

Qur'an-related Intertextuality: Textual Potentiation in Translation

Aladdin Al-Kharabsheh

Dept. of English, The Hashemite University, PO box 330186, Zarqa 13133, Jordan

E-mail: alakh22@yahoo.com

Received: 06-04-2017

Accepted: 11-06-2017

Advance Access Published: September 2017

Published: 01-11-2017

doi:10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.6n.6p.195

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.6n.6p.195>

Abstract

Qur'an-related intertextuality, envisaged as an enriching communicative act both monolingually and interlingually, represents a case of semantic complexity that is wired to present inconceivable translation challenges. Drawing on Derrida's (1977) dichotomy *iterability/citatoriality*, Kristeva's (1980) *vertical intertextuality*, Fairclough's (1992a; 1992b; 1995 & 2011) *manifest intertextuality*, and Bakhtin's (1986) *double voicing* or *re-accentuation*, the study argues that Qur'an-related intertextuality is conducive of conceptual densities, the 'harnessing' of which requires 'mobilizing' those translation strategies that should exceed the *lexicographical equivalence* (Venuti 2009) to establish intertextual relations relevant to the form and theme of the foreign text. To resolve the arising translation problems, the study basically proposes two synthetic approaches: the *gist-paratextual* and the *gist-exegetical*. Translation skopos has been found to be central to the production and reception of intertextuality and to determining which of the two proposed synthetic approaches to operationalize. Finally, analysis shows that Qur'an proved to be a virtual breeding ground for *textual dynamism and potentiation*.

Keywords: Qur'an-related intertextuality, semantic complexity, exegetical translation, gist translation, paratextual action, translation skopos, registral difference

1. Introduction

Intertextuality (or interdiscursivity) is a semiotic-dialogic concept that has undergone incessant and inflationary development. Attempting to provide a fine-grained and over-arching definition of intertextuality may be a mammoth task, due to its polymorphic nature. Thus, to talk about intertextuality is possible, but it is also "to enter a minefield of warring definitions" (Worton, 1986, p. 14). As a field of inquiry, intertextuality has been dealt with from different perspectives and for different purposes. For instance, intertextuality has been addressed, inter alia, by Literary Theorists (e.g. Birch, 1986; Clayton and Rothstein, 1991; Bassnett, 2007), Linguistics (e.g. Allen, 2000; Hodges, 2011), Sociolinguistics (e.g. Gordon, 2003; Tovaes, 2005; Tannen, 2006), Semiotics (e.g. Culler, 1981; Orr Leonard, 1986), Semantics (e.g. Holthuis, 1994; Lemke, 1995), Linguistic Anthropology (e.g. Bauman, 2004 & 2005; Agha and Wortham, 2005; Semino, 2009), Critical Discourse Analysis (e.g. Fairclough, 1992a; 1992b & 1995; Chouliaraki and Fairclough, 1999), Translation and Interpreting Studies (e.g. Alexieva, 1985 & 1992; Hatim, 1997; Venuti, 2009), Education and Pedagogy (e.g. Bernstein, 1990 & 1996), Media and Cinematic Studies (e.g. Reader, 1990; Hanna and Smith, 2000, Hiramoto and Sung-Yul Park, 2010), Religious/Scriptural Studies (e.g. Fewell, 1992; Barton, 2000; Fishbane, 2000), and Computer Science (e.g. Bolter, 1991; Riffaterre, 1978 & 1994; Ray, 2006). Obviously, there is no stable approach to analyze such a complex phenomenon.

Indeed, there is no authoritative definition for either the term or the approaches it may represent. In his discussion of intertextuality, Allen (2000, p. 2) explicitly states that intertextuality is "one of the most commonly used and misused terms in the contemporary critical vocabulary". Resonating originally in the sphere of critical theory, intertextuality exceeded its boundaries, as various disciplines have adopted and adapted this notion. To this effect, Irwin (2004) points out that intertextuality has acquired almost as many meanings as users. This diversity has given rise to many concomitant views and statements, whose detailed discussion falls beyond the scope of this paper. In this paper, we neither intend to provide a historical review of the notion in question, nor to present the multifarious approaches of a controversial theory of intertextuality, where there is a consensus only on one aspect, i.e., that intertextuality rests on the idea of relations between texts (for a detailed account on the historical development of the term, see Hanna and Smith, 2000).

The seminal works of Mikhail Bakhtin, especially that one germane to dialogism, have largely inspired Kristeva to coin the term intertextuality in the late 1960s, for which Kristeva is openly acknowledged

nowadays. Bakhtin (1981 & 1986) advocates that any use of language is effectively engulfed in a wider dialogue where “the utterance is related not only to preceding, but also to subsequent links in the chain of speech communion” (Bakhtin, 1986, p. 94; for similar ideas, see also Voloshinov, 1973). According to Bakhtin, the text “lives only by coming into contact with another text (with context). Only at this point of contact between texts does a light flash, illuminating both the posterior and anterior, joining a given text to a dialogue. We emphasize that this contact is a dialogic contact between texts...behind this contact is a contact of personalities and not of things” (1986, p. 162).

Obviously, the vantage point here is that when any given text comes into contact with another, such a text somehow subsumes anterior texts and foresees posterior texts. This dialogic contact between texts is idiosyncratic, as it embraces all the ways through which any given stretch of language can resonate with other stretches. It is this iterability of texts that constitutes one of the most powerful bases for the potentiation and production of intertextuality (Bauman, 2004, p. 4). Thus, the basic force of intertextuality is to undermine textual boundaries. In other terms, “texts are always spilling over into other texts” (Fewell, 1992, p. 23), and the “dialogical space of texts” (Kristeva, 1980, p. 66) is bound to shatter the autonomy and univocality of any particular text. Kristeva plainly states “any text is constructed as a mosaic of quotations; any text is the absorption and transformation of another (quoted in Juvan, 2008, p. 11-12). Kristeva declared that “every text is from the outset under the jurisdiction of other discourses which impose a universe on it” (cited in Culler, 1981, 105; see also Thibault, 1994, p. 1751).

For Holthuis (1994, p. 77), intertextuality is not viewed as “a text-inherent property”; rather, it is “a specific form of meaning constitution, and therefore as a phenomenon of text processing”. Tannen (2006) handles intertextuality in terms of “recycling,” “re-keying,” or “reframing” prior texts (see also Gordon, 2003 and Tovares, 2005). However, reshaping, recycling, re-keying, or reframing a given prior text may not go without alteration, as this process may occur “with varying degrees of fidelity to its meaning in the originating context” (Hodges, 2011, p. 11). Bazerman (2008, p. 83-84) maintains that “we create our texts out of the sea of former texts that surround us, the sea of language we live in. And we understand the texts of others within that same sea.” Inspired by all that has been mentioned, this paper will subscribe to the broad view that Intertextuality, an ubiquitous textual phenomenon that is a “precondition for the intelligibility of texts” (Hatim and Mason, 1997, p. 219), is basically a linguistic mechanism whereby a text makes a reference to a previous or anticipated texts explicitly or implicitly, or otherwise triggering meanings expressed in such texts.

The driving force behind this investigation is the common observation that Qur’anic discourse empowers MSA (Modern Standard Arabic) in an extraordinary way, and so, Qur’an-related intertextuality, a form of high textual empowerment, can pose recalcitrant problems in translation, and a mishandling of them would result in considerable semantic loss. Indeed, this is an uphill translation task since the translator is supposed to provide a translation of the text, which relays, *as part of its communicative intent* those intertextual features that are part of the greater textual fabric. Thus, the unity of the text rests on intertextuality. The underlying premise of this study is that Qur’anic discourse is very much likely to give rise to a special instance of *vertical* or *manifest* intertextuality, which specifically involves subtle and intricate multi-layered meanings, i.e., Qur’an-related intertextuality represents a case of conceptual density. This is a challenging concept of intertextuality as Qur’anic features or elements normally reflect a unique, nuanced and empowering discourse that is extricably bound up to complicate the job of the translator. To put it differently, the Qur’anic discourse is believed to be a virtual breeding ground for textual dynamism and potentiation, and so Qur’an-related intertextuality is expected to be a constitutive and complicated component of the total meaning of any given text, as such a discourse is too specifically set in a particular locale. This entails calling for both the immediate and broader *contexts* to be integrated fairly subtly into the text in question.

2. Literature Review: Intertextuality Under the Microscope of Translation

Putting intertextuality under the microscope of translation, it can be said that different scholars have offered different views that boil down to one overarching statement: translation is an intertextual event since texts, be it SL texts or TL texts, overlap, intersect, or rather ‘clone’ each other in one way or another in varying degrees. This is so as the TL text is the reformulation of the prior text.

To this effect, Schäffner (2010) views translation as ‘intercultural intertextuality’, whereas Farahzad (2009) looks at translation as an ‘intertextual practice’, i.e., as an ‘intertext’ which bridges a ‘prototext’ (source text) and ‘metatext’ (the target text). On their part, Neubert and Shreve (1992) regards translation as ‘mediated intertextuality’ in light of their earlier definition of translation as ‘text-induced text production’ (see also Hatim and Mason, 1990; Hatim and Munday, 2004; Schäffner, 2004 & 2012). Khanjan and Mirza (1386/2008) stress on the crucial role of the theory of intertextuality in translation theory and practice, bringing to light some issues such as the “uncertainty of meaning and non-originality of the source text,” “putting emphasis on the importance of contextual elements,” “raising the translator’s professional position,” and “the demand for doing a typological analysis” prior to translation.

For Hatim and Mason (1990, p. 129), “each intrusion of a citation in the text is the culmination of a process in which a sign travels from one text (source) to another (destination). The area being traversed from text to

text is what we shall call the "intertextual space" (ibid., p. 129). Likewise, Hatim (1997) discusses the notion of intertextuality from a translational perspective and assesses its status in the process of translation. Hatim points out that in order for the different types of intertextual relations to be appealing to the translator, "they must be seen within some conception of translation strategy that captures the complexity of the decision-making process at work" (ibid., p. 29). Couched in the terms of the semiotic dimension of context, Hatim's approach for handling intertextuality in translation is a semiotic one that capitalizes on the close relationship between text and context (ibid., p. 31). "This is to see the intertextual reference, as underpinned by the way we use texts and elements within texts as signs in responding to the requirements of one important aspect of context, namely, the semiotics of the communicative act" (ibid., p. 31). Thus, the basis of adequacy and appropriateness in translation is not "diction", but "signs" in social life, which through intertextuality, galvanise intention and operationalise features of register" (ibid., p. 31).

According to Venuti (2009, p. 158), translation itself is a unique case of intertextuality. For him, intertextual relations cannot be maintained merely by relaying the words and phrases that make those relations in the foreign text, as such a relaying is geared to produce a semantic correspondence, but it may not capture the specific cultural significance of a foreign intertext. In other words, this significance relies not only on the "lexicographical equivalence" (ibid., p. 162), "but on form, on resemblances among foreign linguistic features, graphemic and acoustic, lexical and syntactical, stylistic and discursive" (ibid., p. 159). Indeed, the view that the foreign text is not only decontextualized, but also recontextualized constitutes the point of departure of Venuti's study. The recontextualization process is concerned with producing another intra-textual context, and another network of intertextual and interdiscursive relations, established by and within a translation. As a consequence, another context of reception emerges, and translation can be looked at not as being instrumental, but rather as being hermeneutic, i.e., a translation enacts an inscription that renders only one specific interpretation of the foreign text (ibid., p. 162).

Venuti elucidates that this specific interpretation can be communicated by applying a "category that mediates between the foreign language and culture, on the one hand, and the translating language and culture, on the other, a method of transforming the foreign text into the translation" (ibid., p. 162). Such a category, according to him, consists of *interpretants*, which can be either formal or thematic. *Formal interpretants* include "a concept of equivalence, such as a semantic correspondence based on dictionary definitions, or a concept of style, a distinctive lexicon and syntax related to a genre or discourse" (ibid., p. 162), whereas, *thematic interpretants* include codes such as "specific ideas, beliefs and representations; a discourse in the sense of a relatively coherent body of concepts, problems, and arguments; or a particular interpretation of the foreign text that has been articulated independently in commentary" (ibid., p. 163). Finally, Venuti stresses that it is the translator's employment of "interpretants that recontextualizes the foreign text, replacing foreign intertextual relations with a receiving intertext, with relations to the translating language and culture which are built into the translation" (ibid., p. 163).

Alawi (2010) carries out a study where he examines intertextuality in the practices of literary translation between English and Arabic. He points out that translation studies, literary criticism and linguistics take interest in intertextuality, which "responds to the contemporary understanding and treatment of texts" (ibid., p. 2440), and which views a text "as a tissue of relations between signs that are influenced by space and time" (ibid., p. 2440). Alawi echoes Krestiva's (1980) notion that any given text can be deoriginated to the zero level, i.e., all constituent parts of a text must have their own origins that can be traced back in already existing texts. Alawi's makes the main conclusion that translators should be engaged with the translation process on the assumption that every stretch of language (part or whole) is likely to recur sometime somewhere. This assumption should also lead us to understand that since every reading of a text is a rewriting of it, then every translation in a sense is a new reading and a new rewriting that is influenced by the factors of time and place (ibid., p. 2455).

Kuleli (2014) investigates intertextual allusions from a literary point of view and evaluates their translations as well. To him, intertextuality must not be confined to literature analysis only; rather, it can also be applied to translation analysis. A skilful translator should be able to deliver satisfaction to the target language audience, as same as that which the source culture readers obtain from the text (ibid., p. 212). Thus, for an embedded message such as allusion in a source text, the translator should sanction creating a similar gap in the target language, thereby forcing the target language readership to try to find the allusion (ibid., p. 212). This in turn would enable them to obtain as much pleasure as possible from the translated text (ibid., p. 212).

Zhang and Zhao (2015) addresses the effect of intertextual elements, stressing the point that ignoring the translator's subjectivity and creativity would put him/her in an awkward position in translation, whereas *the theory of intertextuality* drives the translation community to re-define the translator's role (ibid., p. 158). In a study that attempts to make an initial quest for a relationship between intertextuality and ideology, Sanatifar (2015) discusses some potential difficulties that translators may face in the rendition of intertextual references in the context of political speech. The study also attempts to account for the causes that may give rise to mistranslation in this context, and it offers a number of concrete guidelines for a more efficient and effective translation of intertextual references in political speech.

3. Methodology

All selected examples are authentic news-headlines that were taken from different media outlets, i.e., from various electronic news agencies' websites that will be used to validate the basic premise of the study. Needless to say that the type of vertical/manifest intertextuality is made through direct quotation in the linearized version of the text referred to. It should also be pointed out that Pichthall's ([1930] 2015) *The Meaning of the Glorious Qur'an: Explanatory Translation* will be used for the Qur'anic elements/verses figuring in the selected examples. The aim for having such a kind of translation is twofold: to give the reader the flavor of religious translation, and to act as a starting point for the ensuing discussion.

For the purposes of analyzing the obtained data, the present study specifically draws on intertextual relations that can be captured under Kristeva's (1980) concept *vertical intertextuality*, and Fairclough's (1992a; 1992b & 1995) *manifest intertextuality*, as these are two different labels to describe the most predominant type of intertextual relations. The study also draws on Derrida's (1977) dichotomy *iterability/citatonality* and Bakhtin's concept (1986) *double voicing* or *re-accentuation*. Indeed, this is the theoretical scaffolding that this study will depend on. *Iterability* is concerned with the general repetition of texts across different contexts, whereas *citatonality* is concerned with the idea that when a text is employed in a new context, over attention or special focus is given to the context from which such a text was taken. As far as *double voicing* or *re-accentuation* is involved, Bakhtin (1986, p. 79-80) asserts that texts may not only borrow elements or conventions from other texts, but may also "double voice" or "re-accentuate" them by, for instance, making reference to them ironically, parodically or really reverently.

Thus, the intertextual reference in our case can be viewed as involving fairly *dynamic* concepts, culled from their original milieu, i.e., the Qur'an, and used in a 'manifest' and/or 'vertical' manner. This crucial component of intertextual practice can be indissolubly linked to Derrida's (1977) *iterability* and *citatonality*, and Bakhtin's (1986) *double voicing* or *re-accentuation*, which are particularly operative in Qur'an-related intertextuality, as the Qur'an is a sacred document that is always given a special focus and an utmost attention by Muslims, and to which reference is made reverently.

4. Discussion

As indicated before, the current investigation advocates that Qur'an-related intertextuality is an intractable translation issue, and so maintaining this particular level in Arabic-into-English translation is a mammoth task. Before any meaningful discussion takes place, it is useful to remind here that the kind of Qur'anic elements employed in MSA journalistic texts will serve as instances to demonstrate the intricacy of translating Qur'an-related intertextuality. To give a concrete sense of how Qur'an-related intertextuality works in the context of contemporary media language, let us take examples. The configuration that will be followed here is that the Qur'anic element figuring in any given news-headline plus its corresponding translation (i.e. Pichthall's translation) will be underlined. However, the rest of the translation, i.e., the non-Qur'anic part will be mine, then this will be followed by a discussion. Let us now consider the first bunch of examples:

(1) وول ستریت : فنادق القاهرة خاوية على عروشها

Wall Street: Cairo's Hotels are (now) all ruined on their trellises (Pickthall 2015, p. 91).

(2) تقرير اسباني: مستشفيات العراق خاوية على عروشها!

A Spanish Report: Iraq's Hospitals are (now) all ruined on their trellises (ibid., p. 91).

(3) بالصور .. أنفاق غزة خاوية على عروشها

In Pictures: Ghaza's tunnels are (now) all ruined on their trellises (ibid., p. 91).

The underlined linguistic chunk in the examples above (1-3), i.e., *خاوية على عروشها* is a semantically-loaded Qur'anic element that cranks up a vivid vertical intertextual relation between this text and the sacred text, or the natural habitat from which this Qur'anic element was originally culled. In Arabic, the expression *خاوية على عروشها* is used quite a lot both formally and informally as to label any given place with a great deal of dysfunctionality, stagnation, or sometimes, when such a place is deserted and at a standstill. The iterability of this Qur'anic chunk cannot be understood without looking into its citatonality. Indeed, the expression *خاوية على عروشها* appeals intertextually to three independent Qur'anic places or contexts, each of which presents either a didactic story or a didactic lesson. The first context is provided in Surah 18 Al-Kahf/ Verse 42:

وَأَحِيطَ بِثَمَرِهِ فَأَصْبَحَ يُقَلِّبُ كَفَّيْهِ عَلَى مَا أَنْفَقَ فِيهَا وَهِيَ خَاوِيَةٌ عَلَى عُرُوشِهَا وَيَقُولُ يَا لَيْتَنِي لَمْ أُشْرِكْ بِرَبِّي أَحَدًا (الكهف 42/18)

And his fruit was beset (with destruction). Then began he to wring his hands for all that he had spent upon it, when (now) it was all ruined on its trellises, and to say: Would that I had ascribed no partner to my Lord! (Pickthall, 2015, p. 91)

The above Qur'anic context provides the Qur'anic famous story of two men or two brothers: one is a believer and the other is a disbeliever. The believer was poor, whereas his brother, the disbeliever, was rich,

as he had two big gardens that are described in detail in the Qur'an. These gardens contain vine trees; they are surrounded by palm trees; streams and rivers are cutting through them; and, they provide fabulous greenery sceneries. Later, the disbeliever becomes mean and arrogant, as he starts looking down at his brother, who, in turn, warned him against the way he is acting, as this is quite displeasing to God. The poor man also explained to his brother that God gave him all of these riches, as he loves him, and so he should believe in the Day of Judgment. The disbeliever turned a deaf ear to his brother and one morning he woke up to the catastrophic news that his gardens were devoured by fire, and that they were completely destroyed, i.e., *when it was all ruined on its trellises*. The second Qur'anic context is provided in Surah 2 Al-Baqara / Verse 259:

أَوْ كَالَّذِي مَرَّ عَلَى قَرْيَةٍ وَهِيَ خَاوِيَةٌ عَلَى عُرُوشِهَا قَالَ أَنَّى يُحْيِي هَذِهِ اللَّهُ بَعْدَ مَوْتِهَا فَأَمَاتَهُ اللَّهُ مِئَةَ عَامٍ ثُمَّ بَعَثَهُ قَالَ كَمْ لَبِثْتَ قَالَ لَبِثْتُ يَوْمًا أَوْ بَعْضَ يَوْمٍ قَالَ بَلْ لَبِثْتَ مِئَةَ عَامٍ فَانظُرْ إِلَى طَعَامِكَ وَشَرَابِكَ لَمْ يَتَسَنَّهْ وَانظُرْ إِلَى جَمْرِكَ وَاجْعَلْكَ آيَةً لِلنَّاسِ وَانظُرْ إِلَى الْعِظَامِ كَيْفَ نُنشِزُهَا ثُمَّ نَكْسُوهَا لَحْمًا فَلَمَّا تَبَيَّنَ لَهُ قَالَ أَعْلَمُ أَنَّ اللَّهَ عَلَى كُلِّ شَيْءٍ قَدِيرٌ (البقرة 259/2).

Or (bethink thee of) the like of him who, passing by a township which had fallen into utter ruin, exclaimed: How shall Allah give this township life after its death? And Allah made him die a hundred years, then brought him back to life. He said: How long hast thou tarried? (The man) said: I have tarried a day or part of a day. (He) said: Nay, but thou hast tarried for a hundred years. Just look at thy food and drink which have rotted! Look at thine ass! And, that We may make thee a token unto mankind, look at the bones, how We adjust them and then cover them with flesh! And when (the matter) became clear unto him, he said: I know now that Allah is Able to do all things. (Pickthall 2015, p. 13).

According to this context, another well-known Qur'anic story is given: a man passes by a town thought to be Jerusalem (according to the vast majority of Qur'an exegetes), which he finds in complete destruction. It is believed that نبوخذ نصر (i.e. Nebuchadnezzar II) is the one who destroyed Jerusalem in bid to defeat the Israelites, who had rebelled against their king and killed him, as the king had given the Babylonians hostages. The hostages were then killed and Nebuchadnezzar II made his way to Jerusalem. He ravaged the town and flattened its houses, i.e., *a township which had fallen into utter ruin*. God makes this man dies for a hundred years, then God brings him back to life as to enable him to see that everything has changed and that the town has been re-built and restored. God gives this man some pieces of water-tight evidence as to prove to him that he died for a hundred years, such as the bones of his donkey and the rotten food and stuff that he had with him before entering the one-hundred hibernation stage. The third and last Qur'anic context can be found in Surah 22 Al-Haj / Verse 45:

فَكَأَيُّ مَن قَرْيَةٍ أَهْلَكْنَاهَا وَهِيَ ظَالِمَةٌ فِيهَا خَاوِيَةٌ عَلَى عُرُوشِهَا وَبُئْرِ مَعْتَلَةٌ وَقَصْرِ مَشِيدٍ (الحج 22 / 45)

How many a township have We destroyed while it was sinful, so that it lieth (to this day) in, and (how many) a deserted well and lofty tower! (Pickthall 2015, p. 105).

In this Qur'anic context, God addresses prophet Mohammed by saying to him that We (i.e. God) have wrecked many sinful towns. These are sinful towns as they diverted from the path of God, a mischievous act that angered their Lord, who, after giving them the chances to repent, has decided to destroy them *and so their towns lieth (to this day) in*.

Translationally speaking, it is quite obvious that the Qur'anic expression *خاوية على عروشها* forges a complex intertextual relationship, owing to the fact that it unfolds three different texts that cannot be captured in one *lexicographical equivalence* in the TL. In other words, this is *a tripartite intertextual relationship* that presents the translator with the challenging task of communicating it over to the TL. Another aspect that may further complicate the job of the translator is the fact that this religious discourse is part of the formal register of MSA, whereas it is not part of the formal register in English. Thus, keeping the source language (henceforth SL) religious tone and register can be 'intoxicating' to the target language (henceforth TL). As a result, Pickthall's translations: *when (now) it was all ruined on its trellises, a township which had fallen into utter ruin*, and *so that it lieth (to this day) in* may not be good options, as these sound too odd in English. So, with this additional lingua-cultural difference, translators may find themselves in an awkward position to get a tight grip on such a cultural-intertextual complexity.

No matter what translation strategy that translators may opt for, translation loss is inevitable. Given the registral difference between Arabic and English, the first translational procedure should involve bridging such a registral rift in the TL version, simply by attempting to provide a communicative or functional translation. Based on this, the problem would be partly resolved, i.e., the problem would be resolved only register-wise, but there will remain the focal issue, the intertextual meaning. In the three examples above (1-3), a possible communicative translation for *خاوية على عروشها* that may resonate well in the TL may be *in tatters* or figuratively *moth-eaten*:

- (1) Wall Street: Cairo's Hotels are *in tatters/ moth-eaten*
- (2) A Spanish Report: Iraq's Hospitals are *in tatters/ moth-eaten*.
- (3) In Pictures: Ghaza's tunnels are *in tatters/ moth-eaten*.

It can be said that the translation options *in tatters* and *moth-eaten* may resolve the problem register-wise, but these are bound up to obliterate the Qur'an-related meaning or the tripartite intertextuality induced by

the expression *خاوية على عروشها*. As a consequence, another translational procedure is required as to maintain the intertextual level. Indeed, a tripartite intertextual relationship like this is likely to give rise to a very complex Qur'an-related intertextuality for which a *synthetic approach* incorporating *gist translation* and *paratextual action* (henceforth *gist-paratextual*) can be proposed in this context. According to this approach, translators can wrap up this three-strata context, i.e. translators can make a laconic summary of this three-strata context, and then, present it in a footnote or end-note. The latter procedure is what we term *paratextual action*, i.e., to take a paratextual action such as footnoting, end-noting or annotating, etc.. Indeed, relegating the tripartite intertextual relationship to an inferior position, i.e., to a paratextual position should be looked at positively since such a procedure can enable translators to avoid producing very enlarged translations, as for spatial limitations, it would be quite difficult to include the nitty-gritty of such three lengthy intertextual contexts within the body of the TL copy.

However, it all depends on the skopos (i.e. purpose/aim/function and targeted audience) of translation, as in certain contexts, translators may be allowed to enlarge the TLT to great extents. Thus, the translation commissioner has got the final say on this issue. On the assumption that having a fairly enlarged translation is sanctioned, translators may have, at their disposal, another tenable solution, i.e., another *synthetic approach* which involves the merger of *gist translation* and *exegetical translation* (henceforth *gist-exegetical*). The former, as it has just been indicated, has to do with producing a laconic summary, whereas the latter is a kind of extended translation allowing a complex meaning of any given lexical item or expression to be explained at length in the body of the TL version. In short, *exegetical translation* is a procedure that would enable translators to incorporate their *gist translation* within the body of the TLT. The merit of the latter *synthetic approach* (i.e. *gist-exegetical*) is that any given intertextual level of meaning would be invariantly kept within the TL version, i.e., it would be given the same prominence as that of the SLT, and so, the SLT and TLT can be said to stand on equal footing, without the prospect of relegating any aspect of meaning to an inferior paratextual position. In a nutshell, the skopos of translation can be a main factor that can assist translators in determining which of these two *synthetic approaches* to operationalize.

(4) الآن حُصِّصَ الْحَقُّ وظهّرت براءة مناهجنا التعليمية مما اتهمت به

Now the truth is out and our educational curricula are innocent of what they have been accused of (Pickthall 2015, p. 73).

(5) الآن حُصِّصَ الْحَقُّ.. أين أنت يا صدام حسين؟

Now the truth is out: Where are you Saddam? (ibid., p. 73)

(6) الآن حُصِّصَ الْحَقُّ وكشف القناع عن نسب السيستاني

Now the truth is out and al-Sistani's lineage is unveiled (ibid., p. 73).

The underlined linguistic stretch الآن حُصِّصَ الْحَقُّ (i.e. Now the truth is out) in the examples above (4-6) is a foreign-scriptural element that gives rise to a manifest rich Qur'an-based intertextuality that may present an uphill translation task. Basically, this Qur'anic signifier is also used formally in MSA, and to a lesser extent, informally as simply to mean that the entire truth has surfaced up and has become so well-known to everyone. The Arabic verb *حصص* means to know something for sure and beyond any reasonable doubt, or when something is known or figured out in an unquestionable manner. Indeed, the only word that collocates with the verb *حصص* in Arabic is the noun *الحق* (i.e. the truth), a collocational primacy which yields textual potentiation. The iterability of this Qur'anic expression in formal MSA has a semantic and cultural significance that cannot be captured without examining the context where it figures in. Thus, citationality-wise, the exact Qur'anic context can be found in Surah 12 Yusuf/ Verse 51:

قَالَ مَا خَطْبُكَ إِذْ رَأَوْتَنِّي يُوسُفَ عَنْ نَفْسِهِ قُلْنَ حَاشَ لِلَّهِ مَا عَلِمْنَا عَلَيْهِ مِنْ سُوءٍ قَالَتِ امْرَأَتُ الْعَزِيزِ الآن حُصِّصَ الْحَقُّ أَنَا رَأَوْتُهُ عَنْ نَفْسِهِ وَإِنَّهُ لَمِنَ الصَّادِقِينَ

He (the king) (then sent for those women and) said: What happened when ye asked an evil act of Joseph? They answered : Allah Blameless! We know no evil of him. Said the wife of the ruler: Now the truth is out. I asked of him an evil act, and he is surely of the truthful. (Pickthall 2015, p. 73).

The foreign-scriptural text and context in the examples above (4-6) indicate that the expression الآن حُصِّصَ الْحَقُّ encapsulates a very well-known and significant Qur'anic story that should be unfolded here. This is the story of prophet Yusuf (i.e. Joseph) with the wife of the Governor of Egypt, al-Aziz (العزیز). Indeed, this is a very famous story that the Holy Qur'an depicts in a fabulous and enchanting manner and that every Muslim is familiar with. Given the fact this is a very detailed and long story, and for spatial limitations, the story cannot be fleshed out here. However, the reader can consult Surah 12 Yusuf that is devoted for this story.

As far as translating the foreign text above is concerned, it is conspicuous that the expression الآن حُصِّصَ الْحَقُّ constitutes the thorniest constituent in the example, as it offers a complex foreign intertext that ought to be retained in the target language text (henceforth TLT). Indeed, the three-word structure (i.e. الآن حُصِّصَ الْحَقُّ) stands for a lengthy story that presents a semantic richness as well as a robust mode of expression. On this

basis, a semantic equivalence for الآن حصص الحق such as *the truth is known*, or *the truth is shining now* can 'purge' the TLT from the abnormal religious register originating from the SL, thereby restricting, to a large extent, the translation loss to the intertextual level. In other words, what is needed is a translation that can *double voice* or *re-accentuate* this Qur'anic story in an TL version that is devoid of the upsetting SL religious discourse. Given the fact that this is a very informative context, which gives rise to a case of *heightened* Qur'an-derived intertextuality, both approaches, the *gist-paratextual* as well as the *gist-exegetical* can be used in parallel. However, the *gist-paratextual approach* does seem to be more tenable and reliable than the other: the entire story of prophet Yusuf (in other words, Joseph) with the wife of the Governor of Egypt, al-Aziz (العزیز) can be wrapped up and inserted in a paratextual tactic such as footnoting, and so it can communicate over to the TL audience the significance and value of the foreign intertext (الآن حصص الحق).

(7) قصور المنطقة الخضراء تباع بثمن بخس وبالتقسيط المريح.

Green Zone's Mansions are sold for a low price and with comfortable mortgages. (Pickthall, 2015, p. 71).

(8) السيد الصرخي الحسني: نحن لا نبيع حرياتنا بثمن بخس.

Mr. Al-Sarkhi Al-Husni: We do not sell our freedoms for a low price (ibid., p. 71).

(9) السنوسي.. عندما يباع عزيز قوم بثمن بخس..!؟

Al-Senussi: When a man who once had his heyday is sold for a low price (ibid., p. 71).

The underlined Qur'anic segment بثمن بخس (i.e. for a low price) in the examples above (7-9) is associated with a vertical Qur'an-related intertextuality that is extricably bound up to offer a conceptual density that may not be easy to negotiate to the TL. In fact, this segment entertains a high degree of currency and frequency of use in MSA, i.e., it entertains a high degree of iterability. It literally means *at a very cheap price*. As far as citationality is concerned, this particular linguistic sequence shares the same Qur'anic context and/or story of the previous example (i.e. الآن حصص الحق) given in Surah 12 Yusuf. Needless to say, thus, that there is no need to spell out such a presumably well-known context, and so, the analysis will jump directly to discuss the above examples (7-9). Yet, a mere mention of the verse where this specific Qur'anic sequence (i.e. بثمن بخس) emerges in the Surah is deemed necessary here:

وَشَرَوْهُ بِثَمَنٍ بَخْسٍ دَرَاهِمَ مَعْدُودَةٍ وَكَانُوا فِيهِ مِنَ الزَّاهِدِينَ (يوسف 20/12).

And they sold him for a low price, a number of silver coins; and they attached no value to him (Pickthall 2015, p. 71).

In reference to the story of prophet Yusuf, the most illuminating thread within such a context is that after the caravan of merchants had salvaged Yusuf from the well, and after reaching Egypt, *they sold him to the slave-traders for a low price*, i.e., *for a few silver coins*. Of utmost importance in this thread is the sequence بثمن بخس (i.e. for a low price).

In example 7 above, the news-headline is about the Green Zone (a common label used for the International Zone of Baghdad), where mansions are sold *for a very cheap price* (i.e. بثمن بخس) through affordable mortgages, while example 8 is a news-headline pertinent to a Shia religious authority, Mr. Al-Sarkhi Al-Husni, who delivered a sermon on the occasion of Eid Ramadan in which he stated that they (i.e. the Shia Muslims) do not sell their freedoms *for a very cheap price* (i.e. بثمن بخس). The last example 9 is also a news-headline for an article that talks about Mr. Abdullah Al-Senussi, a Libyan national who was Head of Libyan Military Intelligence and brother-in-law of Colonel Muammar Gaddafi. Known as Gaddafi's 'Black Box', Al-Senussi is notoriously known for having blood-stained hands since the 1970s. In 2012, Al-Senussi fled the country (i.e. Libya), but was arrested at Nouakchott airport in Mauritania, and the Libyan government instantly requested his extradition. Six months later, the Mauritanian government extradited Al-Senussi to the Libyan authorities, and he was sentenced to death for atrocities he allegedly committed during the reign of Gaddafi. The author of this particular article is a Mauritanian national, who bitterly slams his government for extraditing Al-Senussi, and accusing it of accepting to negotiate a dirty deal with the Libyan warring factions, which resulted in extraditing Al-Senussi; or rather, which resulted in selling him *for a very cheap price* (i.e. بثمن بخس).

In as much as the translation of بثمن بخس is concerned, it can be said that Pickthall's translation happen to be an idiomatic one, free of the tracings of the religious discourse that can produce an odd register in English. Consequently, in this specific foreign intertext, translators would not have to worry about the registeral problem if they were to adopt Pickthall's translation. Equally important is the proposed TL counterpart *for a very cheap price* which may sound a better idiomatic translation option, as the word بخس in Arabic signifies a sharp sense of under-evaluation and/or worthlessness, and so, it means not only *low*; rather, *very low* or *very cheap*. Clearly, neither the option *for a low price* nor *for a very low/cheap price* seems to resolve the problem once and for all, as translators would remain grappling with maintain the intertextual level represented in the long story of Yusuf, as it is a crucial layer of meaning.

Since this example belongs to *the same context* of the previous one (الآن حصص الحق), i.e., since this is another clear case of *heightened* Qur'an-related intertextuality, the same solutions can be offered here, i.e.,

either the *gist-paratextual approach* or the *gist-exegetical approach*. Hence, the skopos of translation requires no further emphasis, as a determining factor that can enhance translator in the decision-making process relevant to which synthetic approach to switch to. Indeed, without having a 'translation brief' from the commissioner, it can be argued that each of the two proposed *synthetic approaches* looks to be a satisfactory translation procedure for this particular example (بئس بخص). Yet, if choice has to be made, there is an inclination for the *gist-paratextual approach*, as it can enable a smooth and untroubled communication of the foreign intertext, compared with the *gist-exegetical* one, which is bound to recontextualize and establish such a conceptually-dense foreign intertext within the body of the TL, with the possibility of producing an enlarged TL version that may deviate from normal patterns of linguistic use.

(10) هل أتاك حديث الأظعمة الفاسدة؟

Hath there come unto thee tidings of expired food? (Pickthall 2015, p. 202).

(11) هل أتاك حديث الحاشية؟

Hath there come unto thee tidings of rulers' entourage? (ibid., p. 202).

(12) هل أتاك حديث جهاد النكاح؟

Hath there come unto thee tidings of 'Sexual Jihad'? (ibid., p. 202).

The underlined linguistic construction, i.e., هل أتاك حديث (Hath there come unto thee tidings of...) in the examples above (10-12) is a foreign-Qur'anic intertext that offers a vertical Qur'an-related intertextuality that is likely to present translation hurdles. Essentially, this Qur'anic construction is often used in MSA, but it is rarely used informally. In Arabic, هل أتاك حديث is a linguistic question-making formulae, which literally means *Has the talk of...reached you?* Actually, this is a remarkable Qur'anic question-making formulae that catches the attention of the listener or reader, and which creates an air of suspense in any communicative act. This may explain why this formulae is quite iterable in MSA. Since this study is attaching a special importance to the context from which such constructions are extracted, i.e., a citationality, it is crucially important to grasp the intertextual relations formulated here. Citationality speaking, the Qur'anic question-making formulae هل أتاك حديث pertains to at least three contexts provided in Surah 88 Al-Ghashiya/ Verse 1, Surah 20 Ta-ha/ Verse 9, and Surah 51 Az-Zariyat/ Verse 24, respectively:

هل أتاك حديث الغاشية (الغاشية 1/88)

Hath there come unto thee tidings of the Overwhelming? (Pickthall 2015, p. 202).

وهل أتاك حديث موسى (طه 9/20)

Hath there come unto thee the story of Moses? (ibid., p. 96).

هل أتاك حديث ضيف إبراهيم المكرمين (الذاريات 24/51)

Hath the story of Abraham's honored guests reached thee (O Muhammad)? (ibid., p. 169).

A quick glance at the contexts above can show that this is another tripartite Qur'an-related intertextuality. The most predominant context is the first (i.e. the one provided in Surrah 88 Al-Ghashiya), as the mere mention of هل أتاك حديث would trigger lay Muslims' memory to instantly recall the word الغاشية as to fill the gap, or as to complete this question. The Qur'anic lexical item الغاشية literally means *the overwhelming event*, while Qur'anically, it is one of the labels for the Day of Judgment. This can explain why the word *overwhelming* is capitalized in Pickthall's translation above. In this Surah which bears the same title, i.e., الغاشية (i.e. The Overwhelming), and for the purpose of reporting on the Day of Judgment, God addresses Prophet Mohammed in the opening verse of this Surah with this question: Hath there come unto thee tidings of the Overwhelming? A tantalizing insight on the course of events relevant to this Day is given throughout the Surah, just right after the inaugural verse.

In short, in most cases, the expression هل أتاك حديث is intertextually reminiscent of الغاشية (i.e. The Overwhelming Day) and of the relevant details revealed in the Surrah 88 Al-Ghashia. This is a point of contact that yields another level of meaning, i.e., a vertical intertextual level that requires a special care in the translation process. The second context comes to unfold the story of Prophet Moses. This is another long and exciting story in the Qur'an. The last context, i.e., the third, harks back to the story of Prophet Abraham's honored guests. Again, for spatial limitations, the details of The Overwhelming Surah as well as that of the two stories (i.e. Prophet Moses's and Prophet Abraham's honored guests) cannot be given here. However, these story can be easily obtained from the Qur'an, or from other well-known Islamic religious sources. Insofar as the translation of the examples (10-12) is involved, it is quite obvious that translators would face difficulties in communicating over to the TL the three-layer context, i.e., the *rich* Qur'an-based intertextuality. On the other hand, Pickthall's translation is quite classical and scriptural, for its inclusion of some archaic Middle English words such as *hath*, *unto* and *thee*. This classical register does not seem to fit modern English, i.e., Pickthall's translation is geared towards bringing about an annoying registral rift between the two languages.

Let us now turn to the examples above. Example 10 was taken from Al-Jazeera News website, which reports on the renowned Al-Jazeera programme presenter, Faisal Al-Qasim, who host the famous debate show الإتجاه والإتجاه المعاكس (The Opposite Direction), and who used the example in 10 as an opening utterance for the show, which was devoted to talking about *expired food*. As for example 11, this is a news-headline for an article that was written by Dr. Hassan Al-Ajmi, who talks, in a somehow chronological order, about Muslim rulers' entourage throughout history. Interestingly enough, for the title of this particular article, the author employs the word الحاشية which phonically and morphologically rhyme with الغاشية let alone the employment of هل اتاك حديث as to produce the title هل اتاك حديث الحاشية (i.e. Hath there come unto thee tidings of the entourage?) which resembles to a large extent the Qur'anic verse هل اتاك حديث الغاشية (i.e. Hath there come unto thee tidings of the Overwhelming?). Indeed, this is not a weird coincidence; rather, this is a planned linguistic action. Evidently, the author's purpose is not to take the reader into a spiritual journey to that overwhelming day (i.e. the Day of Judgment), and its drift of events; rather, it is to empower his language by employing such a foreign-Qur'anic intertext. Yet, this linguistic utilization of the Qur'an is not without a price: a complication of meaning.

In the last example 12, the neologism 'Sexual Jihad' makes headlines nowadays in many media outlets, as this is a strange disconcerting concept to all Muslims across the globe. In fact, 'Sexual Jihad' is a controversial practice of women who voluntarily offer themselves in sexual comfort role to men fighting for the establishment of the so-called Islamic rule or state. It is claimed that this practice originated in Tunisia, which waged war against Al-Qaida, and then, through Tunisian girls, it has festered in volatile countries such as Syrian and Iraq. In order to attract the greatest attention to this topic, the author has decided to exploit the same Qur'an-related linguistic equation: هل اتاك حديث as to produce a very attention-grabbing, yet linguistically and culturally powerful title like the one in example 11 above. Again, the result is not only restricted to having a robust title, but also to having an intertextual relation, i.e., a semantic sophistication that is not easy to retain in the TLT.

Based on all that has been said so far, it is self-evident that the classical-religious register used in the authoritative Qur'anic translations, such as Pickthall's would cause havoc to the present-day English audience, and so, to obtain a communicative translation, Pickthall's religious translation should be modified into an acceptable choice such as: Have you got the story of...? or Have you heard about...? These suggested translation options seem to capture the basic textual essence, but undoubtedly, they seem to do injustice to the tripartite intertextual relationship. Obviously, this example (i.e. هل اتاك حديث), and its all relevant linguistic manifestations represent another case of an *intensified* Qur'an-based intertextuality that can be resolved through our suggested synthetic approaches, the *gist-paratextual* or the *gist-exegetical*, which, standing on equal footing, can warrant the transfer of such a sophisticated intertextual relationship. It should be reaffirmed here that the TLT has to go in line with the purpose and intentions of the SLT, with the translation-commissioner's policy, and with the TL readership's expectations, values, and context of use, which may also give translators the license or liberty to venture down even untrodden paths in this regard.

(13) محلل اقتصادي: الحكومة تضع التوقعات الاقتصادية "رجما بالغيب".

An Economic Analyst: The Government Produces Economic Forecast by Guessing at Random. (Pickthall 2015, p. 90).

(14) محاولة اغتيال «كبير».. لم يكن رجماً بالغيب!

Attempt to Assassinate Kubar was not Guessing at Random (ibid., p. 90).

(15) رجما بالغيب: سكان العراق 34 مليون نسمة

Guessing at Random: Iraq's Population Reaches 34 Billions (ibid., p. 90).

The underlined Qur'anic structure رجما بالغيب (i.e. guessing at random) in the examples above (13-15) emerges to deliver a manifest Qur'an-related intertextuality that may throw up translation challenges. Basically, this commonly quoted or used expression literally means *unforeseeable*, *utterly unknown*, or in a more religious sense, *pre-science* which is always attributable to God. This Qur'anic structure enjoys a high degree of iterability in MSA, and figures only in one rich Qur'anic context, i.e. in Surah Al-Kahf/ Verse 22, which should be highlighted as to envisage the intertextual relation engendered by such a structure. Citationally speaking, the following is the original Qur'anic context where رجما بالغيب appears:

سَيَقُولُونَ ثَلَاثَةٌ رَابِعُهُمْ كَلْبُهُمْ وَيَقُولُونَ خَمْسَةٌ سَادِسُهُمْ كَلْبُهُمْ رَجْمًا بِالْغَيْبِ وَيَقُولُونَ سَبْعَةٌ وَثَامُنُهُمْ كَلْبُهُمْ قُل رَّبِّي أَعْلَمُ بِعَدَّتِهِمْ مَا يَعْلَمُهُمْ إِلَّا قَلِيلٌ فَلَا تُمَارِ فِيهِمْ إِلَّا مِرَاءً ظَاهِرًا وَلَا تَسْتَنَفِثْ فِيهِمْ مِنْهُمْ أَحَدًا (الكهف 22/18).

(Some) will say: They were three, their dog the fourth, and (some) say: Five, their dog the sixth, guessing at random; and (some) say: Seven, and their dog the eighth. Say (O Muhammad): My Lord is best aware of their number. None knoweth them save a few. So contend not concerning them except with an outward contending, and ask not any of them to pronounce concerning them (Pickthall 2015, p. 90).

The Qur'anic verse above (22) falls within a broader context of an intriguing Qur'anic narrative of what is widely known as قصة أهل الكهف (i.e. the story of The People of the Cave), which is told in the Qur'an in

Surah Al-Kahf 18, verses 9–26. After a brief opening of Surah Al-Kahf, the story of *The People of the Cave* is narrated in a manner that exhibits how firm faith can reflect positively on believers, as it would engulf them with comfort and inner peace. According to Surah Al-Kahf, a number of young men, who believed in God (i.e., a number of believers) were living in a certain pagan community, where the king would execute anyone who worships anything other than the idols they had. This repression propelled the young men to seek refuge in a cave. The Qur'an also mentions that a dog was accompanying those believers. After that God makes them sleep for 309 lunar years, and when they were made to wake up, they find that the entire world has changed and the community they had fled is no longer a pagan one.

The number of the cave-sleepers is not known for sure, as it is not specified in the Surah. However, the Qur'an reports that there were two clashing groups who were trying to know their exact number: "(Some) will say: They were three, their dog the fourth, and (some) say: Five, their dog the sixth" (Al-Kahf 18/22; Pickthall, 2015, p. 90). At this juncture, the Qur'an employs *رجما بالغيب* to mean that both groups were *guessing at random for something that is pre-science or that is totally hidden or unknown*. Thus, the pragmatic bottom-line of *رجما بالغيب* is to put an end to the ongoing process of the *futile guessing* the two groups were engaged in, as this is God's knowledge. This may account for the reason why MSA employs this Qur'anic expression so heavily whenever there is a situation that is fraught with absolute ambiguity, or when a person does not have the faintest idea about a something or about doing something, and instead, things are performed by going in all directions, and by going in endless loops.

The examples above (13-15) come to re-accentuate the use of *رجما بالغيب* in the manner just indicated. Example 13 is a news-headline that was taken from a Moroccan electronic news website, where the author harshly criticizes his government for the poor planning; rather, for not having the explicit knowledge, nor the skill to produce the needed economic forecast, and that the government does this through *making guesses* and through going in all directions. In other words, this is a *رجما بالغيب* case. The second example 14 is a news-headline for an article that talks about an attempt to assassinate the Wali (i.e. Governor) of North Darfur, Mr. Osman Kuber. The author of the article argues that such an attempt was known to him and to his colleagues, i.e., 'the battalion' of writers and columnists who belong to the same news agency, and who together warned against such an expected attempt. In other words, the author tries to make the point that such an assassination attempt *was not a رجما بالغيب case*, i.e., *it was not guessing-at-random attempt*. as they (i.e. the author himself and his colleagues) had some bits and pieces of information which enabled them to make an informed conjecturing. The last example 15 is a title for an article that was posted on an Iraqi political website, where the author contends that at present time there are no reliable sources in Iraq that can enable obtaining the required data for making a reliable thorough census, and the fact that Iraq's population is 34 billion is a *رجما بالغيب* case, i.e., this is not a true figure, as nobody knows how the Iraqi government obtained it, i.e., this is a *guessing-at-random census*.

This linguistic usage of *رجما بالغيب* can be easily translated into the TL as *making guesses*, or *guessing at random*. Indeed, Pickthall's translation, *guessing at random* used in the examples (13-15) appears to be a convenient *lexicographical equivalence* that can keep the textual essence, but not the intertextual one. In other terms, Pickthall's translation does seem to be conversant with the normal register of modern English, with no misgivings about the registral difference. However, neither the choice to *make guesses* nor Pickthall's *guessing at random* can establish an analogous receiving intertext, as such translational choices do not touch on the cultural significance and value of this story, i.e., the story of *The People of the Cave* that lie just underneath the surface of *رجما بالغيب*. Apparently, such non-saturatable Qur'an-related intertextuality call for pondering our proposed synthetic approaches, i.e., the *gist-paratextual approach* or the *gist-exegetical approach exegetical*, which can be used in tandem, unless the skopos of translation is figured out. To reiterate, translation is an intentional communicative act, and a critical understanding of its skopos can help the translators in deciding on which *synthetic approach* to resort to, or even about which other appropriate translational procedures to take. Indeed, the skopos of translation can transform translators into TL authors, who are released from the sort of limitations and constraints imposed on them by a flawed understanding of the concept of faithfulness or loyalty to the SLT, and who can free themselves from the exigencies of equivalence.

5. Conclusion

The primary concern of this study has been with how Qur'anic discourse is intertextually called upon by actual elements of such a sacred text, and with how such foreign-scriptural formulations or intertexts should be dealt with from a translational point of view. The tide of the foregoing discussion has attempted to examine the difficulties and problems associated with translating into English Qur'an-related intertextuality, featuring in MSA in general, and in the headlines featuring in news agencies' websites in particular. The study draws on Derrida's (1977) dichotomy *iterability/citability*, Kristeva's (1980) *vertical intertextuality*, Fairclough's (1992a; 1992b; 1995 & 2011) *manifest intertextuality*, and Bakhtin's (1986) *double voicing or re-accentuation* to support the premise that Qur'an-related intertextuality can be viewed as an enriching interlingual communicative act that is conducive of conceptual densities that entail 'mobilizing' the translation strategies that can assist in building intertextual relations pertaining to the form and theme of the foreign text. This premise is accentuated by Venuti's (2009, p. 157) view that

"intertextuality enables and complicates translation, preventing it from being an untroubled communication and opening the translated text to interpretive possibilities that vary with cultural constituencies in the receiving situation".

To resolve the translation problems arising from Qur'an-related intertextuality', the study proposes two synthetic approaches: the *gist-paratextual approach* and the *gist-exegetical approach*. These two approaches propose three techniques viz. *gist translation* (cf. Dickens *et al.*, 2002), *exegetical translation* (cf. Dickens *et al.*, 2002), and *paratextual action*. *Gist translation* is concerned with giving translators the choice of wrapping up any given lengthy, detailed, or semantically-loaded text in the form of a synoptic account or laconic summary, whereas, *exegetical translation*, a form of extended translation, goes in the opposite directionality, as it is concerned with allowing translators to explain within the body of the TLT any complex meaning of any given lexical item or expression. *Paratextual action* is concerned with relegating any textual material to an inferior position, i.e., to a paratextual position through taking a paratextual action, such as footnoting, end-noting, annotating, etc.

In a nutshell, the *gist-paratextual approach* subsumes producing a gist translation, then relegating it to a paratextual position in the TLT, whereas the *gist-exegetical approach*, involves producing a gist translation, then incorporating it within the body of the TLT. Thus, the former approach is associated with giving cases of conceptual density an inferior position in the TLT, whereas the latter is associated with giving such cases a prominence in the TLT. Preference, however, is for the *gist-paratextual approach*, as it can enable smooth communication to take place, compared with the *gist-exegetical* one, which is likely to engender enlarged translations that may derail from normal patterns of linguistic use. Indeed, preference for this particular conclusion and/or approach concurs with Federici's (2007) perspective that "the translator can decide to add a glossary or to insert footnotes in order to highlight those intertextual references which are not so clear for the target reader (ibid, p. 153)", and with Neubert and Shreve's view (1992, pp. 117-123) that the translator ought to "mediate" effectively between the textual and communicative conventions of the ST and TT languages, i.e., the intertextual properties of both the ST and the TT have to be fully grasped, which makes translation "an exercise in cross-cultural and cross-linguistic intertextuality" (ibid., p. 123).

The study also concludes that the skopos of translation is central to the production and reception of intertextuality, and to determining which of the two proposed synthetic approaches to operationalize. The study also stresses that a skopos-driven perspective, which necessitates not only focusing on the purpose and/or function of the SLT, but also which entails giving a special attention and care to the TL readership and the translation-commissioner's expectations and aspirations, would grant translators a remarkable degrees of freedom and flexibility in translation, and would open up new horizons for more adequate translation solutions for most forms of intertextuality. In other words, the study attempts to accentuate the fact that the skopos of translation can release the translators from the kind of limitations and constraints imposed on them by a narrow-minded understanding of the concept of faithfulness or loyalty to the SLT, i.e., the skopos can free the translators from the exigencies of equivalence. This conclusion is supported by Farahzad's (2009, pp. 127-130) viewpoint that the relationship between what she calls "prototext" and its subsequent "metatexts" is not one of equivalence, but may be accounted for through intertextuality: "metatexts", she argues, makes the conventional ideas of "equivalence", "source text" and "target text" invalid.

Registral difference between Arabic and English has also been found to provide additional translational turbulences, as Arabic religious discourse is infused with the normal or formal register of MSA, whereas, it is 'abnormal' or 'intoxicating' in the formal register of English. This conclusion is substantiated by Farghal (1993 & 1995). As a corollary, the study suggests that bridging the registral rift, or rather 'purging' the TL version from the SL religious discourse should be the first translational procedure to be taken, before engaging in the painstaking process of rendering the foreign intertextual aspects of meaning. Finally, the study shows that the Holy Qur'an proved to be a virtual breeding ground for *textual dynamism and potentiation*, as any text excerpted from the Qur'an can illuminate any other non-sacred texts, not because the Qur'anic discourse is mystifying, eloquent, and inimitable, but because it formulates an empowering language repertoire, or an empowering language inventory, a fact that may account for the heavy employment of Qur'anic elements in MSA.

References

- Agha, A., & Wortham, S. eds. (2005). Discourse across speech-Events: Intertextuality and interdiscursivity in social life. *Special Issue of the Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 15(1).
- Alawi, N. (2010). Intertextuality and literary translation between Arabic and English. *An- Najah Univ. J. of Res. (Humanities)*, 24(8), 2437-2456.
- Alexieva, B. (1985). Semantic analysis of the text in simultaneous interpretation. In H. Bühler (Ed.) *Proceedings of the Xth World Congress of FIT* (pp. 195-198). Wien: Braumüller.

- _____ (1992). Types of texts and intertextuality in simultaneous interpreting. In Mary Snell-Hornby, Franz Pöchhacker and Klaus Kaindl (Eds.), *Translation Studies: An Interdiscipline* (pp. 179-188). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Allen, G. (2000). *Intertextuality*. London: Routledge.
- Bakhtin, M. (1981). *The dialogical imagination*. Translated by Emerson, C. and Holquist, M., University of Texas press: USA.
- _____ (1986). *Speech genres and other late essays*. Emerson, C. and Holquist, M. (Eds.), Texas: University of Texas press.
- Barton, J. (2000). Intertextuality and 'the final form' of the text. In A. Lemaire & M. Saebo, (Eds.) *Congress Volume: Oslo 1998, Volume 80* (pp. 33-37). International Organization for the Study of the Old Testament. Brill: Leiden, (pp. 33-37).
- Bassnett, S. (2007). Influence and intertextuality: A reappraisal. *Form for Modern Languages Studies*, 43(2), 134-146.
- Bauman, R. (2004). *A world of others' words: Cross-cultural perspectives on intertextuality*. UK: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- _____ (2005). Indirect indexicality', identity, performance: Dialogic observations. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 15(1), 45-150.
- Bazerman, C. (2008). Intertextuality: How texts rely on other texts. In Bazerman, Charles and Prior, Paul (Eds.), *What writing does and how it does it: An introduction to analyzing texts and textual practices*. USA: Lawrence Erlbaum
- Bernstein, B. (1990). *The structuring of pedagogic discourse: Class and control*. Vol. IV, London: Routledge.
- _____ (1996). *Pedagogy, symbolic control and identity*. London: Taylor and Francis.
- Birch, D. (1986). Cunning beneath the verbs: Demythologising Singapore English poetry. In P. Hyland (Ed.), *Discharging the canon: Cross-cultural readings in literature* (pp. 147-190). Singapore: Singapore University Press.
- _____ (1989). Working effects with words -whose words? Stylistics and reader intertextuality. In R. Carter and P. Simpson (Eds.), *Language discourse and literature: An introductory reader* (pp. 257-273). London: Unwin Hyman.
- Bolter, J.D. (1991). *Writing space: The computer, hypertext, and the history of writing*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Chouliaraki, L. and Fairclough, N. (1999). *Discourse in late modernity*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Clayton, J. and Rothstein, E. (1991). *Influence and intertextuality in literary history*. USA: The University of Wisconsin Press.
- Culler, J. (1981). *The pursuit of signs: Semiotics, literature, deconstruction*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- _____ (1976). Presupposition and intertextuality. *MLN*, 91(6), 1380-1398.
- Derrida, J. (1977): *Limited inc.: Evaston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press*.
- Dickins J. et al. (2002). *Thinking Arabic translation. A course in translation method: Arabic to English*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. (1992a). Discourse and text: Linguistic and intertextual analysis within discourse analysis. *Discourse and Society*, 4(2), 133-168.
- _____ (1992b). *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge: Polity.
- _____ (1995). *Critical discourse analysis*. London: Longman.
- _____ (2011). *Media discourse*. New York: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Farahzad, F. (2009). Translation as an intertextual practice. *Perspective: Studies Translatology*, 16(3&4), 125-131.
- Farghal, M. 1993. Arab fatalism and translation from Arabic into English. *Target*, 5(1), 43-53.
- _____ 1995. Euphemism in Arabic: A Gricean interpretation. *Anthropological Linguistics*, 37(3), 366-378.
- Federici, E. (2007). The translator's intertextual baggage. *Forum for Modern Language Studies*, 43(2), 147-160.
- Fewell N. D. (1992). *Reading between texts: Intertextuality and the Hebrew Bible*. Kentucky, USA: Westminster/John Knox Press.
- Fishbane, M. (2000). Types of biblical intertextuality. In A. Lemaire & M. Saebo (Eds.), *Congress Volume: Oslo 1998, Volume 80* (pp. 39-44). International Organization for the Study of the Old Testament. Brill: Leiden.
- Gordon, C. (2003). *Intertextuality in family discourse: Shared prior text as a resource for framing*. Ph.D. diss., Georgetown University.
- Hanna, M. and Smith, J. (2000). The media and their audience: Intertextuality as a paradigm. In Ulrike H. Meinhof, and Jonathan Smith (Eds.), *Intertextuality and the media: From genre to everyday life* (pp. 1-18). Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Hatim, B. (1997). Intertextual intrusions: Towards a framework for harnessing the power of the absent text in translation. In Karl Simms (Ed.), *Translating Sensitive Texts: Linguistic Aspects* (pp. 29-45). The Netherlands: Editions Rodopi, Atlanta.
- Hatim, B. and Mason, I. (1990). *Discourse and the translator*. London: Longman.
- Hatim, B. and Mason, I. (1997). *The translator as communicator*. London: Routledge.
- Hatim, B. and Munday, J. (2004). *Translation: An advanced resource book*. London & New York: Routledge.

- Hiramoto, M. and Sung-Yul Park, J. (2010). Media intertextualities: Semiotic mediation across time and space. *Pragmatics and Society*, 1(2), 79–188.
- Hodges, A. (2011). *The 'war on terror' narrative: Discourse and intertextuality in the construction and contestation of socio-political reality*. New York: Oxford University Press
- Holthuis, S. (1994). Intertextuality and meaning constitution: An approach to the comprehension of intertextual poetry. In János, Petöfi and Terry, Olivi (Eds.), *Approaches to poetry: Some aspects of textuality, intertextuality and intermediality* (pp. 77-93). Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Irwin, W. (2004). Against intertextuality. *Philosophy and Literature*, 28(2), 227-242.
- Khanjan, A. and Mirza, Z. (1386/2008). Intertextuality and its theoretical consequences in translation. *Translation Studies*, 5(20), 5-29.
- Kristeva, J. (1980). *Desire in language: A semiotic approach to literature and art*. In Leon S. Roudiez (Ed.) and translated by T. Gora et al. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Kuleli, M. (2014). Intertextual allusions and evaluation of their translation in the novel *silent house* by Orhan Pamuk. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 158, 206-213.
- Lemke, J. L. (1995). Intertextuality and text semantics. In P. Fries & M. Gregory (Eds.), *Discourse in society: Systemic functional perspectives: Meaning and choice in language: studies for Michael Halliday* (pp. 85-114). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- Neubert, A. and Shreve, G.(1992). *Translation as text*. Kent and London: Kent State University Press.
- Orr, L. (1986). Intertextuality and the cultural text in recent semiotics. *College English*, 48(8), 811-823.
- Pichthal, M. (1930/2015). *The Meaning of the glorious Qur'an: Explanatory translation. Revised Edition*. Beltsville: Amana Publications. Retrieved from: http://www.islamicbulletin.org/free_downloads/quran/quran_pikhtal.pdf
- Ray, T. (2006). Multimediality, interactivity, and hypertextuality.” In Ray T. (Ed.), *Online journalism: A basic text* (pp. 34-59) *University Publishing Online*.
- Reader, K. (1990). Literature/cinema/television: Intertextuality in Jean Renoir's *Le Testament du docteur Cordelier*. In: Worton, Michael and Still Judith, eds. *Intertextuality: theories and practices* (176-189). Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Riffaterre, M. (1978). *The Semiotics of poetry*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- _____ (1994). Intertextuality vs. hypertextuality. *New Literary History*, 25(4), 779-788.
- Sanatifar, M. (2015). Lost in political translation. (Mis)translation of an intertextual reference and its political consequences: The case of Iran. *The Journal of Specialized Translation*, 24, 129-149.
- Schäffner, C. (2010). Political communication: Mediated by translation. In Urszula, Okulska and Piotr, Cap (Eds.), *Perspective in politics and discourse* (pp. 255-279). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- _____ (2004). Political discourse analysis from the point of view of translation studies. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 3(1), 117-150. doi:10.1075/jlp.3.1.09sch.
- _____ (2012). Intercultural intertextuality as a translation phenomenon. *Perspective: Studies in Translatology*. 20(3): 345-364.
- Semino, E. (2009). Text-worlds. In G. Brône and J. Vandaele (Eds.), *Cognitive poetics: Goals, gains, and gaps* (pp. 33-71). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Tannen, D. (2006). Intertextuality in interaction: Reframing family arguments in public and private. *Text & Talk: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Language, Discourse Communication Studies*, 26(4-5), 597–617.
- Thibault, P. J. (1994). Intertextuality. In R. E. Asher (Ed.), *The Encyclopaedia of language and Linguistics* (pp. 1751-1754). Vol.4. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Tovares, A. V. (2005). *Intertextuality in family interaction: Repetition of public texts in private settings*. Ph.D diss., Georgetown University.
- Venuti, L. (2009). Translation, intertextuality, interpretation. *Romance Studies*, 27(3), 157-173.
- Voloshinov, V. (1973). *Marxism and the philosophy of language*. Translated by Matejka, L. and Titunik, I. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Worton, M. (1986). Intertextuality: To inter textuality or to resurrect it. In Kelley D. and Liasera I. (Eds.), *Cross-references: Modern French theory and the practice of criticism*, (pp.14-23). Society for French Studies. W. S. England: Maney & Son Lid.
- Zhang, W. and Zhao, N. (2015). Analysis of the translators' social and psychological trends from the perspective of intertextuality. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 6(1), 157-162.