when a comparison is made between the Quran in translation and the Bible in translation. So based on this we can conclude that the collocation of *will* with *not* in QPT is shared with the other religious texts the (RW/BNC) and the BIT and is therefore a characteristic collocation in religious texts, whatever their source.

*Will* also occurs with other negation particles: for example, *no* occurs 23 times in R2 position, *nor* occurs 20 times immediately to the left of *will*, *never* occurs 18 times immediately to the right of *will* and *neither* occurs 6 times immediately to the left. From table 5.33 we can see that in QPT we have 205 instances of negative particles out of 1,679 of instances of *will* which account for 12.2% of cases of *will*, whereas in the BNC we have 15093 instances of negation expressions out of 262,234 of instances of *will*, which account for 5.8% of cases of *will*.

Items used in the BNC			Items used in the QPT		
262, 234			1,679		
Not	11,472	R1	Not	136	R1
Never	1520	R1	Never	18	R1
No	1496	R2	No	23	R2
Nothing	191	R2	<i>No mention</i>	-----	-----
Nor	186	L1	Nor	20	L1
Nobody	113	L1	<i>No mention</i>	-----	-----
Neither	53	L1	Neither	6	L1
None	48	L3	None	2	R2
Nowhere	14	R2	<i>No mention</i>	-----	-----
<b>Total</b>	<b>15093=5.8%</b>	<b>That is 2.1</b>		<b>205=12.2%</b>	

Table 5.35. Negation expressions in the QPT and BNC

We conclude that it is safe to claim that *will* in QPT has a strong collocation with *not* in particular and a semantic association/colligation with negation in general. The statistical test below confirms this finding.

	QPT <i>will</i> 1679	BNC <i>will</i> 262,234
Semantic association with negation	205	15093
Other uses of <i>will</i>	1474	247141
Chi-Sq = 127.265, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.000		

Table 5.36. Semantic association of *will* with negation between QPT and BNC

	QPT <i>will</i> 1679	RW/BNC <i>will</i> 3150
Semantic association with negation	205	233
Other uses of <i>will</i>	1474	2917
Chi-Sq = 30.760, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.000		

Table 5.37. Semantic association with negation between the QPT and RW/BNC

	QPT <i>will</i> 1679	BIT <i>will</i> 3,831
Semantic association with negation	205	397
Other uses of <i>will</i>	1474	3434
Chi-Sq = 4.091, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.043		

Table 5.38. Semantic association of *will* with negation between QPT and BIT

The p-value in table 5.36= 0.000 and table 5.37=0.000 shows that there is a significant statistical difference between QPT and the BNC and between the QPT and RW/BNC with regard to the association of *will* with negation, even though there was no difference with regard to the use of *not*. On the other hand the p-value =0.043 in table 5.38 suggests that we again have

no real difference between the QPT and the BIT with regard to the association of *will* with negation so we conclude that this semantic association is shared by the two holy books in translation.

#### 5.14. Pragmatic Association of *will* in QPT

Up till now we have looked at the immediate grammar of *will*. We now look at the pragmatic context. One of the things we notice is that *will* in QPT collocates with expressions of certainty, such as *verily* and *surely*. *Verily* occurs 45 times in total, 39 to the left and 6 to the right and *surely* occurs 43 times in total, 22 to the left and 21 to the right. More specifically, *verily* occurs 24 times immediately to the left of *will*, and *surely* occurs 18 times immediately to the right. There is also an association with *indeed*, which is another expression of certainty; but this is a weaker collocation, occurring only 9 times in total; three of these collocates occur in R1 position. It is however, an expression of certainty and is included in the semantic set of expressions of certainty. Altogether these amount to 97 occurrences and account for 5.8 % of instances of *will*. Instances below illustrate this kind of association.

**Figure 5.25: Concordance lines showing the association of *will* with expressions of emphasis in QPT.**

##### N Concordance

200 death! those who disbelieve will surely say: This is  
201 94. O ye who believe! Allah will surely try you somewhat  
202 and the earth, they will surely answer: The  
203 messenger aforetime, they will surely swear: We  
204 death from which ye shrink will surely meet you, and  
205 they have earned, and it will surely befall them, while  
206 him from his father: that we will surely do. 62. He said

#### N Concordance

1,374 and the followers of vanity will then be lost. 79. Allah it  
1,375 as much again, they verily will seek to ransom  
1,376 if ye are attacked we verily will help you. And Allah  
1,377 16. Then lo! they verily will burn in hell, 17. And it  
1,378 (of religion) and we verily will bear your sins (for you).  
1,379 Day of Resurrection I verily will seize his seed, save but  
1,380 hard punishment or I verily will slay him, or he verily  
1,381 Most High. 21. He verily will be content. (The  
1,382 And lo! the wicked verily will be in hell; 15. They will  
1,383 3. And lo! thine verily will be a reward unailing. 4.  
1,384 their own, and they verily will be questioned on the  
1,385 13. Lo! the righteous verily will be in delight. 14. And lo!

Expressions of emphasis are perhaps to be expected in the context of a word like *will* since *will* reports the future and we usually have a view as to how certain something is that we predicted. What is interesting therefore is not that there is an expression of certainty but the ways that certainty is expressed. Neither *verily* nor *surely* nor *indeed* (in this use) are common in general English.

In the BNC *certainly* occurs 1, 082 times in total; 541 of them occur in R1 position. *Really* occurs 442 times in total, 103 of them in R1 position, and finally *surely* occurs 283 times in total, 175 in R1 position. Altogether these amount to 1807 occurrences accounting for 0.7% of the 262, 234 instances of *will* in the BNC.

In the RW/BN *surely* occurs 13 times in total, four of which occur in L2 position, *certainly* occurs 9 times in total, four of which occur in R1 position, *indeed* occurs 8 times in total, two of which occur in L4 position and *really* occurs 8 times in total, four of which occur in R2 position. Altogether there are 38 instances of expressions of certainty in the environment of *will* in RW/BNC accounting for 1.2% of the 3150 instances of *will* .

The case in the BIT is that we have only one expression of certainty, namely *surely*, which

occurs 32 times in total and interestingly all 32 occurrences occur in R1 position accounting for 0.8% of the 3831 instances of *will* in the BIT.

	QPT <i>will</i> 1679	BNC <i>will</i> 262,234
Pragmatic association of <i>will</i> with emphatic expressions	97	1807
Other uses of <i>will</i>	1582	260427
Chi-Sq = 603.032, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.000		

Table 5.39. Pragmatic Association of *will* with emphatic expressions in QPT and BNC

	QPT <i>will</i> 1679	RW/BNC <i>will</i> 3150
Pragmatic association of <i>will</i> with emphatic expressions	97	38
Other uses of <i>will</i>	1582	3112
Chi-Sq = 84.206, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.000		

Table 5.40. Pragmatic Association of *will* with emphatic expressions in QPT and RW/BNC

	QPT <i>will</i> 1679	BIT <i>will</i> 3831
Pragmatic association of <i>will</i> with emphatic expressions	97	32
Other uses of <i>will</i>	1582	3799
Chi-Sq = 124.698, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.000		

Table 5.41. Pragmatic association of *will* with emphatic expressions in QPT and BIT

The p-value = 0.000 in the above three tables suggests a highly significant statistical difference between the QPT and all the comparative corpora in terms of associating *will* with expressions of certainty. This means that this type of association is a feature particular to QPT.

*Will* reports the future, so we might expect statements of *will* to be reporting events or states that will happen next year or the following day etc. We do indeed get in the QPT a collocation with particular time items but interestingly they are not used the way we would expect. So for example *will* has a strong relationship with *day* but the relationship is not with a phrase like *next day*

We also have co occurrence with *hour* but it does not manifest itself as an expression like *in the next hour* which is what we might predict from the future tense. Instead, it refers to one very important day. So basically *will* predicts certainty but not the kind of certainty we are used to in everyday English and *will* predicts words of time but not used in the way that general English uses them.

*Day* occurs 114 times in total in conjunction with *will* in QPT. The majority of these occurrences (100) occur to the left of *will*, of which 33 occur in L4 position. The 114 occurrences account for 6.8 % of instances of *will*, which means that one instance in every 14 occurs with *day*.

The word *day* occurs 1459 times in total in conjunction with *will* in the BNC. 909 of these occur to the left of *will*; of these 324 occur in L2 position. The 1459 occurrences account for 0.6% of all instances of *will* in the BNC, in marked contrast to QPT where the collocation accounts, as we have seen, for 6.8% of occurrences. The word *hour* occurs 11 times in total in QPT, all of them occur to the left of *will*; five of these occur in L1 position. These occurrences account for 0.7% of instances of *will*. In the BNC, *hour* occurs 198 times in total; of these 113 occur to the left and 85 occur to the right; 36 of the right occurrences occur in R4 position. The

198 occurrences account for 0.1% of the 262,234 instances of *will* in BNC. For statistical comparisons we only consider the largest number of occurrences whether it occurs to the right or to the left of *day* and *hour* in the BNC and QPT.

	QPT <i>will</i> 1679	BNC <i>will</i> 262,234
Pragmatic association of <i>will</i> with time markers	38	360
Other uses of <i>will</i>	1641	261874
Chi-Sq = 500.756, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.000		

Table 5.42: Pragmatic association of *will* with time markers in QPT and BNC

	QPT <i>will</i> 1679	RW/BNC <i>will</i> 3150
Pragmatic association of <i>will</i> with time markers	38	13
Other uses of <i>will</i>	1641	3137
Chi-Sq = 35.893, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.000		

Table 5.43: Pragmatic association of *will* with time markers in QPT and RW/BNC

	QPT <i>will</i> 1679	BIT <i>will</i> 3831
Pragmatic association of <i>will</i> with time markers	38	11
Other uses of <i>will</i>	1641	3820
Chi-Sq = 51.722, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.000		

Table 5.44: Pragmatic association of *will* with time markers in QPT and BIT



The p-value= 0.000 in the three tables shows very significant difference in the association of *will* with time markers in the QPT and the BNC, the RW/BNC and the BIT. From this we conclude that this association is a QPT specific feature.

What we are showing is that a devoted reader of the Quran in translations will be primed differently from the ordinary reader of a newspaper or any other genre.

As we have seen *Day* is not the only temporal expression with which *will* collocates in QPT, the collocation with *day* is one instance of a more general semantic association with terms of time. Within that semantic association, however, in QPT there is a referential association, because the two words *day* and *hour* both characteristically refer to one very particular chosen time, that is the day of Resurrection. It is interesting that *day* and *hour* seem to refer to the same thing in QPT despite their different denotations. The explanation lies in the fact that the day of Judgement or the day of Resurrection is not the same as any other kind of day. In other words, *day* in QPT is not meant to denote 24 hours; it is meant to denote a moment selected in time by God and therefore the word *hour* will do the same job. These two words in the unique context of QPT are synonyms, which they certainly are not in the BNC or the RW/BNC or the BIT.

**Figure 5.26: Concordance lines showing that *day* refers to a particular day, the *Day of Resurrection*,**

N Concordance

208 ? 67. Friends on that day will be foes one to another,  
209 is uppermost this day will be indeed successful.  
210 Sovereignty on that day will be the True (Sovereignty)  
211 30. Unto thy Lord that day will be the driving. 31. For he  
212 15. Then, on that day will the Event befall. 16. And  
213 the Hereafter. 22. That day will faces be resplendent,  
214 37. Every man that day will have concern enough to  
215 Sovereignty on that day will be Allah's, He will judge  
216 known, 11. On that day will their Lord be perfectly  
217 their Lord; 24. And that day will other faces be

**Figure 5.27: Concordance lines showing that *hour* refers to a particular day, the *Day of Resurrection*.**

N Concordance  
 1,048 7. And because the Hour will come, there is no doubt  
 1,049 disbelieve say: The Hour will never come unto us.  
 1,050 tryst, and the Hour will be more wretched and  
 1,051 36. I think not that the Hour will ever come, and if indeed  
 1,052 I deem not that the Hour will ever rise, and if I am

### 5.15. Colligations of *Will* in QPT

As is true of the English language as a whole, *be* commonly goes with *will* and there are different uses for *be* in association with *will*. The most common patterns of *be* in QPT are the use with passives and the use with adjectives. The most common pattern of *will* with *be* in QPT is the pattern of passives; this however is the rarer use in the BNC. The passive structure *will be +pp* occurs in QPT 163 times, accounting for 9.7% of the instances of *will* with *they* as subject (41 cases), *ye* (40 cases) and *it* (31 cases). 22 of instances of *it* occur with *said* in particular.

**Figure 5.28: Concordance lines showing the pattern of passive with *they* in connection with *will* in QPT.<sup>21</sup>**

N Concordance  
 1,155 disbelieve assert that they will not be raised again. Say  
 1,156 enter the Garden, and they will not be wronged in aught -  
 1,157 avail them with Allah. They will be fuel for Fire. 11. Like  
 1,158 cometh, in that day they will be sundered. 15. As for  
 1,159 rivers flow, wherein they will be safe for ever. A gift of  
 1,160 thence with shame, and they will be abased. 38. He said: O  
 1,161 rivers flow, wherein they will be allowed armlets of gold,  
 1,162 but surely on that day they will be covered from (the  
 1,163 forth before from Us, they will be far removed from  
 1,164 the Day of Resurrection they will be consigned to the most  
 1,165 blaspheme His names. They will be requited what they do.  
 1,166 they know) that they will be gathered unto their  
 1,167 have done wrong. Lo! they will be drowned. 28. And when

<sup>21</sup> Note that examples 1,157 and 1,159 are not passives.

The other common structure with *be* is the structure with descriptive adjectives. This occurs 60 times and accounts for 3.4 % of instances of *will*. The most common word which occurs as subject with this structure is *theirs*. The structure *theirs will be* occurs 41 times in QPT, accounting for 2.4% of instances of *will*, whereas it occurs just eight times in BNC accounting for just 0.003% of instances of *will* so it is 800 times more frequent in the QPT than it is in the BNC. The word *theirs* in most cases is associated with the destination of hell or paradise, an unusual semantic association for a pronominal form to have.

**Figure 5.29: Concordance lines showing the structure *theirs will be* in QPT.**

N Concordance

1,019 who do good works that theirs will be a great reward. 10. And  
 1,020 He make them grow. Theirs will be a painful doom. 175.  
 1,021 be lost. 31. As for such, theirs will be Gardens of Eden,  
 1,022 patron this day, and theirs will be a painful doom. 64. And  
 1,023 requite the guilty. 41. Theirs will be a bed of hell, and over  
 1,024 doubled for them, and theirs will be a rich reward. 19. And  
 1,025 the revelations of Allah, theirs will be a heavy doom. Allah is  
 1,026 Those who disbelieve, theirs will be an awful doom; and  
 1,027 and do good works, theirs will be forgiveness and a great  
 1,028 the way of Allah; so theirs will be a shameful doom. 17.  
 1,029 wrath is upon them and theirs will be an awful doom. 17. Allah

**Figure 5.30: Concordance lines showing the structure *theirs will be* in the BNC**

N Concordance

1 such as theirs <w VM0>will help to elucidate this  
 2 s and theirs <w VM0>will be a bureaucratic role;  
 3 grudge of theirs <w VM0>will bring them out against  
 4 fines; theirs <w VM0>will have been the Porsche  
 5 tain, theirs <w VM0>will be a fast bowling  
 6 ts to theirs <w VM0>will not merely impoverish  
 7 tain, theirs <w VM0>will be a fast bowling  
 8 Michael, theirs <w VM0>will be a royal progress

In lines 1 and 3 the occurrences of *theirs will* are quite clearly part of a postmodification and the same seems to be true of line 6. Also, *theirs will help* (line 1) does not use the verb *be*. We have therefore only four cases in the BNC that are comparable with those in QPT.

	QPT <i>will</i> 1679	BNC <i>will</i> 262,679
The cluster <i>theirs will be</i>	41	4
Other uses of <i>will</i>	1638	262673
Chi-Sq = 5837.927, DF = 1		

Table 5.45. The cluster *theirs will be* in QPT and BNC

This is one of the discoveries in the data which is unattested in the language as a whole. Investigating the concordance lines for the RW/BNC and the BIT reveals that the pattern *theirs will be* is a QPT - specific feature because it does not occur at all in the RW/BNC or the BIT.

### 5.16. The structure *whom He will*

There are 93 instances of *whom He will* in QPT which means that 5.5 % of all instances of *will* occur in the structure *whom He will*; none of these are followed by a verb (*whom He will meet* for example). There are only six instances of *whom he will* in the BNC, accounting for only 0.002% of all instances of *will* in the BNC and all of these are followed by a verb. It is hard to imagine a stronger contrast. The string of words occurs proportionally over 2000 times more often in QPT than in the BNC, and the strings are used in any case in grammatically different ways in the two corpora. In terms of meaning it is a structure referring to a participant, a way of labelling a participant, and it means He gives "to anyone He likes". It is not used in ordinary English to mean that. It has no specific meaning in the BNC because the word cluster is part of a larger structure.

The RW/BNC and the BIT contain no occurrence of the clusters *theirs will be* and *Whom He will* and therefore we can claim that these word clusters are QPT specific features.

**Figure 5.31: Concordance lines showing the structure *whom He will* in QPT.**

N Concordance  
420       unto His light whom He will. And Allah speaketh to  
421       earth. He forgiveth whom He will, and punisheth whom He  
422       sendeth astray whom He will, and whom He will He  
423       providence for whom He will, and straiteneth it (for whom  
424       lordship over whom He will. Allah is Able to do all  
425       and He will punish whom He will. Allah is Able to do all  
426       for His mercy whom He will. Allah is of Infinite Bounty.  
427       will, and punisheth whom He will. Allah is Forgiving, Merciful.  
428       increase manifold to whom He will. Allah is All-Embracing,  
429       He giveth unto whom He will. Allah is of Infinite Bounty.  
430       He bestoweth it on whom He will. Allah is All-Embracing,  
431       will, and forgiveth whom He will. Allah is Able to do all  
432       He giveth unto whom He will. Allah is All-Embracing,  
433       Allah verily sendeth whom He will astray, and guideth whom

**Figure 5.32: Concordance lines showing the only instances of *whom he will* found in the BNC.**

N Concordance  
1       that these are his people with <w PNC>whom <w PNP>he <w VMD>will always be present,  
2       few hundred individuals with many of <w PNC>whom <w PNP>he <w VMD>will eventually become  
3       on the throne and Diana, with <w PNC>whom <w PNP>he <w VMD>will not have lived for  
4       an activity and other managers with <w PNC>whom <w PNP>he <w VMD>will have to work.  
5       and conditions of the carrier from <w PNC>whom <w PNP>he <w VMD>will be claiming the goods  
6       , or for the benefit of those <w PNC>whom <w PNP>he <w VMD>will name in his will

### 5.17. Chapter Summary

In this chapter I have linguistically analysed three key words *say*, *believe* and *will* in the Pickthall translation. We found that *say* collocates strongly with *Allah* and *Muhammad*, which rarely occur in the BNC, the RW/BNC or the BIT. It also collocates with *O* and when so used it occurs in two contexts, either with *Mohammad* in particular, or with reference to a large number of people.

The data showed that the phrases *they say* and *they will say* are very frequent in QPT and a comparison of the statistics of the two phrases showed a significant difference between the QPT and the other three corpora in the frequency of *they say* and the frequency of *they will say*. A more general semantic association of *say* in QPT, BNC and the BIT is with *large numbers of people* and a more specific feature of QPT is the association of *say* with large numbers of people within vocatives. Again another instance of referential association in QPT is identified which is an association with names/attributes referring to God occurring in the context of *say*.

We also have shown that *say* in QPT strongly occurs with vocatives and functions as an imperative, which is not the case in the BNC. This feature is however shared with the BIT, though the p value is higher for QPT than for BIT when they are compared with the BNC. While the feature of *say* functioning as an imperative is true of both the QPT and BIT, the statistics show a significant difference between QPT and BIT in the colligation of *say* with interrogatives.

We also have identified a colligation of *say* with future modality *shall* and *will* in QPT and that the chi-square test confirmed a significant difference in the colligation of *say* with *shall* and *will* in a comparison of QPT with the BNC and with the RW/BNC but no significant difference between QPT and BIT.

A new kind of priming, termed punctuation association, has been identified in my data with

regard to question marks and exclamation marks. Statistical tests confirmed that the association of *say* with *Lo!* is a unique feature of the QPT.

The next word examined was *believe*, where the data showed that the collocate *in* was used more frequently in QPT in connection with *believe* and that it collocated with *believe* differently. The claim was statistically confirmed that there is a significant difference between QPT, the BNC and BIT in the frequency of *believe in* but no significant difference in this respect was found in QPT and RW/BNC.

The collocation of *believe* with *O* in QPT is a significant feature of QPT. The collocation of *believe* with *not* is shared with the BNC and the RW/BNC but not with BIT. We have shown that the collocates that occur with the phrase *those who believe and do good works* differ from those that occur with *those who believe* and that the phrase *those who believe and do good works* is unique to QPT.

We have identified a pragmatic association of *believe* with negation in QPT and found a significant difference in the use of negative markers between QPT and BNC. We did not however find a significant difference in the use of negative markers between the QPT and RW/BNC or BIT.

The third word examined was the grammatical term *will*. Here we found a strong collocation of *will* with *Allah*. The theological reason for this strong association with *Allah* is that the Quran in translation is representing the future as in Allah's hand. Secondly there is a referential association; over a third of the lines with *will* contain a reference to *Allah*. There is in such lines either the word *Allah* or a pronoun or another word (*Lord* for example) referring to *Allah*, somewhere in the context. Thirdly, we found that *Allah* occurs as a subject in a quarter of all the lines.

We have identified a collocation of *will* with *not* in QPT and found a significant difference with regard to the collocation of *will* with *not* between QPT and BNC. However, when we compared QPT with the RW/BNC and the BIT, we found no significant difference which suggests that this collocation is shared in religious texts.

We found too that *will* collocates with *day* and it also has semantic associations with words expressing time (typically *day* and *hour*) and within that semantic set we noted a referential association with the day of Resurrection.

A semantic association of *will* with negation in QPT is identified and we found a significant difference between QPT and the BNC and the RW/BNC in this respect. On the other hand, this association is shared by both the Holy texts: the QPT and the BIT.

Two pragmatic associations with *will* have been identified in QPT: we found a pragmatic association of *will* with expressions of certainty. The difference was significant between QPT and the other three corpora; this association is accordingly unique to QPT. The other pragmatic association of *will* is with time markers and again there is a significant difference between the QPT and the other three corpora, making it another QPT- peculiar feature.

Finally, I have demonstrated two unique word clusters as part of the colligations of *will* in QPT; the cluster *theirs will be* and the cluster *Whom He will*. I have noted a strong contrast between *Whom He will* in QPT and *Whom He will* in BNC, the cluster being over 2000 times more common in QPT than in the BNC. Furthermore, it is different in terms of meaning and in terms of its grammar.



## CHAPTER 6

### THE HOLY QURAN IN THE TAQI TRANSLATION

#### 6.1. Introduction

We have in previous chapters looked at sample lexical items from the translations of Irving and Pickthall, both of whom are English speakers translating from Arabic into their own language. In this chapter we are going to look at the translation of an Arabic speaker from Morocco, Dr M Taqiu-Din (henceforth Taqi) who is translating into English from his own language. Irving, Pickthall and Taqi consequently represent different kinds of translators. Irving and Pickthall are English speakers who probably do not know Arabic quite as well as a native speaker would but who will be in a position to represent the Quran's meanings in natural-sounding English, whereas Taqi knows the Arabic language very well but may not know English so well. So we examine the ways in which an Arabic translator handles various lexical relationships formed by the key words *day*, *deeds* and *shall*.

Taqi is a different kind of translator in other ways as well. He quite often puts in brackets information to clarify the text. His translation offers a commentary and notes in both Arabic and English related to the verses translated and this makes his translation more literal. He was assisted in his translation by Dr M. Muhsin.

As noted in chapter 6 the collocates, semantic associations and other primings of the key words *day*, *deeds* and *shall* will be examined in Taqi's translation. The selection of these words parallels that for the Pickthall translation. *Day* is one of the commonest nouns in English and *shall*, like *will*, is a grammatical item. *Deeds* like *believe* can have theological implications but these are not inevitable. Of the three words, *day* will get the greatest amount of attention because it raises a number of interesting issues, some of which have already been touched upon in the previous chapter. As before, the data will be compared with the BNC, the RW/BNC and with the BIT in order to determine whether our findings with regard to the words examined are

features of the language of the Quran as represented in Taqi's translation (I am going to use the abbreviation QTT to refer to the Quran in the Taqi's translation). or whether they are features of the language as a whole or are features of religious writing in general, as reflected in the Bible and the religious sub-section of the BNC.

## **6.2. Keyword 1: *Day***

The first word to be investigated in the Taqi translation is *day* which is number 57 in the keyword list. *Day* occurs 633 times in QTT and it occurs 66,181 times (after removing 2778 duplicates) in the BNC. Given that QTT is 20,413 words long, instances of *day* comprise 3.1% of the tokens of QTT and, given that the BNC is a hundred million words in size, instances of *day* comprise 0.066% of tokens of this corpus. This means that *day* is proportionally 47 times more common in the QTT than in the BNC.

*Day* occurs 827 times in the RW/BNC out of 1,184,062 words and it occurs 1740 times in the BIT out of 828,942 words. Therefore *day* comprises 0.07% of the tokens in RW/BNC and 0.21% of the tokens of the BIT. Given, as we saw above, that *day* comprises 3.1% of the tokens of QTT, this means that *day* occurs 44.2 more times in QTT than in the RW/BNC and 14.8 times more often than in the BIT.

## **6.3. Investigation of the collocations for the word *day***

### **6.3. 1. The collocation of *day* with *Resurrection* in QTT**

We saw in the previous chapter that *day* and *hour* were used in Pickthall's translation in rather special ways. We should not be surprised therefore that the most common collocate to the right of *day* in the Quran in Taqi's translation identified by Wordsmith is *Resurrection*. *Day* collocates with *Resurrection* 178 times and the collocation accounts for 28.1% of the instances

of *day* in QTT. Therefore, we can claim that *day* in QTT has a very strong collocation with *Resurrection*. This is not the case in the BNC; in the BNC, out of 66181 instances of *day*, just six occur with *Resurrection*, a mere 0.009% of the data set. It will also be noticed that even in these six cases *day of Resurrection* does not on every occasion refer to the day of Judgement. The data are as follows:

**Figure 6.1: Concordance lines showing the only six instances of *Resurrection* occurring with *day* in the BNC.**

N Concordance

- 1 into my kingdom on the <w NN1>Day of False Resurrection, &equo;
- 2 2000 years since the <w NN1>day of the Resurrection. Faith
- 3 The feasting for the <w NN1>day of Christ's resurrection painted b
- 4 him, and shall in the last <w NN1>day share his resurrection.
- 5 in the Christian year, the <w NN1>day of Christ's Resurrection, and
- 6 year and the week; the <w NN1>day of the Resurrection and Sunday,

In the RW/BNC and the BIT the word *Resurrection* is not listed as a collocate of *day* and a manual examination of the corpus data for *day* in both the RW/BNC and the BIT found no occurrence at all of *Resurrection* with *day*. This confirms the claim that *day* has a very strong collocation in QTT with *Resurrection* referring to a particular day i.e. the day of Judgement and that this collocation is unique to QTT.

Compare the examples above with examples below from Taqi's translation with regard to the use of capital letters in the phrase *Day of Resurrection*.

**Figure 6.2: Concordance lines showing the use of capital letters in the phrase *Day of Resurrection* occurring with *day* in the QTT.**

#### N Concordance

233 in them." 42. So Today (i.e. the Day of Resurrection), none of you can  
234 "Allāh will judge between you on the Day of Resurrection about that wherein  
235 earth in truth, and on the Day (i.e. the Day of Resurrection) He will say: "Bel", -  
236 say: "When is this promise (i.e. the Day of Resurrection will be fulfilled) if you  
237 have oaths from Us, reaching to the Day of Resurrection that yours will be  
238 say: "When will this promise (i.e. the Day of Resurrection) come to pass? if  
239 Day the event is finally fulfilled (i.e. the Day of Resurrection), those who  
240 (Peace be upon him)brought and the Day of Resurrection, etc.), 3. About  
241 Favours, Honours, etc. on the Day of Resurrection) to whom He wills  
242 exclusively for them (believers) on the Day of Resurrection (the disbelievers will  
243 shall you be brought into being (on the Day of Resurrection) [in two groups, one  
244 till the Day they are raised up (i.e. the Day of Resurrection)." 15. (Allāh) said:

The use of capital letters in the phrase *Day of Resurrection* primes the reader to associate the combination of *day* and capitalization with the extraordinary dimension of this event; this can be termed *Orthographic Priming*. Giving the words *Day and Resurrection* a capital letter indicates quite clearly that it is to be reacted to in a special way. Almost always, *Day of Resurrection* occurs with *the*. And the phrase *The Day of Resurrection* then collocates with *on*. The collocate *on* as identified by Wordsmith occurs 184 times in L2 position and in particular it occurs with the phrase *the day of Resurrection* 93 times. This collocation *on the day of Resurrection* accounts for 14.7% of the (633) instances of *day*, that is to say nearly one in six instances of *day* in QTT occurs as part of the nested combination *on the day of Resurrection*. This collocation is specific to the QTT.

The data also show that there is a colligation with prepositions preceding *the Day of Resurrection*. The dominant (collocation) preposition is *on* as just noted. But there are other prepositions, such as *of* which occurs 11 times, *till* which occurs 8 times, *in* and *to* which each occur twice and *by* and *until* which each occur once. This association occurs 116 times and accounts for 18.3 % of the instances of *day*.

**Figure 6.3: Concordance lines showing the collocation of *Day* with *Resurrection* and a colligation of the phrase *the Day of Resurrection* with prepositions in QTT.**

N Concordance

228 will assemble us all together (on the Day of Resurrection), then He will judge  
 229 with his face the awful torment on the Day of Resurrection (as he who enters  
 230 (from the horror of the torment of the Day of Resurrection). 38. That Allāh may  
 231 We testify," lest you should say on the Day of Resurrection: "Verily, we have  
 232 Lord will judge between them on the Day of Resurrection about that wherein  
 233 when mankind are gathered (on the Day of Resurrection), they (false deities)  
 234 to follow them in this world, and on the Day of Resurrection, they will be among  
 235 of the life of (this) world, then on the Day of Resurrection, he will be among  
 236 themselves and their families on the Day of Resurrection. Verily, that will be a  
 237 all shall appear before Allāh (on the Day of Resurrection) then the weak will  
 238 34. Woe that Day to the deniers (of the Day of Resurrection)! 35. That will be a  
 239 49. Woe that Day to the deniers (of the Day of Resurrection)! 50. Then in what  
 240 47. Woe that Day to the deniers (of the Day of Resurrection)! 48. And when it is  
 241 die, and will again give you life (on the Day of Resurrection). Verily! Man is  
 242 (that they will not be resurrected on the Day of Resurrection). Introduction to  
 243 they (too) will die. 31. Then, on the Day of Resurrection, you will be  
 244 verily, they shall be questioned on the Day of Resurrection about that which  
 245 40. Woe that Day to the deniers (of the Day of Resurrection)! 41. Verily, the  
 246 "Allāh will judge between you on the Day of Resurrection about that wherein  
 247 Islāmic Monotheism, this will be on the Day of Resurrection when they will see  
 248 19. Woe that Day to the deniers (of the Day of Resurrection)! 20. Did We not  
 249 who invent lies against Allāh, on the Day of Resurrection? [i.e. Do they think

There are no examples of the exact phrase *The Day of Resurrection* in the BNC, and therefore there are no data with which to compare the results for QTT. However, five of the six collocations of *day* and *resurrection* in the BNC are connected with *of* and three of these are preceded by a preposition, so there is a small amount of evidence in support of the view that *day of resurrection* also colligates with prepositions in the wider language.

### 6.3.2. The collocation of *day* with *when* in QTT

The two phrases *the day* or *a day* in QTT also collocate with the word *when* in a context where events take place at a particular time, and again the reference in this context is to the

day of Resurrection but this time the day of Resurrection is referred as *a day* or *the day*; what are then described are events that will happen and take place on that particular day. The collocate *when* with *day* as identified by Wordsmith occurs 92 times in total; 77 of these collocates occur in R1 position in the phrases *the day when* or *a day when*, accounting for 12.2% of the instances of *day* (633) in QTT, which means that one in eight sentences containing *day* uses the wording *the day when* or *a day when*. In the BNC, *day* co-occurs with *when* 1,137 times in R1. This means that 1.6% of instances of *day* in the BNC occur with *when*, which in turn means that the combination occurs over seven and a half times more frequently in QTT than in the BNC. The reason why it occurs so often in the QTT is because it is being used to refer to a specific day i.e. the day of Judgement whereas in the BNC those clusters do not refer to the Day of Resurrection. Let us examine this finding.

	QTT <i>day</i> 633	BNC <i>day</i> 66181
The collocate <i>when</i>	77	1137
Other uses of <i>day</i>	556	65044
Chi-Sq = 383.535, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.000		

Table 6.1. The collocate *when* in R1 position in the phrase *a day when* or the phrase *the day when* in QTT and BNC.

	QTT <i>day</i> 633	RW/BNC <i>day</i> 827
The collocate <i>when</i>	77	26
Other uses of <i>day</i>	556	801
Chi-Sq = 44.494, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.000		

Table 6.2. The collocate *when* in R1 position in the phrase *a day when* or *the day when* in QTT and RW/BNC

	QTT	BIT
	<i>day</i> 633	<i>day</i> 1,740
The collocate <i>when</i>	77	46
Other uses of <i>day</i>	556	1694
Chi-Sq = 85.604, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.000		

Table 6.3. The collocate *when* in R1 position in the phrase *a day when* or *the day when* in QTT and BIT

The p-value= 0.000 in each of the above three tables shows a very significant difference in the frequency of the collocations *the day when* and *a day when* in the QTT as compared with the BNC or the RW/BNC or the BIT. Secondly, as we have seen, the collocations occur in a different usage from those found in the BNC, the RW/BNC or the BIT. Examples from QTT below illustrate this point.

**Figure 6.4: Concordance lines showing the collocation of *Day* with *when* in QTT**

**N Concordance**

562 will be gathered together, and that is a Day when all (the dwellers of the  
563 to Him and avoiding all evil), and fear a Day when no father can avail aught for  
564 reckoning), 5. On a Great Day, 6. The Day when (all) mankind will stand before  
565 except by His Knowledge. And on the Day when He will call unto them  
566 the Hell-fire)? 62. And (remember) the Day when He will call to them, and say:  
567 what they used to do. 128. And on the Day when He will gather them (all)  
568 that must be fulfilled. 17. And on the Day when He will gather them together  
569 is Able to do all things." 30. On the Day when every person will be  
570 is a disgracing torment. 6. On the Day when Allâh will resurrect them all  
571 and disobedient). 109. On the Day when Allâh will gather the  
572 of Recompense is? 19. (It will be) the Day when no person shall have power (to  
573 Day of Resurrection)! 35. That will be a Day when they shall not speak (during  
574 Day of Recompense?" 13. (It will be) a Day when they will be tried (i.e. burnt)  
575 unto them a painful torment. 35. On the Day when that (Al-Kanz: money, gold  
576 is none that can avert it; 9. On the Day when the heaven will shake with a

Another point to make here is that when in the translation the translator wants to refer to the *doer*, the Actor is always tends to be some expression referring to Allah. So there is an association with Allah similar to that found for *will*. As we know with referential priming, semantic association and colligation, there is usually a dominant collocation around which the other primings cluster in the expression. So previously, I talked about the dominant collocation with *on* on the Day of Resurrection as part of the larger colligation of *day* with other prepositions. In the same way the dominant collocation here is very obviously with the word *Allah* but the larger referential association is with expressions referring to Allah, including other expressions or pronouns (*We*).

**Figure 6.5: Concordance lines showing a collocation and referential association with *We* referring to Allah.**

N Concordance

503 that you used to disbelieve.[] 65. This Day, We shall seal up their mouths, and  
 504 (evil-doers, corrupts, etc.). 92. So this day We shall deliver your (dead) body  
 505 life of the world deceived them." So this Day We shall forget them as they forgot  
 506 may increase in evil and sins). 85. The Day We shall gather the Muttaqûn (pious  
 507 of hope. 47. And (remember) the Day We shall cause the mountains to  
 508 mock at! 34. And it will be said: "This Day We will forget you as you forgot the  
 509 them all together. 100. And on that Day We shall present Hell to the  
 510 will be blown (the second blowing): that Day, We shall gather the Mujrimûn

### 6.3.3. The collocation of *day* with *this* and *that* in QTT

The next most common collocates to the left of *day* are the two demonstratives, *this* and *that*, and both are again used to refer to the Day of Judgment. This is yet another case of a unique referential association. This collocation of *that* with *day* occurs 122 times in total; 75 of these collocates occur immediately to the left of *day* in QTT. These account for 11.8% of the instances of *day*, which means that one in eight instances of *day* occurs as part of the phrase *that day*. The other demonstrative left collocate is *this* which occurs 64 times in total; 44 of these collocates occurs in L1 position, accounting for 7% of the instances of *day*. This means



that between them *that day* and *this day* account for almost exactly one in five instances of *day*. Examples are:

**Figure 6.6: Concordance lines showing the demonstrative *that* as a common left collocate of *day* in QTT.**

N Concordance  
 136 can avert it. On that Day men shall be divided  
 137 Romans). And on that Day, the believers (i.e.  
 138 not? 67. Friends on that Day will be foes one to  
 139 excuse. 37. Woe that Day to the deniers (of the  
 140 The sovereignty on that Day will be the true  
 141 ness) will, on that Day, have the best a  
 142 of ropes)." 34. Woe that Day to the deniers (of the  
 143 red to them on that day, and they will not be  
 144 from the terror on that Day. 90. And whoever  
 145 water? 28. Woe that Day to the deniers (of the  
 146 for you a fate like that day (of disaster) of the  
 147 of the Paradise, that Day, will be busy in joyful

The crucial point here is that we have the expression *that day* in everyday English but its uses are totally different and there is no real connection between these uses and the one in the QTT. The collocation of *that* with *day* in the BNC occurs 6,219 times in total; 1,844 of these collocates occur in L1 position out of 66,181 instances of *day* in the BNC, i.e. 1 in 35.9 occurs in the phrase *that day*.

	QTT	BNC
	<i>day</i> 633	<i>day</i> 66,181
The collocation <i>that day</i>	75	1,844
Other uses of <i>day</i>	558	64337
Chi-Sq = 184.574, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.000		

**Table 6.4. The occurrence of *that day* in L1 position in QTT and the BNC**

In the same way, the collocation of *this* with *day* occurs 2,558 times in total; 935 of these collocates occur in L1 position in the BNC, i.e. 1 in 70.8 of instances of *day* occurs as part of the phrase *this day*.

	QTT	BNC
	<i>day</i> 633	<i>day</i> 66,181
The combination <i>this day</i>	44	935
Other uses of <i>day</i>	589	65,246
Chi-Sq = 133.201, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.000		

Table 6.5. The occurrence of *this day* in L1 position in the QTT and the BNC

The p- value indicates a significant difference in the frequency of *that day* in the QTT and the BNC. The phrase *that day* is over 4.2 times more common in the QTT. The phrase *this day* is over 5.7 times more common in the QTT. These frequencies point to the fact that these phrases (*this day* and *that day*) both have a special significance in the QTT.

The case in the RW/BNC is that *that* occurs 32 times in total in association with *day*; 25 of these collocates occur in L1 position, accounting for 3.0% of the 827 instances of *day* in the RW/BNC. *This* in combination with *day* occurs 15 times in total; 13 of these collocates occur in L1 position, accounting for 1.8% of the instances of *day* in the RW/BNC. The difference between the QTT and the RW/BNC in terms of the frequency of the two phrases *that day* and *this day* is given in the table below.

	QTT <i>day 633</i>	RW/ BNC <i>day 827</i>
The combination <i>that day</i>	75	25
Other uses of <i>day</i>	558	802
Chi-Sq = 43.771, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.000		

Table 6.6. The frequency of *that day* in L1 position in QTT and RW/BNC

	QTT <i>day 633</i>	RW/ BNC <i>day 827</i>
The combination <i>this day</i>	44	13
Other uses of <i>day</i>	589	814
Chi-Sq = 27.653, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.000		

Table 6.7. The frequency of *this day* in L1 position in QTT and RW/BNC

The p-value= 0.000 in the two tables above shows a significant difference in the frequency of *that day* and *this day* in the QTT and the RW/BNC. We now consider the comparative frequency of *that day* and *this day* in the BIT.

	QTT <i>day 633</i>	BIT <i>day 1,740</i>
The combination <i>that day</i>	75	226
Other uses of <i>day</i>	558	1514
Chi-Sq = 0.545, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.460		

Table 6.8. The frequency of *that day* in L1 position in QTT and BIT

	QTT <i>day</i> 633	BIT <i>day</i> 1,740
The combination <i>this day</i>	44	324
Other uses of <i>day</i>	589	1416
Chi-Sq = 48.240, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.000		

Table 6.9. The frequency of *this day* in L1 position in QTT and BIT

The p-value= 0.460 in table 6.8 suggests no significant difference between the QTT and the BIT in the use of *that day*. In table 6.9 on the other hand the p-value is small and means that there is a significant difference in the use of *this day* between the QTT and the BIT. I conclude that there is a real significant difference between the QTT and all other comparable corpora in terms of the frequency of the two combinations *that day* and *this day* with one exception which is that occurrences of the phrase *that day* in the BIT do not differ significantly in terms of frequency from those in QTT. Furthermore, the phrases *that day* and *this day* in QTT refer to one particular day i.e. the day of Resurrection whereas in the other comparable corpora they have other referents. The referential association of *day* appears to be unique to the QTT.

#### 6.3.4. The collocation of *day* with *last* in QTT

Another common collocate to the left of *day* is *last* in the phrase *last day*; the collocate *last* as identified by Wordsmith occurs 26 times in total in QTT; interestingly all the 26 collocates occur in L1 position and every single example occurs with *the*. In the BNC however, the collocate *last* occurs 928 times in total of which only 439 occur immediately to the left of *day*. The collocation of *last* with *day* accounts for 4.1% of the instances of *day* in QTT

whereas in the BNC this combination accounts only for 0.6% of instances. This collocation then is more common in the QTT than in the language as a whole. Let us examine this finding through the chi-squared test.

	QTT <i>day</i> 633	BNC <i>day</i> 66,181
Collocation of <i>day</i> with <i>last</i>	26	439
Other uses of <i>day</i>	607	65742
Chi-Sq = 107.614, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.000		

Table 6.10. The collocation of *day* with *last* in L1 position in QTT and BNC

	QTT <i>day</i> 633	RW/BNC <i>day</i> 827
Collocation of <i>day</i> with <i>last</i>	26	12
Other uses of <i>day</i>	607	815
Chi-Sq = 9.981, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.002		

Table 6.11. The collocation of *day* with *last* in L1 position in QTT and RW/BNC

	QTT <i>day</i> 633	BIT <i>day</i> 1,740
Collocation of <i>day</i> with <i>last</i>	26	8
Other uses of <i>day</i>	607	1732
Chi-Sq = 43.729, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.000		

Table 6.12. The collocation of *day* with *last* in L1 position in QTT and BIT

The p-value =0.000 in table 6.10 confirms the finding above that the collocate *last* is significantly more common in QTT than in the BNC. In table 6.11. the p-value= 0.002 shows that the difference in the collocation of *last* with *day* is still significant and in table 6.12. the p-value = 0.000 suggests a big difference between QTT and BIT in the collocation of *last* with *day*.

Looking now at how the combination *last day* is used in the BNC, we find that only eight occurrences of the phrase *last day*, which occurs 439 times in L1 position in the BNC, refer to the day of Judgement (a very small proportion). 259 of the occurrences of the phrase are followed by prepositions, so we have *the last day of ..* etc. 59 % of all the lines in the BNC in the context of *last day* are followed by prepositions that are syntactically connected to the head noun *day*; the proportion would be still higher if we include prepositions that served other functions. Another difference lies in the fact that there are 69 possessives in the BNC to the immediate left of *last day* accounting for 15.7% of the instances of the phrase whereas in the QTT, of the 26 occurrences of the phrase *last day*, none occur with possessives and none are followed by prepositions.

As with the combination *Day of Resurrection*, etc, all the instances of *last day* in the QTT occur with capital letters and they all refer to the day of Judgement, whereas in the BNC there are only 13 with capitals, seven of which are references to the Day of Judgement. There is also a single use of *last day* to refer to the Day of Judgement that uses lower case.

In the RW/BNC there are 13 instances of *last* as a collocate of *day*; 12 of these occur in L1 position but only two of these refer to the Day of Judgement. In the BIT on the other hand there are 10 instances of *last* in combination with *day*; 8 of which occur in L1 position. Here again, though, none of the instances refer to the Day of Judgement. The phrase *the last day* in the QTT is semantically associated with Allah and with an expression of faith, most typically

utilising the verb *believe*. There appears to be a nesting, whereby *last day* combines with *the*, and this combination in turn collocates with the phrase *believe in Allah*. This is unique to the QTT as there are no instances in the BNC, the RW/BNC or the BIT. Therefore, we can say that we arrive at a collocation of two nested combinations, producing the final combination *believe in Allah and the last day*.

**Figure 6.7: Concordance lines showing a collocation of two nested combinations in QTT.**

NConcordance  
 67 who believe not in Allāh and the Last Day and whose hearts are in doubt that  
 68 if you believe in Allāh and the Last Day. And let a party of the believers  
 69 in (the Meeting with) Allāh and the Last Day and remembers Allāh much. 22.  
 70 some who believe in Allāh and the Last Day, and look upon what they spend in  
 71 the one who believes in Allāh, the Last Day, the Angels, the Book, the  
 72 who believe in Allāh and the Last Day, making friendship with those who  
 73 say: "We believe in Allāh and the Last Day" while in fact they believe not. 9.  
 74 Those who believe in Allāh and the Last Day would not ask your leave to be  
 75 whoever believes in Allāh and the Last Day and do righteous good deeds shall  
 76 of them as believe in Allāh and the Last Day." He (Allāh) answered: "As for him

### 6.3.5. The collocation of *day* with *night* in QTT

Finally, the data show that *day* collocates with *night* in QTT, for instance *night and day*, *night and the day*, *night into the day*. This collocation occurs 45 times in total; 18 of these collocates occur in L3 position accounting for 2.8% of the instances of *day*. There is however nothing special about this collocation in QTT because these words also collocate in the language as a whole. *Night* is identified as a collocate of *day* in the BNC occurring 1,088 times in total; 459 of these collocates occur in R2 position, accounting for 0.7% of the instances of *day* in the BNC. So it is four times more common in the QTT than it is in the BNC.

	QTT <i>day</i> 633	BNC <i>day</i> 66,181
Collocation of <i>day</i> with <i>night</i>	18	459
Other uses of <i>day</i>	615	65722
Chi-Sq = 40.891, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.000		

Table 6.13. The collocation of *day* with *night* in L3 in QTT and in R2 in the BNC

Again the p-value confirms the finding above in that there is a significant difference in the collocation of *day* with *night* between the QTT and the BNC. So although the collocation exists in both corpora it is significantly more frequent in the QTT than it is in the BNC. Examining the collocates of *day* in the RW/BNC showed no occurrence of *day* with *night*. The picture as regards BIT is as follows:

	QTT <i>day</i> 633	BIT <i>day</i> 1740
Collocation of <i>day</i> with <i>night</i>	18	34
Other uses of <i>day</i>	615	1706
Chi-Sq = 1.714, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.191		

Table 6.14. The collocation of *day* with *night* in L3 in QTT and in R2 in BIT

We conclude that there is no real difference in the collocation of *day* with *night* between the QTT and the BIT.

#### 6.4. The Semantic Associations of *day* in QTT.

Turning now to the semantic associations of *day* in QTT, the first and the most important of these in Taqi's translation of the Quran is the association with large numbers of people in a



state of disbelief or faith e.g. *deniers* which occurs 20 times, *those who disbelieve* which occur 10 times, *disbelievers* which also occurs six times, *believers* which occurs five times, *dwellers of paradise* occurs twice and *men of understanding*, *polytheists*, *sinner*s, each of which occurs once. Other words that refer to large numbers of people in QTT include the pronouns *you* which occurs 89 times in total and *they* which occurs 60 times in total but they are excluded from this kind of association. The association occurs 46 times and accounts for 7.3% of the 633 instances of *day* in QTT. Examples of this type of association are shown below. In the BNC there is only one word *Muslim*, an expression expressing belief, which occurs 12 times in total. Examination of instances of *day* in the RW/BNC and the BIT turned up no occurrences of expressions describing (dis) believers and therefore this is a QTT specific feature; although it exists in BNC, it is much more frequent in the QTT than in the BNC as the chi- sq test in Table 6.15 shows.

**Figure 6.8: Concordance lines showing the collocation of *Day* with one expression (*deniers*) expressing disbelief in QTT.**

N Concordance	
433	Day to the deniers (of the Day of Resurrection)! 16. Did
434	Day to the deniers (of the Day of Resurrection)! 29. (It
435	Day to the deniers (of the Day of Resurrection)! 38. That
436	Day to the deniers (of the Day of Resurrection)! 46. (O
437	Day to the deniers (of the Day of Resurrection)! 25.
438	Day to the deniers (of the Day of Resurrection)! 48. And
439	Day to the deniers (of the Day of Resurrection)! 41.
440	Day to the deniers (of the Day of Resurrection)! 50.
441	Day to the deniers (of the Day of Resurrection)! 35. That
442	Day to the deniers (of the Day of Resurrection)! 20. Did

	QTT <i>day</i> 633	BNC <i>day</i> 66,181
Association of <i>day</i> with ( <i>dis</i> ) <i>believers</i>	46	12
Other uses of <i>day</i>	587	66, 169
Chi-Sq = 3798.608, DF = 1		

Table 6.15. Semantic association of *day* with (*dis*) *believers* in QTT and BNC.

The other semantic association is with the generality of mankind including *mankind* which occurs 11 times in total, *man* (used generally in the same way as *mankind*) which occurs six times, *everyone* which occurs four times, and *every person* and *men* which each occur three times. This association occurs 27 times and accounts for 4.3% of the 633 instances of *day* in QTT. In the BNC this association also occurs where it is represented by general expressions such as *men* which occurs 144 times in total, *everybody* which occurs 20 times in total and *everyone* which occurs 79 times in total. Altogether there are 243 instances reflecting this association and they account for 0.4% of the 66,181 instances of *day* in the BNC. In the RW/BNC there are no expressions expressing the generality of mankind. In the BIT however, there are a few words expressing this association including *people* which occurs 33 times, *man* which occurs 22 times (eight of which have however to be excluded because they are used to refer to specific people), *men* which occurs 12 times and finally we have *every man* occurring twice and *everyone* which occurs once. This association occurs 62 times and accounts for 3.6% of the 1740 instances of *day* in BIT. Instances of this association from QTT are given below:

**Figure 6.9: Concordance lines showing the association of *Day* with *mankind* in QTT**

N Concordance  
 1 SAW) mankind of the Day when the torment will  
 2 (Hour) is? 4. It is a Day whereon mankind will  
 3 or curved." 108. On that Day mankind will follow  
 4 of the Hereafter. That is a Day whereon mankind will  
 5 mankind on the greatest day (the 10th of Dhul-Hijjah  
 6 charge of mankind of the day and the night)[]. 79.  
 7 has inspired it. 6. That Day mankind will proceed  
 8 are gathered (on the Day of Resurrection), they  
 9 of mankind (on the Day of Resurrection) just  
 10 mankind together on the Day about which there is  
 11 5. On a Great Day, 6. The Day when (all) mankind will

We now consider the comparative frequency of this association across corpora.

	QTT <i>day</i> 633	BNC <i>day</i> 66,181
Association of <i>day</i> with generality of <i>mankind</i>	27	243
Other uses of <i>day</i>	606	65938
Chi-Sq = 236.737, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.000		

Table 6.16: Semantic association of *day* with generality of *mankind* in QTT and BNC.

	QTT <i>day</i> 633	BIT <i>day</i> 1740
Association of <i>day</i> with generality of <i>mankind</i>	27	62
Other uses of <i>day</i>	606	1678
Chi-Sq = 0.634, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.426		

Table 6.17: Semantic association of *day* with generality of *mankind* in QTT and BIT.

Table 6.16 shows a significant difference between QTT and the BNC in terms of the association of *day* with generality of *mankind*; table 6.17, however, shows no significant

difference between QTT and BIT in this respect. We conclude that this association is shared by both holy texts but that the association of *day* with *(dis) believers* is unique to QTT.

Another semantic association for *day* in QTT is the association with body parts. in particular *faces, hearts, hands, eyes* and *mouth*. This association occurs 15 times representing 2.4 % of instances of *day* in QTT. Many instances of body parts are also accompanied by the word *some* or *other*, which are used to indicate generalization. The effect of this particular association is to show that the body parts themselves will be either positively, or negatively, influenced by the horror of the day of judgement. The following instances are taken from the QTT.

- 1- Consider not that Allah is unaware of that which the Zâlimûn (polytheists, wrong-doers, etc.) do, but He gives them respite up to a Day when the eyes will stare in horror.
- 2- They fear a Day when hearts and eyes will be overturned (from the horror of the torment of the Day of Resurrection).
- 3- And some faces, that Day, will be Bâsirah (dark, gloomy, frowning, and sad),
- 4- Some faces that Day, will be bright (true believers of Islamic Monotheism)
- 5- Some faces that Day shall be Nâdirah (shining and radiant). Looking at their Lord (Allah). And some faces, that Day, will be Bâsirah (dark, gloomy, frowning, and sad),
- 6- (Some) hearts that Day will shake with fear and anxiety. Their eyes cast down.
- 7- This Day, We shall seal up their mouths, and their hands will speak to Us, and their legs will bear witness to what they used to earn.

In the BNC, there are instances of *day* associating with body parts including *eye, eyes, faces, heads, heart, hearts* and *nose*. This association occurs with 147 instances of *day* in the BNC, accounting for 0.2 % of the instances of *day* in the BNC.

	QTT <i>day</i> 633	BNC <i>day</i> 66,181
Association of <i>day</i> with <i>body parts</i>	15	147
Other uses of <i>day</i>	618	66034
Chi-Sq = 119.554, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.000		

Table 6.18. Semantic association of *day* with *body parts* in QTT and BNC.

	QTT <i>day</i> 633	BIT <i>day</i> 1,740
Association of <i>day</i> with <i>body parts</i>	15	23
Other uses of <i>day</i>	618	1717
Chi-Sq = 3.234, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.072		

Table 6.19. Semantic association of *day* with *body parts* in the QTT and BIT

It is noted that there is a significant difference in the association of *day* with body parts between the QTT and the BNC as the p-value=0.000 suggests in table 6.18: in the RW/BNC there are no instances of body parts in association with *day*. On the other hand, the p-value =0.072 in table 6.19 suggests that there is no significant difference in the association of *day* with body parts between QTT and BIT which means that this association is a feature shared by both holy texts.

A further point to highlight concerns the Referential Association of *day* in QTT. It is noticeable from the concordance listing that the Day of Resurrection in QTT is referred to by a range of expressions each of which has its own connotations and its own implications. So the Day of Resurrection is described as a day of decision, a day of Judgement, a day of Reckoning, a day of Assembling, a day of coming out (from the graves), a day of the time appointed, a day of Recompense, a day of Mutual meeting, a day of Gathering, a day of

sorting out (people of paradise from people of Hell), a day of grief and regrets, a day of shadow (a gloomy cloud), and the promised day (and it is also referred to as the Hour) . Here we have another instance of referential association, albeit one in which all but one of the referring expressions contains the word *day*. All of these instances of *day* refer to one single *day*, the *day of Judgement*.

### 6.5. Colligations of *Day* in QTT

The strongest colligation of *day* is with modal expressions of future normally expressed by the use of *will* and the use of *shall*. The colligation with *will* and *shall* occurs 228 times in total and accounts for 36.0 % of the (633) instances of *day*. The reason behind this strong colligation is that in most cases, the clause refers to what will happen on the Day of Judgement i.e. it refers to a future event. The two grammatical words *will* and *shall* are also identified as collocates in QTT. Examples that show this relationship are given below.

**Figure 6.10: Concordance lines showing the colligation of *day* with *will* in QTT in R1 position.**

N Concordance  
14 others. 38. Some faces that Day, will be bright (true  
15 26. The sovereignty on that Day will be the true  
16 blowing); 9. Truly, that Day will be a Hard Day. 10.  
17 night), or openly (during the day), will any be destroyed  
18 2. Some faces, that Day, will be humiliated (in  
19 not? 67. Friends on that Day will be foes one to  
20 of the Paradise, that Day, will be busy in joyful  
21 56. The sovereignty on that Day will be that of Allâh (the  
22 and the Decision, that Day, will be (wholly) with  
23 8. (Other) faces, that Day, will be joyful, 9. Glad  
24 up), 8. (Some) hearts that Day will shake with fear and  
25 37. Everyman, that Day, will have enough to  
26 24. And some faces, that Day, will be Bâsirah (dark,

**Figure 6.11: Concordance lines showing the colligation of *day* with *shall* in QTT.**

N Concordance  
 199 104. And (remember) the Day when We shall roll up  
 200 successful. 22. And on the Day when We shall gather  
 201 therein forever. 28. And the Day whereon We shall  
 202 71. (And remember) the Day when We shall call  
 203 83. And (remember) the Day when We shall gather  
 204 89. And (remember) the Day when We shall raise up  
 205 You will revert. 16. On the Day when We shall seize  
 206 97. And the true promise (Day of Resurrection) shall  
 207 84. And (remember) the Day when We shall raise up  
 208 Fire (i.e. Hell-fire on the Day of Resurrection) shall  
 209 footsteps. 109. On that day no intercession shall

The table below compares the way that *day* colligates with future time expressions in the BNC and QTT.

QTT- <i>day</i> - occurs 633			BNC- <i>day</i> occurs 66,181		
<i>Shall</i>	61	in total	<i>Shall</i>	111	in total
<i>Will</i>	176	in total	<i>Will</i>	1,495	in total
<i>Going to</i>	0		<i>Going to</i>	160	
Total 237 = 37.4%			Total 1766 = 2.7 %		

**Table 6.20: Colligation of *day* with modal expressions of future in BNC and QTT**

In terms of *day*'s association with future verb forms in the BNC, we have 1766 instances of future expressions occurring in 66,181 lines; future forms occur with *day* 2.7% of the time in the BNC whereas in the QTT we have 237 instances out of 633, accounting for 37.4% of instances of *day*. This means that there is a very strong association of *day* with future time represented by *will* and *shall* in the QTT and a much weaker association of *day* with future expressions in the BNC.

	QTT <i>day</i> 633	BNC <i>day</i> 66,181
Colligation of <i>day</i> with <i>will</i> and <i>shall</i>	237	1766
Other uses of <i>day</i>	396	64415
Chi-Sq = 2607.007, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.000		

Table 6.21: The colligation of *day* with *will* and *shall* in QTT and BNC

	QTT <i>day</i> 633	BIT <i>day</i> 1,740
Colligation of <i>day</i> with <i>will</i> and <i>shall</i>	237	291
Other uses of <i>day</i>	396	1449
Chi-Sq = 115.148, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.000		

Table 6.22: The colligation of *day* with *will* and *shall* in QTT and BIT

The p-value= 0.000 in the two tables above shows a significant difference between the QTT and the BNC and the BIT in the use of *will* and *shall* (future modality) with *day*. The case in the RW/BNC is that there are only two instances of *will* associating with *day*. The implication is that this is a specific QTT feature for the reason mentioned earlier.

The second most common colligation in the QTT is a colligation pattern which we have already alluded to, namely *day of* followed by a noun, where *day* in many cases has a capital letter, for instance Day of Resurrection, Day of Judgement and Day of assembling.

## 6.6. Pragmatic Associations of *day* in QTT.

### 6.6.1. Pragmatic Association of *day* with negation

It is noticeable from the data that *day* has a pragmatic association with negation. This is expressed by the use of negative markers, *no* which occurs 22 times in total, *not* which occurs



20 times in total, *nor* which occurs 10 times in total, *none* which occurs six times in total and *never* which occurs five times. This association occurs with 63 instances out of the 633 instances of *day* and accounts for 10% of the instances of *day* in QTT. Apart from *never*, all of these negative markers are all also identified by Wordsmith as collocates of *day*.

**Figure 6.12: Concordance lines showing the association of *day* with negative markers in R1 position in QTT.**

N Concordance  
 167 you knew not." 57. So on that Day no excuse of theirs will  
 168 men deny? 39. So on that Day no question will be asked  
 169 respect of Allâh." 15. So this Day no ransom shall be taken  
 170 their footsteps. 109. On that day no intercession shall avail,  
 171 (this) my life!" 25. So on that Day, none will punish as He  
 172 will have no refuge on that Day nor there will be for you  
 173 no kinship among them that Day, nor will they ask of one  
 174 No fear shall be on you this Day, nor shall you grieve, 69.

**Figure 6.13: Concordance lines showing the association of *day* with negative markers in R2 position in QTT.**

N Concordance  
 439 believe in Allâh and the Last Day would not ask your leave  
 440 in Allâh, (2) nor in the Last Day, (3) nor forbid that which  
 441 no friend has he here this Day, 36. Nor any food except  
 442 there comes from Allah a Day which none can avert it.  
 443 is? 19. (It will be) the Day when no person shall  
 444 avoiding all evil), and fear a Day when no father can avail

So in total we have 63 instances of negative expressions out of 633 of instances of *day* in the QTT (10%) and we have 2516 out of 66,181 of instance of *day* in the BNC (3.8%) which confirms that the pragmatic association of *day* with negation is a common feature for both the BNC and the QTT but is stronger in the QTT than in the BNC. (BNC percentage is rather low). The table below shows the occurrence of negativity in both corpora in conjunction with *day*.

Numbers and percentages of negatives items occurring in QIT and BNC	
QTT 633	<i>Not</i> 20, <i>no</i> 22, <i>none</i> 6, <i>nor</i> 10, <i>never</i> 5 = 63      10%
BNC 66,181	<i>Not</i> 1351, <i>no</i> 593, <i>never</i> 310, <i>nothing</i> 114, <i>nobody</i> 22, <i>non</i> 45, <i>none</i> 20, <i>nor</i> 36, <i>nowhere</i> 5, <i>neither</i> 20 = 2516      3.8%

Table 6.23: Occurrence of negative markers in QTT and BNC in the context of *day*

We now test for significance.

	QTT <i>day</i> 633	BNC <i>day</i> 66,181
Association of <i>day</i> with negation	63	2516
Other uses of <i>day</i>	570	63,665
Chi-Sq = 63.923, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.000		

Table 6.24: Pragmatic association of *day* with negative particles in the QTT and the BNC

Tables 6.25 and 6.26 compare QTT with RW/BNC and the BIT respectively.

	QTT <i>day</i> 633	RW/BNC <i>day</i> 827
Association of <i>day</i> with negation	63	6
Other uses of <i>day</i>	570	821
Chi-Sq = 67.798, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.000		

Table 6.25: Pragmatic association of *day* with negative particles in QTT and RW/BNC

	QTT <i>day</i> 633	BIT <i>day</i> 1,740
Association of <i>day</i> with negation	63	152
Other uses of <i>day</i>	570	1588
Chi-Sq = 0.834, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.361		

Table 6.26: Pragmatic association of *day* with negative particles in QTT and the BIT

We notice that the p-value= 0.000 in table 6.24 and table 6.25 tells us that there is considerable difference between the QTT and the BNC and the RW/BNC in terms of the strength of association of *day* with negation. However, in the BIT the p-value= 0.361 suggests no difference between the QTT and the BIT in this respect and this means that this relationship is a common feature of both the QTT and the BIT.

### 6.6.2. Pragmatic Association of *day* with emphatic expressions in BNC and QTT.

A further pragmatic association is the association of *day* with expressions of certainty, such as *verily*, *truly*, *surely*, and *indeed*. This association occurs 32 times and accounts for 5.1% of occurrences of *day* whereas it occurs 397 times in the BNC out of 66,181 of instances of *day*, accounting for only 0.6 % of instances. There are possible reasons for this strong association in the QTT; the most likely reason is that the Quran as Muslims believe has a different kind of status as a text and the language is indicating that a reader of the Quran should be in no doubt of the absolute truthfulness of what has been said and the importance of what has been said. To illustrate this point consider the following examples.

- 1- *Certainly*, I fear for you the torment of a Great Day!"
- 2- *Truly*, that Day will be a Hard Day.
- 3- *Verily*, the Hour (Day of Judgment) is surely coming, *therein is no doubt*, yet most men believe not.

- 4- "Worship none but Allah; *truly*, I fear for you the torment of a mighty Day.
- 5- *Surely*, I fear for you the torment of a painful Day."
- 6- *Truly*, You are the Bestower." 9. Our Lord! *Verily*, it is You Who will gather mankind together on the Day about which there is no doubt. Verily, Allah never breaks N
- 7- *Truly*, that Day will be a Hard Day.
- 8- *Verily*, the dwellers of the Paradise, that Day, will be busy in joyful things.
- 9- *Verily*, the Day of Decision is a fixed time,
- 10- *Verily*, that Day (i.e. the Day of Resurrection) their Lord will be Well-Acquainted with them (as to their deeds), (and will reward them for their deeds) .

The table below shows the various expressions of certainty which are used in the two corpora the BNC and the QTT.

Items used in BNC 66.181		Items used in QIT- 633	
Indeed	53	Indeed	5
Surely	28	Surely	5
truly	15	Truly	2
verily	No mention	Verily	20
certainly	74	Certainly	0
sure	95	sure	0
certain	89	certain	0
definitely	6	definitely	0
definite	6	definite	0
true	31	true	0
	397 0.6%		32 5.1%

Table 6.27: Association of *day* with emphatic expressions in QTT and BNC

From the table 6.27 we conclude that emphatic expressions are more common in the QTT than in the BNC. This finding is statistically examined as follows:

	QTT <i>day</i> 633	BNC <i>day</i> 66,181
Association of <i>day</i> with emphatic expressions	32	397
Other uses of <i>day</i>	601	65784
Chi-Sq = 195.099, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.000		

Table 6.28: Pragmatic association of *day* with emphatic expressions in QTT and BNC

The p-value= 0.000 confirms that there is a significant difference between the QTT and the BNC in the association of *day* with expressions of certainty. We now consider whether this is the case in the RW/BNC and the BIT.

	QTT <i>day</i> 633	BIT <i>day</i> 1740
Association of <i>day</i> with emphatic expressions	32	14
Other uses of <i>day</i>	601	1726
Chi-Sq = 44.118, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.000		

Table 6.29: Pragmatic association of *day* with emphatic expressions in QTT and BIT.

There are no expressions of certainty in the RW/BNC in association with *day*. Here again in table 6.29 the p-value=0.000 suggests a big difference between the QTT and the BIT in the frequency of occurrence of expressions of certainty with *day*. So we conclude that this feature is particular to QTT and not a feature of general English or of religious writings.

## **6.7. Keyword 2: *Deeds***

The second word to be investigated in the QTT is *deeds* which appears high in the keyword list (number 19). It is also a word which has a synonym *-actions-* which intuitively is a more common word in modern English than *deeds*. Relatively speaking *deeds* is an unusual word in everyday English and therefore it is worth exploring. *Deeds* occur 359 times in QTT out of 204,713 and it occurs 602 times in the BNC out of 100 million. So the frequency of *deeds* in QTT is 1 in 570 (1.8 occurrences in every 1000 words) as opposed to 1 in 166,113 (1.8 occurrences in every 30,000 words) in the BNC which means that it is 30 times more common in the QTT.

*Deeds* occur 28 times in the RW/ BNC out of 1,184,062 words and it occurs 33 times in the BIT out of 828,948 words. The frequency of *deeds* in QTT is, as mentioned above, 1 in 570 as opposed to 1 in 42,288 in the RW/BNC which means that it is 74 times more common in QTT than in RW/BNC. In the BIT, moreover, it occurs 1 in 25,119 times which means that it is 44 times more frequent in QTT than in the BIT.

## **6.8. Collocations of *deeds* in QTT**

### **6.8.1. The collocation of *deeds* with *and* in QTT**

Somewhat surprisingly, *and* is the most common collocate of *deeds* in QTT and occurs in the company of *deeds* 273 times in total; of those occurrences, 163 occur to the left of *deeds* and 110 occur to the right; of the left collocates 63 occur in L4 position. This collocation in total accounts for 76.0% of the 359 instances of *deeds* in QTT. On the face of it, this high proportion of occurrences needs to be examined for some significance in terms of theology. However, we need first to check whether the same collocation is true of general English as reflected in the BNC.

**Figure 6.14: Concordance lines showing collocation of *deeds* with *and* in L4 position in QTT.**

N Concordance

57 and do righteous good deeds, and again fear Allāh  
58 and do righteous good deeds, for them is a reward  
59 And the righteous good deeds that last, are better  
60 and do righteous good deeds, and this none shall  
61 and did righteous good deeds, such shall be  
62 and do righteous good deeds, there is no sin on  
63 and do righteous good deeds, for them are  
64 and do righteous good deeds, they are dwellers of  
65 and does righteous good deeds, and then remains  
66 and do righteous good deeds, surely, We shall  
67 and does righteous good deeds (by obeying Allāh),  
68 and do righteous good deeds, those: theirs will be  
69 and by doing righteous deeds sincerely for Allāh's

**Figure 6.15: Concordance lines showing collocation of *deeds* with *and* in L2 position in QTT.**

N Concordance

332 (by oppression and evil deeds, etc.), that Allah  
333 all kinds of sins and evil deeds) and loves Allāh  
334 Record of good and bad deeds so that we see it)  
335 (i.e. to do evil and wicked deeds; to speak or to do  
336 all kinds of sins and evil deeds which Allāh has  
337 of their good and bad deeds, Paradise and Hell,  
338 of their disbelief and evil deeds). 40. And indeed  
339 all kinds of sins and evil deeds and by performing all  
340 all kinds of sins and evil deeds which he has f  
341 from sins and evil deeds, and by performing

**Figure 6.16: Concordance lines showing collocation of *deeds* with *and* in R1 position in QTT.**

N Concordance

55 ), and do righteous deeds, and remember Allah  
56 Faith with righteous deeds and by giving up  
57 remit from them their evil deeds and shall reward  
58 it and say: "To us our deeds, and to you your  
59 and does righteous good deeds, and then remains  
60 Messengers, by doing evil deeds and crimes) ! And  
61 and do righteous good deeds, and this none shall  
62 to hasten on to do good deeds, and they used to  
63 and do righteous good deeds, and humble th  
64 all kinds of sins and evil deeds and by performing all

In the BNC *and* occurs in the company of *deeds* 231 times in total; of those occurrences, 101 occur to the left of *deeds* and 130 occur to the right; of the right collocates 58 occur in R1 position. This collocation in total accounts for 38.4% of the 602 instances of *deeds* in the BNC which means that it is in fact a strong collocation in general English also. Nevertheless, it is still twice as common in the QTT. One possible reason for this is that, interestingly, *deeds* in the QTT means actions and usually it is part of an expression recording two actions that need to be connected or performed together.

	QTT <i>deeds</i> 359	BNC <i>deeds</i> 602
Collocation of <i>deeds</i> with <i>and</i>	273	231
Other uses of <i>deeds</i>	86	371
Chi-Sq = 127.972, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.000		

Table 6.30: The collocation of *deeds* with *and* in QTT and BNC

So proportionally this collocation is twice as common in the QTT as in the BNC and statistically the difference is very significant.

	QTT <i>deeds</i> 359	RW/BNC <i>deeds</i> 28
Collocation of <i>deeds</i> with <i>and</i>	273	7
Other uses of <i>deeds</i>	86	21
Chi-Sq = 33.831, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.000		

Table 6.31: The collocation of *deeds* with *and* in QTT and RW/BNC



	QTT <i>deeds</i> 359	BIT <i>deeds</i> 33
Collocation of <i>deeds</i> with <i>and</i>	273	9
Other uses of <i>deeds</i>	86	24
Chi-Sq = 35.612, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.000		

Table 6.32: The collocation of *deeds* with *and* in QTT and BIT

It is noticeable from the two tables 6.31 and 6.32 which give the p-value =0.000 that there is again a significant difference in the collocation of *deeds* with *and* in QTT compared with BIT and RW/BNC.

### 6.8.2. The collocation of *deeds* with *good*, *righteous* and *evil* in QTT

The next most common collocate identified of *deeds* identified by Wordsmith is *good*. There are 146 examples of *good* occurring with *deeds*, 140 of which occur to the left of the word. Of the left collocates 118 occur in L1 position so it is very rare for the word *good* to occur after *deeds* in the QTT, though the case is different in the original Arabic of the Quran and in the Arabic language in general, where adjectives follow nouns. This collocation (118) accounts for 32.9 % of the instances of *deeds* in QTT.

**Figure 6.17: Concordance lines showing the collocation of *deeds* with *good* in QTT.**

N Concordance

94 one another to perform all kinds of good deeds (Al-Ma'rûf ÇááÚÑæÝ)which Allâh  
 95 So as for those whose scale (of good deeds) will be heavy, they will be the  
 96 Allâh much (perform all kinds of good deeds which He has ordained)], O men  
 97 Allâh much (perform all kinds of good deeds which He has ordained)]. If you  
 98 103. And those whose scales (of good deeds) are light, they are those who lose  
 99 Allâh, and hope for (the reward of good deeds by worshipping Allâh Alone, on)  
 100 Then, those whose scales (of good deeds) are heavy, - these, they are the  
 101 and whatever with Allâh (of good deeds) will remain. And those who are  
 102 much (performing all kinds of good deeds which He has ordained)], and  
 103 Allâh much (perform all kinds of good deeds which He has ordained)]. And the  
 104 forbidden and perform all kinds of good deeds which Allâh has ordained). 22.  
 105 what he sent forward (of his evil or good deeds), and what he left behind (of his  
 106 Allâh much, perform all kinds of good deeds which He has ordained] that you  
 107 and by performing all kinds of good deeds which He has ordained), on them  
 108 wayfarers, and whatever you do of good deeds, truly, Allâh knows it well. 216.  
 109 Allâh much (perform all kinds of good deeds which He has ordained)]. 3. Who  
 110 sins and by doing all kinds of good deeds which He has ordained). 52. And

In the BNC, *good* occurs in association with *deeds* 30 times in total, of which 28 occur to the left; of the left collocates 26 occur in L1 position, accounting for 4.3% of the 602 instances of *deeds* in the BNC which means that it is a weak collocation in general English.

	QTT	BNC
	<i>deeds</i> 359	<i>deeds</i> 602
Collocation of <i>deeds</i> with <i>good</i>	118	26
Other uses of <i>deeds</i>	241	576
Chi-Sq = 143.895, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.000		

Table 6.33: The collocation of *deeds* with *good* in QTT and BNC

The p-value= 0.000 shows a significant statistical difference between the QTT and the BNC in the collocation of *deeds* with *good*. In the RW/BNC there are only three instances of *good* in the company of *deeds* and in the BIT there are only two instances of *good* in association with *deeds* as follows:

1-Remember me, O my God, concerning this, and wipe not out my *good deeds* that I have done for the house of my God,

2- Reported his *good deeds* before me, and uttered my words to him.

The numbers are too small to carry out a statistical test. The conclusion is that *deeds* has very strong collocation with *good* in QTT but that this collocation is much weaker in the BNC. The next most common collocate of *deeds* identified in QTT is the word *righteous* which occurs 102 times; of these, 100 occurrences occur to the left of *deeds* which means that *righteous* has a strong tendency to occur as a left collocate and only two occur as right collocates. Of the 100 left collocates, 64 are collocates in L2 position. The collocation with *righteous* as a left collocate accounts for 27.9 % of the instances of *deeds*. Examples below illustrate this strong collocation.

**Figure 6.18: Concordance lines showing the collocation of *deeds* with *righteous* in L2 position in QTT.**

N Concordance	
137	Monotheism) and do righteous good deeds, to Gardens under which rivers
138	Monotheism) and do righteous good deeds, to them We shall surely give lofty
139	Monotheism) and do righteous good deeds. Those, theirs is forgiveness and
140	in Allāh and performs righteous good deeds, He will admit him into Gardens
141	in Allāh and performs righteous good deeds, He will remit from him his sins,
142	and by performing righteous good deeds), and is patient, then surely, Allāh
143	Monotheism) and did righteous good deeds will be in Gardens of delight
144	and that I may do righteous good deeds that will please You, and admit
145	Monotheism) and do righteous good deeds, for them is forgiveness and
146	Monotheism) and do righteous good deeds, theirs will be forgiveness and a
147	Monotheism) and do righteous good deeds, for them are Gardens (Paradise)
148	you who believe, and do righteous good deeds, that He will certainly grant them
149	Monotheism) and do righteous good deeds, to Gardens underneath which

**Figure 6.19: Concordance lines showing the collocation of *deeds* with *righteous* in L1 position in QTT**

N Concordance  
 252 and does righteous deeds; as for such, there  
 253 for doing righteous deeds, and also the  
 254 SAW), and did righteous deeds (in the life of this  
 255 thereafter and do righteous deeds, (for such) verily,  
 256 etc.], and do righteous deeds. Verily! I am  
 257 ), and do righteous deeds, and remember Allah  
 258 ), and do righteous deeds, for those, Allāh will

The BNC, RW/BNC and the BIT contain no occurrences of *righteous* with *deeds* at all which means that this collocation is unique to the QTT.

Another common collocate of *deeds* identified by Wordsmith in the QTT is *evil* which occurs 82 times in total, 74 of which occur to the left. Of the 74 left collocates, 64 occur in L1 position. The 74 occurrences of the collocation of *evil* with *deeds* account for 20.6% of the instances of *deeds* in the QTT.

**Figure 6.20: Concordance lines showing the collocation of *deeds* with *evil* in QTT.**

N Concordance  
 7 (by committing evil deeds and sins)! Despair not  
 8 from all kinds of sins and evil deeds that Allāh has forbidden  
 9 abstaining from sins and evil deeds, and by performing  
 10 forbids Al-Fahshā' (i.e. all evil deeds, e.g. illegal sexual acts,  
 11 those who continue to do evil deeds until death faces one of  
 12 those who committed evil deeds and then repented  
 13 from all kinds of sins and evil deeds which Allāh has  
 14 and every kind of evil deeds, etc.), and Al-Baghy  
 15 by Allāh (sins and evil deeds, etc.)), as you are  
 16 ), but many of them do evil deeds. 67. O Messenger  
 17 then, to whom the evil of his deeds made fair-seeming, so  
 18 se (reward for good deeds and punishment for evil  
 19 (evil, wicked and filthy deeds, etc.). Verily, they were  
 20 from all kinds of sins and evil deeds which Allāh has

Examining the collocates of *deeds* in the BNC reveals that *evil* occurs 13 times in total, all to the left of *deeds*; 12 of these collocates occur in L1 position. This collocation accounts for

2.2% of the instances of *deeds* in the BNC. Proportionally the collocation of *deeds* with *evil* is 9.4 times more common in the QTT than in the BNC.

**Figure 6.21: Full concordance lines showing the collocation of *deeds* with *evil* in the BNC.**

N Concordance

110 insinuate that evil <w NN2>deeds have been comm  
 111 die, their evil <w NN2>deeds tend to be remembered  
 112 many of the evil <w NN2>deeds of recent years which  
 113 nces of evil <w NN2>deeds sown in previous  
 114 in it his evil <w NN2>deeds were less likely to be  
 115 of one of his evil <w NN2>deeds&equo;. This ritual of  
 116 had, by his evil <w NN2>deeds, provided just cause for  
 117 dark pit for the evil <w NN2>deeds of the Great Ones of  
 118 because of his evil <w NN2>deeds, she is destroyed by  
 119 perpetrator of evil <w NN2>deeds may see, beforehand,  
 120 of evil thoughts, evil <w NN2>deeds, this wicked l  
 121 bound by evil <w NN2>deeds, then, whoof ,

	QTT	BNC
	<i>deeds</i> 359	<i>deeds</i> 602
Collocation of <i>deeds</i> with <i>evil</i>	74	13
Other uses of <i>deeds</i>	285	589
Chi-Sq = 93.011, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.000		

Table 6.34: The collocation of *deeds* with *evil* in QTT and BNC

Statistically, there is a significant difference in the collocation of *deeds* with *evil* between the QTT and the BNC as indicated by the p-value of 0.000. In the RW/BNC corpus *evil* occurs only once in the company of *deeds* as shown below:

- 1- Tebbit that many of the *evil* <w NN2>*deeds* of recent years which have seen

In the BIT there are likewise only two instances of *evil* in association with *deeds* as shown below:

1- God speed is partaker of his *evil deeds*.

2- And after all that is come upon us for our *evil deeds*, and for our great trespass,

It is noted that the collocations with *good*, *righteous*, and *evil* indicate a semantic association of *deeds* with ethical values.

### 6.8.3. The collocation of *deeds* with *do* in QTT

Looking now at the verbs that precede *deeds*, another common collocater of *deeds* is the verb *do* which occurs 90 times in total, 82 of which occur to the left of *deeds* and eight to the right. Of the 82 left collocates, 45 are collocates in L3 position occurring in the phrase *and do righteous good deeds* except for one instance of the phrase *and also do other good deeds* and one instance of the phrase *and whatever you do of good deeds*. The collocation with *do* as a left collocater accounts for 22.8 % of the (359) instances of *deeds* in QTT.

**Figure 6.22: Concordance lines showing collocation of *deeds* with *do* in QTT.**

#### N Concordance

80 and do righteous good deeds, out of His Bo  
81 and do righteous good deeds, as Mufsidûn (  
82 to do righteous good deeds and will forgive  
83 and do righteous good deeds, for them will be  
84 and do righteous good deeds, surely, We shall  
85 and do righteous good deeds, and humble th  
86 and do righteous good deeds, and gives them  
87 and do righteous good deeds. Say (O Muhamm  
88 and do righteous good deeds, and those who  
89 and do righteous good deeds, for them are  
90 may do righteous good deeds, such as please  
91 and do righteous good deeds, they are dwellers  
92 and do righteous good deeds, for them will be  
93 may do righteous good deeds that will please  
94 and do righteous good deeds, and they are  
95 and do righteous good deeds, and recommend

Looking now at the BNC we find that *do* occurs with *deeds* 13 times in total out of 602 instances of *deeds* in the BNC. Of these occurrences 10 occur to the left and three occur to the right; of the 10 left collocates five occur in L3 position. The collocation of *do* with *deeds* as a left collocate accounts for 1.7% of the instances of *deeds* in the BNC which means that it is a very weak collocation in general English in comparison with the collocation of *do* with *deeds* in the QTT. Proportionally it is 13.4 times more common in the QTT than in the BNC. Instances of *do* in the company of *deeds* in the BNC are shown below.

**Figure 6.23: Concordance lines showing the collocation of *deeds* with *do* in the BNC.**

N Concordance  
 142 do the mortgage <w NN2>deeds, including the  
 143 and do all such <w NN2>deeds, acts matters and  
 144 and do all such <w NN2>deeds acts matters and  
 145 to do her good <w NN2>deeds. Now, on Saturda  
 146 to do so, and <w NN2>deeds made by a company

	QTT <i>deeds</i> 359	BNC <i>deeds</i> 602
Collocation of <i>deeds</i> with <i>do</i>	82	10
Other uses of <i>deeds</i>	277	592
Chi-Sq = 116.537, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.000		

**Table 6.35: The collocation of *do* with *deeds* in QTT and BNC**

The p-value of 0.000 shows a significant difference between the QTT and the BNC in the frequency of occurrence of the collocation of *do* with *deeds*. The RW/BNC and the BIT contain no occurrences of the collocation.

## 6.9. The two structures *Allah has forbidden* and *He has ordained*.

Looking to what follows *deeds*, we find that *Allah* and references to *Allah* (*He*, *We* and others) tend to occur to the right of *deeds*. They occur quite often in a particular kind of structure, e.g. the structure ‘*deeds which He has forbidden*’ and ‘*deeds which He has ordained*’ so it is more accurately the nested construction that contains reference to *Allah* that occurs with *deeds*.

**Figure 6.24: Concordance lines showing a particular kind of structure in conjunction with *deeds* in QTT.**

N Concordance  
130 (abstain from all kinds of sins and evil deeds which He has forbidden) and love  
131 Allāh much (perform all kinds of good deeds which He has ordained)], O men  
132 (abstain from all kinds of sins and evil deeds which he has forbidden), and love  
133 and by performing all kinds of good deeds which He has ordained), on them  
134 [(abstain from all kinds of sins and evil deeds which He has forbidden) and love  
135 94. So whoever does righteous good deeds while he is a believer (in the  
136 Allāh much (perform all kinds of good deeds which He has ordained)]. If you  
137 much (performing all kinds of good deeds which He has ordained)], and  
138 Allāh much (perform all kinds of good deeds which He has ordained)]. 3. Who  
139 [abstain from all kinds of sins and evil deeds which He has forbidden and love  
140 (abstain from all kinds of sins and evil deeds which He has forbidden), and love  
141 Allāh much (perform all kinds of good deeds which He has ordained)]. And the  
142 Allāh much, perform all kinds of good deeds which He has ordained] that you  
143 sins and by doing all kinds of good deeds which He has ordained). 52. And  
144 Allāh much (perform all kinds of good deeds which He has ordained)], no fear

The claim here is that we have four phenomena, which overlap with each other. We have collocation with *deeds* and that is clearly seen in the choice of *forbidden* and *ordained*. We also have the beginnings of a semantic association, because they are both part of a semantic set of judgment. We have, in addition to this, a colligation with post modification and finally, we have expressions which tend to be references to *Allah*, which is what I have been describing as a *Referential Association*.

A further important point regarding the two structures *Allah has forbidden* and *He has ordained* relates to the patterns that occur specifically with these kinds of structures. It is interesting to note that the structure *Allah/He has forbidden* occurs with the pattern *abstain*



*from all kinds of sins* and the structure *He has ordained* occurs with the pattern *perform all kinds of deeds*. To put it another way, we can say that there is a collocation of patterns here i.e. the nested combination *abstain from all kinds of sins* collocates with the nested combination *and evil deeds which He has forbidden*. So the collocation here is a collocation of two nested combinations or a collocation of phrases rather than a collocation of words. The same thing applies to the other structure; the combination *perform all kinds of deeds* collocates with the nested combination *which He has ordained* producing the pattern *perform all kinds of deeds which He has ordained*. The examples above illustrate this kind of collocation.

These two patterns *abstain from all kinds of deeds which He has forbidden* and *perform all kinds of deeds which He has ordained* are very precise in the sense that they are particular to QTT only and apparently do not exist outside QTT.

#### **6.10. Investigating a colligation of *deeds* in QTT**

We have seen that *deeds* colligates with adjectives in QTT. *Deeds* also colligates with future modality, another association it shares with *day*. On 77 occasions it occurs with *will* or *shall*, accounting for almost 1 in 5 instances of *deeds* (21.4%). In the BNC however, there is no occurrence of the modal *shall* in the context of *deeds* and *will* occurs 18 times in total accounting for 3% of the instances of *deeds* in the BNC.

**Figure 6.25: Concordance lines showing colligation of *deeds* with future modality in QTT.**

N Concordance  
 344 ) and did righteous deeds, will be made to  
 345 as a disbeliever, then his deeds will be lost in this  
 346 doer of good deeds, his deeds will take him to  
 347 bad[] , 40. And that his deeds will be seen, 41.  
 348 whose balance (of good deeds) will be heavy,[] 7.  
 349 whose balance (of good deeds) will be light, 9. He  
 350 and similarly evil deeds will take their doers  
 351 then, those who do evil deeds will only be r  
 352 (then) surely (all) your deeds will be in vain, and  
 353 and did righteous good deeds will be in Gardens

The difference between QTT and BNC in this respect is characteristically significant. (see table 6.36 below).

	QTT <i>deeds</i> 359	BNC <i>deeds</i> 602
Colligation of <i>deeds</i> with future modality	77	18
Other uses of <i>deeds</i>	282	584
Chi-Sq = 86.013, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.000		

Table 6.36: Colligation of *deeds* with *future modality shall* and *will* in QTT and BNC

The RW/BNC contains no occurrence of future modality with *deeds* and there is only one instance in the BIT of future modality with *deeds*, shown below.

I will remember his *deeds* which he doeth, prating against us with malicious words:

### 6.11. Keyword 3: *shall*

We looked in the previous chapter at the grammatical item *will* in QPT; we shall now look at the key word *shall* in QTT. *Shall* is number 56 in the keyword list generated by Wordsmith

for QTT and we have already seen that it associates with both *day* and *deeds*. For both reasons it seems worthy of investigation. It occurs 657 times in Taqi's translation, and in the BNC, it occurs 19,984 times. The proportion of *shall* to *will* in the QTT is one to three whereas it is one to ten in the BNC.

## **6.12. Investigation of collocations and semantic associations of *shall* in QTT**

### **6.12.1. The collocation of *shall* with negation - *not* - in QTT**

The concordance list shows that *not* is a very common immediate right collocate to *shall* in QTT which occurs 59 times in total, 52 of which occur to the right of *shall*; Of the 52 right collocates, 48 occur in R1 position. *Nor* is another common collocate which occurs 52 times in total, 29 times to the left and 23 to the right. Of the 29 left collocates, 26 occur in L1 position. Then the word *no* occurs with *shall* 51 times in total, 34 times to the left of *shall* and 17 to the right in R2 position. *Never* occurs 13 times in total, 4 times to the left and nine times to the right in R1 position, and finally *none* occurs 7 times in total, 6 of which occur immediately to the left of *shall*. Altogether there are 106 occurrences of negatives in conjunction with *shall* and these account for 16.1 % of the 657 instances of *shall* in QTT. So it would seem that *shall* has a strong pragmatic/semantic association with negation and that some of the negative markers are themselves strong collocates of *shall*. Examples from QTT include:

**Figure 6.26: Concordance lines showing most common right collocate of *shall* in QTT.**

N Concordance  
232 59. "Except our first death, and we shall not be punished? (after we have  
233 SAW) "Present no excuses, we shall not believe you. Allâh has already  
234 is nothing but our first death, and we shall not be resurrected. 36. "Then bring  
235 (O Muhammad (Peace be upon him)) shall not forget (it), 7. Except what Allâh,  
236 or three, or four but if you fear that you shall not be able to deal justly (with  
237 a Day (of Judgement) when a person shall not avail another, nor will  
238 through the heavens and the earth. It shall not come upon you except all of a  
239 shall We join their offspring, and We shall not decrease the reward of their  
240 horror). 46. The Day when their plotting shall not avail them at all nor will they be  
241 bestow upon me a kingdom such as shall not belong to any other after me:  
242 went off in anger, and imagined that We shall not punish him (i.e. the calamities  
243 and do righteous deeds, certainly! We shall not suffer to be lost the reward of  
244 them a sign (from Allâh) they say: "We shall not believe until we receive the like  
245 to change Allâh's Words. Say: "You shall not follow us; thus Allâh has said

**Figure 6.27: Concordance lines showing most common left collocate of *shall* in QTT.**

N Concordance  
184 ordained), on them shall be no fear, nor shall they grieve. 14. Such shall be the  
185 effect on them so that they die, nor shall its torment be lightened for them.  
186 not be taken out from there (Hell)[], nor shall they be Yustâ'tabûn (i.e. they shall  
187 righteous, on them shall be no fear, nor shall they grieve. 36. But those who  
188 sense of fatigue shall touch them, nor shall they (ever) be asked to leave it."  
189 be accepted from him, nor shall intercession be of use to him, nor  
190 Paradise, no fear shall be on you, nor shall you grieve." 50. And the dwellers of  
191 Lord. On them shall be no fear, nor shall they grieve.[] 275. Those who eat  
192 will not be asked about our sins, nor shall we be asked of what you do." 26.  
193 on them shall be no fear, nor shall they grieve.[] 70. Verily, We took  
194 no fear shall come upon them nor shall they grieve[], - 63. Those who  
195 Evil shall touch them not, nor shall they grieve. 62. Allâh is the Creator

Halliday and James (1993) show that roughly one sentence in ten has a negative marker. This means that a negative marker occurs with *shall* in translations of the Quran 1.7 times more often than would be predicted on the basis of Halliday's ratio of positive to negative.

In the BNC there are 1235 instances of *not* in R1 position in conjunction with *shall*, 17 instances of *nor* in L1 position, 135 instances of *no* in R2 position, 254 instances of *never* in R1 position and 6 instances of *none* in L4 position. Altogether there are 1647 occurrences of negative markers which account for 8.2% of the 19,984 instances of *shall* in the BNC. So the

pragmatic/semantic association of *shall* in QTT with negation is twice as strong as in the BNC. More specifically, in the BNC there are just 17 instances of *nor* in L1 position (one in 1175 instances) whereas there are 26 such instances in QTT (one in 25).

	QTT <i>shall</i> 657	BNC <i>shall</i> 19,984
Association of <i>shall</i> with negation	106	1647
Other	551	18337
Chi-Sq = 50.983, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.000		

Table 6.37: The association of *shall* with negative markers in QTT and BNC

	QTT <i>shall</i> 657	RW/BNC <i>shall</i> 427
Association of <i>shall</i> with negation	106	43
Other uses of <i>shall</i>	551	384
Chi-Sq = 8.026, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.005		

Table 6.38: The association of *shall* with negative markers in QTT and RW/BNC

	QTT <i>shall</i> 657	BIT <i>shall</i> 9,833
Association of <i>shall</i> with negation	106	1035
Other uses of <i>shall</i>	551	8798
Chi-Sq = 19.981, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.000		

Table 6.39: The association of *shall* with negative markers in QTT and BIT

The p-value = 0.000 in tables 6.37 and 6.39 suggests a significant difference between the QTT and the BNC in the association of *shall* with negative markers and likewise between the QTT

and the BIT. The p-value in table 6.38= 0.005 likewise shows a significant difference between the QTT and the RW/BNC in the association of *shall* with negative markers, albeit slightly less strong.

### 6.13. Pragmatic association of *shall* in QTT

Perhaps predictably, given *day's* pragmatic association with certainty, *shall* occurs with adverbs of certainty in QTT such as *certainly* which occurs 23 times, *verily* which occurs 21 times, *indeed* which occurs 20 times, *surely* which occurs 14 times and *truly* which occurs 8 times. This association accounts for 13.1 % of instances of *shall* in the QTT.

However, in the BNC, it was found that only 1.2 % of 19.984 instances of *shall* occur with expressions of certainty. (See Table 6.40)

QTT- 657	In total	Position	BNC-19,984	In total	Position
Certainly	23	16 R1	Certainly	85	71 R1
Verily	21	14 L2	Indeed	38	16 L3
Indeed	20	7 R1	Surely	8	4 R1
Surely	14	10 L2	Sure	49	25 L2
Definitely	8	3 L2	certain	39	8 R4
definite	None	None	True	18	6 R5
Truly	None	None	Definitely	10	6 R1
True	None	None	Definite	None	None
Sure	None	None	Truly	None	None
Certain	None	None	verily	None	None
	86			247	

Table 6.40: Expressions of certainty in conjunction with *shall* in QTT and BNC

So proportionally it is nearly 11 times more common in the QTT than in the BNC and statistically as shown in the tables below, there is a significant difference in pragmatic association of *shall* with emphatic expressions between the QTT and the BNC and between the QTT and the BIT, as the p-value=0.000 in each case indicates. The RW/BNC contains no occurrence of emphatic expressions with *shall*. The conclusion is that this association is very strong in the QTT but weaker in both the BNC and the BIT and non existent in RW/BNC.

	QTT <i>shall</i> 657	BNC <i>shall</i> 19,984
Expressions of certainty with <i>shall</i>	86	247
Other uses of <i>shall</i>	571	19737
Chi-Sq = 563.097, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.000		

Table 6.41: Pragmatic association of *shall* with expressions of certainty in QTT and BNC

	QTT <i>shall</i> 657	BIT <i>shall</i> 9,833
Expressions of certainty with <i>shall</i>	86	71
Other uses of <i>shall</i>	571	9762
Chi-Sq = 638.972, DF = 1, P-Value = 0.000		

Table 6.42: Pragmatic association of *shall* with expressions of certainty in QTT and BIT

What is also striking here is that the two key words *shall* and *day* both have an association with expressions of certainty as seen in the table below. This points to these being a complex set of relations among the key words we have examined.

Key words	Number of instances	Percentages of emphatic expressions with <i>shall &amp; day</i> in QTT
<i>Shall</i>	657	13.1 %
<i>Day</i>	633	11.1 %

Table 6.43: The proportion of emphatic expressions of *shall* and *day* in QTT

*Shall* also occurs with time reference in QTT. The table below shows that the most common time markers in the BNC are expressions like *tomorrow, now, day, days, and next*. Other time markers found in the BNC in the context of *shall* are words like *week, morning, year, years, hour and hours*. We also have days of the week as time markers in the BNC. So in the BNC *shall* has a strong association with a variety of time markers; they represent however a totally different kind of use. In the QTT *shall* has a semantic association with only a limited number of time markers; *day* in particular is the most common marker referring as we have seen to the *day of Resurrection*. To conclude, we can say that *shall* in both corpora shares the semantic association with time markers, but the association has totally different uses in the two corpora. The use of *shall* with *day* as a time marker referring to the day of Judgement in QTT is a Quran Language specific feature.



Time markers in the BNC	Number of occurrences		
	In Total	Position	
Tomorrow	82	22	R3
Now	396	122	R1
Day	110	23	L2
Days	54	15	R5
Next	266	81	L3
Moment	57	21	L2
Today	53	16	L2
Week	61	35	L2
Weeks	16	7	L2
Year	84	33	L2
Years	67	17	L3
Hour	11	5	L5
Hours	34	9	L1
Last	54	13	L3
	1345	419	

Table 6.44: Association of *shall* with time markers in the BNC

#### 6.14. Colligations of *shall* in QTT.

*Shall* colligates with subject pronouns. The most common is *we*, which occurs 189 times immediately to the left of *shall*. 34 of these (i.e. 5.2 % of all instances of *shall* in QTT) have different referents and the remaining instances refer to Allah (i.e. 23.6% of the instances of *shall* in QTT occur with *we* referring to Allah). Next we have the pronoun *you*, which occurs 83 times (i.e. 12.6 %) in L1 position (*you* has plural meaning in all but 3 cases) and *they* which occurs 70 times (i.e. 10.7 %). There is then a large drop in frequency to the next

pronouns *I* which occurs 27 times and *it* which occurs 16 times in R2 position. Finally, *he* occurs 14 times (four of these written with capitals and referring to Allah). Overall, this colligation accounts for 60.7 % of the 657 instances of *shall* in QTT.

In the BNC, the RW/BNC and the BIT there is a similar colligation with subject pronouns so this colligation is actually shared by all the corpora, though with a variation in terms of frequency and with the difference that the majority of the subject pronouns in the QTT are referents referring to Allah.

Another colligation of *shall* in the QTT is with interrogatives. This priming occurs 58 times and accounts for 8.7% of the instances of *shall*. In fact this priming is not exclusive to the QTT but is also the case in everyday English as represented by the BNC, though with a variation in terms of frequency.

**Figure 6.28: Concordance lines showing colligation of *shall* with interrogatives in QTT.**

N Concordance

314 whispered to him, saying : "O Adam! Shall I lead you to the Tree of Eternity  
 315 disbeliever) says: "When I am dead, shall I then be raised up alive?" 67. Does  
 316 47. She said: "O my Lord! How shall I have a son when no man has  
 317 said (in astonishment): "Woe unto me! Shall I bear a child while I am an old  
 318 to Whom you shall be returned. 23. "Shall I take besides Him *āliha* (gods), if  
 319 SAW to the people of the Scripture): "Shall I inform you of something worse  
 320 flowing rivers, etc.) with Him. 15. Say: "Shall I inform you of things far better than  
 321 she (his sister came up and) said: "Shall I direct you to a household who will  
 322 are doing is in vain." 140. He said: "Shall I seek for you an *llāhan* (a God)  
 323 14. Say (O Muhammad SAW): "Shall I take as a *Wali* (helper, protector,  
 324 etc.). 114. [Say (O Muhammad SAW)] "Shall I seek a judge other than *Allāh*  
 325 40. "When your sister went and said: 'Shall I show you one who will nurse  
 326 who recite Our Verses to them. Say: "Shall I tell you of something worse than  
 327 except *iblis* (Satan). He said: "Shall I prostrate to one whom You  
 328 that He is *Allāh*, my Lord and none shall I associate as partner with my  
 329 am the first of the Muslims." 164. Say: "Shall I seek a lord other than *Allāh*, while

To sum up we can say the colligation of *shall* with interrogatives is shared with the other three corpora. The point, though, is that the proportion of *shall* to *will* is different; although the colligation is the same, *shall* is chosen more often in QTT and therefore comes into the

foreground. *Shall* behaves exactly the same way in the QTT as it does in the BNC but it is used proportionally more often in the QTT than in the BNC.

## 6.15. Chapter Summary

The key words *day*, *deeds* and *shall* were selected and investigated in terms of collocation, colligation and other lexical relationships and the findings were compared with the three corpora the BNC, RW/BNC and BIT. In general there have been several claims and a major discovery made in this chapter. The QTT specific feature of *Orthographic priming* has been identified.

The first claim made is the very strong association of *day* in QTT with the word *Resurrection* which is very weak in the BNC and not found in the RW/BNC or the BIT. There were no occurrences of the exact phrase *day of Resurrection* in the BNC. We found a specific collocation in the QTT with respect to the phrase which is *on* in the phrase *on the day of judgement*. We also have seen that the two collocations *the day when* and *a day when* are used differently in QTT from those found in the BNC. We also found that the expression *that day* in QTT is used quite differently from the same expression in the BNC. A significant difference was found in the frequency of *that day* and *this day* in the QTT and the BNC and the RW/NC. A significant difference was also found in the use of *this day* in QTT and BIT but no significant difference was found in the use of *that day* in QTT and BIT. We have identified a unique referential association of *this day* and *that day* in QTT that is a reference to one particular day, the day of Resurrection. We have explored how differently the combination *last day* is used in the three corpora. Finally a significant difference was found in the collocation of *day* with *night* between the QTT and the BNC; this collocation does not exist in the RW/BNC. In the BIT the case was different in that no statistical difference was found between the QTT and the BIT in this respect.

We have identified a QTT particular semantic association of *day* with expressions of (*DIS*) *BELIEF* and two shared semantic associations between holy texts, one with *generality of mankind* and another is with *body parts*.

A referential association is recognized in that a range of expressions all refer to the day of Judgement in the context of *day*.

The next word chosen for investigation was *deeds*. Although the collocate *and* found in QTT is shared with the BNC, the difference is significant in comparison with the BNC and the other corpora. A significant difference between QTT and BNC has been found in the collocation of *deeds* with *good* and the collocation of *deeds* with *evil*. Instances of *deeds* in the RW/BNC and the BIT do not contain enough occurrences of *good* or *evil* for operation of the chi-square test. We identified a collocate of *deeds* particular to QTT which is *righteous*. We also found a significant difference between QTT and BNC in the collocation of *deeds* with *do*; the data showed no occurrence of *do* with *deeds* in both the RW/BNC and the BIT.

We have identified two patterns unique to QTT which are ...*abstain from all kinds of deeds which he has forbidden* and *perform all kinds of deeds which he has ordained*.

In addition to the colligation of *deeds* with adjectives in QTT, we have noted a colligation of *deeds* with future modality in QTT; this was found to be a significant difference between QTT and the BNC. The other corpora lack this colligation.

Turning now to *shall*, we have argued that *shall* has a strong collocation with negative markers and a strong association with negation and that the pragmatic association with negation in the QTT is stronger than in the BNC. This was confirmed by the significant difference between QTT and BNC, BIT and RW/BNC. A very common collocate of *shall* in the QTT is *day* referring to the day of Judgement. We also have found that *shall* in QTT has

**very strong pragmatic association with expressions of certainty and that the case for such an association in the BNC is weak. We also pointed to the fact that the key words *day*, *deeds* and *shall* all have strong associations with certainty.**

**We noted that *shall* in QTT and in BNC share a semantic association with TIME MARKERS but with totally different kinds of use and that *day* as a time marker in the QTT referring to the day of Judgement is a Quran - specific feature.**

**Finally, the priming of *shall* with interrogation is shared in both corpora but with a variation in terms of frequency.**

## CHAPTER 7

### COMPARISONS OF CHAPTERS WITH RESPECT TO PRIMINGS AND FINDINGS

#### 7.1. Introduction

In this chapter the translations we have been studying will be compared with each other in respect of their distinctive *collocations*, *semantic associations*, *colligations* and *pragmatic associations*. I also compare the translations with regard to the different kinds of primings discovered in the course of our investigation starting with *priming for figurative language* and then looking at *priming for punctuation* and finally *orthographic priming*. What we shall seek to investigate is whether these discoveries are true of all the translations of the Quran or whether they are true of a particular translation only. There are two aspects to this; first of all, how do the translations compare with each other, and secondly how they all compare with the original Arabic of the Quran?

Other new kinds of primings such as *referential association* and *pronominal association* will however be excluded from the comparison because these primings are unlikely to differ greatly across translations.

It is impossible for me to check on every finding that I have made in the course of my thesis in terms of whether that finding is true of all the three translations. So I have taken a representative sample of each of the categories of comparison and used that sample to discover the degree to which the translators agree or disagree with each other. I have chosen a sample of collocations, colligations, semantic associations, and orthographic primings.

#### 7.2. Comparisons of distinctive collocations across translations

We start by looking at the way the different translations compare with regard to collocation. To this end, I selected certain collocations to find out whether the translations differed in

respect of the distinctive collocations. We saw in earlier chapters that *guidance* and *mercy* were strong collocates in the Irving translation, as were *painful* and *torment*.

In the case of *those who believe* we have the collocation between the phrase *those who believe* and *deeds*, and the collocation between *those who believe* and *good*, and the collocation of all three together. The translations appear to differ in the larger clusters containing these collocations which were therefore chosen for closer attention. Table 7.1 shows the collocations we chose to look at.

Number of instances of collocations	Irving Translation			Pickthall Translation			Taqi Translation		
	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C
<i>Guidance and mercy</i>	11	149	7.4%	11	164	6.7%	9	168	5.4%
<i>Painful torment</i>	65	306	21.2%	3	46	6.5%	69	374	18.4%
<i>Painful doom</i>	000	000	000%	60	224	26.8%	000	000	000%
<i>Say O Mohammad</i>	000	732	000%	69	706	9.8%	145	760	19.1%
								<i>Say to them O Mohammad</i>	
<i>O ye who believe</i>	000	467	000%	94	433	21.7%	83	476	17.4%
								<i>O you who believe</i>	

Table 7.1 Comparisons of distinctive collocations across translations<sup>22</sup>

<sup>22</sup> A = number of instances of collocations B = number of instances of keyword C = % of instances of keyword



We can see that the collocation *guidance and mercy* exists in all three corpora; in two of the translations (Irving's and Pickthall's) the frequency is very similar, but in the third translation (Taqi's) it is less strong than in the other translations. What is more striking is the distribution of the second collocation *painful torment* across the three translations; we have 65 instances of *painful torment* in the Irving translation, involving 21.2% of the 306 instances of *torment* in the translation and we have likewise 69 instances of the collocation in Taqi's translation, involving 18.4% of the 374 instances of *torment* in this text. So we have similarity in these translations. However, we find a totally different picture in Pickthall's translation where we have only 3 instances of *painful torment* out of 46 of all instances of *torment* in the translation. The reason for this is that Pickthall uses a different word, *doom*, as an equivalent to *torment*. Hence, we have 60 instances of *painful doom* in the Pickthall corpus out of the 224 occurrences of *doom* in his translation, involving 26.8% of the instances of *doom*. Both *painful torment* and *painful doom* are distinctive collocations compared with the BNC; neither occur at all in the BNC. The choice of the word *doom* in Pickthall's translation may be to try and capture the element of judgement as one of the meanings of *doom*, (whereas *torment* does not contain any notion of judgement). The issue is that in doing so he is using the language in an unusual way which might be regarded as mistranslation. It is not clear that the Arabic original is intended to have that meaning.

In the case of associating *say* with the vocative *O* in the phrase *Say O Mohammad* it is observed that the three corpora are different with regard to the number of vocatives. The possible reason why Irving might be different is that he is trying to avoid an archaic use. In fact Irving is not expressing the vocative at all in his translation and this is a significant difference of some importance. Irving might think that it is clear from the context that *Mohammad* is being addressed and that is why he is not expressing the vocative in his translation. On the other hand, the other translators chose to retain it; they are alike in

showing a colligation between *say* and the vocative *O*. Pickthall's translation and Taqi's translation agree in expressing the vocative by the use of *O* but they differ in terms of frequency. The collocation *Say O Mohammed* in Taqi's translation is twice as common as in the Pickthall translation. As regards the collocation of *O* with the phrase *ye who believe* there is not a big difference between Pickthall's translation and Taqi's translation. *O* is a strong collocate of *ye who believe* in the two corpora whereas in the Irving translation, as we have seen, there is no collocation with *O*.

As regards the collocation construct *those who believe* the translators each have developed their own clusters so we have *those who believe and perform honourable deeds* in Irving's text, *those who believe and do good works* in Pickthall's text and *those who believe and do righteous good deeds* in Taqi's. We have similarity in two of the corpora (Irving and Taqi) in terms of the proportion of their chosen clusters to the total instances of *believe* but one of them (Pickthall) uses his chosen cluster considerably more often than the others do. The collocations can be assumed to vary according to the translators' own understanding of the original Arabic text and I generalise from this that we are going to find a regular variation in the kinds and amounts of collocations across the three translations.

### **7.3. Comparisons of distinctive colligations across translations**

We have looked at collocations and now we are looking at colligations. Some key colligations are included in the table 7.2. below.

Colligations Across Corpora	Irving Corpora			Pickthall Corpora			Taqi's Corpora		
	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C
Colligation of <i>torment</i> with the future tense.	56	306	18.3%	2	46	4.3%	72	374	19.3%
Colligation of <i>say</i> with interrogatives.	150	732	20.5%	170	706	24.1%	125	760	16.4%
The colligation of <i>day</i> with <i>this</i>	6	424	19.3%	43	523	23.5%	44	633	18.8%
The colligation of <i>day</i> with <i>that</i>	76			80			75		
	Irving uses <i>someday</i> more than <i>this day</i> 44 times.								

Table 7.2: A comparison across corpora in terms of findings of colligation<sup>23</sup>

The general point here is that two of the colligations are shared across all the three translations; they are the colligation of *say* with interrogatives and the colligation of *day* with demonstrative adjectives. The first of the three colligations is significantly different, however, in that one translation (Pickthall translation) does not show the colligation of *torment* with the future. The word *torment* as a word occurs in his translation as we have seen less often but this does not explain the almost entire absence of the association with the future. As regards the colligation of *say* with interrogatives there is not a large difference between any of the translations, though they are on a scale of frequency that has Irving's translation in the

<sup>23</sup> A=number of instances of colligations B= number of instances of keyword C= % of instances of keyword

middle. Likewise the colligation of *day* with demonstrative adjectives occurs in all translations. Irving's slightly smaller frequency is because he uses another expression *some day* in places where the other translators use *this day*. This expression occurs 44 times in his translation, whereas in the other two translations it never occurs.

#### 7.4. Comparison of semantic and pragmatic associations across translations

Table 7.3 represents a comparison of semantic and pragmatic associations found in the individual translations.

Semantic and pragmatic associations across corpora	Irving Corpus	%	Pickthall Corpus	%	Taqi Corpus	%
Associations of <i>will</i> with negation.	389 instances of negative particles associated with 2692 instances of the keyword <i>will</i> .	14.5%	205 instances of negative particles associated with 1,679 instances of the keyword <i>will</i>	12.2%	253 instances of negative particles associated with 2182 instances of the keyword <i>will</i> .	11.6%
Associations of <i>day</i> with large numbers of people.	212 references to large numbers of people out of 424 instances of <i>day</i> .	50%	242 references to large numbers of people out of 523 instances of <i>day</i> .	46.3%	250 references to large numbers of people out of 633 instances of <i>day</i> .	39.5%
Associations of <i>shall</i> with expressions of certainty.	No use of expressions of certainty with the 286 instances of <i>shall</i> .	000%	54 instances of emphatic expressions associated with 364 instances of <i>shall</i> .	14.8%	86 instances of emphatic expressions associated with 657 instances of <i>shall</i> .	13.1%

Table 7.3: A comparison across corpora in terms of semantic and pragmatic association

As can be seen from Table 7.3 the translations differ very little in terms of their association of *will* and negation and they differ only slightly in terms of association of *day* with large numbers of people. There is however, a real difference between Irving and the other two translations in respect of the use of certainty expressions. There are no expressions of certainty with *shall* in the Irving translation as opposed to 54 emphatic expressions in the Pickthall translation and 86 emphatic expressions in Taqi's translation. Both Pickthall and Taqi are reflecting the original Arabic of the Quran in their translations whereas Irving has decided that emphasis can be inferred from the context. I totally disagree with Irving because each expression of certainty in the QIT has its own implications and functions differently. Not including them in the translation leads to inaccuracy in reflecting the meaning of the original text.

Although the three translations differ little in their association of *will* with negation, in one of them (the Pickthall translation) *will* itself is used less often than it is in the other two translations. There is a difference of nearly 1000 instances between Pickthall and Irving. Taqi's translation falls between the two, but even here there are still approximately 500 more instances. In Irving's translation, *will* is considerably more frequent; it is more than one and a half times as frequent in Irving as it is in Pickthall.

### 7.5. Comparisons of exclamation marks and question marks across translations

	QIT	QPT	QTT
<b>Exclamation marks</b>	1746	2439	1696
<b>Question marks</b>	1016	933	913

Table 7.4a: The number of question marks and exclamation marks across the three corpora.

The differences are however not great as regards question marks with Irving using 10% more than the other two translations. As regards exclamation marks, there is also not a big difference in number between Irving's and Taqi's translations but there is a large difference in the number of exclamation marks between Pickthall's and Taqi's translations. The effect on the readers of using extra exclamation marks will be to make the translation seem more emphatic and that has itself implications for how it might be read and how it might prime the reader. The Quran is a very special kind of text, and therefore one would expect English translations of it to reflect that specialness and to be in consequence different in a number of respects. One of these respects would appear to be punctuation.

		First thousand sentences- Sample one		Second thousand sentences- sample two		Third thousand sentences- sample three	
Number of question marks in QIT	1016	79	7.8%	110	10.8%	155	15.3%
Number of exclamation marks in QIT	174	205	11.7%	197	11.3%	291	16.7%
Number of question marks in QPT	933	75	8.0%	105	11.3%	120	12.9%
Number of exclamation marks in QPT	2439	245	10.0%	290	11.9%	264	10.8%
Number of question marks in QTT	913	80	8.8%	87	9.5%	109	11.9%
Number of exclamation marks in QTT	1696	134	7.9%	201	11.9%	191	11.3%

Table 7.4b: Distribution of question marks and exclamations across translations

Overall, it is found that the QIT uses more exclamation marks and question marks than other kinds of texts and this is one of the factors that make the style of the QIT distinctive from that of other texts. Heavy use of question and exclamation marks is a distinctive stylistic feature which is not true to the same extent of other religious texts (though Beekman & Callow (1974) draw attention to the special use of rhetorical questions in the Bible). In order to see how question marks and exclamation marks distribute across the three translations in the whole QT, three samples were taken of each translation; each sample contained a thousand sentences; the three samples were taken from different parts of the Quran, being drawn from the beginning, the middle and the end of the QIT. The table above gives the distribution of exclamation marks and question marks across the three translations. Broadly speaking, with the Irving translation, exclamation marks are spread evenly but question marks are not equally spread; there are twice as many in the third sample as there are in the first. Likewise with Pickthall, there are one and a half times as many question marks in the third sample as in the first but the exclamation marks are much more evenly spread. In Taqi's translation, the first and second thousand sentences do not differ very much in terms of question marks, but in the third thousand there are rather more. Exclamation marks are almost identical in frequency in the second and third samples but the first sample has fewer such marks. There is some evidence therefore as regards question marks that they are more concentrated in the last third of the Quran in translation whereas the distribution of exclamation marks seems to be random. Overall, though, the translators distribute exclamations and question marks differently

## 7.6. Question marks and exclamation marks occurring with *torment* and *mercy*

Table 7.5 shows the occurrence of question marks and exclamation marks with the keywords *torment* and *mercy* across the three different corpora.

	Key words	Number of Occurrences	Question marks occurring with <i>torment&amp; mercy</i>		Exclamation marks occurring with <i>torment &amp; mercy</i>	
QIT	<i>Torment</i>	306	20	<b>6.5 %</b>	31	<i>10.1 %</i>
	<i>Mercy</i>	149	13	<i>8.7 %</i>	10	<b>6.7 %</b>
QPT	<i>Torment</i>	46	<b>1</b>	<b>2.2 %</b>	5	<i>10.9 %</i>
	<i>Mercy</i>	164	13	<b>7.9 %</b>	16	<i>9.8 %</i>
QTT	<i>Torment</i>	374	23	<b>6.1 %</b>	39	<i>10.4 %</i>
	<i>Mercy</i>	168	13	<b>7.7 %</b>	15	<b>8.9 %</b>

Table 7.5. Question marks and exclamation marks occurring with *torment* and *mercy*

There are two points here. The first is that one of the stylistic features of the Quran in translation is that it uses considerably more question marks and exclamation marks than are found in news writing, fiction or most other kinds of writing. The second point is that certain words and phrases occur more or less frequently with certain punctuation marks; we can term this 'punctuation priming', which like all priming can be priming for its occurrence or avoidance. If we look at the numbers in bold in table 7.5, we find that all these numbers are lower percentages than the percentages of the distributions of the punctuations throughout the Quran in translations as a whole. What this means is that the word *mercy* in QinT is less likely to occur with an exclamation mark or question mark than would be expected in the Quran as a whole.



Likewise when the word *torment* is used punctuation devices (exclamations or question marks) are less likely to be used in conjunction with it than one would expect in the Quran as a whole. What this really means is that *mercy* and *torment* tend not to occur in emphatic or exclamatory statements, the numbers in italics in table 7.5 indicate weak negative associations.

### 7.7. *Say* and *believe* in association with question marks and exclamation marks.

Now we compare the association of *say* and *believe* with question marks and exclamation marks in the three corpora.

	Key words	Number of instances of <i>say/ believe</i>	Number of question marks & percentages		Number of Exclamation marks & percentages	
QIT	<i>Say</i>	732	160	21.9%	206	28.1%
	<i>Believe</i>	467	39	8.4%	55	<b>11.8%</b>
QPT	<i>Say</i>	706	175	24.8%	190	26.9%
	<i>Believe</i>	433	38	8.8%	175	<b>40.4%</b>
QTT	<i>Say</i>	760	138	18.2%	170	22.4%
	<i>Believe</i>	467	28	6%	109	23.3%

Table 7.6. *Say* and *believe* in association with exclamation marks and question marks

The crucial point to notice here is the shared primings. The translators are going to prime their readers with the same feature for *believe*, namely that *believe* has a negative association with question marks. Anyone reading the QinT is likely to come to associate *believe* with statements rather than questions. Another striking point is that the Irving translation has a

negative association between *believe* and exclamation marks whereas the Pickthall translation has a positive one. The translations are alike regarding the relationship between *believe* and question marks, and they are also alike in the association they make for *say* with question marks and exclamation marks. However, while they are alike in avoiding question marks with *believe* and are alike in the use of question marks with *say*, one of them (Irving) uses fewer exclamation marks with *believe* than the other two and one of them (Pickthall) uses far more. This means that Pickthall will positively prime the reader to associate *believe* with exclamation marks and Irving will negatively prime him/her.

#### **7.8. *Day* and *deeds* in association with exclamation marks and question marks**

Looking now at Table 7.7, the number of exclamation marks associated with *day* in the three corpora are almost the same. *Day* and exclamation marks account for 16.8%, 15.1%, and 12.25 % of the instances of *Day* in the three corpora. However, they differ a great deal as regards associating *deeds* with exclamation marks. The difference is particularly striking with Irving having such an association in only 2% of instances of *deeds* versus 13% in Pickthall. The reason is that Irving has changed a number of exclamatory sentences into statements.

Concerning question marks, Irving and Taqi associate *deeds* with question marks to a similar degree, but there is a big difference in the actual number of instances of *deeds* in both corpora. There are 101 instances of *deeds* in Irving versus 359 in Taqi. A similar pattern occurs with the word *day* in association with question marks. Again they all do not use the association in similar proportions and again there is a big difference in terms of frequency in the three corpora.

	Words and entries		Question marks		Exclamation marks	
QIT	<i>Day</i>	424	27	6.4%	71	16.8%
	<i>Deeds</i>	101	2	2%	2	2%
QPT	<i>Day</i>	523	38	7.3%	79	15.1%
	<i>Deeds</i>	54	4	7.4%	7	13%
QTT	<i>Day</i>	633	53	8.4%	77	12.2%
	<i>Deeds</i>	359	13	3.4%	18	5%
Quran Sample 3000 sentences			344		693	

Table 7.7 *Day* and *deeds* in association with exclamation marks and question marks

### 7.9. Orthographic Priming across all three corpora

In chapter six, I noted that orthographic priming is an association that the reader makes between a particular way of representing the letters of a word and a particular meaning. The issue then is whether orthographic primings we have identified are specific to particular translations or are characteristic of all the translations. The first instance considered is the use of *him* in the phrase *believe in Him*. The phrase *believe in Him* is instance of what Hoey (2005) refers to as textual collocation in the sense that *Him* has a textual collocation/ cohesive relationship with a preceding referent which is Allah/God in the context of QIT. What however is interesting here is that the orthography makes it a unique textual reference, quite different from any other kind of reference. In the context where *Him* refers to *God* or to *Allah* in either the BNC or the QIT, there is *orthographic priming* for a capital letter for the pronoun *him*, when referring to God or Allah, which is a case of nesting.

In the case of *Day of Judgement*, when *day* collocates with *of* and *judgement* to form the cluster *day of judgement*, then further orthographic priming occurs with both *Day* and *Judgement* beginning with a capital letter. When capitalised, the phrase can only refer to the final day when God judges the world, whereas a lower case *day of judgement* could in theory refer to something much more trivial. In the case of the *Day of Resurrection*, it can never be used to refer to any day other than the final day. This is true in Christian literature as well as in Muslim literature. There are other terms that are unique to Islam, with a similar orthographic character and referring to the same day; these include *The Day for Repayment*, *The Day of Reckoning*, *the Day of Assembling*, *the Day of Summoning*, *the Day of Decision* and *The Day of Meeting*. The interesting point is that they all are different ways of referring to the same day and each has its own implications and connotations. So when *day* has a referential association with the final day in which Allah determines the fate of all his creatures, we are primed by QinT orthographically to expect a capitalization

When the three translations are compared, we find that this priming is shared by all translations but differs from one translation to another in terms of the specific expressions that are used to refer to the *Day of Judgement*.

Taqi (633)		Pickthall (523)		Irving (424)	total
the Day of Judgement	4	the Day of Judgement	15	The Day for Repayment	12
the Day of Reckoning	3	the Day of Reckoning	4	The Day of Reckoning	4
the Day of Recompense	14	the day of Summoning	1	The day of the Summons	1
the Day of Assembling	1	The Day of Assembling	1		
the Day of Resurrection	171	The Day of Resurrection	70	on Resurrection Day	70
the Day of Decision	1	The Day of Decision	5		
the Day of Gathering	1	The Day of Meeting	1	The Day of Gathering/ Meeting	2
the Promised Day -	2	the Promised Day	3		
the Last Day – 26 times	26	the Last Day	27	The Last Day	27
a Great Day/a great day	7+2	a tremendous Day	2		
Hard Day – hard day	1+2	awful day/awful Day	3+6	awful day+ lower case adj+day	6+6
a Mighty Day/ a mighty day	1+1				
the Day of Mutual Meeting	1	the Day of Mutual Disillusion	1		
the True Day	1	The True Day	1		
the Day of sorting out	2	The Day of Separation	1	The Day for Sorting things 4+1	4
the Day of the time appointed	2	The Day of appointed time	3	day of Distinction/ day of Threat	1+1
the Day of grief and regrets	3	a day of anguish	1	The Day of Regret	1
the Day of coming out	1	the day of coming forth	2		
Meeting of a known Day	1				

Table 7.8a: Variation across the three corpora in the use of capital and lower case

Taqi		Pickthall		Irving	
				Some day/ some day	41+1
this Day/ this day	32+16	this day/ This day	28+13	This day/ This Day	5+1
On that Day/ on that day			16+63	On that day/ on that day	15+48
the Day	68			On the day/ on/the day	10+40
their Day	6				
your Day	8	the Day	15		
	3	their Day / their day	2+2	their day/ your Day	4+1
a Day/ A day	23	a Day/ A day	14		
a day	13	a day	27	a day refer to day of Judgement	38

Table 7.8b: variation across the three corpora in the use of capitals and lower case

Tables 7.8a and 7.8b shows that there are clear differences across the three corpora with respect to the phrases used but we still have orthographic priming in all three. Interestingly there are slight variations across the translations in their use of capitals and lower case. The presence of any capitalisation is evidence of priming, but the priming evidently varies in strength across the translations.

In Taqi's translation the reader is strongly primed to associate *day* with a capital letter; it is capitalised 383 times out of 633, accounting for 60.5% of all instances of *day* in his translation. By comparison, when *day* is used to refer to a very special day at the end of time, then it occurs 41.9% of the time with a capital letter in the Pickthall translation and it occurs capitalised 46.2 % of the time in the Irving translation. The percentage looks higher in

Irving's translation compared with that of Pickthall's but there are 101 fewer instances in the number of instances of *day* in Pickthall's translation. The crucial point here is that *Orthographic Priming* is true of all the translations but is strongest in Taqi's Translation.

## 7.10. Conclusion

I have shown that translations differ sometimes in their use of collocations and clusters. I have also shown that some of these collocations are distinctive and specific to the Quranic text compared with the BNC. (e.g. *painful doom*).

The corpora sometimes differ in terms of their frequency of use of clusters. For example, the frequency of the cluster *painful torment* in the Irving and Taqi corpora is much the same: 65 out of 306 instances of *torment* in Irving versus 69 out of 374 in Taqi whereas Pickthall only uses this cluster three times out of 46 instances of *torment*. Another example is the cluster *guidance and mercy* which is less strong in Pickthall's translation than in the other two corpora - Irving's and Taqi's. We have also seen that they differ in terms of pragmatic associations, for example in their expressions of certainty and emphasis in that one of the corpora never uses expressions of certainty and two use emphatic expressions differently.

Finally, I have shown that the three corpora are much alike in terms of punctuation priming i.e. in the use of interrogatives and exclamation marks in conjunction with particular words but there is variation across the three corpora in terms of the proportion of their use.



## **CHAPTER 8**

### **CONCLUSIONS**

#### **8.1. The Implications of Lexical Priming Theory**

An implication of lexical priming is that there is no single language which behaves in the same way in all situations. As a result of that we cannot make a description of the language which is true for every kind of text. Certain texts have a considerable importance for their readers and undisputedly the Quran is prominent amongst these texts; possibly more than any other text in the world, the Quran has a highly significant place in the life of those who read it regularly. In that respect, it is likely that those who read it will be primed by it in such a way that they associate special collocations, colligations, semantic associations and other kinds of associations with vocabulary in the Quran. In this thesis I have sought to show that translations of the Quran into English use English in a way that is distinctive and different. Sometimes it has taken the form of words being used more frequently that are rarer in general English and sometimes it has taken the form of words having different collocations, colligations and semantic associations etc from those of general English.

#### **8.2. The purpose of the thesis: reasons for examining the Quran in translations**

The purpose of the thesis has therefore been threefold. It has been to look at a text and describe the features of this text in enough detail to show how it produces different primings and may have a different effect on its readership from that of the language as a whole. Wherever I have identified examples of words being used in different ways, I have been identifying evidence that there is a separate priming function associated with the Quran.

The second reason for undertaking the investigations repeated in this thesis was that because of the special nature of the Quran, its translations might throw up new kinds of priming, different from those so far identified by Hoey (2005) for everyday language.

The third reason for looking at the Quran in translation has been to study the way in which the language is used in the Quran itself. Given that for a very substantial proportion of population in the world the Quran is the most important text they will ever read, the more we can discover about what is happening in the language of it even in translations, the more useful that will be for its study. It has not been possible to study the Arabic in this thesis because Arabic poses particular problems for corpus linguistic study because of its script but I have tried in places to show where the translations differ from the Arabic and where the translators have had to make decisions that are different because of the differences between the two languages.

### **8.3. Findings of the study**

There have been three kinds of results. The first kind is a result of my applying Lexical Priming Theory to the study of the Quran and because the Quran in translation is a very different kind of text from any other text, it has thrown up a range of new kinds of primings (features of the language) that lexical priming theory has not previously described. Certain features are found to be specific features of the Quran in translation. Other features are found to be characteristics of religious writing in general. These were discovered as a result of comparisons I have made between the QIT and the BNC on the one hand and the RW/BNC and the BIT on the other. Crucially there were features shared across the religious texts. Some of the characteristics of the QinTs will be shared with other kinds of texts. Others are highly distinctive of the QinTs and separate from other kinds of texts.

### 8.3.1. General Findings

We have of course also findings about the words examined that apply to general English as well as to QIT or apply with different strengths in the three corpora. As an example we can refer to the word *torment* which co-occurs with adjectives in both the QIT and the language as a whole but the proportion differs in that *torment* has in the QIT a very strong colligation with adjectives but has a much weaker colligation in the BNC. Other examples are shown as follows:

The BNC, RW/BNC and the QIT all share the colligation of *mercy* with possessives but it is stronger in the QIT than in the BNC or the RW/BNC and the difference is statistically significant: see tables 4.21, table 4.22, and table 4.23.

The colligation of *mercy* with reflexive pronouns is shared between the BNC and the QIT but it is stronger in the QIT than in the BNC and the difference is statistically significant as shown in table 4.25.

An example of a difference between Holy Books and other kinds of writing is that both the QIT and the BIT have *show mercy* (in the context of *mercy*) to a greater extent than the language as a whole (see table 4.10).

Another example is the association of *torment* with emphatic expressions which is a stronger feature in the QIT than in the BNC in that there are only three emphatic expressions in association with *torment* in the BNC. These are *even*, *surely* and *really* which each occur once. There are no emphatic expressions in the BIT in association with *torment* which means that this kind of relationship is much stronger in QIT than in the BNC but it is a QIT specific feature in comparison with the BIT.

The collocation of *believe* with *O* is shared with the BNC but it is stronger in QPT and the difference is statistically significant as table (5.17) shows. *O* is not identified as a collocate of *believe* in the other two corpora, the RW/BNC and the BIT.

The collocation of *believe* in QPT with *revealed* or *revelation* is very strong in QPT and very weak in the BNC and non-existent in the other two corpora (i.e. the RW/BNC and the BIT).

The phrase *they will say* is a significant collocation in the QPT and the statistical test gives evidence of a big difference between QPT and the BNC, the RW/BNC and the BIT in the frequency of *they will say*.

### **8.3.2. Findings which are distinctive for the QITs**

The reflexive pronoun *Ourselves* in connection with *mercy* is a QIT feature only, because it occurs 8 times in the QIT referring to God but in the BNC does not occur at all (see table 4.24). There is no association with reflexive pronouns in the BNC/RW or the Bible and therefore we conclude that this feature is a distinctive feature of QIT.

Likewise the collocates *grant* and *taste* of *mercy* in QIT do not show as collocates in the BNC, the RW/BNC or the BIT and therefore these are also QIT specific features.

*Book* is identified as a collocate of *mercy* in QIT but is not identified as a collocate in the other three corpora. Likewise, the frequency of *mercy for* in the QIT differs from the frequency of *mercy for* in the BNC.

The collocation of *torment* with *taste* in QIT is not identified as a collocate in the BNC, the RW/BNC or the BIT.

Another example is the collocation of *say* with the vocative *O* in QPT which occurs in two contexts. It either occurs with reference to a large number of people such as *O mankind*, *O my*

*people, O people of the scripture* or in the combination *say O Mohammad*. The collocation of *say* with the vocative *O* is a QPT and QTT feature only. There are no instances of *O* associated with *say* in the QIT, RW/ BNC or the BIT which means that this collocation is specific feature to the QPT and the QTT only.

The collocation of *day* with *Resurrection* is a QTT specific feature. *Resurrection* is not listed as a collocate in the BIT.

We noticed a unique referential association in QTT in which the collocates *this* and *that* in association with *day* both refer to a particular day i.e. the *day of Resurrection*.

Another specific referential association in QTT is that the day of Resurrection in QTT is referred to by a range of expressions such as *day of Reckoning, day of coming out, day of decision, day of Mutual Meeting* etc.

The semantic association of *mercy* with Holy Books is specific to QIT. There is no evidence of a semantic association of *mercy* with Holy Books in the BNC, the RW/BNC or the BIT.

The semantic association of *believe* in QPT with [Scripture or] Holy Books is not recognised in the BNC or the other corpora and therefore it is unique to the QPT.

The association of *say* with an exclamatory expressed by *Lo!* in QPT is particular to QPT (it is also found that *Lo!* does not occur in QIT or QTT in association with *say*) as there were no instances of *Lo!* in the RW/BNC associated with *say* and there was only one instance in the BIT associated with *say*.

Other QPT specific features are the two word clusters (as part of the colligation of *will* in the QPT,) '*theirs will be*' and '*Whom He will*'. The RW/BNC and the BIT contain no occurrence of the clusters '*theirs will be*' and '*Whom He will*' and therefore these word clusters are QPT specific features. In the BNC '*theirs will be*' occurs only 4 times out of 262,679 and '*whom*

*he will* ‘ occurs 6 times only which makes the contrast even greater (see table 5.45 and figure 5.32)

We now turn to the original discoveries which I have identified and that are considered as contribution to corpus linguistics.

#### **8.4. Lexical Priming Discoveries**

I also have identified a number of very specific kinds of primings which have not been previously referred to in the linguistic literature and which are considered to be contributions to the field of corpus linguistics in general and to lexical priming theory in particular. Instances of these are **Referential association**, **Pronominal semantic association** and **Priming for figurative language** (in chapter four), **Punctuation priming** (in chapter five) and **Orthographic priming** (in chapter six)

The first of these new kinds of priming is a kind of semantic association but it is different from semantic association as usually defined. It occurs when a word or an expression refers out of the text into the world and what it refers to is always of the same kind. This is what I refer to as ***exophoric Referential association***.

The second new kind of priming also relates to semantic association and it occurs that when we have a word which occurs frequently in the context and therefore looks like a collocation but refers to different members of a semantic set. For example the pronoun *they* collocates with *torment* (in the examples given in the study) but does not refer to the same people on each occasion. *They* might on some occasions refer to people who suffer the torment, it might on a few occasions refer to people who escaped the torment. So there are different referents but the same pronoun. This kind of semantic association is different from referential

association and I call it *Pronominal Semantic Association*. Both this and the previous new kind of priming make use of reference.

The third new kind of priming is priming with *figurative language*. The association of *mercy* and *torment* with *taste* is evidence that *mercy* and *torment* have been used figuratively. Mercy cannot be tasted and is not a food (see chapter 4)

The fourth new kind of lexical priming I have identified occurs in connection with exclamation marks and question marks. This is like a textual colligation relationship but the colligation is with punctuation marks rather than with textual position as such. I call this *punctuation priming*. For example it was noticed that the word *say*, which is not a question word, co-occurs with a certain kind of punctuation, the exclamation mark (!) and the question mark (?), with a high frequency in the QIT in the three translations. *Say* occurs one in three times with an exclamation mark or question mark. The reader is therefore primed to associate it in QIT with these punctuation marks. This is an interesting finding and the point here is that the BNC doesn't permit one to identify this kind of priming.

The final new type of lexical priming identified is that of *orthographic priming*; which refers to an orthographic indication that a particular word or phrase has a unique referent, such as the capitalisation of *day* indicating unambiguously that it refers to the Day of Resurrection. (See chapter 6).

Now that they have been identified, these kinds of priming can be investigated in other kinds of texts. It is not an accident that they occur or are recognised in the first place in translations of the Quran; it is because the Quran is such a different kind of text from those which are typically used in corpora that it has thrown up important findings about language in its study. This draws attention to the risks that any linguist takes of working only with a general corpus or with particular well studied kinds of writing. These will necessarily reflect the kinds of

features of language that have been described before. Looking at a distinctive kind of text such as the Quran text is more likely to uncover new kinds of priming and it is to be expected that other distinctive texts will throw up similar kinds of new forms of priming effect.

In one sense the language of the Quran is an extreme case of something that is true more generally. This is that the BNC or any general corpus mixes together all sorts of different kinds of texts and then overall from those texts certain features and patterns come out having certain frequencies but actually every kind of text has its own special linguistic features and patterns. This has been shown to be true of such kinds of texts as novels, newspapers, and advertisements. What I am doing is adding a very special kind of text to these, one that is special in many ways. Some of these ways are as follows:

First of all, most profoundly, it is a unique text created in a unique way.

Secondly, of course, it is a translated text in that the meaning is translated but the translation has to be as close as it can be to the original.

Thirdly, it is read in a different kind of way because it is repeatedly read and for those who are devoted Muslims the language will repeatedly prime them in a way that is not true of any other kind of text.

It is a text from a class of holy texts and therefore shares features with a small number of other holy texts.

All of these grounds make it the object of a unique stylistic analysis and this study is, as far as I can tell, the first study to deal with stylistic features for translations of the Quran using corpus linguistic techniques. We can also note that there are theological implications to the distinctive features identified. Although it would not be appropriate in this thesis to go into these in any detail I will give two brief instances as follows:



### **8.5. Implications about Allah and references to Allah in connection with saying**

The association of *say* with *Allah* and with references to Allah is a linguistic reflection of the fact that the Quran is understood to have been dictated by God to Mohammed. It is entirely natural that the text should reflect that understanding. In other words what is traditionally said about the Quran is supported by the kind of language there is inside the Quran.

### **8.6. The high use of *shall* and *will* in connection with the word *day* when used in the phrase *Day of Judgement*.**

The implication is that all the instances of *will* and *shall* that refer to the future and always refer to the final future event represent the future in a particular kind of way. If one is an atheist and has no belief in God then there is no sense in which there is a cut off point to the future; the future goes on and on forever. If on the other hand one is a member of the three faiths of the book, Muslim or Jew or Christian, then one believes (in different ways) that there is a cut off point, a final point, a Day of Judgment. It is the same for Muslims and Christians and Jews – it is the day when the Messiah will come, so all three have a point at which the future in some way stops in the sense that history will stop. My finding concerning the association of *will* + *day of Judgement* is that firstly the Quran is about preparing yourself for that day of Judgement and secondly it is defining the ultimate *will*; there is no *will* beyond that *will* because at that point we move into a period where there is no history, no future in that sense. Those who are saved will be there (in paradise) and those who aren't will be damned and there will be no change to their state. That is a theological point but it grows very directly out of the language.

## 8.7. Future Research

The kinds of research that linguists might want to undertake and which might be of great benefit to the field of corpus linguistics and translation are various.

- 1- A study might, for instance, be made of how the language of Muslims is affected by their knowledge of the Quran. So for example one might want to get English-speaking Muslims to talk about God's mercy and find out whether their discussion of mercy is different from that of someone without experience of the Quran either in the original form or in translation.
- 2- A study could be done of the language which people speak in a religious context to see whether the language is different from the language of ordinary people.
- 3- Another kind of study one might want to consider is on the BIT. One might identify keywords there, explore their function and then look at the key features in the BIT and at whether they are present in the QinTs or not.
- 4- Another kind of research might look more closely at all the special kinds of lexical priming features (orthographic priming, punctuation priming etc) to see whether they occur in other unusual kinds of writings, at the same time examining these writings to see whether there are any other kinds of special priming. Since I have added five different kinds of priming on the basis of an unusual text, the implication is that there might be other special kinds of priming that might be identified in other unusual texts.
- 5- One of the things that will be worth investigating is how chapters of the Quran in translation may prime people. For example, one could look at people of different faiths who are reading the Quran or people who are Muslim, but from different ethnic groups and who have different languages or cultures. If we were to ask some people to read the translations of the chapters, one might then ask them to give their interpretation of what they have read and one can discover whether they were using

the language in the same way as the text they have read. Another question also would be whether their understanding of the Quran in translation coincides with orthodox readings of the original Arabic and also to see whether their understanding is affected by the language of the Quran or by their cultures and their own opinions and views in interpreting texts.

- 6- And finally, the most obvious future research is a corpus study of the Arabic of the Quranic original. This would allow one to identify authoritatively the features of the Quran and to compare them with its translations.

## Bibliography

- Al-Azami, Muhammad Mustafa .2003. *The History of the Qur'anic Text from Revelation to Compilation: A Comparative Study with the Old and New Testaments*. Leicester: UK Islamic Academy.
- Abdelwali, Mohammad. 2007. 'The loss in the translation of the Qur'an' *Translation Journal and the Author*. VII, No 2.
- Abdul Haleem, M.A.S. 1999. *Understanding the Quran: Themes and Style*. London: I.B. Tauris Publisher.
- Abdalhaqq, and Bewley Aisha. 1999. *The Noble Qur'an: A New Rendering of its Meaning in English*. London: Bookwork. Norwich. . . .
- Al- Hilali, Taqi-ue Din & Khan, M.M. 1996. *The Noble Quran*. Riyad: Darussalam.
- Abou Sheishaa Mohammed, A.M .2003. 'A Study of the Fatwa by Rashid Rida on the Translation of the Quran". *Journal of the Society for Qur'anic Studies*, Vol 1. Islamic Writings.
- Abu 'Ubaid, Qasim b. Saliem. *Fadii'il al-Qyr'iin*,(sic) ed. M. al- 'Atiyya et al Damascus, 1415/ 1995).[Sic]
- Abul Qasim al Khui Ayatullah. Sayyid (nd) *The Collection and Preservation of the Qur'an. Two Important Chapters from Albayan fi Tafsiril Qur'an-* translated from the Arabic by Mulla Asghar Ali M.M Jaffer. Stammers, Middlesex: Madrasa As Syed al Khui.
- Alsaid. M. S, 1989. Major Problems in Translating Kuranic Meanings into English. M.A thesis. Irbid: Yarmouk University. Language Centre.
- Arthur Jeffery, 1937. *Materials for the History of the Text of the Qur'an*. Leiden, The Old Codices. E J Brill.
- Alsoouteey, Galal-Aldeen. 1973. *Alitqan fee Uloom Alquran*. Bairut: Almaktabah.
- Az-Zarkakhshi, Badruddin. (nd) *al-Burhiinfi 'Uliim al- Qyr'iin*, ed. M. Abu al-Fadl Ibrahim, 4 vols. (Cairo, 1376/1957).
- Badawi, Jamal. 2008. 'Translation of the Quran (part one): Meaning and Development'. Canada: *Muslim Intellectual*.
- Badawi, Jamal. 2008. "Translation of the Quran (Part Two): Problems of Translation Canada: *Muslim Intellectual*.
- Baker, M. 1992. *In Other Words: A Course Book on Translation*. London: Routledge.
- Baker, Paul. 2006. *Using Corpora in Discourse Analysis*. London: Continuum.
- Bassnett, S.2002. *Translation Studies*.(3<sup>rd</sup> edn). London and New York: Routledge.
- Beekman, John and Callow John. 1974. *Translating the Word of God*. Michigan: Zondervan.

- Bell, Roger, T. 1991. *Translation and Translating: Theory and Practice*. London and New York: Longman.
- Biber, D., S. Johansson, G. Leech, S. Conrad and E. Finegan. 1999. *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. Harlow: Longman.
- Burton, John, 2010. *The Collection of the Quran*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Catford, J. C. 1967. *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Chomsky, Noam .1957. *Syntactic Structures*. Amsterdam: Mouton.
- Chomsky, Noam 1965. *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. The MIT Press: Cambridge.
- Clear, Jeremy. 1993. 'From Firth principles: Computational tools for the study of collocation' Baker, Mona, Francis, Gill and Bonelli Tognin, Elena (eds) *Text and Technology in the Honour of John Sinclair*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins
- Cook, Guy. 2003. *Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Daryabadi, Abdul Majid 2002. *The Glorious Quran: Text, Translation & Commentary*. UK: The Islamic Foundation Trust.
- Denffer, Von. Ahmad .1981. *Ulum al Qur'an: An Introduction to the Science of the Quran*. Leicester: The Islamic Foundation.
- El-Farran, Shadi. 2006, 'The problem in translating the Noble Quran'. USA: *Ahl AlQuran: Intellectual Quranic Centre*.
- Elsayed, M.H.O .1988. 'Islam, the Quran and the Arabic literature'. *Al-Serat- AJournal of Islamic Studies* Vol XIV. No 1.
- Firth, J. R .1957. *Papers in Linguistics*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Gentzler, Edwin. 2001. *Contemporary Translation Theories*. 2<sup>nd</sup>(edn). London: Cromwell Press Ltd.
- Gilchrist, John. 1989. *Jam' Al- Qur'an- The Codification of the Qur'an Text: A Comparative Study of the Original Collection of the Qur'an Text and the Early Surviving Qur'an Manuscripts*. Mondeor: MERSCA
- Glasse, Cyril. 2001. *The New Encyclopaedia of Islam. (Revised edition of the Concise Encyclopaedia of Islam)*. Lanham. New York: AltaMira press.
- Gries, Stefan Th. 2009. *Quantitative Corpus Linguistics with R: A Practical Introduction*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Halliday, M .A. K and Hasan, R. 1976. *Cohesion in English*. London. Longman.
- Halliday, M.A.K. & Z.L. James. 1993. "A quantitative Study of Polarity and Primary Tense in the English Finite clause" in Sinclair, J.M; Hoey, M & G Fox (eds) *Techniques of Description; Spoken and Written Discourse*. London: Routledge.
- Hartmann, R, R.K and Stock, F.C. 1972. *Dictionary of Language and Linguistics*. Amsterdam: Applied Science Publishers

- Hatim, Basil and Munday, Jeremy. 2004. *Translation. An Advanced Resource Book*. London: Routledge.
- Hoey, Michael. 1997. 'From corpus to text structure: new uses for computer corpora' B, Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk & P.J.Melia (eds) *Practical Applications of Language Corpora PALC (Proceedings)* Lodz: Lodz University Press.
- Hoey, M. 2005. *Lexical Priming: A New Theory of Words and Language*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Hosni Abdul Moneim, A. (ed) 1990. 'On translating the Quran (an introductory essay) *Journal of the King Saud University, Vol 2*.
- Hunston, S. 2002, *Corpora in Applied Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Irving, Thomas. B. 1992. *The Noble Qur'an: Arabic Text and English Translation*. USA: Amana Books.
- J McH, Sinclair .2004. *Trust the Text: Language: Corpus and Discourse*. (edited by Ron Carter) London: Routledge.
- Kennedy, G.1998. *An Introduction to Corpus Linguistics*. London: Longman.
- Kidawi, A. R. 1987. 'Translating the untranslatable - A survey of English translations of the Quran,' *The Muslim World Book Review*, Vol. 7, No. 4, Summer 1, available at <http://soundvision.com/Qur'an/English.shtml>
- Khalifa, Mohammed. 2005. 'Translation: Tried & True'.  
[www.cyberistan.org/islamic/translate.htm](http://www.cyberistan.org/islamic/translate.htm)
- Leech, Geoffrey. 2001. 'The role of frequency in ELT: new corpus evidence brings a re-appraisal'. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.
- Lefevere, A 1975. *Translating poetry: Seven Strategies and a Blueprint*. Assen/ Amsterdam: Van Gorcum.
- Louw, B .1993. "Irony in the text or insincerity in the writer? the diagnostic potential of semantic prosodies," in M. Baker et al (eds) *Text and Technology*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Ludeling, A, and Kyto, M. 2008. *Corpus Linguistics: An International Handbook*. Volume 1, New York: Walter de Gruyter. Berlin.
- Mahlberg, M. 2007. "Cluster, key clusters and local textual functions in Dickens", *Corpora: Corpus-Based Language Learning Processing and Linguistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- McAuliffe, Jane Dammen.2003. *Encyclopaedia of the Quran*. Vol (3) J-O. Brill, Leiden Boston.
- McAuliffe, Jane Dammen.2004. *Encyclopaedia of the Quran*. Vol (4). Brill, Leiden- Boston.

- McEnery, T. & Wilson, A. 2004. *Corpus Linguistics* (2<sup>nd</sup> edition). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Meetham, A.R. and Hudson, R. A. 1969. *Encyclopaedia in Linguistics. Information and Control*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Mohammed, Khaleel. 2005. 'Assessing English translations of the Qur'an'. V x11: N2. *The Middle East Quarterly*. Middle East Forum. Philadelphia.
- Morgan, G. A., Leech, N. L., Gloeckner, G.W., & Barrett, K. C. 2007. *SPSS for Introductory Statistics: Use and Interpretation* 3<sup>rd</sup> (edn). Mahwah, New Jersey London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Munday, Jeremy. 2002. *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*. London: Routledge.
- Musaji, Sheila, 2006. 'Through the looking glass: Hilali- khan Quran Translation' *The American Muslim (TAM)*.
- Murata, S and Chittick, W. C .2004. *The Koran*. (publisher and Vol N not supplied).
- Nassimi, Daoud. M. 2008. A Thematic Comparative Review of Some English Translations of the Qur'an. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Birmingham: The University of Birmingham.
- Newmark, Peter. 1988. *A Textbook of Translation*. Hemel Hempstead: Prentice Hall International: UK Ltd.
- Newmark, Peter 2001. *About Translation*. Sydney: Multilingual Matters LTD:
- Nida, Eugene. A. and C. Taber 1969. *The Theory and Practice of Translation*, Leiden: Brill.
- Nida, Eugene, A. 1976. A Framework for the analysis and evaluation of theories of translation: in Brislin (ed) "*Translation Application and Research*". New York: Gardener Press INC.
- Pickthall, M. M. 2002. *The Meaning of the Glorious Qura'an: Explanatory* . Beltsville, Maryland, USA: Amana publications.
- Pullum, Geoffery K. 2006. *Ungrammaticality, Rarity, and Corpus use. Corpus Linguistics and Linguistic Theory*.
- Qadhi, Abu-Ammaar Yasir. 1999. *An Introduction to the Sciences of the Qur'an*. Birmingham: Al- Hidayah publishing.
- El-Rakhway, Trandil. 2006. 'An approach to the translation of the meaning of the Quran into English'. Egypt. *Al- Azhar*. Vol number not supplied in the original
- Saheeh International. 2009. *Translation of the Meanings of the Quran*. Riyadh: Al Muntada Al-Islami Trust. [sic]
- Saqr, Attyah .2006. 'Fatwa on Translating the Quran'. IslamicOnline.net fatwa bank-sciences of the Quran.

- Saudi, Sadiq. 2008. 'Some semantic, stylistic and cultural problems of translation with special reference to translating the Glorious Quran'. *Syaab Translation Journal (SIJ)*. Volume 1, Egypt: Elmina University.
- Scott, M. (1997) *Wordsmith Tools (Software)*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Scott, M. and Tribble, C .2006. *Textual Patterns: Key Words and Corpus Analysis in Language Education*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Shadi. 2006, 'The problem in translating the Noble Quran'. USA: *Ahl AlQuran: Intellectual Quranic centre*.
- Sinclair, J. 1991. *Corpus, Concordance, Collocation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sinclair, John. 2005. *Collins Cobuild English Grammar*. (2<sup>nd</sup> edn). Glasgow: Harper Collins Publishers.
- Stewart, D. 2010. *Semantic Prosody. A Critical Evaluation*. New York: Routledge.
- Stubbs, M. 1995. *Corpus Evidence for Norms of Lexical Collocation*, Oxford. Oxford University Press.
- Stubbs, M. 2001. *Words and Phrase: Corpus studies of lexical semantics*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Stubbs, M. 2005. 'Conrad in the Computer: Examples of Quantitative Stylistics Methods'. *Language and Literature* 14 (1), pp.5-24.
- Teubert, Wolfgang and Cermakova Anna,. 2007, *Corpus Linguistics: A Short Introduction*. London: Continuum.
- Tibawi, A. L. 1962. 'Is the Quran translatable'? Early Muslim opinions'. *The Muslim World*, Vol. 52
- Thomas, J & Short, M. 1996. *Using Corpora for Language Research*. New York: Longman Publishing.
- Tzortzis, Hamza Andreas. 2006. *The inimitable Quran - The Qur'ans Unique Literary Form*.
- Wansbrough, John. 2004. *Quranic Studies: Sciences and Methods of Scriptural Interpretation: Foreword, Translation, and Expanded Notes* by Andrew Rippin. New York: Prometheus Books.
- Winter, Eugene. 1982. *Towards a Contextual Grammar of English* London: George Allen & Unwin.