Research Journal in Advanced Humanities

RJAH

https://doi.org/10.58256/qpnsqt70

Open Access

Check for updates

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Section: *Philosophy & Religion*

The emotion expression غضب (anger) in Holy Quran: A semantic and discourse analysis

Nashwa Khudair Abbas[1]* & **Manaf Abdul Hussain Mahdi**[1]

[1]Department of English, College of Education for Human Sciences, University of Kerbala, Iraq

*Correspondence: nashwa.k@s.uokerbala.edu.iq

ABSTRACT

This research examines the emotion expression of غضب (anger) in the Holy Quran via an integrated semantic and discourse analysis. It examines the 14 occurrences of غضب in its selected nominal form in the Holy Quran at the lexical-semantic, contextual, and discourse levels through qualitative textual analysis. Lexical-semantic analysis is based on classical Arabic lexicography, structural semantics, semantic field theory, and componential analysis; contextual analysis draws on both Quranic context and selected exegeses; and discourse analysis applies text linguistics and rhetorical discourse analysis. The findings reveal that غضب is characterised by intensity and strong displeasure and is semantically near-synonymous with طخس (displeasure) and ظيغ (rage) albeit with diagnostic distinctions. At the contextual level, 13 instances of غضب refer to Divine punitive anger while one refers to human emotional anger, revealing the significance of attribution and context. Cohesion and coherence integrate these meanings within connected textual units, while repetition and parallelism foreground their semantic distinctions as well as their discourse functions. Accordingly, the study demonstrates that the Quranic use of غضب extends beyond the representation of emotion to participate in the organisation and evaluation of relations among conduct, authority, transgression, and response

KEYWORDS: غضب (anger), emotion expression, semantic analysis, contextual analysis, discourse Analysis, Holy Quran

Research Journal in Advanced Humanities

Volume 8, Issue 1, 2027

ISSN: 2708-5945 (Print)

ISSN: 2708-5953 (Online)

ARTICLE HISTORY

Submitted **20 August 2026**

Accepted: **11 November 2026**

Published: 01 **January 2027**

HOW TO CITE

Abbas, N. K., & Hussain Mahdi, M. A. (2027). The emotion expression غضب (anger) in Holy Quran: A semantic and discourse analysis. *Research Journal in Advanced Humanities*, *8*(1). https://doi.org/10.58256/qpnsqt70

Published in Nairobi, Kenya by Royallite Global, an imprint of Royallite Publishers Limited

© 2027 The Author(s). This is an open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Introduction

Emotion is not merely an internal psychological state but is expressed and constructed by means of language and communication. Linguistic analysis of emotion expressions involves the encoding of their affective and evaluative meaning: expressive meaning encodes subjective feelings and attitudes (Cruse, 2011); and emotion expression adds affective and interpersonal information to discourse (Mackenzie & Alba-Juez, 2019).

The study of emotional meaning thus involves a complementary perspective, a lexical-semantic one and a discourse one. While the first focuses on the features and relations of a semantic nature, the second considers how meaning works in the wider textual contexts. Their interplay is significant since emotional meaning is contingent on the form and context (Kövecses, 2000; Mackenzie & Alba-Juez, 2019).

This context-orientated approach is especially appropriate for emotion expressions since their interpretation is dependent on linguistic and cultural context (Plutchik, 1994). The current research adopts this approach to the analysis of بغض (anger) in the Holy Quran, investigating the lexical-semantic characteristics, context realisation, and functioning of the expression in the Quranic discourse.

Consequently, the current research integrates semantic and discourse analysis to investigate the ways of constructing the meaning of بغض.

Anger as an Expression of Emotion

Emotion can be described as a multicomponent process including appraisal, physiological response, motivation, expression, and subjectivity (Scherer, 2005). From this standpoint, emotion is not reduced merely to subjective feelings but consists of a number of coordinated changes initiated as a response to events considered important to a person. Scherer (2005) defines anger as one of the emotions related to adaptive reactions to the events carrying consequences for human wellbeing and action.

At the same time, anger does not have to be perceived as a fully uniform emotion in terms of various languages and cultures. According to Kövecses (2000), concepts corresponding to anger display both shared and culture-specific properties, and their conceptual complexity is mirrored in the linguistic and cultural realisation of the concept. However, Kövecses' cross-linguistic description of anger reveals a broader scheme in which this emotion is linked to the eliciting event, the emergence of the emotional state, and its subsequent expression. The presence of both shared and specific characteristics points to the necessity of analysing anger within its own linguistic and cultural environment.

In Arabic, بغض (anger) must therefore be approached through its own lexical and textual environment rather than assumed to be semantically identical to the English label 'anger'. Classical Arabic lexical sources show that the interpretation of بغض is variable, dependent on attribution (Ibn Faris, 1979;Al-Isfahani, 2016; Ibn Manzur, 1999). These considerations provide the conceptual basis to analyse the semantic and contextual realisation of بغض and its function in Quranic discourse.

Semantic Analysis

The semantic approach starts with Classical Arabic lexicography of the lexical item, and it is complemented by structural semantics, semantic field theory, and componential analysis. The lexical sources in Classical Arabic help in identifying the root meaning and lexical characteristics of بغض (anger), whereas three different semantic theories respectively analyse its lexical relations, broader semantic domain, and the semantic features that distinguish it from related expressions.

The theory of structural semantics analyses meaning in terms of lexical relations in the lexicon of a language (Lyons, 1995). In relation to synonymy, Cruse (2011) distinguishes among absolute synonymy, propositional synonymy, and near synonymy. Absolute synonyms are completely interchangeable within any context without the slightest difference in their meanings; on the other hand, propositional synonyms share the same propositional content but may differ in their expressive meanings. Near-synonyms are lexical items that have meanings which overlap with each other but retain certain semantic distinctions.

In Semantic Field Theory, the meanings of the lexical items are analysed through their semantic association network, where their meanings are determined by their place in a larger lexical system (Lyons, 1963, 1968, 1977a).

In componential analysis, the meaning of the lexical items is represented as a set of semantic features

(Cruse, 2011; Crystal, 2010; Lyons, 1995). Nida (1975) makes a distinction between common components, which are semantic features that are common among a group of lexical items, and diagnostic semantic components, which are used to distinguish one lexical item from another within the same semantic domain.

Contextual Analysis

Context is crucial in understanding meaning, as linguistic expressions cannot be completely understood apart from their contextual settings. The contextual meaning comes out as the product of the interplay between linguistic form and relevant contextual knowledge (Levinson, 1983; Leech, 1983; Lyons, 1977b). Linguistic context, or co-text, is especially relevant since the words and expressions surrounding the word give information that helps clarify the meaning of a lexical item in a particular textual context (Yule, 2020).

Discourse Analysis

Discourse analysis analyses the construction and relationships of meanings beyond words and sentences (Gee, 1999; Paltridge, 2012). Within discourse analysis, text linguistics investigates textual connectivity and continuity of sense (Beaugrande & Dressler, 1981), while rhetorical discourse analysis explores how linguistic patterns contribute to rhetorical meaning.

Text linguistics analyses the relationships that make a text a communicatively meaningful entity. Beaugrande and Dressler (1981) define textuality through seven criteria, among which cohesion is the relationship among the linguistic elements on the surface level, whereas coherence is the relationship among the concepts creating continuity of meaning.

Rhetorical discourse analysis shifts attention from the connectivity of the text to the way linguistic patterning makes the meanings in the discourse prominent and effective. The repetition of certain elements in discourse makes the meaning more emphasised and even emotionally effective (Wales, 2011), whereas parallelism can foreground semantic contrasts through structurally corresponding expressions (Leech, 1969; McGuigan, 2007).

Previous Studies

Ulah (2019) studies بضغ (anger) in Hamka's Tafsir Al-Azhar via thematic interpretation and content analysis, highlighting the regulatory approaches of anger control through remembrance of Allah, patience, forgiveness, and virtuous conduct. The study emphasises the thematic-exegetical perspective of بضغ without conducting an integrated linguistic analysis of بضغ on semantic, contextual, and discursive levels.

Khasanah (2021) employs the semantic perspective of Toshihiko Izutsu to study the basic, relational, and historical meaning of بضغ and its Quranic Weltanschauung by contrasting Divine and human بضغ and analysing the relationship between بضغ, ظيغ (rage), طخس (displeasure), ربصلا (patience), and ملحلا (forbearance). While the study contextualises بضغ in the human life experience, it does not analyse its textual and rhetorical functions within Quranic discourse.

Annisa (2022) applies a semiotic approach to the comparison of بضغ and ظيغ to conclude that these two terms are semantically distinguishable and ظيغ symbolises a high level of anger. The study is more about the semiotic and synonymic distinction of بضغ than its contextual and discursive functions.

Azhar (2024) compares the concepts of بضغ, ظيغ, طخس, and مظك (restraint of anger) through qualitative thematic interpretation and shows different forms and degrees of anger and dissatisfaction. The study's focus is on the thematic and synonymic dimension of بضغ, not on its discourse organisation.

Uyuni et al. (2026) integrate classical Arabic lexicography with corpus-linguistic analysis of five near-synonymous pairs of terms in the Holy Quran, including بضغ and طخس. Their findings distinguish بضغ as emotional anger from طخس as Divine displeasure; however, the study does not deal with the contextual and discourse functions of بضغ in the Holy Quran.

Collectively, the five previous studies have investigated بضغ through thematic-exegetical, semantic, semiotic, synonymic, and corpus-linguistic perspectives. However, they give limited attention to the systematic integration of lexical-semantic analysis with contextual realisation and textual-rhetorical functioning in connected Quranic discourse. The current study aims to fill this gap by undertaking interconnected lexical-semantic, contextual, and discourse analyses of بضغ.

Methodology

This research adopts qualitative textual analysis of بغض (anger) in the Holy Quran. The Arabic data are based on the Cairo Edition (1924, riwayah Hafs an Asim) of the Quranic text, while Ali Quli Qara'i's (2005) *The Qur'an: With a Phrase-by-Phrase English Translation* provides the English renderings. The interpretation of the expression under analysis is conducted based on the Arabic text and Arabic lexicographic and exegesis sources.

The data consist of the 14 occurrences of بغض in the selected nominal lexical form, while verbal and adjectival derivatives of ب-ض-غ are not considered to ensure consistency of the unit of analysis. These occurrences are found in Al-Baqarah (2:61; 2:90, two occurrences), Al-Imran (3:112), Al-Araf (7:71; 7:152; 7:154), Al-Anfal (8:16), Al-Nahl (16:106), Taha (20:81, two occurrences; 20:86), Al-Nur (24:9), and Al-Shura (42:16). These occurrences have been identified using the digital Quranic corpus Tanzil (n.d.), while manual checking has been done against the Arabic Quranic text, where the surah, verse, and context have been indicated for each occurrence.

The analysis is conducted at three levels that are interrelated. Firstly, lexical-semantic analysis employs Ibn Faris (1979), Al-Isfahani (2016), and Ibn Manzur (1999) to gather Classical Arabic lexical evidence; Cruse (2011) for semantic relations and componential analysis; Lyons (1977a) for semantic field theory; and Nida (1975) for common and diagnostic components.

Secondly, contextual analysis establishes how بغض is realised in each particular Quranic context, with the help of comparative analysis by Al-Tabrisi (2006), Al-Tabari (2010), Al-Tabatabai (1997), and Qutb (2003). Contextual meanings that have similar or close meanings are grouped accordingly.

Thirdly, discourse analysis investigates the role played by these contextual meanings within the connected Quranic text units. Beaugrande and Dressler's (1981) Text Linguistics is applied to examine cohesion and coherence, focusing on continuity within the surface text and continuity of sense across the selected units. Rhetorical discourse analysis investigates the role of repetition and parallelism in rhetorical foregrounding and the communicative force of meaning, as provided by Leech (1969), Wales (2011), and McGuigan (2007). Regarding the discourse analysis, one representative occurrence of بغض was selected for each of the two contextual meanings identified in the contextual analysis. The verse containing each selected occurrence was then examined within a connected textual unit comprising the surrounding verses relevant to its discourse context. Accordingly, the discourse analysis was conducted on two representative textual units rather than on all fourteen occurrences.

Data Analysis

The fourteen nominal occurrences of بغض (anger) form the basis of the lexical-semantic and contextual analyses, whereas the discourse analysis focuses on two selected textual units representing the contextual meanings identified in the analysis.

1. Lexical-Semantic Analysis of Anger

Based on Classical Arabic lexical sources, بغض (anger) is mainly characterised as an emotion that is associated primarily with intensity and strong displeasure. According to Ibn Faris (1979), ب-ض-غ denotes الشدة (intensity) and القوة (strength), and بغض is explained through the intensification of سخط (displeasure). Al-Isfahani (2016) makes the distinction between human and Divine attribution in that human بغض entails agitation of the blood of the heart and a wish for revenge, while Divine بغض is seen as retribution and not an emotion experienced or physiological reaction of humans. Similarly, Ibn Manzur (1999) sees بغض as ضيق الرضا (opposite of satisfaction) and associates Divine attribution of بغض with condemnation and punishment. Thus, the lexical evidence indicates that the attribution plays a central role in the semantic realisation of بغض.

Structural semantic analysis of بغض in connection with سخط and غيظ(rage) is based on the distinctions drawn in the selected classical Arabic lexical sources. It is clear from the sources that there is a close semantic connection between the three expressions, although there are certain distinguishing characteristics of a lexical nature as well. In light of the classification provided by Cruse (2011) of different types of synonymy, one could state that the relation of بغض to سخط and بغض to غيظ could be referred to as near synonymy.

Following Lyons'(1977a) semantic field theory, the semantic field analysis of بغض locates it as part of a larger conceptual field of transgression and retribution. Some of the lexical expressions that are connected to

transgression are كفر (disbelief), عصيان (disobedience), and اعتداء (transgression) in Surah Al-Baqarah (2:61), كفر in Surah Al-Nahl (16:106), افتراء (fabrication) in Surah Al-Araf (7:152), and طغيان (excess) in Surah Taha (20:81). On the other hand, some lexical expressions that are associated with retribution are ذلة (humiliation) and مسكنة (wretchedness) in Surah Al-Baqarah (2:61) and Al-Imran (3:112), رجس (affliction) in Surah Al-Araf (7:71), عذاب (punishment) in Al-Baqarah (2:90), Al-Nahl (16:106), and Al-Shura (42:16), جهنم (Hell) in Al-Anfal (8:16), and هوى (ruin) in Taha (20:81). These expressions are dealt with as conceptually related lexical items rather than as synonyms of غضب.

Following the componential approach of Cruse (2011) and Nida's (1975) distinction between common and diagnostic semantic components, componential analysis further elucidates how غضب, سخط, and غيظ are semantically related by comparing the common and diagnostic semantic features of these expressions. Semantic features identified in the above lexical analyses serve as a foundation for comparison. The semantic features included in the matrix were derived from the lexical descriptions provided by Ibn Faris (1979), Al-Isfahani (2016), and Ibn Manzur (1999), and were organised for comparison following the componential approach adopted in the study. A plus sign means that a semantic feature is explicitly identified in the selected lexical sources, while a minus sign indicates only that the feature is not identified as a defining feature in these sources; it does not necessarily imply the complete absence of that feature. The componential comparison is given in Table 1.

Table 1. Componential Comparison of غضب (anger), سخط (displeasure), and غيظ (rage)

No.	Semantic Feature	غضب (anger)	سخط (displeasure)	غيظ (rage)
1	Intensity	+	+	+
2	Dissatisfaction	+	+	-
3	Agitation	+	-	+
4	Retaliation	+	-	-
5	Dislike	-	+	-
6	Punishment	+	+	-
7	Greater intensity	-	-	+

The comparison reveals that غضب, سخط, and غيظ are characterised by a feature of intensity, but the diagnostic features differ among them. In غضب and سخط, the common feature is dissatisfaction, while in سخط, the distinguishing feature is dislike. The common feature between غضب and غيظ is agitation, while غيظ is characterised by greater intensity. Retaliation is specific to human غضب, while punishment is shared between غضب and سخط in Divine attribution. The feature matrix thus describes the potential lexical semantic features, not implying that every feature is equally prominent in every Quranic occurrence; context-specific realisations are examined separately in the contextual analysis.

2. Contextual Analysis of Anger

The contextual analysis categorises the nominal occurrences of غضب (anger) depending on the context that appears around them in the Quran and the selected exegeses of Al-Tabrisi (2006), Al-Tabari (2010), Al-Tabatabai (1997), and Qutb (2003). These classifications are represented in Table 2.

Table 2. Contextual Classification of the Quranic Occurrences of غضب (anger)

No.	Contextual Meaning	Representative Verse	Supporting Occurrences	Total
1	Divine Punitive Anger	Al-Araf (7:71)	Al-Baqarah (2:61; 2:90, first occurrence; 2:90, second occurrence); Al-Imran (3:112); Al-Araf (7:152); Al-Anfal (8:16); Al-Nahl (16:106); Taha (20:81, first occurrence; 20:81, second occurrence; 20:86); Al-Nur (24:9); Al-Shura (42:16)	13
2	Human Emotional Anger	Al-Araf (7:154)	-	1
	Total			14

2.1 Divine Punitive Anger

In this contextual meaning, بضغ (anger) is related to Divine punishment directed to those who persist in disobedience and rejection of Divine authority. This meaning is clearly stated in Al-Araf (7:71):

> نإطَلْسُ نمِ اهَبِ ُلَّلا لَزَّنَ امَّ مكُؤُابَآوَ مْتُنأَ اهومُتْيَمَّسَ ءامَسْأَ يفِ يِنِنَولُدِاجَتُأَ بِّضَغَوَ سِّجِر مْكُيْلَعَ عَقَوَ دْقَ لَاقَ —
> نَيرِظِتَنمُلْا نَمِّ مكُعَمَ يِنِّإِ اورُظِتَنافَ
>
> — "He said, 'There has become due against you a punishment and wrath from your Lord. Do you dispute with me regarding names which you have named—you and your fathers—for which Allah has not sent down any authority? So wait!'"
> (Al-Araf 7:71; Qara'i, 2005, p. 216)

In this verse, بضغ (anger) is directly related to Divine punishment. In his interpretation of the word سجر as punishment, al-Tabrisi (2006) defines Divine بضغ as the punishment which is meant for those deserving it, with the concluding command اورظتنااف (so wait) further emphasising the punishment which is awaited. Similar to this view, al-Tabari (2010) mentions that punishment and بضغ of Allah, the Exalted, had become incumbent upon the people of Prophet Hud. Similarly, al-Tabatabai (1997) links the words بضغ and سجر to the people of Prophet Hud's separation from Allah, the Exalted, due to their insistence on idolatry and the threat of punishment falling upon them as a result of it. Qutb (2003) similarly links بضغ to an unavoidable Divine punishment which was incumbent upon them.

2.2 Human Emotional Anger

In human attribution, بضغ (anger) refers to an emotional condition undergone by Prophet Musa. It is reflected in Al-Araf (7:154):

> نَوبُهَرْيَ مْهِبِّرَلِ مْهُنَيذِلَّلِ ٌةَمْحَرَوَ ىدًهُ اهَتِخَسْنُ يفِوَ حَاوَلْأَلْا ذَخَأَ بُضَغْلْا ىسَومُ نعَ تَكَسَ امَّلَوَ —.
>
> — "And when Moses' indignation abated, he picked up the tablets whose inscriptions contained guidance and mercy for those who
> are in awe of their Lord."
> (Al-Araf 7:154; Qara'i, 2005, p. 229)

The بضغ in this verse refers to the emotional condition of Prophet Musa when his people adopted the calf as their god of worship. According to Al-Tabrisi (2006), the phrase "بضغلا ىسوم نع تكس" means the quieting of his anger and also states that he became quiet in anger because of the possibility of his people's repentance. Similarly, Al-Tabari (2010) gives the explanation of the phrase that it indicates his anger was gone and he became calm. In this verse, Al-Tabatabai (1997) did not provide a detailed explanation of the بضغ, treating its meaning as clear from the context. Qutb (2003) stresses the strength of the expression by personifying the بضغ as if it were a living force that acted on Prophet Musa until it became quiet when he took the tablets.

3. Discourse Analysis of Anger

This section analyses how the two contextual meanings of بضغ(anger) function in the selected textual unit of the Holy Quran through text linguistics and rhetorical discourse analysis.

3.1 Text Linguistics

Text linguistics studies the two selected textual units by examining their cohesion and coherence, following Beaugrande and Dressler's (1981) framework.

3.1.1 Divine Punitive Anger

The representative occurrence of بضغ (anger) as divine punitive anger is analysed within Al-Araf (7:70-72):

> عَقَوَ دْقَ لَاقَ ﴾٧٠﴿ نَيقِداصَّلا نَمِ متَنكُ نإِ انَدُعِتَ امَبِ انَتِأْفَ انَؤُابَآ دُبُعْيَ نَاكَ امَ رَذَنَوَ هُدَحْوَ ُلَّلا دَبُعْنَلِ انَتَئْجِأَ اولُاقَ —
> يِنِّإِ اورُظِتَنافَ نإِ اهَبِ ُلَّلا لَزَّنَ امَّ مكُؤُابَآوَ مْتُنأَ اهومُتْيَمَّسَ ءامَسْأَ يفِ يِنِنَولُدِاجَتُأَ بِّضَغَوَ سِّجِر مْكُيْلَعَ
> ﴾٧٢﴿ نَيِنِمؤُمْ اونُاكَ امَوَ انَتِايَآبِ اوبُذَّكَ نَيذِلَّا رَبِادَ انَعْطَقَوَ انَّمِ ٍةَمْحَرَبِ هُعَمَ نَيذِلَّاوَ هُانَيْجَنأَفَ ﴾٧١﴿ نَيرِظِتَنمُلْا نَمِّ مكُعَمَ

— “They said, ‘Have you come to [tell] us that we should worship Allah alone and abandon what our fathers have been worshiping?! Then bring us what you threaten us with, should you be truthful.’ He said, ‘There has become due against you a punishment and wrath from your Lord. Do you dispute with me regarding names which you have named—you and your fathers—for which Allah has not sent down any authority? So wait! I too am waiting along with you.’ Then We delivered him and those who were with him by a mercy from Us, and We rooted out those who denied Our signs and were not faithful.”
(Al-Araf 7:70–72; Qara’i, 2005, p. 216)

At the level of cohesion, there is recurrence between اولاق (they said) and لاق (he said), and between انؤابآ (our fathers) and مكؤابآ (your fathers), ensuring the continuity between the people’s challenge and the response of Prophet Hud and preserving the reference to the worship which they inherited from their ancestors. There is partial recurrence between اورظتنتناف (so wait) and الملمنتظريني (those who wait), connecting the warning with its expected results. The pro-forms keep the main participants across the sequence as مكبر (your Lord), اوموتيمس (you have named them), مكعم (with you), هانيجنأف (We delivered him), and معه (with him). The junction through ف is used in ‘انتأف›, ‹اورظتنتناف’, and ‘هانيجنأف’ to link the challenge, warning, and its consequence.

At the level of coherence, in verses Al-Araf (7:70-72), there is a logical development from the challenge and rejection to the warning of Allah and its resulting consequences. In verse 70, there is the challenge of the people who reject the exclusive worship of Allah, the Exalted, and their demand for the threatened punishment. In verse 71, there is a response by declaring that سجر (punishment) and بضغ have become due to them. In verse 72, there are the opposite results of divine mercy and deliverance on the part of Prophet Hud and his followers and the destruction of the disbelievers. Thus, the sequence links transgression, Divine punitive anger, mercy, and retributive consequence within a coherent conceptual progression.

3.1.2 Human Emotional Anger

The representative occurrence of بضغ (anger) as human emotional anger is analysed within Al-Araf (7:152–154):

اولُمِعَ نَيذِلَّاوَ ﴿١٥٢﴾ نَيرِتَفتمُلْا يزِجنَ كَلِذكَوَ ايَنْدُلْا ةِايَحَلْا يفِ ةَّلَّذِوَ مْهِبِّرَ نمِ بٌضَغَ مْهُلُانَيَسَ لَجْعِلْا اوذُخَتَّا نَيذِلَّا نَّإِ — يفِوَ حَاوَلْأَلْا ذَخَأَ بُضَغْلْا ىسَومُ نعَ تَكَسَ امَّلَوَ ﴿١٥٣﴾ مٌيحِرَّ رٌوفُغَلَ اهَدِعْبَ نمِ كَبَّرَ نَّإِ اونُمَآوَ اهَدِعْبَ نمِ اوبُاتَ مَّثُ تِايَئَيِّسَّلا نَوبُهَرْيَ مْهِبِّرَلِ مْهُ نَيذِلَّلِ ٌمَحْرَوَ ىدًهُ اهَتِخَسْنُ ﴿١٥٤﴾

— “Indeed those who took up the calf [for worship] shall be overtaken by their Lord’s wrath and abasement in the life of the world. Thus do We requite the fabricators [of lies]. Yet [to] those who commit misdeeds but repent after that, and believe,—indeed, after that, your Lord shall surely be all-forgiving, all-merciful. And when Moses’ indignation abated, he picked up the tablets whose inscriptions contained guidance and mercy for those who are in awe of their Lord.”
(Al-Araf 7:152–154; Qara’i, 2005, p. 229).

At the level of cohesion, recurrence between **بضغ**in 152 and **بضغ** in 154 links the Divine and human uses of the same lexical expression within the textual unit. Partial recurrence happens between **ميحر** (all-merciful) in verse 153 and **ةمحر** (mercy) in verse 154, connecting the possibility of Divine forgiveness with the mercy associated with the tablets. Junction is achieved using **مث** (then), **و** (and), and **املو** (and when) and organises the movement between the successive propositions.

At the level of coherence, Al-Araf (7:152-154) builds on a conceptual progression of Divine judgment to the possibility of repentance and forgiveness, then to the subduing of Prophet Musa’s human anger. Verse 152 shows **بضغ** in Divine attribution, where it is linked to punishment and abasement to the people who worshipped the calf. Verse 153 brings out the possibility of repentance and divine forgiveness. Verse 154, on the other hand, brings out **بضغ** (anger) in human attributes as a feeling that subsequently subsides. The textual unit therefore distinguishes Divine **بضغ** as punitive and retributive from human **بضغ** as an affective state that can arise and then subside.

3.2 Rhetorical Discourse Analysis

Rhetorical discourse analysis focuses on the analysis of repetition and parallelism in the two selected textual units in reference to the contextual meaning of **بضغ** (anger) (Table 3). The Quranic verses along with their English translations have already been given in the text's linguistic analysis. Here, only those linguistic forms are cited that are directly related to the rhetorical patterns.

Table 3. Rhetorical Screening of the Two Selected Textual Units

No.	Contextual Meaning	Selected Textual Unit	Repetition	Parallelism	Rhetorical Treatment
1	Divine Punitive Anger	Al-Araf (7:70–72)	Relevant	Relevant	Analysed under Repetition and Parallelism
2	Human Emotional Anger	Al-Araf (7:152–154)	Relevant	-	Analysed under Repetition

3.2.1 Repetition

In Al-Araf (7:70-72), repetition takes place in the form of the root ر-ظ-ن in اورظتنافا (so wait) and المنتظرين (those who wait). This repetition emphasises the warning made to the people of Prophet Hud as well as the certainty of the consequence mentioned. The repetition thus foregrounds the force of the Divine warning in relation to غضب (anger).

In Al-Araf (7:152-154), the repeated lexical item is غضب, which appears in verses 152 and 154. It means that the same lexical expression is repeated with different attributions. It is attributed to Divine punitive anger in verse 152, while in verse 154 it refers to the human emotional state of Prophet Musa. This recurrence sheds light on the semantic contrast between Divine and human غضب while preserving the lexical continuity over the textual unit.

3.2.2 Parallelism

In Al-Araf (7:70-72), parallelism can be found in the following two coordinated structures: فأنجيناه والذين معه (Then We delivered him and those who were with him) and وقطعنا دابر الذين كذبوا (and We rooted out those who denied). The union of the two Divine acts emphasises the contrast between salvation and destruction. This structural juxtaposition reinforces the punitive contextual meaning of غضب (anger), juxtaposing the salvation of Prophet Hud and his followers with the destruction of the deniers.

Findings and Discussion

Across the 14 nominal occurrences of غضب (anger), its semantic and discourse profile is governed by lexical meaning, attribution, Quranic context while its discourse functions are illustrated through the two selected representative textual units. Lexically, the term is defined through intensity and strong displeasure, and it is near synonymous with سخط(displeasure) and غيظ(rage) while preserving diagnostic differences. In terms of context, 13 occurrences realise Divine punitive anger, while one is human emotional anger.

At the discourse level, recurrence, partial recurrence, pro-forms and junction account for connectivity, while coherence ties غضب with the progressions, including transgression, warning, punishment, repentance and forgiveness. Repetition foregrounds Divine warning as well as the contrast between Divine and human, while parallelism accentuates the contrast between deliverance and destruction.

Attribution appears to be central in the realisation and functioning of غضب (anger). When attributed to Allah, غضب is typically realised as a punitive or retributive consequence of disobedience and rejection of Divine authority instead of a human psychological state. When attributed to a human, it refers to the temporary emotional state of Prophet Musa that is triggered by a religious offence. It means that the distinction is not only semantic but also functional, implying that the Quranic realisation of غضب goes beyond the representation of affective states to participate in the organisation and evaluation of relations between conduct, authority, transgression and response.

Additionally, the textual and rhetorical contexts accentuate these contextual meanings. The Divine punitive unit moves from rejection and challenge to warning and consequence, with deliverance contrasting to destruction. As to the human unit, recurrence of غضب across Divine and human attribution creates lexical continuity while emphasising semantic difference. Therefore, discourse organisation activates and accentuates

the differences available in the lexical and contextual meanings. The discourse analysis does not merely reiterate the lexical and contextual meanings of بضغ; rather, it demonstrates how these meanings are textually activated and functionally differentiated within connected Quranic discourse. In the selected units, cohesion, coherence, repetition, and parallelism highlight the distinction between Divine punitive anger and human emotional anger, thereby extending the lexical and contextual distinction to the discourse level.

Finally, the moral evaluative dimension of بضغ can be detected in the functioning of the discourse. When attributed to Allah, بضغ is connected with negatively evaluated conduct such as disbelief, disobedience, transgression, fabrication and rejection of Divine authority, together with punitive or retributive consequence. When attributed to a human, Prophet Musa's anger emerges as a reaction to the religious transgression committed by his people. These patterns indicate that بضغ contributes not only to the representation of punitive and emotional states but also to the negative evaluation of transgressive conduct within Quranic discourse.

Conclusion

This research investigated the 14 nominal occurrences of بضغ (anger) in the Holy Quran through lexical-semantic and contextual classification, with representative examples examined in greater detail at the contextual and discourse levels. Classical Arabic lexical evidence and semantic analysis identified the lexical profile of بضغ, while the immediate Quranic context and selected exegeses identified its contextual realisations. Text linguistics and rhetorical discourse analysis were then applied to analyse the role of these meanings in the connected Quranic textual units.

The analysis indicates that attribution is central to the Quranic realisation of بضغ. Divine attribution of بضغ mainly refers to the punitive or retributive consequence of Allah to the disobedience and rejection of His authority, while human attribution of بضغ refers to the temporary emotional state which may arise due to the religious wrongdoing and fade away. These differences suggest that بضغ is not just an expression of emotion, but it is also a constituent part of the Quranic pattern of connecting emotion with behaviour, authority, transgression, response and evaluation.

The contribution of the research to the analysis of Quranic emotion expressions lies in showing how lexical-semantic distinctions, contextual attribution and discourse organisation interact in the realisation and functioning of بضغ. In contrast to the reviewed approaches to emotion expressions in the Holy Quran, which tend to address their lexical, contextual and discourse features separately, the current analysis considers them together within a single analytical framework to explain the semantic and textual behaviour of the expression.

The limitations of the research include the 14 nominal occurrences of بضغ, four selected exegetical sources, cohesion and coherence in text linguistics, and repetition and parallelism in rhetorical discourse analysis. Possible directions of future research may include other derivatives of ب-ض-غ or a comparative study of بضغ with other Quranic emotion expressions.

References

Al-Isfahani, R. (2016). مفردات ألفاظ القرآن الكريم [Vocabulary of the words of the Holy Quran] (7th ed.). Dhawil Qurba Publications.

Al-Tabari, M. ibn Jarir. (2010). تفسير الطبري: جامع البيان عن تأويل آي القرآن [Al-Tabari's exegesis: The comprehensive explanation of the interpretation of the verses of the Quran] (I. M. Abd al-Hamid et al., Eds.; 12 vols.). Dar al-Hadith.

Al-Tabatabai, M. H. (1997). الميزان في تفسير القرآن [The balance in the interpretation of the Quran] (22 vols.). Muassasat al-Alami lil-Matbuat.

Al-Tabrisi, A. A. al-Fadl ibn al-Hasan. (2006). مجمع البيان في تفسير القرآن [The compendium of elucidation in the interpretation of the Quran] (10 vols.). Dar al-Murtada.

Annisa, M. N. (2022). Analisis semiotika: Taraduf kata Ghadab dan Ghaiza dalam Al-Qur'an. Al-Mubarak: Jurnal Kajian Al-Qur'an & Tafsir, 7(1), 73–91. https://doi.org/10.47435/al-mubarak.v7i1.991

Azhar, M. (2024). Makna marah dalam Al-Qur'an: Kajian sinonimitas lafal Ghadab, Ghaidẓ, Sakhiṭ dan Kadẓim [Undergraduate thesis, Universitas Islam Negeri Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta]. UIN Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta Institutional Repository. https://repository.uinjkt.ac.id/dspace/handle/123456789/80528

Beaugrande, R.-A. de, & Dressler, W. U. (1981). Introduction to text linguistics. Longman.

Cruse, D. A. (2011). Meaning in language: An introduction to semantics and pragmatics (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press.

Crystal, D. (2010). The Cambridge encyclopedia of language (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Gee, J. P. (1999). An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method. Routledge.

Ibn Faris, A. ibn F. (1979). معجم مقاييس اللغة [Dictionary of language standards] (A. M. Harun, Ed.; 6 vols.). Dar al-Fikr.

Ibn Manzur, M. ibn Mukarram. (1999). لسان العرب [The Arabic language] (A. M. Abd al-Wahhab & M. al-Sadiq al-Ubaydi, Eds.; 3rd ed., 18 vols.). Dar Ihya al-Turath al-Arabi.

Khasanah, U. (2021). Konsep Ghadab dalam Al-Qur'an: Analisis semantik Toshihiko Izutsu [Undergraduate thesis, Institut Agama Islam Negeri Salatiga]. http://perpus.iainsalatiga.ac.id/lemari/fg/free/pdf/?file=http://perpus.iainsalatiga.ac.id/g/pdf/public/index.php/?pdf=12118/2/skripsi

Kövecses, Z. (2000). Metaphor and emotion: Language, culture, and body in human feeling. Cambridge University Press.

Leech, G. N. (1969). A linguistic guide to English poetry. Longman.

Leech, G. N. (1983). Principles of pragmatics. Longman.

Levinson, S. C. (1983). Pragmatics. Cambridge University Press.

Lyons, J. (1963). Structural semantics: An analysis of part of the vocabulary of Plato. Blackwell.

Lyons, J. (1968). Introduction to theoretical linguistics. Cambridge University Press.

Lyons, J. (1977a). Semantics (Vol. 1). Cambridge University Press.

Lyons, J. (1977b). Semantics (Vol. 2). Cambridge University Press.

Lyons, J. (1995). Linguistic semantics: An introduction. Cambridge University Press.

Mackenzie, J. L., & Alba-Juez, L. (Eds.). (2019). Emotion in discourse. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

McGuigan, B. (2007). Rhetorical devices: A handbook and activities for student writers. Prestwick House.

Nida, E. A. (1975). Componential analysis of meaning: An introduction to semantic structures. Mouton.

Paltridge, B. (2012). Discourse analysis: An introduction (2nd ed.). Bloomsbury Academic.

Plutchik, R. (1994). The psychology and biology of emotion. HarperCollins College Publishers.

Qara'i, A. Q. (2005). The Qur'an: With a phrase-by-phrase English translation (2nd rev. ed.). Islamic College for Advanced Studies Press.

Qutb, S. (2003). في ظلال القرآن [In the shade of the Quran] (32nd ed., 6 vols.). Dar al-Shuruq.

Scherer, K. R. (2005). What are emotions? And how can they be measured? Social Science Information, 44(4), 695–729. https://doi.org/10.1177/0539018405058216

Tanzil. (n.d.). Tanzil Quran text. https://tanzil.net/

The Holy Quran. (1924). القرآن الكريم [The Holy Quran] (Cairo ed., Hafs an Asim). Al-Matabi al-Amiriyyah.

Ulah, Z. (2019). Cara mengendalikan marah menurut Al-Qur'an: Analisis ayat-ayat tentang Ghadab dalam Tafsir Al-Azhar karya Buya Hamka [Master's thesis, Universitas Islam Negeri Sunan Ampel Surabaya]. Digilib UIN

Sunan Ampel Surabaya. https://digilib.uinsa.ac.id/id/eprint/30412/
Uyuni, Y. R., Nuryulia, S., Milah, A. S., Mu'izzudin, M., & Hawari, A. (2026). Arabic Qur'anic near-synonymy: A corpus-based analysis of Al-Raghib Al-Aṣfahani's Mufradat Alfaẓ Al-Qur'an. Jurnal Al Bayan: Jurnal Jurusan Pendidikan Bahasa Arab, 18(1), 87–110. https://doi.org/10.24042/4h3p6t28
Wales, K. (2011). A dictionary of stylistics (3rd ed.). Routledge.
Yule, G. (2020). The study of language (7th ed.). Cambridge University Press.