MANIFESTATIONS OF RELIGIOUS INTERTEXTUALITY IN THE SELECTED AUTOCHTHONOUS   ARABIC LITERARY HERITAGE OF SOUTH WEST NIGERIA

Hakeem Salmon
Lagos State University, Ojo, Nigeria

ABSTRACT

Intertextuality – one of the seven standards of textuality, according to the proposals of De Beaugrande and Dressier- is the intersection within the text of an expression taken from other texts A poet who studies poetry for several years does not only becomes acquainted with patterns and structures that are repeated in others, but also adopts them , advertently or otherwise in his output .As the holy Quran and Hadith are repertoires of religious science and spiritual knowledge, muslims are expected to draw from them not only to fortify their spiritual entity but also to strengthen their linguistic dexterity and invigorate their literary aesthetics. Little wonder that we see leaders,orators,literati and belletrists right from the inchoate Islam and throughout the successive literary periods incorporating and embedding parts of the Quran in their output, be it poetry or prose. This phenomenon also featured prominently in Nigerian autochtonous literery productions right from the era of Usman Dan Fodiyo till the present day. This paper is set to investigate religious intertextuality in the selected samples of literary outpours of two prominent religious icons in south west Nigeria.

Keywords: Holy Quran, Intertextuality, Islam, Belletrists, Poetry

1. INTRODUCTION

Intertextuality is the shaping of texts' meanings by other texts. ' [1] It entails an author's borrowing and transformation of a prior text or to a reader's referencing of one text in reading another. It becomes of the attractions of literary and linguistic criticism since it responds to the contemporary understanding and text treatment. Thus, it sees a text as a tissue of relations between signs that are influenced by space and time.This paper is set to investigate the manifestation of religious intertextuality in Arabic poetry in alignment with the structure below

2. TEXT : MEANING , EVOLUTION AND GENESIS
2.1 Meaning:
Text refers to any written or spoken passage of any length. However, it cannot be just a random collection of sentences neither can the sentence be just a random collection of lexical items. It should be a unified whole whose whole units, words and sentences are connected together in a cohesive manner through cohesive devices that make the text hang together and create its unique texture and total unity. [2] In each text, the cohesive devices are employed as linguistic means intra-sententially [the same sentence] and inter-sententially   [plural sentences] to achieve cohesion.

2.2 Evolution and Genesis of Text
Islam, a monotheistic religion, relates the beginning of all things including languages and their origin to the Almighty Allah. The Qur'an succinctly and explicitly postulates

And He (Allah) taught Adam all the names (of everything)   then He showed them to the angels and said " Tell me the   names of these if you are truthful". They (the angels) said "Glory be to Thee! We have no knowledge but that which Thou have taught us. Surely, Thou art the All Knowing, the the All wise. [3]

It further emphasizes the infiniteness and inexhaustibility of word formation:

"And if all 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". [4]

Dwelling on the same issue, the holy Bible unequivocally asserts

"In the beginning was the word and the word was with God and the word was God". [5]

Despite 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 languageh 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". [6]

Scientifically, there is a growing trend that likes to think of the evolution of texts, the way Darwin thought the evolution of species; all evolved from a one-cell ameba.

2.3 Texts and Matrices

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, interprete, understand and then translate a text.[7] Stanley Fish, 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, or thus 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".[8]

By and large, one can safely agree that every reading is a rewriting of a text and that this rewriting (reading) is strictly influenced by time and place. More so, our understanding of things has to do generally with our experiences in life; the most immediate of experic::ces are the most influential on us, each reading differs as the matrix of that particular reading differs.

For this, a slip of tongue is considered by Freud as a mail from the unconscious mind and not simply an incidental speech faltering. A hungry person is likely to say "bread spread" instead of "bed spread" as s/he argues with his/her partner and a thirsty person in likely to say water' as s/he talks to someone about his "daughter". [9]

3. INTERTEXTUALITY
3.1 Concept of Intertextuality

Intertextuality is the actual presence of one text in another. It is referred to as *al-tanass* in Arabic language. It was coined by the Bulgarian poststructuralist Julia Kristeva in 1966 and since then, the term "intertextuality" has been borrowed and transformed many times. William Irwin says, the term "has come to have almost as many meanings as users, from those faithful to Kristeva's original vision to those who simply use it as a stylish way of talking about allusion

and influence". [10] Her coinage of intertextuality represents an attempt to synthesize Ferdinand de Saussure's semiotics [his study of how signs derive their meaning within the structure of a text] with her Russian master, M. Bakhtin's dialogism   [his examination of the multiple meanings, or "heteroglossia", in each text (especially novel) and in each word [11] For the Bulgarian, "the notion of intertextuality replaces the notion of "intersubjectivity" [12] when we realize that meaning is not transferred directly from writer to reader; but instead, is mediated through or filtered by "codes" imparted to the writer and reader by other texts. This intertextual view of literature support the concept that the meaning of a text does not reside in the text, but is produced by the reader in relation not only to the text in question, but also the complex network of texts involved in the reading process as shown by Roland Barthes.'[13]

More recent poststructuralist theory re-examines "Intertextuality" as a production within texts, rather than as a series of relationships between different texts.' [14] According to Hatim and Mason,' Intertextuality is a precondition for the intelligibility of texts. It is viewed to be a device through which a text refers backward or forward to previous or up coming texts, carried out by alluding to, adapting, or invoking meanings embedded in those other texts. [15] Such intertextual networks should be recognised and understood by recipients, in order to retrieve the full range of intended meaning in .a given text. Unsuccessful endeavours to do so will certainly end with partial understanding, or incomplete recovery of the actual meaning intended while producing the concerned text. The interest in intertextuality in the domains of literature and linguistics is combined usually with the philosophical trends of post-structurallism and deconstruction that dominated the 2nd part of the 20th century. [16] A text is seen as a shifting field of relations that are influenced by temporality and space in the deconstructive logic which defies the existence of a fixed meaning of a text. Thus, the meaning of a text is not really the meaning of the listener. Meanings, according to the conventions of deconstruction are 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." [17] Time and place also influence these relations. Something said years ago somewhere might mean another thing today in different location to different people. The structure of relations is governed by dialectic of resemblance and difference; a text is understood by its relationship to other texts within the established structure. Fouler observes:"The textual system exists before any texts, and texts are born always already situated within that system, like it or not".[18] There is no doubt that a reader can only understand a text if s/he is put within its matrix of relations. Unfamiliarity with certain object, words and concepts leads to lack of comprehension; this affirms the fact that each reading of a text is a rewriting of it. Julia Kristeva states that there is no original text, it is possible to deoriginate texts to a zero level by which nothing remains unsaid before.[19] Readers' abilities in this regard are vary, due to their levels of experience in the culture of the language and their knowledge of the world. Less informed readers are less likely to be able to trace the tissues of relationships between texts. We generally create our texts out of 1 surrounding language structures and texts. When a writer or speaker reads or listens to texts, s/he rewrites (reproduces) them according to her/his new surrounding and knowledge of other texts. For this, it is safe to agree with Kristeva that there is simply no word that is unsaid or unused in different contexts by different writers or speakers. The writer's or the speaker's new ways of putting words together determines the originality of a work. Kristeva referred to texts in terms of two axes: horizontal and vertical, he expatiates that horizontal axis connects the author and readers of text while the other connects the text to other texts. However, Willian Irwin criticises

Kristeva's enthusiasm for intertextuality. In his *"Intertextuality"* he 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" [20]. This argument, whereas, might interest layman, as Irwin himself is caught in the tapestry of intertextuality while trying to undermine the reader's role. 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".[21]

If this is de-originated it would remove Irwin two levels from his text, one to Faulkner's *The Sound and the Furry*" and one to Shakespeare's *"Macbeth"*.By and large, while intertextuality attended to the present time despite its inception in the 1960s and 1970s, it also anticipated and catered for the age of information since we cannot remain static, nor can we reverse things to the past. 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"*.[22]

3.2 New terms, old practices

While the theoretical concept of intertextuality is associated with post-modernism, the device itself is not new. Julia Kristeva and some intellectuals of the second half of the 20th century began their philosophical mission as structuralists and later became among the most prominent poststructuralists. While intertextuality and deconstruction are post-structural terms, they, generally, find their roots in structuralism. Other structuralists, even before Julia Kristeva's introduction of intertextuality in 1966 as a term to describe the relationship between texts, took similar stands towards finding unifying tissues among different texts. Joseph Campbell, in 1949, argues that all myths share one structure that he delineates into different stages and calls monomyth, in his book, "The Hero with a thousand faces" one of the most influential books in the 20th century. He, therefore, traces a tissue of relations that is cross-cultural and bond to one origin [23]

The ubiquity of the term "Intertextuality' in post-modern criticism has crowded out related terms and important nuances. Some critics, such as Irwin lament that intertextuality has eclipsed allusion as an object of literary study while lacking the later term clear definition.[24]

4. ALLUSION: A FORM OF INTERTEXTUALITY

One major form of intertextuality in modern literature is allusion which can be defined as a reference, often covert or indirect to another text in a way that brings into the text some of the associations of that other text. Usually made to significant events, places or people who have very ve1i- known qualities that the speaker or writer wishes to highlight in his/her new text. Sources of allusion include all cultural texts from literature, history and others. Hatim and Mason observe that Each intrusion of a citation in the text is the culmination of a process in which a sign travels from one text [to another [The area being traversed from text to text is what we shall call the intertextual space.[25] Allusions participate in the creation of a network of tissues between texts within the context of intertextuality. Some are very popular and occur severally in texts, they travel between texts and every time they are borrowed. they gain new meaning within the intertextual space.

In Arabic literature. allusions arc abundant and very much revealing, the more they travel in the intertextual space, the more they continue to gain new qualities. A reference to Umar bin Khattab would generally connote the values of justice, democracy, courage, humbleness and equality. Umar is alluded to for his humbleness and justice in the example below:

qad rāʾa ṣāḥibu kisra an raʾā ʿumaran
bayna 'l-raʾiyyāti ʿutlan wa raʾīhā[26]

"'Startled was the envoy of the Caesar when saw he
Umar humble and a guardian amongst his subjects"   [

5. INTENTIONAL AND UNINTENTIONAL INTERTEXTUALITY

Intertextuality can be both intentional and unintentional. While 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. At times, utterances may not be identified by the majority of readers and therefore. appear deceptively original when they are not. On the other hand,, a writer or a speaker may opt for utterances that s/he is exposed to from another unidentified source or not even remember reading or hearing at one point in time and place.

However, if a poet reminds us of what has been said by another that does not mean he is consciously copying or imitating him.[27]

Intentional and unintentional intertextuality can happen on the level of the word [تناص الكلمة] المفردةّ] the sentence [تناصّ الجمل] or the whole text [التناصّ النصّي] It can be cross-cultural as much as within the same culture. The word 'a ssassination" is taken as one of the many word coinages that Shakespeare introduced to the English Language. Critics point to the fact that the word did not exist in the language before him. The word is also believed to have Arabic origin. It has affinity with *hashashin* an adjective of one who takes *hashish* to drug himself.[28]

Usually, texts 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"*. [29]   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 every mechanics and structures of a language such has 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 versus 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].[30] 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 an intentional choice that lends itself to the 'tissues' of intertextual discourse.[31]

6. RELIGIOUS INTERTEXTUALITY IN SELECTED SAMPLES

Intertextuality, of course, is not restricted to poetry but all literary genres as well as all kinds of discourse and texts can be deoriginated in the same way. Though, poetry is considered to be one of the most challenging genres in Arabic literature. An exercise in deoriginating the

religious intertextual relations in the below samples, demonstrates how familiar patterns and stretches of language become textual oases in literature.

For practical purpose we are investigating religious intertextuality in two liturgical materials themed *Lāmiyyah al-Awwaliyyah* ” - a prayer book by shaykh Muhammad al-Awwal composed with letters of the last two verses of Suratu – ‘l-Tawbah Q9: 128-129 – and *Nuniyyah ibn Malik* _ a prayer book by shaykh Rabiu Adebayo Malik composed with letters of "Ayatul-‘l-Kursiyy”i. (Q:255) _ respectively

6.1 *Lāmiyyah al-Awwaliyyah*

The first hemistiche of line one

Li-llāhi fi kulli yawmin sha’nu khalqatihi
    ‘usran wa yusran bilā nawmin wa qaylūlin

recalls part of Q55:29 “ *kulla yawmin huwa fi sha’nin*

In the second hemistitch *“usran wa yusran* “ is an echo of Q94:5 *“fa-inna ma’a ‘l-‘usri yusran inna ma’a ‘l-‘usri yusran’’* while *bilā nawmin wa qaylūlin* reflects prt of Ayat al-Kursiyy(Q2:255) *” lā ta’khudhuhu sinatun wa lā nawmun”*

The second line

Man kāna bil—ilāhi yumsiku kāna mu’taminan
    Min bu’si ‘ukhrā wa dunyānā wa ahwālin

echoes Q65:3 “*wa man yatawakkal ‘alā Llāhi fa-huwa hasbuhu, inna Llāha bāligu amrihi qad ja’ala Llāhu li-kulli shay’in qadran*

Allāhu Hayyun Qayyūmun in line 3

Allahu Hayyun Qayyūmun tūla ‘umratinā
    narjūhu minka bi-tībi ‘ayshin lā mālin

reflects the beginning of Ayat Q2:255” *Allāhu lā ilāha illā Huwa ‘l-Hayyu ‘l-Qayyūmu’’*

Line four

Sallim jamā’atanā min kaydi hāqidinā
    Kamā sallamta ibna Ya’qūba mina ‘dhdhalāli

recalls the history of prophet Yūsuf the son of prophet Ya’qūb as narrated in most part of Q:12.

Ka-‘asfi ‘l-‘ardi ma’kūlin in the second hemistitch of line 5

Kullu ‘idānā bi-kalbin minka ahlikhum
    hattā yakūnū ka’asfin minka ma’kūlin

is an echo of part of Q105:5 *fa-ja’alahum ka’asfin ma’kūlin*

The second hemistitch of line six

‘āmin jamī’a bilādi ‘-muslimīna kamā
    āmanta umma ‘l-qurā min khawfin wa awjālin

Reflects part of Q106:4 “ *wa ‘āmanahum min khawfin*”

The second hemistitch of line sevenr

Nu’māka yā Rabbanā haqqan narūmu bilā
    Shakkin la-minka jamī’u ‘l-khayri yaltazimu

recalls part of Q3: 26 “*bi-yadika ‘l-khayru innaka ‘alā kulli shay’in Qadīrun’’*

In line eight

Matīnun , Dhū quwwatin fi ‘l-khalqi qahiratin
    Wa la yazalu ladayhi ‘l-khalqu majbulun

reflects part of Q81:58 “ *inna Llaha Huwa ‘l-Razzāq Dhū ‘l-quwwati matīnun*” while the remaining part of the line recalls part of Q6:18 *“ wa Huwa ‘l-Qāhiru fawqa ‘ibādihi wa Huwa ‘l-Hakīmu ‘l-Khabīru’’*

In line nine,'
Ajib lanā yā Waliyya 'l-mu'minīna shubban
           Bi-'l-muslimīna ḥisānan kadhā 'l-'īlu
is an echo of part of Q2:257 " *Allāhu Waliyyu 'l-ladhīna 'āmanū yukhrijuhum mina 'l-ẓulumāti ilā 'l-nūri''*
The last linegbb
Yā 'Awwalu , 'Akhīru yā 'l-ẓāhiru lijamī-
         'l -'ārifīna wa yā Bāṭinun li-dhī jahlin
recalls part of Q 57:3 "*Huwa 'l-Awwalu wa 'l-'Ākhiru wa 'l-ẓāhiru wa 'l-Bāṭinu, wa Huwa bi-kulli shay'in `Alīmun''*

6.2 Nūniyyah ibn Mālik
The first line
Allāhu jalla ta'ala mā lahu kuf'un
         wa lā lahu waladun Āaqqan wa 'abawāni
reflects absolute monotheism, one of the fundamental creeds of Islam, which is the concept of Q:112 *(sūratu 'l-ikhlāṣ)* and some verses of the Holy Quran such as Q6:163 " *lā sharīka lahu wa bi-dhālika umirtu wa 'anā awwalu 'l-muslimīna* " as well as Q6:102 " *dhālikumu 'Llāhu Rabbukum lā ilāha illā Huwa Khāliqu kulli shay'in , fa-'budūhu wa huwa 'alā kulli shay'in Wakīlun*"
Acceptance of Allah's judgment as reflected in
Q68:48 "*fa-'sbir lihukmi Rabbika wa lā takun ka-ṣāḥibi 'l-ḥuti idh nādā wa huwa makẓumun*"
echo the first hemistitch of the second line
Wa qad ṣabarnā bi-ḥukmi Llāhi khāliqinā
               Wa ' Llāhu yanṣuru man yad'ū bi-'īqāni

The third line
Wa sarī'un fī sabīli 'Llāhi wa-jtahidū
         Bi-mālikum wa bi-nafsin shukran Mannāni
recalls Q61:11 " *wa tujāhidūna fī sabīli Llāhi bi-'amwālikum wa anfusikum dhālikum khayrun lakum in kuntum ta'lamūna* "
The first part of line four
Hayyi' lanā 'amranā wa-'rshid maqāṣidanā
                   ḍi'fa 'ujūrin bi-tathqīl I 'l-mīzāni
is an echo of Q18:10 " *Rabbanā 'ātinā min ladunka raḥmatan wa hayyi' lanā min 'amrinā rashadan***"
In line five, the first part
 laka 'l-hidāyatu, tahdī man tashā' wa 'ttaqū
                 narjū 'l-rashāda kadhā 'ilman bil-tibyāni
recalls Q:28V:56 Innaka lā tahdī man aḥbabta wa lākinna 'lLāha yahdī man yashā' wa Huwa a'lam bil-muhtadīna
The sixth linea
Hayyun Ilḍhun wa Qayyumun wa lā sinatun
               *lahu wa laysa lahu nawmun bi-'ajfān*i
reflects the beginning of āyatul Kursiyy Q:2V:255 "*Allāhu lā ilāha illā Huwa, al-Hayyu al-Qayyūmu, lā ta'khudhuhu sinatun wa lā nawmun*"
The first hemistitche of line seven
Hādī 'l-'ibādi ihdinā dawman ṭarīqa 'l-hudā

Tammim lanā nūranā min ghayri nuqṣāni

echoes Q1:6 " Ihdinā 'l-ṣirāṭa 'l-mustaqima" while the second stanza reflects Q:66V:8
''Rabbanā 'atmim lanā nūranā wa 'ghfir lanā innaka 'alā kulli shayin Qadīrun
The second stanza of line nine
Shafā'unā fīka yā dhā 'lmanni wa 'l-karami
                    Shaffi' nabiyyaka fīnā kun bi-ghufrāni.
reflects part of Q8:33 ''*wa ma kāna 'Llāhu li-yu'adhdhibahum, wa 'anta fīhim, wa mā kāna 'lLāhu mu'adhdhibahum wa hum mustagfirūna*
The first hemistitche of line ten
Mallik lanā kulla mulkin Anta Mālikuhu
                    matti' ma'īshatanā mat'an bi-'īmāni
is an echo of part of Q3:26 " *Quli 'Llāhumma Mālika 'l-mulki, tu'tī 'l-mulka man tashāu'*
The eleventh line
li- Llāhi tadbīru mā fī 'l-kawni ajma'ihi
                    ḥattā 'l-ṭuyūra kadhā fi-'l-baḥri ḥitānun
recalls part of Q10:3 " *yudabbiru 'l-'amra mā min shafī'in 'illā bi – 'idhnihi*
In line twelve,
Allāhu yubṣirunā, Allāhu yasma'unā
                    Allāhu yub'idunā 'an kulli ṭughyāni
recalls two of the beautiful names of Allah as reflected in Q58:1 " *Qad sami'a 'Llāhu qawla 'llatī tujādiluka fī zawjihā…………………..inna 'Llāha Samī'un Baṣīrun*
The second hemistitche of line thirteen
Fīkulli fardin wa jam'in lā siwāhu ṭurran
                    wa huwa 'l-Khabīru bimā fī qalbi 'l-insāni
recalls Q57:13-14 " *wa asirrū qawlakum awi 'jharū' bihi , innaHu 'Alīmun bidhāti 'l-ṣuduri, 'alā ya'alamu man khalaqa wa Huwa 'Llaṭīfu 'l-Khabīru*
The first stanza of line fourteen
Rabbī Qarībun Mujībun ji'tu mubtahilan
                    'rrjū 'l-futūḥa wa kashfa kulli 'aḥzāni
recalls part of Q2:186 ''*wa 'idhā sa'alaka 'ibādī 'annī .fa-Innī Qarībun 'ujību da'wata dā'in 'idhā da'āNi* "
The first stanza of line fifteen
'ud'ū Ilāhakum khawfan wa bi-tama'in
                    yujib Rabbiya man yad'ū bi-sur'ānin
is an echo bf Q7: 55-56 " *ud'ū Rabbakum taḍarru'an wa khufyatan, innaHu lā yuhibbu 'l-mu'tadīna.Wa-'d'ūHu khawfan wa ṭama'an, inna raḥmata 'Llāhi qarībun mina 'l-muḥsinīna*
while the second stanza reflects the beginning of Q2:186
" *wa idhā sa'laka 'ibādī 'anNN fa-Innī Qarībun 'ujību da'wata dā'in* "

7. CONCLUSION

This paper examined the phenomenon of religious intertextuality in the verses of two prominent clerics - shaykh Muhammad al-Awwal Ayinla and shaykh Rabiu Adebayo Malik –through the lens of their liturgical materials namely *Lāmiyyah al-Awwaliyyah* and *Nuniyyah ibn Malik* respectively. A general human idiosyncracy is being influenced by other texts without necessarily meaning imitation , but a stupendous knowledge that could signify creativity and ingenuity. In the samples dissected, our artists through the medium of religious intertextuality, did not only succeed in exhibiting their profound mastery of primary source of Islamic law ,

60

but also strengthened their impression in literary dexterity and artistic poetisation. They also deployed the style of sewing relevant words and thoughts together to demonstrate the semantic depths of the intertext and evokes ample emotional response from their congregation and followers

REFERENCES

1   www.merriam.website.com, 24/11/2024 0330hr.

2. Hussein Abdu Raof, *Arabic Stylistics A Coursebook,* .Harrassowitz Verlag, Wiesbaden, p 86

3. *The Holy Qur'an* (1996). The translation of King Fahd
Center: Medina, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. Q2:31.

4. *Ibid*, Q 31: 26.

5. *The Holy Bible* (1999) . King James Version, New York:
American Bible Society. John 1:1.

6. *Ibid*, Genesis 11:6-9.

7. Nabil Alawi.(2010) Intertextuality and Literary Translation between Arabic amd English, *An-Najah University Journal of Research* ,.24,issue 8, , p. 2448.

8. Stanley E. Fish,(1980) "*Is There a Text in This Class? The Authority of Interpretive Communities.* Cambridge,MA: Harvard University Press.p 143

9. Nabil Alawi, *Op.Cit*, p.2450.

10. Willian Irwin, [2004]. Against Intertextuality. *Philosophy and Literature*, V28, Number 2, pp.227-

11. *Ibid,* p.228.

12. Julia Kristeva,(1980) *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*. New York:Colombia University Press, p.69.

13. Barthes R.(1977), *Image, Text, Music*. .Stephan Heath New York: Hill and Wang.,p. 125

14. Caselli D.,Becketts Dantes (2005):*Intertextuality in the Fiction and Criticism* . MUP,p 186

15. Basil Hatim and I Masson, (1997). *The Translator as Communicator,* London: Routledge.p.232

16. Nabil Alawi, Op.Cit, p.2439.

17. Don Fowler (2000), *Roman Constructions:Readings in Postmodern Latin*. New York: Oxford University Press. P.117.

18. *Ibid* ,p.119.

19. Julia Kristeva, *Op.Cit*.

20. Willian Irwin, *Op.Cit*, p.240.

21. *Ibid*, p.236.

22. Graham Allen, (2000) *Intertextuality*. New York:Routlege. P.6.

23. Joseph Campbell, (2008) *The Hero with a Thousand Faces*. 3rd edition. Navato, CA: New World Library.

24. Willian Irwin, *Op.Cit*, p.227.

25. Hatim B. and Mason,I. (1990). *Discourse and the Translator*, London: Longman.p.129.

26. Nabil Alawi , *Op Cit*., p.2446.

27. *Ibid.*

28. Pozefsky, Carol.http://en.allexperts.com/q/Etymology-Meaning-Words-474/assassination.htm, 20/12/24 0100hr

29. The Holy Bible. Op. Cit, Genesis 4:1.

30. Nabil Alawi, *Op.Cit*, p.2447.

31. *Ibid.*