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Abstract

In our translation programs at Arab universities we devote a lot of time to the teaching of translation theory believing that there are certain rules and theories that if a student masters, s/he will be a better and more competent translator. An awareness of intertextuality undermines the importance of theorizing about translation in favor of boosting translation practices. This paper discusses allusion and the intertextual space in an attempt to highlight the repeated patterns and the tissues of relations that unite all texts. Theorists of intertextuality claim that there is no original text and that there is nothing unsaid before. It is possible, therefore, to deoriginate texts to the zero level, i.e. to find roots for all components of a text in other previous ones. Thus a translator who practices the translation of poetry for several years becomes acquainted with patterns and structures that are repeated in different other texts. Awareness of theoretical materials on the know-how of translation has little value in contributing to the proficiency of a translator; practice is the path of excellence.
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Introduction

This research is an attempt to investigate the importance of the study of intertextuality in the practices of literary translation between English and Arabic. It is divided into six parts and a conclusion. The first part defines intertextuality with particular reference to literary texts. The second part traces attempts in intertextual studies before Julia Kristeva which are genuinely structural, such as Joseph Campbell’s extensive work with myths and their manifestations in different cultures. Campbell’s work is a profound demonstration of the network of relations that myths create among cultures of different places and different times. Thus, without using the term “intertextuality”, Campbell is virtually engaged in studying some kind of structural relations between texts. The third part is a demonstration of how allusions as one form of intentional intertextuality gain different meanings as they travel among texts, times, places and cultures. The intertextual space is the space in which a sign travels between texts and through which it gains different meanings and implications. The fourth part offers examples and a discussion of intentional and unintentional intertextuality with the assumption that most writers are generally unaware of their borrowings from other texts. Part five is a demonstration of how the matrix of a text influences its reading with the assumption that each reading of a text is a rewriting of it. Part six points briefly to two assumptions of the genesis of texts: the theological and the scientific. There is a growing trend among exponents...
of intertextuality to link the evolution of texts to the biological evolution whereby texts are seen as members in a chain similar to the scala naturae (the great chain of beings) of Darwin. Monotheistic religions, however, offer a different assumption which traces the origin of texts to the first word of God.

By offering this account on intertextuality, and the intertextual space, the researcher hopes that the study of intertextuality will become a major component in the syllabi of translation courses and literature courses at Arab universities so that students become alerted to the tissues of relations between texts in their translation practice and in their study of literature. They, therefore, are encouraged to read extensively in the culture of the English language so that they enrich their reservoir of matrices and boost their comprehension of the language, and, hence, the speed and quality of their translation output.

**Intertextuality in a Nutshell**

The interest in intertextuality in the domains of literature, linguistics and translation is combined usually with the philosophical trends of post-structuralism and deconstruction that dominated the second part of the twentieth century. In the deconstructive logic a text is seen as a shifting field of relations that are influenced by temporality and space. Deconstruction defies the existence of a transcendental signified – a fixed meaning of a text. The meaning of a text is not necessarily what the writer or speaker intends to communicate. Once a word leaves the lips of the speaker it becomes the property of the listener; s/he may understand it within his/her temporal and surrounding realities and matrices. Meanings according to the conventions of deconstruction, the reader-response approach to texts and intertextuality are produced within a system of relations between texts. “We do not read a text in isolation but within a matrix of possibilities constituted by earlier texts which function as langue to the parole of individual textual production.” (Fowler, 2000: 117). These relations are influenced by time and place. Something said one hundred years ago in London may be understood in a different way today in Jerusalem. The structure of relations is governed by a dialectic of resemblance and difference; a text is understood by its relationship to
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other texts within the established structure since, as Fowler observes “The textual system exists before any texts, and texts are born always already situated within that system, like it or not.” (Fowler, 2000: 119)

Intertextuality becomes one of the attractions of translation studies, literary criticism and linguistics since it responds to the contemporary understanding and treatment of texts. Intertextuality, thus, sees a text as a tissue of relations between signs that are influenced by space and time. Such reality explains the different interpretations of literary texts and the constant productions and reproductions of classical plays in our time adopting different perspectives relating the present realities of interlocutors. The production of say \textit{Hamlet} on a Broadway theatre in New York would certainly mean a different reading and perception of the play from that which existed in the sixteenth century when the play was first performed.

Each reading of a text is in fact a rewriting of it. The reader cannot understand a text if s/he is not put within its matrix of relations. Unfamiliarity with certain objects and concepts leads to lack of comprehension. A reader who is not acquainted with what the word “sonnet” means will not be able to relate to the form and the content of the sonnet that s/he reads. Familiarity with the form of the Shakespearean sonnet would mean to the informed reader that he will read three quatrains and a couplet. In the first quatrain the reader expects to find an introduction of a problem or an issue; in the second, s/he expects to find a development of the introduced issue of the first quatrain. The third quatrain gives some sort of a resolution, and the couplet gives the main theme. The sonnet template, therefore, is part of the literary genealogy of texts.

According to Kristeva (1980), there is no original text; it is possible to deoriginate texts to a zero level by which nothing remains unsaid before. Readers vary in their abilities to deoriginate texts; their experience in the culture of the language and their knowledge of the world are responsible for deciphering relationships among texts. Less informed readers are less likely to be able to trace the tissues of relationships between texts. One can safely agree with Kristeva that there
is simply no word that is unsaid or unused in different contexts by different writers or speakers. The originality of a work lies in the writer’s or speaker’s new ways of putting words together. We generally create our texts out of the surrounding language structures and texts. When we read or listen to texts, we rewrite them according to our new surroundings and our knowledge of other texts. “Kristeva referred to texts in terms of two axes: a horizontal axis connecting the author and reader of a text, and a vertical axis, which connects the text to other texts” (cited in Chandler, 2004)

Kristeva’s enthusiasm for intertextuality, however, did not go without criticism. William Irwin (2004) in his “Intertextuality” (published in Philosophy and Literature) debunks intertextuality as a “politically charged theory” which “lacks consistency and which should be stricken from the lexicon of sincere and intelligent humanists” because it “does not illuminate or elucidate but rather mystifies and obscures” (Irwin: 2004: 240). Whereas Irwin’s argument sounds enticing for the layman, I think it is caught in the logocentrism of its premise. First the talk about Marxism and the concept of the author as the product of capitalism who is stripped of his ownership of knowledge in favor of promoting the role of a reader, is simply iconic and, in short, Western in orientation. Even while trying to undermine the role of the reader, Irwin is caught in the very tapestry of intertextuality. For example, he writes: “When the reader takes the place of the author the text potentially becomes ‘a tale told by an idiot, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing.’” (Irwin: 2004:236). Irwin could only find syntax which, if deoriginated, would remove him two levels from his text; one to Faulkner’s The Sound and the Fury and one to Shakespeare’s Macbeth.

Second, Irwin cites the example of American Baseball and its relationship to Babe Ruth in interpreting American literature

The problem, though, is that the importance of baseball in general, and Babe Ruth in particular, is marginal at best to the interpretation of American literature. Drawing relations between baseball and literature may generate a plaisir du texte for some, but there is no necessary or essential connection between the phenomena. (Irwin: 2004:237)
This discourse ends up in a logocentric assumption that “there is no necessary or essential connection between the Phenomena”. The automatic response of a deconstructionist would be: what if there is?

To conclude, we cannot remain static, nor can we reverse things to the past. Intertextuality anticipated and catered for the age of information while it attended to the present time of its inception in the 1960s and 1970s. Graham Allen sums it up as follows:

That such a turn of vision, when first articulated, looked forward to a world that in the 1960s and 1970s did not quite exist, as well as to a world that did, can be registered simply by switching our attention to the realm of World Wide Web. (Allen, 2000:6)

New Terms Old Practices

Some intellectuals of the second half of the 20th century, including Julia Kristeva, began their philosophical mission as structuralists and then became among the most prominent poststructuralists. While intertextuality and deconstruction are post-structural terms, they, generally, find their roots in structuralism. Even before Julia Kristeva introduced intertextuality in 1966 as a term to describe the relationship between texts, other structural critics took similar stands towards finding unifying tissues among different texts. In 1949, Joseph Campbell published one of the most influential books in the 20th century, The Hero with a Thousand Faces. Campbell argues that all myths share one structure that he delineates into different stages and calls monomyth. There are as many as seventeen stages that myths share, but Campbell cites four major stages representing an archetypal cycle: "passage: separation-initiation-return:"

The standard path of the mythological adventure of the hero is a magnification of the formula represented in the rites of passage: separation-initiation-return: which might be named the nuclear unit of the monomyth. A hero ventures forth from the world of common day into a region of supernatural wonder: fabulous forces are there encountered and a decisive victory is won: the hero comes back from this mysterious
adventure with the power to bestow boons on his fellow man. Prometheus ascended to the heavens, stole fire from the gods, and descended, Jason sailed through the clashing Rocks into the sea of marvels, circumvented the dragon that guarded the Golden Fleece, and returned with the fleece and the power to wrest his rightful throne from the usurper. Aeneas went down into the underworld, crossed the dreadful river of the dead, threw a sop to the three-headed watchdog Cerberus, and conversed, at last, with the shade of his dead father (Campbell, 1949: 30)

Campbell, therefore, traces a tissue of relations that is cross-cultural and bound to one origin. The hero of the different myths that Campbell offers as examples becomes a repeated pattern in every culture amounting to an archetype that is shared in the collective unconscious of one culture or different cultures. Campbell’s monomyth is one form of intertextuality that searches for tissues of relations among different myths in different cultures, only to find that they all have one hero who wears different faces in different cultures. Each of the above heroes initiates a mission, faces difficulties and returns with the prize. Such pattern lends itself to the textual system which, according to Fowler (2000), “exists before any text” is born.

Allusion and the Intertextual Space

In modern literature, allusions are one major form of intertextuality; they are usually made to significant events, places or people who have very well-known qualities that the speaker or writer wishes to highlight in his/her new text. Allusions are borrowed from history, from myth or from any previous text for the purpose of recalling the qualities of the alluded to text in the present moment of the speaker or writer. According to Hatim and Mason, “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” (Hatim and Mason, 1990: 129). T.S. Eliot alludes to Hamlet in his “The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock” because he wanted to bring to his readers the qualities of valor, hesitation and procrastination that the Character of Hamlet represents. Hamlet procrastinates for valid reasons related to his prudence and careful
investigation of the allegations of his father's ghost who urges him to revenge. Prufrock is very much unlike Hamlet; he procrastinates because he is defeated and marginalized in the materialism of twentieth century life. In other texts, Hamlet may be used to bring to the minds of readers a different connotation pending on the matrix of the text. This intrusion of Hamlet in Eliot's "The Love Song" becomes harmonious within the atmosphere of the poem that Eliot draws for his readers. Within the context of intertextuality, allusions participate in the creation of a network of tissues between texts. Some allusions are very popular and occur in several texts; they travel between texts and every time they are borrowed they gain new meanings within the intertextual space. The classical example that is usually cited is Oedipus. In the myth of Oedipus which existed in history before Sophocles, Oedipus is cited as a gloomy and unfortunate creature who is driven to his fate of killing his father and marrying his mother. In Sophocles' play Oedipus gains new qualities associated to the need of the dramatic realities and the poetics of the time. Oedipus in the play is a hero whose virtues as a husband and as a father are highlighted and whose blindness becomes symbolic of his ignorance of who he is and of the shame of marital rites and relations that he lives. In 20th century psychology, Sigmund Freud's allusion to Oedipus gains qualities related to Freud's desire to cite the example of Oedipus as a proof of the psychological problems that one suppresses due to his sexual attachment to his mother. The example of Oedipus is one in an array of examples in mythology.

As the allusion travels in the intertextual space, it continues to gain new qualities. Neither in the time of the myth of Oedipus nor in the time of Sophocles did it occur to any one of the interlocutors that Oedipus will be cited as an example of a psychotic person. Today it is likely that an allusion to Oedipus carries reference to Freud's psychoanalytic interpretation of the Oedipus complex. The allusion to Oedipus transcended the boundaries of time and place; it has become cosmopolitan. Oedipus is known to almost all cultures.

Allusions in Arabic literature are abundant and very much revealing. For example a reference to Omar bin Al-Khattab would generally
connote the values of justice, democracy, courage humbleness and equality. In the following example Omar is alluded to for his humbleness and justice;

قد راع صالح كسرى أن رأى عمرا
بين الرعية عطلا وهو راعيها

“Startled was the envoy of the Caesar when saw he
Omar humble and a guardian amongst his subjects” (Hafez Ibrahim),
(My translation).

The following modern allusion to Omar bin Al-Khattab is quite different. New realities and new spaces create new meanings. Or, as the allusion travels between places and times, it gains new meanings and connotations that are decided by the surroundings of the sender and receiver.

Ibin Al-Khattab is deceased
I here mourn him to you at every pilgrimage
Oh ye natives of far regions, weepers for the shades of memory
(Mohammad Abu Doma, 2006: 7) (My translation)

Abu Doma’s allusion to Omar bin Al-Khattab is very much surprising to present day readers. Omar is generally alluded to to bring to the mind the values of justice, equality and humbleness. But at a time (temporality is recalled here) of spiritual dryness, lack of justice, the urgent need for heroes the likes of Omar and the disintegration of Arabism, the poet, Mohammad Abu Doma, is enraged by people who entertain themselves with the memory of heroes of ancient times when they are incapacitated and when they lack the merit and the courage to defy the enemy. These realities are the matrices that decide the new reading of the text.
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Intentional and Unintentional Intertextuality

Intertextuality can be both intentional and unintentional. Intentional intertextual relations are somewhat visible and can be easily cited such as allusions, plagiarism, the use of conventional symbols and images, the use of poetic and other literary forms, the use of proverbs, patterns of structure and figures of speech. Unintentional intertextuality is invisible and needs a good amount of awareness of the culture of the language to be discerned by a scrutinizing eye of a reader. A writer or a speaker may opt for utterances that s/he is exposed to from another unidentified source that he himself may not remember reading or hearing at one point in time and place. Such utterances may not be identified by the majority of readers and they appear, therefore, deceptively original when they are not. But if a poem by Mahmoud Darwish reminds us of a fragment of a poem by Al-Mutanabi that does not mean that Darwish is consciously copying or imitating Al-Mutanabi.

Intentional and unintentional intertextuality can happen within the same culture as much as it may happen cross-culturally; it can happen on the level of the word, the sentence or the whole text (as in the case of allusions to myths). On intertextuality on the word level, I take, for example, the word “assassination”. Critics point to the fact that the word did not exist in the English language before Shakespeare. It seems that the word is one of the many word coinages that he introduced into the English language. The word is also known to have Arabic origins. It has affinity with hashashin an adjective of one who takes hashish to drug himself (Pozefsky, 2005). But it seems also that the Crusaders used forms of the word in their different European languages to describe Muslim freedom fighters. The story has roots to the claim that these freedom fighters drugged themselves with hashish so that they become brave and won’t fear death (Blyth, 2009). But since Crusader histories are generally not trustworthy, one tends to debunk their sources. It is very likely that the word was used as an equivalent to today’s use of the word terrorist. The Crusaders of the medieval times wanted to defy freedom fighting of Muslims by giving them a bad name. The etymology of the word aside, the present use of the word poses another problem. In the Palestinian
Intifada, the use of the word took another turn. While Palestinian people like to use the word to describe the unjust killing of the young Palestinian activists, Israel wants to use different words such as “target killing”. When Palestinian media use the word “assassination” to describe the acts of Israeli soldiers, the old connotation of someone who drugs himself to be brave disappeared or is, perhaps, forgotten; the word is used to describe the unjust killing of an important person for political and unjust reasons. Such knowledge of the etymology of the word and its matrices would enlighten the translator and would make him able to negotiate meanings as s/he translates.

Texts usually give words added meanings. Only in the language of the Holy Bible do we see the word “know” used as a euphemism for lovemaking or sexual intercourse. “And Adam knew Eve his wife; and she conceived, and bare Cain, and said, I have gotten a man from the LORD” (The Book of Genesis, 4:1) This usage of the word “know” is particular to the Holy Bible; it is the matrix of the text that brings to the minds of readers that the word “know” has a different meaning from that which is commonly known to all (to be acquainted with).

Unintentional intertextuality can be sensed in the very mechanics and structures of a language such as the passive voice, the question tags, the different systems of negation in a language, the formation of subjective and objective questions, the use of marked vs. unmarked structures ---etc. Whereas such language features are visible, their use by interlocutors is mechanical and, therefore, less intentional (though at certain instances it can be intentional). Unintentional intertextuality can also be sensed in the writer’s choice of the genre and the general organizational features of a text. When one writes fiction, poetry or drama, his/her choice of the genre is mechanical since s/he follows the possibilities of his/her talent. But when one chooses the stream of consciousness technique in his/her fiction, or the sonnet in his/her poetry, one is making a more intentional choice that lends itself to the "tissues" of intertextual discourse.
Texts, Matrices and Translation

The matrix of a text decides the meaning that a reader may elicit. The place, the time, the surrounding conditions of the reader and his/her individual and collective unconscious are responsible for building the intertextual relations that are needed to relate, interpret, understand and then translate a text. Stanley Fish, in his *Is There a Text in This Class* (1980) marks a departure from the static acceptance of a text as a subjective entity with fixed meanings that are decided by the text or the writer. For Fish, a text is recreated by a community of readers:

Thus the act of recognizing literature is not constrained by something in the text, nor does it issue from an independent or arbitrary will; rather, it proceeds from a collective decision that will be in force only as long as a community of readers or believers continues to abide by it” (Fish, 1980:11)

The following poem was given to a class of sophomore Palestinian students “a community of readers”. No information was given to them as to lead them to the identity of the poet. All students without any exception liked the poem and were prompted to think of it as one of Mahmoud Darwish’s poems that narrate the atrocities committed against the Palestinian people by the Israeli soldiers. Far from that; the poem was written in 1980 by the Iranian poet Ahmad Shamlu following the fall of the Shah and the rise of the Islamic Republic. The poet is critical of and pained by the killing of Iranian people by Iranians. But the matrix of Palestinian “community of readers” corresponds to the hyperboles of “sniffing” at one’s heart and breath to detect patriotism and love of one’s country and one’s countrymen. It corresponds to the image of “butchers guarding the roads” whose “axes are dipped in blood”. It corresponds to the symbolism of “canaries barbecued/on the wood-fire of lily/and jasmine”. It corresponds to the fear generating scenes of soldiers knocking at the doors destroying one’s light and violating his/her freedom:

DEAD-END

Ahmad Shamlu; (1925 — 2000)
A Persian poet, writer, and journalist

They sniff at your breath
in case you have uttered
a word of love;
they sniff at your heart:
These are strange times,
my precious.

And love itself is whipped and hanged
at a public crossroads:
better to hide your love
in a cellar.

In the twists and turns of
this cold dead-end
they keep their fires alight
fuelled with songs
and poems;
don't try to think:
these are strange times,
my precious.

He who knocks on the door
at nightfall,
has come to destroy your light:
Better to hide your light
in a cellar.

Look, these are the butchers
guarding the roads,
their axes dipped in blood:
these are strange times,
my precious.

---------------------------------- An-Najah Univ. J. of Res. (Humanities), Vol. 24(8), 2010
Smiles are sealed onto lips,
songs are stuffed into
gaping mouths:
better to hide your joy
in a cellar.

Canaries are barbecued
on the wood-fires of lily
and jasmine:
these are strange times,
my precious.

Lucifer, crazed with victory,
feasts on the fruits of our
mourning:
better to hide your God,
in a cellar.

As students become acquainted with the poet and what prompted him
to write the poem, a new matrix is developed and a new less sympathetic
reading emerged. From an intertextual point of view, every reading is a
rewriting of a text and our reading (rewriting) of a text is strictly
governed by time and place; our understanding of things has to do
generally with our experiences in life that are manifold. The most
immediate of experiences are the most influential on us. That is why
Freud considers a slip of a tongue as a mail from the unconscious mind
and not simply an incidental speech faltering. A hungry person is likely
to read “breadshead” instead of “bedspread” as s/he argues with his/her
partner and a thirsty person is likely to read “water” as s/he talks to
someone about his “daughter”. One, therefore, feels the dictations of time
and place either intentionally or unintentionally as they mold his own
feelings as s/he reads (rewrites) the poem; each reading differs as the
matrix of that particular reading differs.
Introducing intertextuality to the domain of translation does not necessarily aim at aborting attempts at theorizing about translation; it only offers models of interpreting texts by texts and linking texts together so that the translation practice becomes more creative, lucid and attainable. Translation theory labors hard in explaining and espousing to students theories of translating poetry that are now contemplatively laborious now laboriously contemplative with little attention paid to translation practice.

The following are excerpts from a poem by Mustafa Al-Jazzar (2008) titled “Oh! Antara”: The poem laments Iraq and the dilemma of Iraqi people after the American invasion. It is a parody of “Mu’allaq Antara,” one of the famous poems of the Jahilia (pre-Islamic) period referred to as “Mu’allaqat” (hangings). These “Mu’allaqat” are poems that recount bravery, pride, platonic love, chivalry and valor among many other heroic traits; traits that are, according to the poet, much needed in present-day Iraq. A little exercise in deoriginating the most visible intertextual relations in the poem demonstrates how familiar patterns and stretches of language become textual oases for a translator or an interpreter.

٦٧٢٨

ىٍاَ١١٩

غيِّنَ تَخْلِّلتْ عَنْكَ. هَذَا دَأْبُهُمُ

كَفْكَفَ دَمُوعُكَ وَانْسَجِبَ يَا عَنْتَرَةٍ

قُفْ يَوْمَةً أَصْبِحْتُ مُسْتَعْمِرَهُ

لا تَرَجُ بَسِمَةُ ثُغْرُها يوْمَا، فَقَدْ

سَقَطْتَ مِنَ الْعَدُّ الْإِسْمِيَّةِ الْجَوْهَرَةِ

قَبِلَ سَيْوِفُ الْغَاشِبِينَ. لِئِصْفَحُوا

وَخِضْ بِجِنْاحِ الْخَزِيِّ وَأَرْجَ الْمَعْتَرَةِ

--------------------------

يَا دَارُ عِيْلَةٍ بِالْعِسْرَاءِ تَكْلِمِي

هل أَصْبِحْتُ جَنْسَتُ بَانِثَ مَقْفُورَةٌ؟

هَلَا سَأَلَتْ النَّيْنَلْ يَا بْنَةُ مَالِكِكَ

كَيفَ الْصَّمْدُوْدَ؟ وَأَيْنَ أَبْنَيْنَانَ الْمَقْدَرَةٍ

--------------------------
Oh! Antara
Abs has forsaken you; it is their temperament
Hold back your tears and withdraw, oh Antara
Abla’s eyes are now colonized
Do not hope for her smile again
For the jewel has fallen from the precious necklace
Kiss the swords of coercers with blessing so that they absolve
And lower to them the wing of shame and ask for their forgiveness

------------------------------------
Oh Abla’s home in Iraq, say:
Have the heavens of Babylon become graveyards?
Have you not asked the steeds oh daughter of Malik?
How steadfastness? And where is forwardness?

------------------------------------
And the tears of Abla’s eyes
Are still monitoring the far bridge to cross

------------------------------------
This is the hand of homelands and it will reward its people
Whoever commits an evil in its path will see it

(Al-Jazzar, 2008) (My translation)
Intertextual relations are, of course, not limited to poetry; all literary genres as well as all kinds of discourse and texts can be deoriginated in the same way. Poetry, though, is known to be one of the most challenging genres in translation practice. A reader who is acquainted with Arab culture and literature will find numerous examples of intertextual relations in the above poem. There are frequent links to the original parodied poem in addition to some other tapestry of resources. The resources alluded to (marked in bold type) are as follows:

In the first line the phrase "دَمْوعَكُمْ آَفْكِف" (hold back your tears) recalls the first words of a poem written by Ibrahim Touqan, the Palestinian poet, which contains the following line:

"كَفِفْ دِمَوَعَكَ لَيْسَ يَنْفَعُكَ البَكَّاءَ وَ لاَ العَوْيِلْ" (hold back your tears for neither tears nor wallowing will do you any good)

In line five, "اْيَلُسْوَفَ القَبِّيْلْ" (kiss the swords of coercers) is an echo of one line in the source poem, “Mu’allaqt Antara,” in which Antara wishes to kiss the arrows since they resemble Abla’s (his beloved) teeth. The simile is perhaps meant to serve the theme of platonic love and bravery.

In line six, "وَأَخَفِضْ جُناحَ" (and lower the wing of) is part of the Quranic phraseology (Verse: 23 Al-Isra’, the Holy Quran). Lines 7&9 are echoes of the source poem.

Line 13, "هَذِي يَدُ" (this is the hand of) is a phrase which echoes part of a poem by the Egyptian poet, Hafez Ibrahim:

"هَذِي يَدُ عَن بَنِى مُصْرِى تُصَاافِحُهمُ قَصَافِحَهَا تُصَاافِحُ نَفْسَهَا الْعَرَب" which translates as follows:

This is my hand on behalf of the people of Egypt; if you shake it all Arabs will come to reconciliation.

Line 14, the phrase "يَرَهُ شَرَّاً" (evil he will see) is an echo of one verse from of the Holy Quran: “So whoever does an atom's weight of evil will see it” (Verse 8, Al-Zalzala, the Holy Quran).
One can only deoriginate the parts of a text that s/he has been made familiar with through his life experience because a text after all, from an intertextual point of view’ takes a loose definition and the mosaic of intertextuality leads to almost indefinite borders and realms.

The theory of translation discourses on the different strategies of translating poetry. For example, compensation is a strategy that a lot of theorists of translation recommend as a strategy to make up for the loss of meaning that is likely to happen within the act of negotiating meanings between the source and target texts. The choice of a compensation strategy is left for the individual discretion and textual potentials of the translator; no extra help is possible that is within the reach of the translation theory. The translator’s ability to compensate, however, is enhanced once his intertextual space and reservoir is enlarged.

Even componential analysis, the most accurate of translation procedures, can be enhanced by familiarity with as many different texts as possible. An informed reader will have more options available to him to choose from once the componential analysis is set up for solving a translation problem.

Evolution and the Genesis of Texts

The question that arises is: is there a first text or an original text? The theological answer to this question is clearly stated. In the Holy Bible it is written, "In the beginning was the word and the word was with God and the word was God" (John 1:1, the Holy Bible). Despite the well-known interpretation of this verse, one is tempted to believe that one possible meaning may also allude to the creation of language because in the Book of Genesis, there is another “theory” of the origin of all languages.

And the LORD said, Behold, the people is one, and they have all one language; and this they begin to do: and now nothing will be restrained from them, which they have imagined to do. Go to, let us go down, and there confound their language, that they may not understand one another's speech. So the LORD scattered them abroad from thence upon the face of all the earth: and they left off to build the city. Therefore is the
name of it called Babel; because the LORD did there confound the language of all the earth: and from thence did the LORD scatter them abroad upon the face of all the earth. (Genesis 11, King James Bible)

The Holy Quran, makes a similar reference to a beginning of words or an early text:

"And He taught Adam all the names, then presented them to the angels; He said: Tell Me the names of those if you are right. They said: Glory be to Thee! We have no knowledge but that which Thou hast taught us. Surely Thou art the Knowing, the Wise" (Verse 31, Al-Baqara, The Holy Quran)

Monotheistic religions seem to have unanimity in assuming the beginning of all things including languages and their origins. The Holy Quran refers to the infinite possibility of word formation: “And if all the trees that are in the earth were pens, and the ocean were ink, with seven oceans swelling it thereafter, the words of Allah would not be exhausted. (Verse 26, Luqman, the Holy Quran)

But modern science has a different say. There is the trend that likes to think of the evolution of texts, the way Darwin thought of the evolution of species; all evolved from a one-cell ameba.

Conclusion

Awareness of intertextuality has become of paramount importance for translators. If there is no original text and if all texts are a rearrangement of other texts, it must be useful for translators to acquaint themselves with textual patterns in both the target and the source languages. I am not suggesting memorization of translated texts, but an engagement in the translation process with 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.
We are therefore invited to review the syllabi of the translation programs at our universities bearing in mind the need for some reduction in courses of theory of translation in favor of introducing translation and intertextual practices.
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