Applying Intertextuality on the Translation of Qur’anic Discoursal Meanings

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study is to examine how intertextuality can be applied as a useful tool to determine the discoursal meanings of the Qur’anic lexical item (آنساء) (aanasaa) and whether its intertextual nuances have been correctly reflected in the translations of the Qur’an. It is hypothesized that no single English verb can be used as an equivalent to the Arabic verb (آنساء) (aanasaa). Regarding the methodology adopted in this study, the discoursal meanings of the lexical item (آنساء) (aanasaa) are discussed first, based on different exegeses of the Qur’an and some Arabic dictionaries, as well. Then, intertextuality is adopted as a theoretical criterion upon which the discoursal meaning of (آنساء) (aanasaa) in the Glorious Qur’an is determined. After deciding the specific discoursal meaning, the study investigates whether the intended discoursal meaning is correctly reflected in the selected translations. It has been found that because translators are inconsistent, they treated each occurrence of that lexical item separately from its other occurrences, and thus were unable to convey the intended meaning. By applying the intertextuality approach, the study concludes that the specific meaning of the Arabic verb (آنساء) (aanasaa) cannot be rendered into English as a single verb in which the intertextuality nuances can be identified. The paper concludes that the Arabic verb (آنساء) (aanasaa) can best be translated into English as (to perceive with comfort), (to descry with comfort) or (to discern with comfort); and that this translation should be adopted in interpreting the Glorious Qur’an so as not to distort the intended Qur’anic message.
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تطبيق التناص على ترجمة معاني القرآن الخطابية
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المستخلص

تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى استقصاء تطبيق التناص بوصفها أداة لتحديد المعاني الخطابية للمفردة القرآنية (آنَسَ)، كما تحاول الدراسة أن تكشف أن كانت الفروقات الدلالية الخطابية تلك المفردة قد انعكست انتكاساً صحيحاً في بعض ترجمات معاني القرآن الكريم. تستعرض هذه الدراسة عدم وجود فعل إنجليزي يمكن استخدامه بوصفه مكافئ في معانيه الخطابية للفعل العربي (آنَسَ). ويقدر تطبيق الدراسة منهجية البحث المعتمدة في الدراسة، فقد نوقشت معاني المعاني الخطابية للمفردة القرآنية (آنَسَ) في بدايات الدراسة، مثلاً على التفسير المختلف للقرآن الكريم. ومن خلال التوصل إلى المعنى الخطابي المحدد، تنقصي المعنى المقابل للمفردة القرآنية (آنَسَ) في البداية، ثم تبنت الدراسة التناص بوصفه معياراً نظرياً تتحدد من خلل المعاني الخطابية للمفردة القرآنية (آنَسَ). وبعد التوصل إلى المعنى الخطابي المحدد، تستقصي الدراسة فيما كلها ترجمات تلك المعاني الخطابية للمفردة القرآنية (آنَسَ)، ويفترض في بعض الأحيان في تطبيق معيار التناص من خلال تدقيق ترجمات مختلفة للفعل ظاهرة القرآنية (آنَسَ)، وقد يعترف ذلك إلى أن العديد ترجمات مثل ذلك الفعل معينة بشكل أكثر تناصاً. ومع ذلك، لم يكونوا موفقين في إيجاد المعنى المقصود، ومن خلال تطبيق التناص، توصل الدراسة إلى استنتاج مفاده أن المعنى المحدد للمفردة العربية (آنَسَ) لا يمكن أن يترجم إلى اللغة الإنجليزية باستخدام فعل واحد، إذ لا يمكن للفعل الإنجليزي أن يحمل المعاني الخطابية والمفاهيم الدلالية التي يحملها نظيره الفعل العربي. كما استنتجت الدراسة أن أفضل ترجمة للمفردة العربية (آنَسَ) إلى الإنجليزية يمكن أن تكون باستخدام عبارات مثل: (to perceive with comfort) أو (to discern with comfort)

بالإضافة إلى الدراسة في ترجمة المعنى هذا الفعل في القرآن الكريم من أجل نقل المعنى الدقيق المقصود.

كلمات مفتاحية: التناص، معاني خطابية، نظرة قرآنية، ترجمات معاني القرآن، آنس

1. Introduction

Intertextuality is one of de Beaugrande & Dressler’s seven standards that combine together to create textuality. Textuality is what makes a text shaped in a peculiar way, and knowledge about the text is produced via its textuality. A text, hence, can be read through its textuality and/or textualities (Silverman, 1986:54). Within the field of text linguistics, a text is seen as a system of communication, and for a text to be identified as such, it has to exhibit specific linguistic characteristics. Baker (1992:112) confirms that certain criteria of organization should be found in a text to be distinguished from randomly collected sentences and paragraphs or “non-text”. Similarly, Crystal (2008:482) describes a text as a unit of language characterized by having a determinable communicative performance that can be manifested through the employment of certain standards which provide the text with its textuality. AL-Sowaidi (2011:66) affirms that through the interaction of the seven standards of textuality that a text acquires its texture. The term textuality also refers to the properties that identify the text as “an object of enquiry” (Rhiney, 2010: 1)².
As a term, intertextuality was first coined by Julia Kristeva in late 1960s. As a matter of fact, it was between 1966 and 1974 when Kristeva invented the notion of intertextuality, gave it a definition, and initiated it in semiotics and literary studies (Juvan, 2008:13). However, the beginnings of intertextuality both as an evaluative theory and a perspective to texts was presented by the conceptualisations of the theorists de Saussure, Bakhtin and Barthes (Zengin, 2016: 299). Intertextuality is unsurprisingly a phenomenon dating back to old recorded human activity; hence, theories of intertextuality could be found as old as discourse about texts has been traced (Alfaro, 1996: 269). Juvan (2008:14) argues that even though the term intertextuality has been attributed to Kristeva, expressions derived from “the same word family are much older and were attested in classical Latin”.

Intertextuality is based on the assumption held by modern theorists that texts – being literary or non-literary – do not exhibit meaning independency (Allen, 2000: 1). In order to understand a text, and ultimately figure out its meaning, a net of textual relations has to be traced. According to Baker and Ellece (2011:64), the concept of intertextuality denotes that texts “refer to or incorporate aspects of other texts within them”. Regarding Roman and Roman (2014:216), they refer to the concept of intertextuality as a description of the relation of “co-presence” holding between texts, namely, one text is present in another text. Peters and Jandrič (2018:155) claim that intertextuality attempts to outline the manner through which a text can be shaped by another text. Al Saideen (2018: iv) makes use of the term intertextuality to refer to “the textual space where texts intersect and new (hyper)texts emerge”. In this study, intertextuality is applied on the discoursal lexical item (آنَسََ / aanasa) which has recurred in different suras in the Qur’anic text to work out the precise intended meanings of this item and to discuss whether the selected translations have managed to arrive at the most suitable renditions.

Accordingly, intertextuality is concerned with the elements responsible for making the understanding of a text relies on the knowledge of other related texts. It has been claimed that intertextuality can be utilized to arrive at the exact meaning through finding out possible relationships between a text and any other related text. Hatim and Mason (1997:188) state that intertextuality can be considered “a precondition for the intelligibility of texts”, namely, one text is dependent on another text which has been formerly encountered. Ahmed (2010: 508) emphasizes that texts refer outwardly to other alternative texts due to the fact that any text will exhibit some degree of likeness to some other texts. Similarly, it has been confirmed by Lemke (2000: 221) that texts are said to be produced from other texts, namely, they are intertextually related. Confirming the significance of intertextuality, Allen (2000: 209) asserts that it is a promising concept that can be both productive and crucial in future as it has already been in the past. Haberer (2007:57), confirms that a text is consistently dependent on other texts, and that “no text exists on its own”. Similarly, Venuti (2009:157) states that each text is inherently an intertext, tied up with other texts in certain relations, and such relations are by some means existent in it. Through those relations, the text can compose its value, meaning, as well as function. By the same token, Nevins (2010: 1) agrees that a text acquires its meaning by means of its relations to other texts. Baker and Ellece (2011 :64), argue that “It is often only possible to make sense of a text by fully understanding how it refers to other texts”. Hussein (2013:40) believes that intertextuality is indispensable, as it can supply us with novel techniques to acknowledge a text. As for Zengin (2016: 302), she regards intertextuality a theory which offers
innovative approaches of thinking, as well as presenting advanced strategies that can be helpful for comprehending texts and interpreting them. According to Al-Kharabsheh (2017:196), intertextuality is primarily seen as a prevalent textual mechanism through which a text can refer to some other relevant text. Dzera (2018:12) supports the opinion that intertextuality has emerged as one of discourse analysis leading criteria in the 1990s and thereafter.

The aim of the present paper is to focus on the notion of intertextuality as an applicable tool that can be utilized to figure out the intended discoursal meanings of the Qur’anic lexical item آناس / aanasa which occurs more than once in different suras of the Qur'anic text. It further investigates whether such intertextual nuances of this Qur’anic lexical item have been correctly reflected in the selected Qur’anic translations. The paper, thus, attempts to answer these three questions:

1. Can intertextuality be deemed a reliable theoretical perspective to be applied to decide the precise meanings, and then arrive at the accurate translations of the Qur’anic lexical item under investigation?
2. Do the selected translations succeed in determining the intended meaning of the lexical item, and consequently arriving at adequate and effective translations?
3. Is consistency being maintained by the same translator when rendering the same lexical item which recurs in different suras of the Glorious Qur’an?

2. Intertextuality: A Multidisciplinary Theory

Intertextuality is, by and large, a rather controversial term. Allen (2000: 1) argues that despite the fact that intertextuality is a widely used term, it is nonetheless one of the “misused terms in contemporary critical vocabulary”. Such being the case, the term has acquired various definitions or explanations (Hammouri, et al, 2013: 211). In the view of Baker and Ellece (2011 :64), the concept of intertextuality has been employed within critical discourse analysis as an aspect in which the broad social and historical contexts are taken into consideration. The same opinion is shared by Rhiney (2010:1), who states that texts can be created and understood in respect of the more extended social and cultural contexts where they originate. However, Hammouri, et al (2013: 211), citing Kristeva (1980), affirm that history and society are peripheral to textuality, and that the basic units which aid in providing the proper interpretation of a text have to be found inside the text itself.

Kristeva (1980) states that “any text is a mosaic of quotations; any text is the absorption and transformation of another”. Based on this definition, she launched the concept of intertextuality in semiotics and literary studies. According to Allen (2000:7), intertextuality comes into existence from the complicated history of contemporary literary theory”. Waaijman (2010:1) also believes that intertextuality is a literary approach which attempts to find out how texts are intersected. Zhao (2017: 126) emphasizes that intertextuality will continue to work as a central factor in the endeavour to discern literature and culture on the whole. Similarly, Khafaga (2020:178) states that intertextuality is confined to literary studies, and affirms that a literary work is not produced by its author alone, but through its relation with other related texts and “to the structure of language itself”. Others, nonetheless, argue that intertextuality can best be treated as a multidisciplinary theory which goes beyond literary studies and can be used to incorporate all kinds of texts. Allen (2000:209) asserts that intertextuality is integrated, to a great extent, not only within the literary theory, but within the “theories of cultural, artistic and
even technological production and reproduction”. It is believed by Childs and Fowler (2006:121) that intertextuality refers to the way through which different types of texts: spoken, written, literary, or even virtual, have references to other related texts. Alawi (2010: 2440) argues that due to the fact that intertextuality is responsible for the comprehension and treatment of texts, it attracts the attention of linguistics, literary criticism and translation studies. Along the same lines, Zengin (2016: 299) confirms that intertextuality can be seen as a group of relations connecting a text with other texts or discourses in different disciplines and cultural fields. He further reasserts this belief by treating intertextuality as “boundary-crossing discipline” which presents unlimited methods for interpreting all sorts of texts, not only literary ones (Ibid:324). Van Zoonen (2017:1), on the other hand, emphasizes that intertextuality can be found in all kinds of texts: spoken or written, formal or colloquial, aesthetic or ordinary, which are related to one another in a certain manner. Intertextuality has been widely used by many researchers as an effective perspective that can be applied on particular types of texts, especially on religious texts. Harb (2014: 68) states that it is useful to rely on intertextuality as a possible method to make out the intended meanings of words in religious texts in general, and in the Quran and the Bible in particular.

3. Intertextuality and Translation
As far as the relation between intertextuality and translation is concerned, it is believed that intertextuality plays an essential role in translation studies. De Beaugrande & Dressler (1981:206) suggest that the entire concept of textuality might rely on exploring the impact of intertextuality as a procedure that affects all communicative activities. Neubert and Shreve (1992, 117) also agree that intertextuality can be regarded as a highly necessary aspect of textuality for the translators. They further postulate that “translation is meditated intertextuality” (Ibid:123). In the opinion of Al-Taher (2008: 161), intertextuality is seen as the ultimate demanding feature of textuality for translators. Venuti (2009: 157-8) views translation as a distinctive manifestation of intertextuality because it is closely related to translation as it is seen as being of crucial importance to reproduce the texts by means of translation. As for Farahzad (2009), translation is acknowledged as a practice of intertextuality. Regarding Schaffner (2012), translation has been introduced as “an intercultural intertextuality”.

In the view of Hussein (2013:7), intertextuality can be utilized as an approach which might give rise to a more constructive translation task. He proceeds to confirm the strong relation between intertextuality and translation by stating that to combine intertextuality theories with translation researches would be helpful for translators, as it would enable them to recognize the intertextual strings available within the text (Ibid:88). It has been revealed by Al-Badani, et al (2014: 791) that intertextuality aids translators recognize and figure out meanings of a given text through referring to other previously encountered text features. Sanatifar (2015: 130), ascertains the fact that translation has to be treated as an intertextual performance in which the target text “is the absorption of and references in the prior text”. Jukko (2016:3), on the other hand, asserts the significance of intertextuality as a useful tool in literary translation since it brings forth support for the comprehension, reading and translation of any literary work. He further declares that since “all texts ultimately are translations of translations”, then translation becomes one type of intertextuality (Ibid:4). Al-Kharabsheh (2017:196) considers translation an intertextual performance in which the source texts and the
target texts exhibit some sort of overlapping, relatedness, and even resemblance to a variable extent. Majkiewicz (cited in Kaźmierczak, 2019: 365) suggests that the translator should study all the relevant intertextual relations and make all possible efforts to restore them in the target text.

4. Review of Related Studies
With regard to the literature available, many Arab researchers have studied intertextuality as a workable tool to determine how texts are interrelated and translated. Many of those researchers, however, address intertextuality as a mechanism applicable on literary texts (Alawi, 2010), (Mohammadi, et al, 2011), (Thawabteh, 2012), (Hussein, 2013), (Al-Saideen, 2018) and (Khafaga, 2020). As for Hammouri, et al (2013), they make use of intertextuality to determine the meaning of some syntactically ambiguous verses. Al-Badani, et al (2014), as well, discuss intertextuality from a syntactic aspect by applying intertextuality as a method to fully understand reference switching in one Qur’anic Surah (Al-Baqarah). Ahmed (2010) opts for making his data more comprehensive by investigating some problems faced by translators when translating three categories of intertextual expressions: religious, historical and literary, which are taken from the Quran, the Prophetic Traditions and novels.

Among the more relevant studies in applying intertextuality on religious texts, and Qur’anic discoursal meanings in particular, Al-Jarah (2011) introduces a re-interpretation of the Qur’anic verse which has frequently been used to advocate the belief in the torment of grave through adopting intertextuality perspective. Adel and Maasoum (2011) use intertextuality as a methodological mechanism to interpret Quran. Al-Sowaidi (2011) attempts to make a contribution that would provide a better understanding of the precise differences in the translation of four near – synonymous Qur’anic pairs. Taha, et al (2013) adopt an intertextual approach to investigate “the intended meaning of two synonymous dictionary entries al-gibaal and al-rawasi in the Holy Quran”. Altakhaineh, et al (2014) examine the discoursal meaning of the lexical item (fata) in the Holy Quran. Harb (2014) discusses how intertextuality can be utilized as a useful approach to understand the meanings of the two lexical items “Biblical soul, and Qur’anic (ruḥ) in religious discourses, namely, the Holy Book of Quran and the Holy Bible”. Khawaldah (2017) conducts an investigation into the viability of intertextuality to figure out the intended meanings of the two Quranic words “الخشية/الخوف / al- xshiah and al- xawf”.

5. Methodology
Initially, ten translators of the Glorious Qur’an have been selected by the researcher to find out how they have rendered the selected Qur’anic lexical item. The ten translators (as their translations are chronologically listed) are: Dawood (1974), Arberry (1980), Yusuf Ali (1989), Irving (1991), Shakir (1996), Hilali and Khan (1998), Pickthall (2002), Ghali (2003), Abdel Haleem (2004) and Khattab (2015). After comparing all the ten English translations, the translation of Ghali due to being totally identical – regarding the lexical item under investigation – to that given by Yusuf Ali, has been excluded. Intertextuality is applied as the theoretical mechanism through which the meanings of the selected Qur’anic lexical item can be accurately decided, and to determine whether the selected translations have been successful in providing accurate and consistent renderings.
6. Discussion
The Qur’anic lexical item aanasa/آنسا has recurred five times in four different suras in the Glorious Qur’an (cf. Abdel Baqi, 2001:93). It occurs twice within the same surah and the same ayah, namely, Al-Qasas (The Narratives), ayah 29:

"فَلَمَّاَقَضَىَٰمُوسَىَالْأَجَلََوَسَارََبِأَهآلِهَِ آنساَمِنأَجَانِبَِالطُّورَِنَارًاَقَالََلَِْهآلِهَِامأكُثُواَإِن َ آنسَتُنَارًاَلَعَل ِيآتِيكُمأَمِنأهَاَبِخَبَرٍَأَو أَ جَذأوَةٍَمِنََالنَّارَِلَعَلَّكُمأَتَصأطَلُونَ"

With regard to the meaning of this ayah, it is concerned with describing the journey made by Prophet Moses and his family after leaving the region of Midian (Madyan) upon completing the term of service to his father – in – law. While having a difficult and long journey in the desert, he lost the way. The night was dark, cold and dreary. Then, he felt some comfort when he managed to catch sight of what seemed to him like a fire burning in the direction of mount Ṭūr Sinā’. He asked his family to stay where they were, while he would proceed towards that fire to ask about the way, or else, to bring them a burning firebrand to keep them warm. After surveying the renditions of this lexical item into English, it seems that the translators disagree in their options. These different renditions are listed in table 1:

Table (1) Translations of aanasa in Ayah 29/ Surat Al-Qasas (The Narratives)²

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translator</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abdel Haleem</td>
<td>“he caught sight of a fire” / “I have seen a fire”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arberry</td>
<td>“he observed on the side of the Mount a fire” / “I observe a fire”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawood</td>
<td>“Moses descryed a fire” / “I can see a fire”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilali and Khan</td>
<td>“he saw a fire” / “I have seen a fire”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irving</td>
<td>“he glimpsed a fire” / “I’ve glimpsed a fire”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khattab</td>
<td>“he spotted a fire” / “I have spotted a fire”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickthall</td>
<td>“he saw in the distance a fire” / “I see in the distance a fire”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shakir</td>
<td>“he perceived on this side of the mountain a fire” / “I have seen a fire”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yusuf Ali</td>
<td>“he perceived a fire” / “I perceive a fire”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be seen that both Hilali and Khan and Pickthall have rendered the lexical item (aanasa) in the same manner – though some difference in tense is found – by opting for using the verb (see) as its target language equivalent. As for Yusuf Ali and Shakir, they both prefer to render the Qur’anic lexical item into (perceive), but Shakir has been rather inconsistent in his translation when he chooses to render the second occurrence of the lexical item into (see) rather than (perceive). Regarding Dawood, Arberry, Irving and Khattab, they opt for selecting different target language equivalents: (descry), (observe), (glimpse) and (spot) respectively. Dawood’s translation, however, show some sort of inconsistency by rendering the second occurrence of the word into (see). (The translation of the whole ayah is illustrated in Appendix I).

It can be assumed that these different translations are attributed to the different interpretations, which in turn, are supposedly triggered by the multiple meanings of the Qur’anic lexical item. It is worth mentioning that translators of sacred texts, in general, and of the Glorious Qur’an, in particular, face a number of challenges. One of these challenges obligates the translator to
delve into the deep intended meaning by going beyond the text through consulting the major commentaries or tafseer (exegesis) books. Zaki (2020:28) believes that it is almost inevitable for the translators of the Qur’an to make painstaking inquiry into religious thought. The commentators, in turn, have many sources of authentic information at their disposal. It is believed by many that one of the most useful sources are dictionaries (Khawaldah, 2017: 94).

Firstly, an attempt is made to detect the definitions of the lexical item (َآنَسََ aanasa) in some of the outstanding Arabic dictionaries. Different definitions have been given after surveying some of these dictionaries including Lisan Al-Arab, Taj Al-Arus, Al-Qamus al-Muhit, al-Mufradat fi Ghareeb al-Qurʾān, Al-Muḥeeṭ fi Al-Lugha and Mukhtar al-Ṣiḥah. These dictionaries give the following definitions: to see /to know something /to look attentively at and turn around trying to see someone /to feel /to see something not familiar with /to see something very clearly /to perceive.

Different meanings have been suggested by the commentators for this particular Qur’anic lexical item in their interpretations. Some commentators, including Al-Baghawi and Al-Baydawi claim that the word (َآنَسََاََ aanasa) has the same meaning of (رآى / أبصار) (he saw). Ibn Katheer suggests that the meaning is (رآى على بعد) (he saw on the distance). Al-Suyuti has given a completely different meaning, namely, (أحس) (he felt). Others opt for giving more than one single meaning: (ابصار / احس / وجد) (he saw/ he felt / he found) are the meanings presented by Al – Tabari. (ابصرها واحسها) (he saw and felt it) are the meanings provided by Makhloof. As for the meanings given by Al-Razi, they include the following: (ابصر / رآى /صادف / وجد) (he saw, he came across, he found). In the same vein, Al-Qurtubi claims that this lexical item can be interpreted in various ways: (ابصر من بعد / احس / وجد) (he saw from a distance / he felt / he found).

The controversy with this word is that some of its interpretations suggest that the verb (َآنَسََاََ aanasa) has the same meaning of the verb (رآى) or (أبصار), hence; creating a state of confusion on the part of the translators and have led them to render it as (see). It is the purpose of this study to have recourse to the global level of the Glorious Qur’an so as to specify the accurate meaning of this lexical item. The analysis is, therefore, reinforced by the notion that the other occurrences of the same word in other suras in the Qur’an can be consulted as “a text base”, in Kintsch’s and van Dijk’s terminology (1978). These other occurrences, it is believed, can work as clues which enable the researcher to make out the intended meaning.

As has been recommended by Al-Sowaidi (2011: 295), an intertextual reference to other parallel Qur’anic texts is necessary to sort out the intended meanings of the ayas under investigation and to “make them more informative and easily accessible to the TT readers”. It has also been stated by Altakhainehe (2019:78) that what helps the reader to figure out the accurate discoursal meanings in a religious text like the Qur’an is comparing the meaning in one ayah to some other related meaning, i.e., moving between the ayas so as to arrive at the intended meaning. The meanings of the Glorious Qur’an, then, exhibit a high degree of connectedness rather than being independent.

Consequently, the present study aims at extracting the intended meaning out of the intertext as a whole. This can be arrived at by introducing intertextuality as a powerful analytical tool which is used to specify the exact Qur’anic discoursal meaning via drawing a network of relations to connect the text with all the other surrounding texts to which it relates. In this study, therefore, each Qur’anic surah is treated as a text whose meaning can be best grasped by having reference
to other suras with the aim of setting up relations that can help in deciphering the accurate
discoursal meanings of the investigated lexical item. The study hypothesizes that the word
(aanasa) does not have the exact meaning of (see). Rather, it is hypothesized that no single
English verb can be used as an equivalent to the Arabic verb (/اَنْسَ/ aanasa). In order to get to
the bottom of the accurate interpretation of the ayas, the hypothesized meaning is applied on
all the ayas in which the word (aanasa) is mentioned. That being the case, references are made
to those ayas with the potential analysis to the meaning of the word.

It is worthy to mention that two other occurrences of the word (aanasa) refer to the same scene
of prophet Moses and his journey from Midian (Madyan) with his family. One such recurrence
is found in surat An-Naml (The Ants)/ ayah 7:

إِذْ قَالَ مُوسَىٰ إِنَّكُمْ مَثَّلُونَ "أَنْسَ مِنَ الْأَمْرِ َْهُُذَا أَنْسَتُكُمْ "

Again, disagreements and inconsistency among the translators can be detected. Table (2)
illustrates the renditions made by the translators. (The translation of the whole ayah is
illustrated in Appendix II).

Table (2) Translations of aanasa in Ayah 7/ Surat An-Naml (The Ants)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translator</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abdel Haleem</td>
<td>“I have seen a fire”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arberry</td>
<td>“I observe a fire”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawood</td>
<td>“I can descry a fire”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilali and Khan</td>
<td>“I have seen a fire”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irving</td>
<td>“I’ve glimpsed a fire”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khattab</td>
<td>“I have spotted a fire”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickthall</td>
<td>“I spy afar off a fire”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shakir</td>
<td>“I see a fire”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yusuf Ali</td>
<td>“I perceive a fire”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An agreement can be traced among Abdel Haleem, Hilali and Khan and Shakir who have
selected the verb (see), whereas the other translators disagree in their renderings by selecting
different verbs including (observe / descry / glimpse / spot / spy afar off / perceive). Some
degree of inconsistency can be noticed in the translators’ renderings. Abdel Haleem has opted
for using the verb (see) and neglecting his other rendition, namely, (catch sight of). The same
inconsistency is made by both Shakir and Dawood, who have preferred to select the verbs (see)
and (descry) respectively instead of the verbs (perceive) and (see). Arberry, Hilali and Khan,
Irving, Khattab and Yusuf Ali have been consistent in their renditions (see Table 1).

The other mention of the word (aanasa) is in surat Ta Ha / ayah 10:

وَهُنَّ أَئِنَّكُمْ حِدِيثٌ مُوسَىُّ اَذَّ رَأَيْتُكُمْ نَارًا فَقَالَ أَلَوْ اَنتُمْ اْسْتَنَنُوْنَ إِلَىِّ الْأَمْرِ َْهُُذَا أَنْسَتُكُمْ "لْعَلَّكُمْ مَثَّلُونَ "

Table (3) Translations of aanasa in Ayah 10/ Surat Ta Ha

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translator</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abdel Haleem</td>
<td>“I can see a fire”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arberry</td>
<td>“I observe a fire”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translator</td>
<td>Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawood</td>
<td>“I can see a fire”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilali and Khan</td>
<td>“I have seen a fire”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irving</td>
<td>“I’ve glimpsed a fire”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khattab</td>
<td>“I have spotted a fire”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickthall</td>
<td>“I see a fire afar off”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shakir</td>
<td>“I see fire”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yusuf Ali</td>
<td>“I perceive a fire”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, an agreement can be found among five of the translators, namely, Abdel Haleem, Dawood, Hilali and Khan, Pickthall and Shakir. They all agree to use the verb (see). The other verbs chosen by the other translators include (observe / descry / glimpse / spot / perceive). As far as consistency is concerned, it can be seen that Arberry, Hilali and Khan, Irving, Khattab and Yusuf Ali have been consistent in their renditions. The other four translators have shown some degree of inconsistency in their renditions. Dawood, for instance, has preferred to leave aside the verb (descry) and returned to the verb (see). Similarly, Pickthall has selected the verb (see) rather than his previous option for the verb (spy). (The translation of the whole ayah is illustrated in Appendix III).

It may be argued that this ayah provides a concrete evidence that the two words (aanasa / آنس and (ra’a / رأی) are synonymous because both words are mentioned within the same ayah. However, the present study upholds the opinion that though they might seem to have some degree of similarity in meaning, they are different words having different communicative meanings. It can be asserted that the verb (ra’a / رأی / see) primarily refers to using the eyes to observe something and that no other sensational meanings like comfort, calmness, relief, fear, or discomfort are associated with it. In contrast, the verb (aanasa / آنس) can be said to incorporate other minute meanings besides the primary meaning of seeing. It has been clarified that besides the regular meaning of observing something, this Arabic word is said to embrace certain feelings of peacefulness and intimacy which accompany the act of seeing ⁹.

Interestingly, another evidence can be given to disprove the claim that these two Arabic words are synonymous. As has been ascertained by Thakur (1999: 26), one applicable tool to make sure that two words are synonymous or not is to discover if they share the same antonyms. Having the same antonym implies that the two words are synonyms. In contrast, if it appears that they have different antonyms, it can be concluded that such words are not to be treated as synonyms. By applying this test on the two words in question, it can safely be deduced that they can be said to be synonyms in some limited contexts. Among the relevant antonyms of the word (ra’a / رأی / see) are: cannot see / to become blind / disbelieve / ignore / overlook / neglect / miss. The relevant antonyms of the word (aanasa / آنس), on the other hand, are: غفل / اهمَلَ / استوحش / خاف / اضطراب (neglect / ignore / feel alone / fear / be confused). It is evident that the two words do not share all the antonyms. They share the antonyms (neglect) and (ignore) only. All the other antonyms are not shared by them. Similarly, it has been confirmed that the antonym of the word آنس /aanasa is توحش(to worry / to feel afraid of / to be frightened of / to conceive a fear)¹¹.

As a matter of fact, the same applies to many other Qur’anic words which may sound synonyms at first glance, but appear to indicate different meanings. As has been stated by Abdul-Ghafoor, et al. (2019:182), many seemingly synonymous lexical items in the Glorious Qur’an will
display some sort of dissimilar meanings upon conducting some deep analysis of their constituents. As Al-Jabri (2012:13) elaborates, each word in the Glorious Qur’an is used to denote a meaning that makes it distinct from any other related words, and thus interchangeability of such related words is not possible. Identically, one of the findings obtained by Al-Omari and Abu-Melhim (2014: 2625) suggests that it is a matter of mere illusion to acknowledge that absolute synonymy exists in the Glorious Qur’an. With regard to the other occurrence of the word (aanasa), it is found in Surat An-Nisa’ (The Women) / ayah 6:

"وَابْتُلُونَ الْيَتَامَىَٰحَتَّىَٰإِذَاَبَلَغُوا الْعَرْشَ فَإِنَّ الْمَجَالَةَ مِنْهُمْ رَمَّتُوهَا فَادْخُلُواٌ إِلَىّهٍْ أَمْوَالَهُمْ"

Strangely enough, the translators have shown a considerable degree of agreement in their renditions, as can be seen in Table (4):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translators</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abdel Haleem</td>
<td>“you find they have sound judgment”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arberry</td>
<td>“you perceive in them right judgment”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawood</td>
<td>“you find them capable of sound judgment”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilali and Khan</td>
<td>“you find sound judgment in them”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irving</td>
<td>“you are sure of their maturity”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khattab</td>
<td>“you feel they are capable of sound judgment”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickthall</td>
<td>“ye find them of sound judgment”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shakir</td>
<td>“you find them maturity of intellect”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yusuf Ali</td>
<td>“ye find sound judgment in them”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be noticed that all the translators – except Arberry – have chosen a completely different rendition of the verb (آنس/ aanasa), hence treating it as if it is a wholly different verb. (The translation of the whole ayah is illustrated in Appendix IV).

It is noteworthy that despite the fact that the scene in this ayah is totally different from the scenes found in the other ayas in which the verb (آنس/ aanasa) has recurred, the meaning intended by this particular verb is not that much dissimilar. By applying intertextuality, it becomes possible to re-read as well as re- interpret this ayah and to figure out the intended meaning. The study claims that the verb aanasa in this ayah shares the same meanings identified in the previous ayas. It can further be asserted that the verb aanasa (to perceive, discern or descry with comfort) has been used in this ayah on purpose; to imply that it is not just a matter of (finding a truth of some kind, being sure of something, or feeling). If such meanings were intended, other verbs would have been used like: (وجدتم/تأكدتم/شعرتم). However, none of these alternatives have been used. This, in turn, supports the fact that what distinguishes the Qur’anic discourse is its utilization of eminently specified lexical items. Each lexical item in the Glorious Qur’an is, therefore, used for a particular reason and has a particular significance.

Consequently, the verb aanasa has been used so as to convey a specific meaning, namely that of (perceiving, discerning or descrying with comfort that orphans, who reach a marriageable age, have sound judgment when testing them). This same meaning is not distinct from the meaning conveyed by the verb aanasa in the other occurrences mentioned above. This intended meaning has been arrived at as a result of applying intertextuality in which the Qur’anic text is
treated as one entirety whose meanings are meticulously interrelated, and its meanings can be interpreted through its own texts.

Based on the different meanings attributed to the verb (آنَسَ / aanasa) by both the Arabic dictionaries and the commentators, different renditions have been given by the translators. These different renditions are illustrated in Figure (1) below:

Figure (1) The different renditions of the verb (aanasa)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>see</th>
<th>perceive</th>
<th>observe</th>
<th>spy afar off</th>
<th>descry</th>
<th>catch sight of</th>
<th>glimpse</th>
<th>spot</th>
<th>feel</th>
<th>be sure</th>
<th>find</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

As can be shown in Figure (1) above, a single Qur’anic lexical item has differently been translated into English. Interestingly, eleven equivalents have been provided by the translators for this particular item. More interestingly still, some translators have been rather indecisive by being somewhat inconsistent in their renditions. Table (5) illustrates how inconsistent some of the translators have been:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ayah 29/ Surat Al-Qasas</th>
<th>Ayah 29/ Surat Al-Qasas</th>
<th>Ayah 7/ Surat An-Naml</th>
<th>Ayah 10/ Surat Ta Ha</th>
<th>Ayah 6/ Surat An – Nisa’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abdel Haleem</td>
<td>caught sight of</td>
<td>have seen</td>
<td>have seen</td>
<td>can see</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arberry</td>
<td>observed</td>
<td>observe</td>
<td>observe</td>
<td>observe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dawood | descried | can see | can descry | can see | find
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
Hilali and Khan | saw | have seen | have seen | have seen | find
Irving | glimpsed | have glimpsed | have glimpsed | have glimpsed | are sure
Hilali and Khan | have been spotted | have been spotted | have been spotted | feel
Irving | have been spotted | have been spotted | have been spotted | feel
Khattab | have been spotted | have been spotted | have been spotted | feel
Shakir | have been spotted | have been spotted | have been spotted | feel
Yusuf Ali | have been spotted | have been spotted | have been spotted | feel

The above table can serve to reveal some remarkable observations. Firstly, it can be noticed that Pickthall can be regarded as the most inconsistent translator with regard to the Arabic word aanasa. He has provided his readers with four different lexical items (see / spy afar off / see afar off / find). Secondly, Abdel Haleem (catch sight of / see / find), Dawood (descry / see / find) and Shakir (perceive / see / find) can be treated as less inconsistent, with three different renditions. Thirdly, the least inconsistent – with two different renditions only – are: Arberry (observe / perceive), Hilali and Khan (see / find), Irving (glimpse / be sure), Khattab (spot / feel) and Yusuf Ali (perceive / find). It is quite obvious that all the translators have not been able to determine the best equivalent that can be used to transfer the intended meaning that this Qur’anic lexical item serves to communicate. Lastly, though more significantly, all the translators have agreed that the last recurrence of aanasa carries a meaning which varies from its other four occurrences. As has been claimed by Altakhaineh, et al (2014: 102), the Qur’an translators – in addition to the different meanings provided by the commentators – might have relied on their knowledge of the world, or else they might have understood the meaning on the basis of the context and / or the real world meaning to detect the intended meaning of the Qur’anic lexical item. As has been argued by Haleem (2018: 17), the translators of the Qur’an are likely to give inaccurate renditions either when they adopt a literal translation approach, hence treating Qur’anic words, ayas and suras as if they are independent of each other, or when they borrow some of the renditions provided by earlier translators without due discernment. Inaccurate renditions, which occur as a result of the translator not being fully able to grasp the intended discoursal meaning of certain source text lexical items, may lead to crucial outcomes on the informative quality of the source text (Scarpa, 2020: 343).

It is the purpose of the present paper to extract the intended meaning that this particular Qur’anic item attempts to communicate via the adoption of an intertextuality approach. Such an approach aims to emphasize the way in which the textual units, namely, the ayas of the Glorious Qur’an are being realized as a whole part of one single text. The meaning of (aanasa), then, is to be arrived at based on the meaning shared by all the ayas in which it is mentioned. The different eleven renditions illustrated in figure 1 above can be seen as a concrete evidence that the translators have been unable to give one single accurate equivalent, which can be attributed to the fact that no single English verb can be found to work as a precise equivalent for the Arabic verb (aanasa). It is believed, yet, that through adopting the intertextuality approach through which an attempt is made to identify the meaning shared by all the ayas in which the verb (aanasa) is mentioned, some of these eleven renditions will be disposed of. The first verb mentioned in figure 1 is (see). The analysis has revealed that this verb cannot be regarded as the best equivalent for the verb (aanasa) (see page 11 above). As a result, this verb is excluded. The second verb is (perceive), which can be said to incorporate some of the meanings implied by (aanasa), i.e., (to identify an object with the aid of the senses, to know, to become aware of).
that the verb (observe) cannot be looked upon as the best equivalent since its meaning is restricted to seeing, noticing or watching, but the other meaning of knowing or becoming aware of are not included. Regarding the verb (spy afar off), it is to be excluded as its relevant meaning is restricted to seeing or noticing someone or something. The verb (descry) is another possible equivalent since it includes both meanings of catching sight of and finding out as well. The phrasal verb (catch sight of) and the verb (glimpse) are not good equivalents due to the fact that their meanings are limited to the act of seeing for a short period of time. The meaning of the verb (spot) is again restricted to the act of seeing or noticing. It is, therefore, not a suitable equivalent. The meanings of the remaining three verbs in Figure (1), namely, (feel, be sure, find) can only be considered suitable equivalents for the verb (aanasa) as it is mentioned in Surat An–Nisa’, and not for the other occurrences of the verb in the other instances. The analysis entails that, out of the eleven equivalents given by the translators, only two equivalents, (perceive) and (descry) can be said to be used as suitable equivalent renditions of the verb (aanasa), provided that some other meanings are added to those two verbs so as to convey all the nuances carried by that verb. Interestingly enough, all the translators have ignored another verb that can be used as an additional possible alternative. This other verb, namely, (discern), can be said to incorporate much (but not all) the meanings implied in the verb (aanasa). As a consequence, the present study states that the intended meaning of the Qur’anic verb (آنَسََ /aanasa) is: (to perceive), (to descend with comfort) or (to discern with comfort). It can be claimed that all the ayas in which the verb (aanasa) is mentioned can share this meaning.

7. Conclusions and Recommendations

With the aid of intertextuality, the current study attempted to delve into the precise intended meaning of the Arabic verb (آنَسََ /aanasa) in the Glorious Qur’an. The study investigated whether Qur’an translators have been successful in transferring the intended meaning of this specific lexical item both accurately and consistently. The analysis revealed that the translators have not provided their readers with accurate renditions that can be said to incorporate all the nuances of the Arabic verb. In addition, their translations have shown a considerable amount of inconsistency which in turn can be attributed to the fact that they looked upon the Qur’anic words, ayas and suras as if they are independent of each other. Depending on intertextuality, the study managed to figure out that the intended meaning of the Qur’anic verb (aanasa) is: (to perceive with comfort), (to descend with comfort) or (to discern with comfort). This meaning is shared by all the ayas in which the verb (aanasa) is mentioned. Intertextuality, then, paved the way for deducing the most suitable interpretations of the Arabic verb (آنَسََ /aanasa) as used in the Glorious Qur’an. The study also uncovered the discoursal meaning of (aanasa) in comparison with (راة /see /ابصر /راي /رائي), clarified their distinct meanings and came to the conclusion that they should not be looked upon as synonymous or near – synonymous. Accordingly, the translators of the Glorious Qur’an opted for selecting a general item, hence, not being able to provide the accurate English equivalent. Based upon the claim made in this study that intertextuality can be used as a significant tool to aid in solving some problematic translation issues by figuring out the intended meanings of Qur’anic lexical items, it is recommended that more studies are needed to reinvestigate the intended discoursal meanings of other Qur’anic lexical items. Such attempts of reinvestigation
can help to uncover new meanings, which, in turn, can lead to providing new, more accurate and consistent translations.

8. Notes
1. For detailed discussions of these terms, see de Beaugrande and Dressler (1981), Neubert and Shreve (1992), and Hatim and Mason (1997).
3. A detailed account on the origins of intertextuality can be found in (Alfar, 1996), (Allen, 2000) and Juvan (2008).
4. All the translations are adopted from the following website: https://www.islamawakened.com/
5. All the definitions can be found in the following website: https://www.arabdict.com/ar/%D8%B9%D8%B1%D8%A8%D9%8A-%D8%B9%D8%B1%D8%A8%D9%8A/%D8%A2%D9%86%D8%B3%D8%AA
6. The following website has been consulted as the source from which the different interpretations of the commentators are adopted: https://www.altafsir.com/indexArabic.asp
7. It has been stated by Al-Samarrai (2003: 92) that the story of prophet Moses is narrated at length and in much detail in Surat Al-Qasas, whereas in Surat An-Naml it is briefly narrated and summarized.
8. The three Suras, therefore, give a complete narration of the story of prophet Moses.
9. For more elaboration on this particular issue, visit the following website: https://www.shiavault.com/books/an-enlightening-commentary-into-the-light-of-the-holy-qur-an-vol-13/chapters/17-section-4-moses
10. https://www.almaany.com/ar/thes-ar-ar/%D8%A2%D9%86%D8%B3/
11. https://www.almaany.com/ar/thes/ar-ar/%D8%A2%D9%86%D9%8E%D8%B3%D9%8E/
12. https://www.dictionary.com/browse/perceive
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Appendix I: The Whole Translations of Ayah 29/ Surah Al-Qasas

Abdel Haleem

“Once Moses had fulfilled the term and was travelling with his family, he caught sight of a fire on the side of the mountain and said to his family: Wait! I have seen a fire. I will bring you news from there, or a burning stick for you to warm yourselves.”

Arberry

“So when Moses had accomplished the term and departed with his household, he observed on the side of the Mount a fire. He said to his household: Tarry you here; I observe a fire. Perhaps I shall bring you news of it, or a faggot from the fire, that haply you shall warm yourselves”

Dawood

“And when he had fulfilled his term and was journeying with his folk, Moses described a fire on the mountain-side. He said to his people: Stay here, for I can see a fire. Perhaps I can bring you news, or a lighted torch to warm yourselves with”

Hilali and Khan

“Then, when Musa (Moses) had fulfilled the term, and was travelling with his family, he saw a fire in the direction of Tur (Mount). He said to his family: Wait, I have seen a fire; perhaps I may bring to you from there some information, or a burning fire-brand that you may warm yourselves.”

Irving

“When Moses had completed the term [that he had promised to work] and was travelling away with his family, he glimpsed a fire on a slope of Mount [Sinai]. He told his family: Stay here! I’ve glimpsed a fire. Perhaps I may bring you some news from it, or an ember from the fire so you may warm yourselves”

Khattab

“When Moses had completed the term and was travelling with his family, he spotted a fire on the side of Mount Ṭūr. He said to his family: Stay here, for I have spotted a fire. Perhaps from there I can bring you some directions or a torch from the fire so you may warm yourselves.”

Pickthall

“Then, when Moses had fulfilled the term, and was travelling with his housefolk, he saw in the distance a fire and said unto his housefolk: Bide ye (here). Lo! I see in the distance a fire; peradventure I shall bring you tidings thence, or a brand from the fire that ye may warm yourselves”

Shakir

“So when Musa had fulfilled the term, and he journeyed with his family, he perceived on this side of the mountain a fire. He said to his family: Wait, I have seen a fire, maybe I will bring to you from it some news or a brand of fire, so that you may warm yourselves”

Yusuf Ali

“Now when Moses had fulfilled the term, and was travelling with his family, he perceived a fire in the direction of Mount Tur. He said to his family: Tarry ye; I perceive a fire; I hope to bring you from there some information, or a burning firebrand, that ye may warm yourselves”
Appendix II: The Whole Translations of Ayah 7/ Surah Al-Naml

Abdel Haleem  “Moses said to his family: I have seen a fire. I will bring you news from there, or a burning stick for you to warm yourselves”

Arberry “When Moses said to his people: I observe a fire, and will bring you news of it, or I will bring you a flaming brand, that haply you shall warm yourselves”

Dawood “Tell of Moses, who said to his people: I can discern a fire. I will go and bring you news and a lighted torch to warm yourselves with”

Hilali and Khan “(Remember) when Musa (Moses) said to his household: Verily! I have seen a fire, I will bring you from there some information, or I will bring you a burning brand, that you may warm yourselves”

Irving “Thus Moses told his household: I’ve glimpsed a fire. I’ll bring you some news from it, or I’ll bring you a glowing ember so that you may warm yourselves”

Khattab “Remember when Moses said to his family: I have spotted a fire. I will either bring you some directions from there, or a burning torch so you may warm yourselves”

Pickthall “(Remember) when Moses said unto his household: Lo! I spy afar off a fire; I will bring you tidings thence, or bring to you a borrowed flame that ye may warm yourselves”

Shakir “When Musa said to his family: Surely I see fire; I will bring to you from it some news, or I will bring to you therefrom a burning firebrand so that you may warm yourselves”

Yusuf Ali “Be hold! Moses said To his family: I perceive a fire; soon will I bring you From there some information. Or I will bring you A burning brand (to light Our fuel.) that ye may Warm yourselves”

Appendix III: The Whole Translations of Ayah 10/ Surah Ta Ha

Abdel Haleem  “He saw a fire and said to his people: Stay here—I can see a fire. Maybe I can bring you a flaming brand from it or find some guidance there”

Arberry “When he saw a fire, and said to his family: Tarry you here; I observe a fire. Perhaps I shall bring you a brand from it, or I shall find at the fire guidance”

Dawood “When he saw a fire, he said to his people: Stay here, for I can see a fire. Perchance I can bring you a lighted torch or find a guide hard by”

Hilali and Khan “When he saw a fire, he said to his family: Wait! Verily, I have seen a fire, perhaps I can bring you some burning brand therefrom, or find some guidance at the fire”

Irving “Once he saw a fire and told his family: Wait here, I have glimpsed a fire. Maybe I can bring you a coal from it, or find some guidance at the fire”

Khattab “When he saw a fire, he said to his family: Wait here, for I have spotted a fire. Perhaps I can bring you a torch from it, or find some guidance at the fire”
Pickthall  “(When he saw a fire and said unto his folk: Lo! Wait! I see a fire afar off. Peradventure I may bring you a brand therefrom or may find guidance at the fire”

Shakir  “When he saw fire, he said to his family: Stop, for surely I see a fire. haply I may bring to you therefrom a live coal or find a guidance at the fire”

Yusuf Ali  “Behold, he saw a fire: So he said to his family: Tarry ye; I perceive a fire; perhaps I can bring you some burning brand therefrom, or find some guidance at the fire”

Appendix IV: The Translations of Ayah 6/ Surah Al-Nisa’

Abdel Haleem  “Test orphans until they reach marriageable age; then, if you find they have sound judgement, hand over their property to them”

Arberry  “Test well the orphans, until they reach the age of marrying; then, if you perceive in them right judgment, deliver to them their property”

Dawood  “Put orphans to the test until they reach a marriageable age. If you find them capable of sound judgement, hand over to them their property”

Hilali and Khan  “And try orphans (as regards their intelligence) until they reach the age of marriage; if then you find sound judgment in them, release their property to them”

Irving  “Test orphans as soon as they reach a marriageable age. If you are sure of their maturity, then turn their property over to them”

Khattab  “Test the competence of the orphans until they reach a marriageable age. Then if you feel they are capable of sound judgment, return their wealth to them”

Pickthall  “Prove orphans till they reach the marriageable age; then, if ye find them of sound judgment, deliver over unto them their fortune”

Shakir  “And test the orphans until they attain puberty; then if you find in them maturity of intellect, make over to them their property”

Yusuf Ali  “Make trial of orphans until they reach the age of marriage; if then ye find sound judgment in them, release their property to them”