Intertextuality in English and Arabic: A Comparative Study

Esam Taher Mohammed

Asst. Prof./ Translation Department/College of Arts /University of Mosul

Abd-AlRahman Ahmad Abd-AlRahman

Prof/Translation Department/College of Arts / University of Mosul

Article Information	Abstract
	The major goal of this study is to shed light on one of the most significant rhetorical phenomena that contributes to the production of written and spoken texts. The notion of intertextuality is not new; rather, it has been around for a long time and was recognized by ancient Arab critics, albeit under different titles. In the West, intertextuality was identified by a pair of significant eras: (i) the structuralist era represented by the father of modern linguistics "Ferdinand de Saussure" and his language semiotics; and (ii) the post-structuralist era represented by Bakhtin and his dialogic theory, then followed by Julia Kristeva, who is credited with the coinage of the concept of intertextuality in the 1960s and the transmission of Bakhtin's views into the West. The study concluded that intertextuality was prevailing in both Arabic and English languages and that Arab critics, as well as Western ones, knew it as a phenomenon but not as a term. For the ancient Arab critics, intertextuality was a kind of poetic theft. They provided various titles in their reference to the phenomenon of intertextuality, including (ألمسخ, ألنسخ, ألسلخ, etc.). However, the ancient Arab critics did not study intertextuality as an individual theoretical phenomenon or literary device as Kristeva did. In fact, before the advent of Kristeva and the other Western scholars who followed her approach, both ancient Western and Arab scholars were using intertextuality subconsciously and without recognizing or studying it as a distinct phenomenon.

أَلتَّنَاصّ فِي اللُّغَتَيْن الْإِنْكِلِيزِيَّة وَ الْعَرَبِيَّة : دِرَاسَة مُقَارَنَة

عصام طاهر محمد*   عبدالرحمن احمد عبدالرحمن**

المستخلص

* استاذ مساعد / قسم الترجمة / كلية الاداب / جامعة الموصل
** استاذ / قسم الترجمة / كلية الاداب / جامعة الموصل

الهَدَف الرَّئِيسِي مِنْ هَذِهِ الدِّرَاسَةَ هُو تَسْلِيط الضَّوْء عَلَى وَاحِدَةٍ مِنْ أَهَمِّ الظَّوَاهِر الْبَلَاغِيَّة الَّتِي تُسَهِمُ فِي إنْتَاج النُّصُوص الْمَكْتُوبَة والمنطوقة . إنَّ مَفْهُومَ التَّنَاصّ لَيْس بِالْجَدِيد , بَلْ إنَّهُ مَوْجُودٌ مُنْذ الْقَدَم وَقَدْ عَرَّفَهُ النُّقَّاد الْعَرَب الْقُدَمَاء مُنْذُ زَمَنٍ بَعِيدٍ وَلَكِن بِمُسَمَّيَات مُخْتَلِفَةٌ . أمَّا فِي الْغَرْبِ ، فَقَدْ ظَهَرَ مَفْهُوم التَّنَاصّ في حِقبتين زمنيتين بَارِزَتَين هُمَا : (1) الحِقْبة البنيوية الَّتِي يُمَثِّلهَا مُؤَسِّس اللغويات الحَدِيثَة والسيميائيات "فرديناند دِي سوسو" . (2) حِقْبة مَا بَعْد البنيوية الَّتِي يُمَثِّلهَا مِيخائِيل باختين صَاحِب النظرية الحوارية ، وَمَن لَحِقَهُ في هَذِهِ الحِقْبة , خَاصَّة الْعَالِمَة البولغارية الْأَصْل جُولِيا كريستيفا ، الَّتِي كَانَ لَها الْفَضْل الْكَبِير فِي صِيَاغَة مَفْهُوم التَّنَاصّ فِي ستينيات القَرْن العِشْرينَ الْمَاضِي فضلاً عن فَضْلِهَا فِي نَشْر آرَاء باختِن فِي الْغَرْبِ . خَلُصَت الدِّرَاسَة إلَى أنَّ التَّنَاصّ كَان سَائِداً فِي كِلْتَا اللُّغَتَيْن الْعَرَبِيَّة والإنجليزية ، وَأن النُّقَّاد الْعَرَب ، وَكَذَلِك الغربيون ، كَانُوا قَدْ عرفوا التَّنَاصّ كَظَاهِرة وَلَيْس كمصطلح . كَان التَّنَاصّ بِالنِّسْبَة للنقاد الْعَرَب الْقُدَمَاء ، نَوْعًا مِن السَّرقَات الشِّعْريَّة وَقَد تَنَاوَلُوه تَحْت مُسَمَّيَات مُخْتَلِفَةٌ مِثْل السَّلْخ ، النَّسَخ ، الْمَسْخ ، إِلخ . وَمَع ذَلِك ، لَمْ يُدَرَّسْ النُّقَاد الْعَرَب الْقُدَمَاء التَّنَاصّ كَظَاهِرة نَظَرِيَّة أَوْ أدَاةً بَلَاغِيَّة مُنْفَرِدَةً كَمَا فَعَلْتُ كرستيفا . وَكَمَا أسْئَلْنَا سَابِقًا ، كَانَ مَفْهُومُ التَّنَاصّ فِي مُتَنَاوَلِ عُلَمَاء الغَرْبِ وَالشّرْق الْقُدَمَاء قَبْل مجيء كرستيفا وَمَن اتَّبَعَهَا مِنْ الْعُلَمَاء الغربيين ، لَكِنَّهُم تَنَاوَلُوه مِنْ دُونِ وَعيّ وَمَنْ دُونَ الاِعْتِرَاف بِهِ كَظَاهِرة بَلَاغِيَّة مُتَمَيِّزَة لَها مُصْطَلَح خَاصٌّ وَمُنْفَرِد بِهَا.

الْكَلِمَات الْمِفْتَاحِيَّة : الحوارية ، ألتَّنَاصّ ، مَا بَعْدَ البنيوية ، السَّرقَات الشِّعْريَّة ، البنيوية

1. **Introduction**:

Although the term intertextuality is a recent one, having been first used by the Bulgarian-French writer and critic "Julia Kristeva," the idea that underlies it is often found in the writings of Ferdinand de Saussure and Mikhail Bakhtin. Intertextuality as a literary device dates back to earlier literary works in both English and Arabic. At the same time, the academic discussion concerning it begins with the development of postmodernism. All types of intertextuality, religious, historical, mythological, and literary, can enhance the written and spoken texts and extend their deeper significance. Olshanskaya (2011:88) argues that contrary to the concept's complicated roots and the reality that it has a history of different descriptions which represent an array of literary and linguistic theories from which the notion has emerged, the term itself is defined fairly uniformly by a wide range of scholars. According to Venuti (2009:158), the particular case of intertextuality involves three complex and uneven sets of relations between (i) the foreign text and other texts, (ii) the foreign text (ST) and the translation (TT), and (iii) the translation and other texts equivalence. In a nutshell, being aware of intertextuality makes it easier for us to comprehend any text. It enriches all people's artistic endeavors and helps them develop their writing style rather than being only a copy or a faint echo of others.

2. **The Objectives**

The objective of this paper is to offer suitable answers to the following questions:
1. What is the concept of intertextuality?
2. Who first realized the notion of intertextuality, the Arabs or the Westerners?
3. Do Arabic and English languages use the same forms of intertextuality?
4. Who is responsible for the spread of the postmodern structuralism notion of intertextuality among Arab modern critics?
5. To what extent the Arab Modern critics were affected by post-structuralist thought?

3. **The Early Beginning of the Notion**

The idea of interrelated texts first appeared in Saussurian structuralism and semiotics. According to Saussure, cited in (Bertens, 2005: 67), any language is a network of signs that relate to one another. Language, for him, is a sort of sign system among many throughout the world. As a result, anything that

is an element of any system is a sign, and the meaning of this sign is established by how it is associated with other signs of the same system. As a result, no sign has significance on its own. A sign's significance depends on how it interacts with other signs and how diverse the system's total sign population is(ibid). In Saussure's view, a sign's meaning arises from its relationship to other signs; in other words, a sign "takes its significance from its function inside a specific structure; from its interactions with the other signs" (ibid). Saussurean school of linguistics was completely content to study language in a vacuum and to use sentences as its basic concept or unit (Bakhtin,1986: 69). In contrast to Saussurean school of linguistics, the Bakhtin circle took the utterance as the point of departure (Bakhtin1986:71). According to Bennett (1979:74-5), Bakhtin proposed dialogism as the propeller for Saussure's pet-like and magic langue. Bakhtin and Volosinov (1986:70) argue that making an abstract analysis of literary genres in particular and any other genres, in general, means ignoring the fact that people use language in particular social circumstances. Here the keyword is an utterance that reflects the human-centered and socially relevant quality of language that Saussurian linguistics failed to spot. Meaning, then, is something unique that arises from the language interaction of particular people in particular social settings (ibid). Through his dialogic discourse theory, Bakhtin conducted his famous critical study "Problems of the Poetics of Dostoevsky" on Dostoevsky's works. In this study, Bakhtin found many voices within the work of Dostoevsky that combat the idea of the existence of autonomous and independent texts. Accordingly, he concluded that the human being has a speech that is not his own but acquired from other voices, so language is a collective property and not individual (Lary, 2019:153-5).

4. The Coinage of the Term

According to Allen (2000:44), the intertextual theory was first developed by Kristeva by combining Saussurean semiotics "relational signs" and Bakhtin's "dialogism or the social word." In Bakhtin, Kristeva saw the intelligence and novelty that had not been understood forty years before. She was very interested in Bakhtin's concept of the plurality of voices or polyphony, which is associated with the idea that there are several voices within a single voice. The static cut of the work is opposed by a dynamic one, in which the literary structure is elaborated in relation to another(Kristeva,2003:8). Kristeva expanded on Saussure's innovative ideas. At the same time, she doubted the assumption that textual material is a closed-off entity. She advanced the idea that a work of literature is not an outcome of an author's original ideas with a single referential meaning but rather a construction of many ideas with multiple referential significations embedded in the text (Zengin,2016:305). Kristeva (1986:37) maintains that "any text is structured as a mosaic of quotations"; "every text is the transformation and the absorption of another text and the language of poetics is read as at least double. Kristeva replaced Bakhtin's concept of voices with her concept of texts, resulting in a modification and paraphrase of Bakhtin's approach (Kristeva,1980:66). For her, "each word (text) is an intersection of words (texts) where at least another word (text) can be read." She confirms that every word contains other words, and every text contains other texts (ibid). Since texts are produced by the reiteration and alteration of additional textual constructions, the intertextuality theory necessitates that we view texts as interdependent systems never be like autonomous entities, and as a consequence, they cannot operate as isolated units (Alfaro,1996:1). The two methods of Bakhtin and Kristeva are similar in some aspects while they differ in others. For example, they are both post-structural, dynamic, and recipient centered and focus on the social aspect of language use. Also, they are similar in some terms, such as "heteroglossia" and "polyglossia," which mean diversity of voices or pronunciation (Todorov 1984: 64-65). In contrast, Kristeva's approach can be considered a remold of Bakhtin's approach replacing dialogism with intertextuality. Accordingly, Kristeva replaced the notion of

inter-subjectivity with intertextuality(inter-objectivity)and intratextuality with intertextuality and unilateral focus on novelistic genres into multiple foci on a wide spectrum of genres (Lesic-Thomas,2005:5-9). Scholars after Kristeva entertained different notions of the term, although they all shared the same core meaning of the interrelationship.In his interest to reformulate Kristeva's original approach that dates back to 1967, the French literary critic and theorist Gerárd Genette has written his famous work "The Palimpsest: Literature in the Second Degree" (1982) in which he argues that the object of poetics is not the text itself, but the archtext. The arch-textuality of the text is defined as the set of general or transcendent categories, such as types of discourse, modes of enunciation, literary genres, etc., that pertain to the palimpsestuous nature of texts. Intertextuality within this framework has a more restricted definition. It is the relationship of co-presence between two or more texts which means a hypotext appears in hypertext (Oke,2021:14-15).Genette, in this case, restricts intertextuality to the relationship in which a text appears within another, either through quotations, allusions, or plagiarism.Therefore, both texts must be present, directly or indirectly(Burns&Lacasse,2018:10). Roland Barthes, in his work "The Pleasure of the Text," says: "I enjoy the kingdom of formulas, the overturning of origins, the ease that makes the previous text come from the subsequent text"(Barth,1975: 57). In his essay "The Death of the Author " Barthes focuses on the fact that the author is not a person, but a culturally, socially and historically constituted subject (Barth,1977:142-148). The critic calls this phenomenon the removal (distancing) of the Author. Therefore, the Author does not "nourish" the book, does not exist before it, does not think and suffer for it"; the modern author "is born at the same time as his text, he is not endowed with a being that would precede or exceed his writing"(ibid). According to Allen(2006:69-70), Barth's contribution to the post-structuralist concept of intertextuality explicitly emphasizes the reader's role in the production of the anti-monological text. Thus, the author mentioned above indicates the presence of two categories of readers: consumers", who read the work in search of stable meaning, and readers" of the text, which are productive during reading. Riffaterre created his unique theory of intertextuality in 1990, in which he adopted a reader-focused approach to intertextuality. He views the text as the origin of all reader's behaviors and a literary text would constantly guide the readers toward the significance of the literary work (Riffaterre, 1990:61). Riffaterre (1978), cited in Kulei (2014: 207), developed the concept of "hypogram" to designate the central notion that drives a text. A word, a short sentence, a concept, or even a cliche that has been grabbed from a previous piece of writing is an example of a hypogram. This demonstrates Riffaterre's conviction that a literary work never exists by itself but is instead the result of ideas from some other texts. According to Riffaterre (1978:66), A hypogram is repeated frequently throughout the text via anomalies that make the reader think himself forced to uncover it via a retroactive reading. This encourages the reader to refer to earlier parts of a certain text and evoke his knowledge of older works in the culture. Additionally, Riffaterre made a distinction between intertextuality and intertext; for him, an intertext could be one or even more texts that the reader has to be acquainted with to recognize the entire importance of a piece of literature. The concept of intertextuality contends that significance and even "literariness" is produced through repeated allusions to other texts (Riffaterre, 1990:56–57).

5. Taxonomy of Intertextuality in English

According to Allen (2011:98), the co-presence of intertextuality manifests itself in the following ways:

1. **Quote**: Generally, it is the most literal and explicit form. It consists of using in a text some words or paragraphs of another text by the same author or another author, clarifying whose quotation it is, and highlighting what is quoted with another font or with quotation marks.

3. **Allusion**: Intertextuality by allusion assumes that the receiver of the text has sufficient knowledge or information about the references cited to ignore the author, the quotation marks or even be flexible concerning the exact text that is cited. This type of intertextuality is very common in practically any audiovisual or literary work, as winks and tributes to other previous works of popular culture. If the receiver does not know the previous reference, he will still be able to follow the discourse of the new text, but part of the information and the author's intention will be lost.

3. **Plagiarism:** The third is the most controversial of the three, as it alludes to criminal practice. In plagiarism intertextuality, the author of the new plagiarism uses the words or images of a previous author without citing and passing them off as his work. We all know notorious academic, literary, cinematographic, or advertising plagiarism since, unfortunately, it can be a fairly common practice. This type of intertextuality differs from the previous one in the intentionality of the author of the new text since there is no spirit of homage but of appropriating the work of another person.

6. The Functions of Intertextuality

In the introduction to his seminal work " Mythology and Intertextuality," Marc Eigeldinger not only defines intertextuality as an act of rewriting and cultural diversion but also specifies the multiple functions of intertextuality and its true role which privileges the language of exchange and plurality'.The following are the main functions of intertextuality suggested by Eigeldinger (1987:17) :

1. A referential and strategic function: What is interesting in this function is that it explains the productivity of the text as follows: "Any quotation, allusion or parody refers to an earlier or contemporary model, to a cultural domain, to a sphere of knowledge that it subjects to the work of assimilation. It refers to authority, an external representation that it appropriates to integrate into the coherence of its new context, where it plays the clutch role.

2. A transformative and semantic function: It is considered by Eigeldinger as the main function of intertextuality because, at this level, it is not a question of reproducing in its raw state the borrowed material but of transforming and transposing it to inaugurate, generating new meaning.

3. Descriptive and aesthetic function: This function acts at the level of the scenery of the narrative through comparison. Eigeldenger notes its contribution to the enrichment of the decor by introducing "the dimension of the aesthetic ornament that it borrows from pre-existing models of painting or theater to fix such an element of the landscape and such character of the portrait.

4. Metaphorical function: This function is, in reality, only the enlargement of the descriptive and aesthetic function, in addition to the enrichment of the text with ornaments. This function conveys, according to Eigeldinger, "signs that carry symbolic meaning. It proposes mythological, plastic or musical equivalences; in a circumscribed space of the text, it inserts similarities, verbal analogies, endowed with the power to increase the symbolic virtue of writing."

5. Parody function: By this function, Eigeldinger demonstrated how, by engaging in the game of cross-dressing, by imitating a model to draw effects of comedy or humor, she invites the narrator to yield to the taste for entertainment and mockery to resort to a playful activity by which he distances himself from any authority.

7. The Early Beginning of the Notion in the East

According to Ḥaddād (1995:135), intertextuality in Arabic literature was first known as "poetic theft" because it was often linked to poetry and discussed as a poetic event. Al-Zuʻbī (2000:19) asserts that intertextuality is not a recent development in contemporary studies; rather, it is a subject with roots in both Eastern and Western critical studies, though under different titles and labels. Al-Kaswānī (2012:4) points out that Arab criticism had never heard of the term "intertextuality" before it was employed by Western criticism. He confirms that the idea of intertextuality and textual interconnection drew the attention of old Arab critics, and they tackled it but under different names such as implication, quotation, citation, plagiarism, pastiche, parody, etc. He asserts that this fact does not lessen the value of our poetic and critical heritage; rather, it gives it new life when it is interpreted in the context of modern critical ideas, giving it immortality because each generation finds in it what it seeks in the context of its growing ideas(ibid). Ḥalabī (2007:40) confirms that when looking for the roots of intertextuality in ancient Arab criticism, the terms used by ancient Arab critics, whether in the rhetorical or critical field, are close to intertextuality and very relevant to the text. The common ground between them and intertextuality is the idea of the transfer of meaning or wording, or both, from one text to another and from one literary work to another with a distinction in purpose and intent. Ibn Abī Ṭāhir (385 AH), cited in Bqshy(2007:16), claims that the speech of the Arabs is overlapped. If we check it, we will undoubtedly discover very little innovation and creativity because of what is typically taken from the sayings of previous generations. He adds(ibid) anyone who believes that his words are not confused with those used by others is in error. According to Murtāḍ(1998:17), the old Arabian famous method of learning how to write poetry, which requires reading and memorization Arabic poetry and then forgetting it, is another sign that Arabs were aware of the idea of intertextuality and the presence of older texts in recent ones. Ibn Khaldūn, as stated in Murtāḍ (1998:69-93), addressed the previously mentioned way of learning poetry among old Arabs by declaring that a poet who memorizes a small amount of fine poetry is not a poet but a poor versifier. He says that someone with a poor memory of fine poetry should stop writing it (ibid). For him, one cannot be a brilliant poet or a clever writer unless he goes through a period of remembering poetry and honing his intuition to weave on this pattern(ibid). Similarly, Mubārakī (2003:3)provides examples that show pre-Islamic poets' awareness of the importance of being in touch with the linguistic heritage of past generations and tracking their pace. This example is represented by the famous saying of Imam ʻAlī Ibn Abī Ṭālib (may Allah bless him):

<div dir="rtl">" لَوْلَا أَنْ الْكَلَامَ يُعَاد لَنَفَذ "</div>

The talk will end if it is not reproduced. (My translation)

According to al-Tabrīzī (1995:193), the words of Imam ʻAlī Ibn Abī Ṭālib (may Allah bless him) come as a confirmation of the artistic fact that ʻAntar Ibn Shaddād repeated in his Muʻallaqah regarding the previous generations who didn't leave nearly anything unsaid for the subsequent ones. Ibn Shaddād says:

<div dir="rtl">"هَلْ غَادَرَ الشَّعَرَاءُ مِنْ مُتَرَدَّم ؟ " (al-Tabrīzī,1995: 193)</div>

Have the poets left anything unversed? (My translation)

According to Murtāḍ(1998:18), Ibn Shaddād, in this half of his poetic verse, demonstrates how it is impossible to abandon the literary heritage of the past due to its critical role in the creation of new poetic writings.

Similarly, Ibn Zuhayr says:

مَا أَرَانَا نَقُولُ إِلَّا معاراً أَو معاداً مِن لفظنا مكرورا .   (al-Andalusī,1983:86)

We are only repeating the words of those who came before us, or we are simply repeating our own with a little polish. (My translation)

In the poetic verse cited above, the poet Ibn Zuhayr claims that earlier people have either said everything we say and we only repeat what they have said as if we borrow their words, or merely we repeat our words by saying them again and again with a little polish. This is further evidence that intertextuality was well understood by the ancient Arabs before the West, even though old Arabs did not mention the precise term in their writings.

The following is a brief discussion of the terms that old Arabs used to refer to intertextuality in the domains of rhetoric and criticism, namely:

(**al-Taḍmīn/inclusion ,** التَّضْمِين)

(**al-Iqtibās / quoting ,** الاقْتِبَاس)

(**altlmyḥ/allusion,** التَّلْمِيح)

(**al-Sariqah/theft,** السَّرِقَة)

(**al-Muʻāraḍāt/ pastiches,** الْمُعَارَضَات)

(**almnāqḍāt/ contraries,** الْمُنَاقَضَات)

Al-Taḍmīn: According to Wahbah and al-Muhandis (1984:108), in al-Taḍmīn, the poet takes some words from another poetic source and usually refers to it unless it is too well-known to be referred to.

In the following example, Ibn al-Khaṭīb, an old Arab poet, includes a hemistich mentioned by the pre-Islam poet Amrw al-Qays' in his famous Muʻallaqah.In this example, Ibn al-Khaṭīb wanted to praise a certain person by including a descriptive hemistich borrowed from Amrw al-Qays in which he praises his horse:

يَقُول أمرؤ الْقَيْس:

"مِكرٍّ مِفَرٍّ مُقبِلٍ مُدْبِرٍ معًا   كَجُلمودِ صخرٍ حطَّه السيلُ مِنْ عَلِ ".

 (Ibn Ḥujr,1984:19)

Amrw al-Qays says:

Attacking, receding, advancing, reverting at once as a huge rock descended by the stream from atop. (My translation)

يَقُولُ ابْنُ الْخَطِيبِ:

"كَأَنَ ابْنَ حُجْرٍ قَدْ عَنَاهُ بِقَولِهِ   كَجُلْمُودِ صَخْر حَطَّهُ السَّيْلُ مِنْ عَلِ"

 (Ibn al-Khaṭīb,1989:105)

Ibn al-Khaṭīb says:

As if Ibn Ḥujr meant him in his saying, "as a huge rock descended by the stream from the top." (My translation)

Al-Iqtibās: According to the perspective of language, al-Iqtibās is derived from the Arabic word (Qbsa), which signifies possessing a torch of fire. As a term, it refers to incorporating something from the Holy Qur'an or a Prophetic tradition into a piece of writing to enrich and honor it(Ibn Manẓūr,1988:167). In early Arab criticism, inclusion and quotation were distinguished, with the former primarily centered on poetry and the latter on the Holy Qur'an and Prophetic Hadith (al-Nuwayrī,1923:182-187). However, some early Arab critics disagreed with this categorization of the two ideas. Accordingly, they described inclusion as the case in which the speaker incorporates something from a poetic or Quranic verse, or even a well-known adage or piece of wisdom, into his discourse(Ibn al-Wāḥid,1995:140). In all of their literary eras, poets consistently referred to the Holy Qur'an as a valuable source, and this is due to the eloquent composition of the Holy Qur'an, which poets frequently draw from to improve and revitalize their words, ideas, and images in exquisite tones(Al-Albānī,2003) cited in (Ḥammād and Muḥammad,2018:69). However when the recipient learns that the poet draws inspiration for his poems from the Holy Qur'an, an element of vigor and excitement move him. He is also made aware of the poetry's depth and artistic and aesthetic value because the Glorious Qur'an is a miracle in every way (ibid).

For further details, consider the following example:

<div dir="rtl">قَالَت تَنَاسَيْت عَهْد الْحَبّ قُلْت لَهَا لَا وَالَّذِي خَلَقَ الْإِنْسَانَ مِنْ عَلَقَ .</div>

(Ibn al-Khaṭīb,1989:690)

"You carelessly forgot the word of love," she said. I responded, "No, I swear by the One who made Man from a Clot"   (My translation)

In the previous example, we can see how Ibn al-Khatib counts on the textual Qur'anic quotation to enrich his poem via reciting the words of the Almighty, specifically the expression "who has created man from a clot,(Alʿlq: 2)" to assure his beloved that giving up her is not one of his traits as well as that he still loves her and remains committed to her.

Altlmyḥ: It is similar to allusion in English. It occurs when a popular tale, poem, historical event or figure, aphorism...etc, is alluded to but is not mentioned. Both prose and poetry may contain instances of this. The best tlmyḥ is when the original text's significance is somehow enhanced (Ḥaddād,195:138).

Consider the following example retrieved from "Qaṣr al-shawq" for more clarification:

<div dir="rtl">وَتَسَأَل إِبْرَاهِيم:</div>

<div dir="rtl">أتحسبين نَفْسِك أَقَلّ شَأناً" مِن رِيَّا وَسَكِينَة؟ !</div>

(Maḥfūẓ,2008:98)

Ibrāhīm asked, "Do you think that you are different from Rayyā and Sakīnah?!"   (My translation)

In this instance, Maḥfūẓ provides an insight to the reader that Khadījah is a bad woman by alluding to two notorious female criminal figures from Egyptian history of the nineteenth century who used to abduct and rob wealthy women.

Al-Sariqah: it is defined by ('Azzām,2001:105)as the practice of using the words of others and attributing them to oneself. Ibn al-Athīr (1960:222) suggests three types of theft:

Al-naskh: It occurs when the writer of the text impacted steals all the meanings and words from the text quoted, or at least the majority of them using similar words or synonyms in place of them (Ḥaddād,1995:136).

يَقُول الْمُتَنَبِّي :

"مَا كُلُّ مَا يَتَمَنَّى الْمَرْءُ يُدْرِكُهُ ..... تَجْري الرِّيَاحُ بِمَا لَا تَشْتَهي السَّفَنُ"

(al-Mutanabbī, 1983:472)

Al-Mutanabbī says:

Man cannot have everything he desires…In opposition to the direction the navigators want, the wind blows. (My translation)

يَقُول مَحْمُودٌ دَرْويش نَاسِخًا لِشَعْر الْمُتَنَبِّي :

" هَذَا زَمَانُ لَا كَمَا يَتَخَيَّلُون : بِمَشِيئَة الْمَلَّاح تَجْرِي الرِّيح والتيار يَغْلِبُه السَّفِينُ ".

(Ḥāfiẓ,1994: 61)

Maḥmūd Darwīsh says:

This is a time not as they imagine: the wind blows at the navigator's command, and the ship overtakes the current. (My translation)

Almskh: It occurs when the text creator alters the rhyme of the cited text while keeping its meaning and some of its words. This type of literary theft is encouraged when the affected work is superior to the cited one in terms of being better developed, condensed, concise, or meaningful. However, If the quoted text is superior to the one influenced, this is not desirable (Ḥaddād:136-137).

يَقُول بَشَّارُ بْنُ بُرْدٍ:

مَنْ رَاقَبَ النَّاسَ لَمْ يَظْفَرْ بِحَاجَتِه . . . . وَفَاز بالطِّيِّبات الفاتك اللَّهَجُ

(al-Iṣbahānī,1905:74)

Bashshār ibn Burd says:

He who observes others reaches no end… And only the persistent valiant receive pleasure. (My translation)

يَقُول سَلَّم الخاسر ماسخاً لِشَعْر ابْنُ بُرْد:

مَنْ رَاقَبَ النَّاس مَات همَّاً . . . . . وَفَازَ بِاللَّذَّات الْجُسُور

(al-Iṣbahānī,1905:74)

Sullam al-Khāsir says:

He who observes others perishes with worry… And only the bold receive delight. (My translation)

Alslkh: It occurs when the author of the influenced work just employs the meaning of the cited text. If the impacted text is superior to the one being quoted, Alslkh is strongly favored. However, if the situation is reversed, it is something disapproved (Ḥaddād:137).

يَقُول الْكِلَابِيّ :   (al-Jurāwī, 1991 : 297)

وَلَم يكُ أَكْثَر الْفِتْيَان مَاًلًا . . . . وَلَكِنْ كَانَ أرحبهم ذِرَاعًا

He wasn't the most moneyed boy….. But he was the most openhanded

(My translation)

وَيَقُول أَشْجَعُ السُّلَمِيُّ سالخا لِشَعْر الْكِلَابِيّ :   (Saʿīd,2023:582)

وَلَيْس بأوسعهم فِي الْغِنَى . . . . . وَلَكِن مَعْرُوفَه أَوْسَعُ

He   is   not   the   richest   boy   around…..   But   the   most   charitable   one.
(My translation)

Al-Muʿāraḍāt: It occurs when a poet creates a poem on a certain subject using any meter and rhyme, then a subsequent poet creates a poem on the same subject with little change using the same meter, rhyme(al-Shāyib,1954:17). The clever wording and captivating aesthetics of the first poet's poem serve as inspiration for the second poet, who usually refrains from disapproving or attacking the first poet (ibid).

يَقُولُ ابْنُ الرُّومِيّ :

" خَجِلتْ خُدودُ الورِد مِن تَفْضِيلُه"....   (Karīm:2012:423)

Ibn al-Rūmī says:

The roses' cheeks blushed in admiration of her beauty…(My translation)

-    وَيَقُولُ ابْنُ أَبِي عُبَيْدَةَ مُعَارِضًا لِابْنِ الرُّومِيّ :
-    " خضَعتْ نواوير الرِّيَاض لِحُسْنِه".....   (Karīm,ibid)

Ibn Abī ʿUbaydah says:

The garden's flowers surrendered to her graceful beauty. (My translation)

Almnāqḍāt: It occurs when a poet creates a poem that glorifies himself, his tribe, and their achievements while mocking another poet and his tribe(al-Shāyib,1954:3). The second poet reacts to his counterpart with a poem that opposes the ideas and images the first poet had presented while also adding pride or mockery. The second poem usually adheres to the preceding rhyme structure and meter (ibid).

يَقُول الْحَارِث بْنِ عَبَّادٍ :   (Alwaṣīfy,2003:174-5)

"قَرّبا مَربَطَ النَعامَةِ مِنّي...... لَيسَ قَولي يُرَاد لَكن فِعالي .

Al-Ḥārith ibn ʿAbbād says:

Bring the rein of my mare (aln'āmah) to me...My deeds speak louder than my speech.   (My translation)

يَرد الْمُهَلْهَل ابْنُ رَبِيعَةَ قَائِلًا :   (Alwaṣīfy,ibid)

قَّربَا مَرْبِط الْمُشَهَّر مِنِّي . . . . قَوْلَي مُطَابِق لِفعالي .

Al-Muhalhil Ibn Rabī'ah replies:

Bring the rein of my stallion (almshyhr) to me...My speech is the same as my deeds.   (My translation)

8. Intertextuality in Modern Arabic

According to Sulaymān (2005:11), the term "intertextuality" is a product of modern Western criticism and has forced itself into Arabian studies. Similarly, Al-Kaswānī (2012:4) points out that Arab criticism had never heard of the term "intertextuality" before it was employed by Western criticism. Bwdhrā' and khayruldīn (2018:25) confirm that the term (al-Tanāṣألتنـاص) in contemporary Arab criticism is a translation of the French term Intertext, where the word (inter) in French indicates exchange (al-Tabādul) and the word text means (al-Naṣ). Thus, intertext or intertextuality has been translated into Arabic as (al-Tabādul al-Naṣṣīألتبـادل النصـي), which refers to texts that are linked to one another (ibid). 'Alī (2011:17) claims that the term intertextuality has entered Arab culture in two ways: (i)directly through our brethren in the Arab Maghreb, who had the benefit of having critics and researchers fluent in French. (ii) indirectly through English, which borrowed the term from the French. Intertextuality was shrouded in confusion and ambiguity, similar to other imported terms that entered the Arabic language(ibid). According to Abū Ghunaym (2013:22-23), among the initiatives that contributed to intertextuality gaining popularity in Arab criticism was the work of some Arab critics and translators who translated various works by Western pioneering researchers and theorists in this field of study. Furthermore, several Arab publications and magazines that dealt with intertextuality designated special issues for publication on the topic(ibid). Al-Rubbā'ī (1997:194) & Aldhwn (2011:112) argue that due to the term's widespread adoption in contemporary Arab criticism, there has been a heated controversy among Arabian critics and researchers about its acceptability and real critical practice. On the one hand, some critics and researchers argued that "intertextuality" is merely the current version of the term "literary thefts," with roots in the long tradition of Arab criticism. On the other hand, another group recognized the necessity to extract the term directly from its Western source, without any simulation or allegation, and their approaches were heavily inspired by Western thought(ibid). For Abū Ghunaym(2013:24), Muḥammad Bannīs, Muḥammad Miftāḥ, 'Abd al-Mālik Murtāḍ, S'īd Yaqṭīn, and al-Ghadhdhāmī are some of the most well-known contemporary Arab critics who helped develop intertextuality and provided critical analysis of it. It's conceivable that these critics were the first to adopt and represent the phrase because most of them have roots in Western culture, which shaped their perspectives and made them similar to those of Western studies.

9. The Function of Intertextuality in Arabic

Intertextuality is significant because of its dialogical mechanism, which demonstrates the surrounding abundance of texts, sounds, and values. It is also significant because it has grown into a successful and practical method for deconstructing the structures of texts and discourses. It expresses the references made in the texts and their links to other texts while also accessing the text's fabric and creative emotion in an attempt to interpret and analyze the text and to make obvious any implicit or explicit meanings

(WaʿdAllāh, 2005:42). Al-Aḥmad (83:2010) affirms that intertextuality is crucial for understanding and clarifying the cultural and historical context of work since it extends from other writings that stand for the author's intentions and viewpoints. Al-Bindārī et al. (2009,243-244) confirm that since intertextuality depends on negotiating the cognitive heritage of the text producer and recipient, a text creator can break the intensity of the closure of language on itself by having language intersect with various semantic orbits and cultural loads that advance the language of the text and cause it to gain reminiscent shades of meaning, semantic energies, and deep aesthetic horizons. It would make language travel beyond the rigid individual structure and advance to the generative one that interferes, surpasses stability and limits, and stimulates the text in the depth of the human memory (ibid). In the long run, intertextuality is what gives a text its value and meaning since it situates the text in a context that enables us to avoid falling victim to the text's indicative system's traps (Ḥāfiẓ, 1994:57). Intertextuality is crucial in allowing the reader to provide a broad spectrum of expectations that aid in text interpretation.

Additionally, it gives readers the postulates necessary for a comprehensive understanding of whatever text they're reading(ibid:58). Intertextuality, therefore, has a double focus that draws the attention of the recipient to the absent and previous texts and abandons the misconception of text independence because any literary work acquires its meaning from the texts that precede it. Under the theory of intertextuality, previously read texts are important elements whose presence aids in our understanding of the current text and its deep dimensions. With the interpretation of those texts, it is possible to fully understand and disclose the creative structures of any current text (ibid:59).

10. Taxonomy of Arabic Intertextuality

Al-Zuʿbī(2000:20)contends that two kinds of intertextuality exist: Direct and indirect. In direct intertextuality, the text is quoted as such, like the Quranic verses, Prophetic Hadiths, poems, historical events and figures, myths, and popular songs and proverbs. Indirect intertextuality, conversely, is deduced from the general sense of the text, i.e., it is revealed by the reader depending on the hints provided by the text.

According to al- Zuʿbī (ibid:27-76), direct intertextuality is categorized into four subgroups, which are as follows:

10.1. Direct Intertextuality:

(a)Religious Intertextuality: al-Zuʿbī (2000:37) contends that religious intertextuality refers to the overlap between the original text and other selected texts retrieved from the Holy Quran or Prophetic Hadith via quotation or implication. He affirms that the retrieved texts must be compatible with the original text's narrative context to successfully achieve any work's intellectual and artistic purposes (ibid). Religious heritage for him, despite its diverse connotations and sources, has always been a source of creativity and a semantic axis for many different meanings and contents (ibid).

Consider the following example from al-Sukkarīyah by Najīb Maḥfūẓ :

قَال الحمزاوي بِحُزْن :

أَنَّ لِي أَنْ اعْتَزَل , اللَّه لَا يُكَلَّفُ نَفْسًا الاوسعها.... (Maḥfūẓ, 2015:19)

Sadly, Al-Ḥamzāwī said:
"It's time for me to quit; God doesn't assign a slave with what he has no power to do." (My translation)

(b) Historical Intertextuality: According to al-Zuʻbī (2000:29), this kind of intertextuality is characterized as referencing historical people or events in selected historical writings together with the novel's original text. It appears appropriate and consistent with the fictional context or the narrative event narrated by the novelist. It fulfills an intellectual or artistic purpose or both of them simultaneously.

For further explanation see the following example from Qaṣr al-shawq by   Najīb Maḥfūẓ :

فَتُسْأَل إِسْمَاعِيل : خُطْبَة مِنْ جَانِبٍ وَاحِدٍ كتصريح 28فبراير ؟   (Maḥfūẓ, 2013:333)

Ismāʻīl asked: is it a one-sided engagement as the announcement of February 28?   (My translation)

(c)Literary Intertextuality: As stated by al-Zuʻbī (2000:50), literary intertextuality refers to the overlapping of selected literary texts, old and new, poetry or prose, with the original text of the novel so that they become as harmonious and indicative of the author's idea or the situation that he embodies and presents in his novel as possible.

Consider the following example retrieved from Qaṣr al-shawq by Maḥfūẓ:

أَجَاب يَاسِين مَازِحًا   (Maḥfūẓ, 2013:58)

غَادَرَني الشَّبَاب وَقُضِيَ الأَمْرُ .

Yāsīn retorted jokingly, "My youth is passed. It's now too late for that.

(My translation)

In intertextuality with:

يَقُولُ الشَّاعِرُ سُوَيْد ابْنُ أَبِي كَهْلٌ :

"ناداني حُبّ سَلْمَى مُتَأَخِّرًا بَعْدَمَا غادرني الشَّبَاب وشدته" .

(Qunūt, 1991: 261)

The poet "Suwayd Ibn Abī khl" says:
Salma's love summoned me late after I had lost my youth and its burning passion. (My translation)

(d)Intertextuality with Popular Literature: According to al-Zuʻbī (2000:63), this type of intertextuality means the writer's attempt to evoke some instances of popular literature, such as traditions and beliefs, popular songs, proverbs, and sayings, and to employ them in the contexts of his novel or poem to serve a contemporary vision that he poses. In this case, the use of such intertextuality must come in harmony with the context of the novel or poem to enrich, renew and deepen the intellectual and artistic dimensions of the work.

Consider the following scenarios retrieved from Maḥfūẓ's trilogy:

1 . الْمُؤْمِن لايلدغ مِنْ جُحْرٍ مَرَّتَيْن.   Bayna al-Qaṣrayn (Maḥfūẓ, 2015:528)

"Fox is not taken twice in the same snare" (Straus,2012:141)

2 . "زوروني كُلِّ سَنَة مَرَّةً حَرَامٌ الْهَجْر بِالْمَرَّة " . .

Bayna al-Qaṣrayn (Maḥfūẓ, 2015:579)

2. Visit me once a year; complete desertion is not fair.

(My translation)

3 . لِلَّهِ فِي خَلْقِهِ شُؤُون .   Al-Sukkarīyah (Maḥfūẓ, 2015:68)

3.Allah knows the rationale for everything's creation . (My translation)

4 . تَسْأَل السَّيِّدُ أَحْمَد , "اتخافين مِنْ الْحَسَدِ وَعِنْدَك هَذَا الْبَخُور ؟ "

Bayna al-Qaṣrayn (Maḥfūẓ, 2015:104)

4. Al-Sayyid Ahmed inquired, "Are you afraid of envy even when safeguarded by such incense?"   (My translation)

10.2.<u>Indirect Intertextuality</u>:

According to al-Zuʻbī (2000:79-83), the main types of indirect intertextuality are as follows: (a)Intertextuality of Thoughts and Meanings: The intertextuality of thoughts and meanings describes a situation in which the writer's text contains indirect intertextual aspects without identifying the source of those elements. Other authors' ideas, vocabulary, or writing styles are involved in indirect intertextuality. It isn't easy to pinpoint the thoughts that have influenced the author; hence this form of intertextuality is not explicitly stated.
For further clarification, consider the following instance:

قَالَ مُحَمَّدٌ عَفَت ساخرا : "تعددت الْأَسْمَاء وَالْفِعْل واحد"

.

Qaṣr al-shawq (Maḥfūẓ, 2013:119)

Mohammed Effat sarcastically said, "The names are different, but the deed is one." (My translation)

In the example mentioned above, indirect intertextuality of thought and meaning shows up in the use of the poetic verse "تعددت الاسباب والموت واحد", which is retrieved from Ibn Nabata's poetry (Ali,2012:66).

(b) Intertextuality of Language and Style: As stated by al-Zuʻbī (ibid:83), the intertextuality of language and style refers to the language and methods of other writers that the author employs artistically and intellectually in his text while keeping the first place for his style. According to Qāsim (1984:179), Maḥfūẓ was influenced by three Western schools: - The French Realism school represented by Balzac and Flaubert. The School of Naturalism is represented by Zola. The school of English Edwardian novelists such as   George   Bernard   but   Maḥfūẓ   retained   his   style   and   put   it   first.

11. Conclusions
The following are the conclusions of the present study:
1. Intertextuality prevailed in both Arabic and English languages. Both Arab critics, as well as Western ones   knew   it   as   a   phenomenon   but   not   as   a   term.

2. Due to the lack of recognition of intertextuality as an essential procedural tool, the term "intertextuality" hadn't been used in Arabic until the late 1970s.

3. The Bulgarian critic "Julia Kristeva" is the first to coin this term. She is the original producer of its systematic identification.

4. In terms of how the concept of intertextuality entered the Arabic language, it was thanks to the efforts of many contemporary Arab critics who were influenced by Western critical studies and who translated and adapted the content of many Western critical books into Arabic, especially the Moroccan critics who had a good grounding in foreign languages and cultures.

5. Both English and Arabic employ very similar techniques of intertextuality directly or indirectly.

6. Despite modern Arab critics' efforts to transfer the term intertextuality to the Arabic language, they fell into the trap of diverse notions and terms due to relying on different Western references. As a result, several terms have been assigned to the Western term "intertextuality," such as (absent text ألنص ألغائب, textual overlap ألتعالق ألنصي, intertextuality ألتناصية, textual interdependence ألتعالق ألنصي).

7. Many of the Arab Modern critics were very affected by the thoughts of postmodern structuralism, especially the ideas and thoughts suggested by Kristeva, Barth, Riffaterre, and Genette.

8. Intertextuality remains a crucial process for writers since no speech begins in a vacuum, and it is through intertextuality that our old legacy is revived and read from different points of view.

References

1. Al-Aḥmad, Nahlah Fayṣal. (2010). **Al-tafā'ul al-naṣṣī : al-tanāṣṣīyah al-   naẓarīyah wa-al-manhaj**. 1ˢᵗ ed., Cairo: al-Hay'ah al-'Āmmah li-Quṣūr al-Thaqāfah.

2. Al-Andalusī, Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad (1983). **Al-'Iqd al-farīd**.   'Abd al-Majīd al-Tarḥīnī (editor), 1ˢᵗ ed. Beirut : Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmīyah.

3. Abū   Ghunaym,   Salmān.   (2013).   **Al-Tanāṣṣ   fī   shi'r   Bashshār   ibn   Burd**.Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Amman: International University of Islamic Sciences.

4. Al-Bindārī, Ḥasan & Ṣrṣwr, 'Abd-al-Jalīl & Thābit, 'Ablah. (2009). **al- Tanāṣ fī al-shi'r al-Filasṭīnī al-mu'āṣir**.Jāmi'at   al-Azhar Journal in Gazza. Vol.11, issue no. 2. Palestine: Silsilat al-'Ulūm al-Insānīyah in Gazza.

5. Alfaro, M. (1996). **Intertextuality: Origins and Development of the .Concept**. In Atlantis, Vol.18, No. (1/2), pp.268–285.

6. Alī, Muhannad.(2011). **Ẓāhirat al-Tanāṣ fī al-Shawqīyāt**.MA thesis. Baghdad : al-'Irāqīyah University.

7. Al-Iṣbahānī, Abī al-Faraj. (1905). **Al-aghānī**. Egypt: al- Taqaddum Press.

8. Al-Jurāwī, Aḥmad ibn ʿAbd al-Salām. (1991). **Al-Ḥamāsah al- Maghribīyah : Mukhtaṣar Ṣafwat al-adab wa-nukhbah Dīwān al-ʿArab**. Vol.1, Damascus: al-Fikr al-muʿāṣir Publishing House.

9. Al-Kaswānī,N.(2012).**Tajallīyāt al-Tanāṣṣ fī Shiʿr Samīḥ al-Qāsim: "akhdha al-Amīrah Yabūs" and "marāthī Samīḥ" As A Case Study**. Algeria: In Qirāʾāt journal, issue no.4.

10. Allen, G. (2000). **Intertextuality**. London: Routledge.

11. _____(2006). **Intertextuality**. London and New York: Taylor and Francis Group.

12. _____ (2011). **Intertextuality**. 2nd ed. Abingdon: Routledge.

13. Al-Mutanabbī, Abū al-Ṭayyib. (1983). **Dīwān al-Mutanabbī**. Beirut : Bayrūt House for printing and publishing.

14. -Nuwayrī, Shihāb al-Dīn. (1923). **Nihāyat al-arab fī Funūn al-adab**. 1ˢᵗ ed., Cairo: Dār al-Kutub wa-al-Wathāʾiq al-Qawmīyah.

15. Al-Shāyib, Aḥmad. (1954). **Tārīkh al-naqāʾiḍ fī al-shiʿr al-qadīm**. Egypt: al-Nahḍah al-Miṣrīyah Library.

16. Tabrīzī, Ibn al-Khaṭīb. (1995). **Sharḥ al-Muʿallaqāt al-ʿashr   almdhhbāt**.Beirut : al-Arqam ibn Abī al-Arqam House for printing and publishing.

17. Alwaṣīfy,   ʿAbd-al-Raḥmān.   (2003).   **Al-naqāʾiḍ   fī   al-shiʿr   al-Jāhilī**. 1ˢᵗ ed., Cairo, Manshūrāt Maktabat al-Ādāb.

18. Al-Zuʿbī,Aḥmad. (2000). **Al-Tanāṣṣ Naẓarīyan wa-taṭbīqīyan**.Jordan, ʿAmmūn House for publishing and distribution.

19. Azzām, Muḥammad. (2001). **Al-naṣṣ al-ghāʾib : Tajallīyāt al-Tanāṣṣ fī al-shiʿr al-ʿArabī**. Demascus : Manshūrāt Ittiḥād al-Kitāb al-ʿArabī.

20. Bakhtin, M. (1986).**Speech Genres and Other Late Essays**. trans. Vern   W. McGee, eds. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist, USA: University of Texas Press

21. Bakhtin, M. & Volosinov, V. (1986).**Marxism and the Philosophy of Language**. L. Matejka and I. R. Titunik (trans.), London:Harvard University Press.

22. Barthes R. (1975) **The Pleasure of the Text**. Richard Miller (trans.), New York: Hill and Wang.

23. Barthes, R. (1977). The Death of the Author. In S. Heath (trans.), **Image-   Music-Text** (pp. 142–148).

24. New York: Farrar, Straus, & Giroux.

25. Bennett, T. (1979). **Formalism and Marxism**. London: Routledge.

26. Bertens, H. (2005). **Literary Theory: The Basics**. London and NewYork: Routledge.

27. Bqshy,   ʿAbd   al-Qādir.   (2007).   **Al-Tanāṣṣ   fī   al-Khiṭāb   al-naqdī   wa-al-balāghī:Dirāsah naẓaryh wa-taṭbīqīyah**. Edited by Muḥammad al-ʿUmarī.Casablanca : Dār Nashr Afrīqiyā

28. Burns, L.&Lacasse,S.(2018).**The Pop Palimpsest: Intertextuality in   Recorded Popular Music**. The USA. University of Michigan Press

29. Bwdhrā', Ḥayāt & khyrāldyn, Ṣulayḥah. (2018). **Jamālīyah al-Tanāṣṣ fī   Shi'r 'Abd al-Wahhāb al-Bayātī**. MA Thesis. al-Msīlah: Muḥammad Būḍyāf University.

30. Eigeldinger, M. (1987).**Mythology and intertextuality**.Geneva: Slatkine.

31. Ḥaddād, S. (1995). **Genre as Linguistic Coding of Social Occasions and the Translation of their Textual/intertextual Potential with Reference to English and Arabic**. Ph.D. Dissertation. Heriot-Watt University.

32. Ḥāfiẓ, Ṣabrī. (1994). **Maḥmūd Darwīsh : Silsilat al-shi'r wa-al-shu'arā'**. Cairo : Dār al-Fatá al-'Arabī.

33. Ḥalabī, Aḥmad Ṭu'mah. (2007). Al-**Tanāṣṣ bayna al-naẓarīyah wa-al-   taṭbīq : shi'r al-Bayātī namūdhajan**. Syria : al-Hay'ah al-'Āmmah al-Sūrīyah lil-Kitāb

34. Ḥammād, Fāṭimah Aḥmad & Muḥammad, Faraj Mansī. (2018). **Athar al- iqtibās wāltḍmyn fī shi'r Lisān al-Dīn ibn al-Khaṭīb**. In al- Anbār Society Journal for Languages and Arts, issue no.27, Iraq

35. Ibn al-Athīr, Ḍiyā' al-Dīn. (1960). **Al-mathal al-sā'ir fī adāb al-Kātib wa-al-shā'ir**. Vol.3, 1ˢᵗ ed., revised by al-Ḥamad al-Ḥūfī, Cairo: Nahḍat Miṣr Press

36. Ibn al-Khaṭīb, Lisān al-Dīn. (1989).**Dīwān Lisān al-Dīn ibn al-Khaṭīb al-Sulaymānī**. 1ˢᵗ ed., Editted and introduced by Muḥammad Miftāḥ , Casablanca: al-Thaqāfah House for publishing.

37. Ibn al-Wāḥid, 'Abd al-'Aẓīm. (1995). **Taḥrīr al-Taḥbīr fī ṣinā'at al-shi'r wa-al-nathr wa-bayān I'jāz al-Qur'ān**. taḥqīq Ḥifnī   Muḥammad Sharaf(editor), Cairo: al-Majlis al-A'lá lil-Shu'ūn al-Islāmīyah

38. Ibn Ḥujr, Amrw al-Qays.(1984). **Dīwān Amrw al-Qays**. Ibrāhīm, Muḥammad Abū al-Faḍl(editor) , 5ᵗʰ ed., Cairo: al- Ma'ārif publishing House

39. Ibn Manẓūr, Muḥammad. (1988). **Lisān al-'Arab**. 3ʳᵈ ed., vo.6. Beirut: Ṣādir House for publishing.

40. Karīm, Kawthar Hātif. (2012). **Ẓāhirat al-mu'āraḍah fī al-shi'r al-Andalusī:Ta'aththur wa Ibdā'**. In al-lughah al- 'Arabīyah wādābhā journal, issue no.15, pp. 415-442

41. Kristeva, J. (1980). **Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art**. New York: Columbia University Press

42. _____.   (1986).   Word,   Dialogue,   and   Novel.   In   Moi,   T.   (ed.),   **The Kristeva Reader**. New York: Columbia University Press, pp. 34–61.

43. _____.(2003). **"Nous Deux or a (Hi)story of Intertextuality**."In   TheRomanic Review, Vol. 93, No. 1-2, NY: Columbia   University Press

44. Kulei, M. (2014). **Intertextual Allusions and Evaluation of Their   Translation in the Novel Silent House by Orhan   Pamuk**. In Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, Vol. 158, pp. 206-213.

45. Lary,N.(2019). **Dostoevsky and Soviet Film: Visions of Demonic   Realism**. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.

46. Lesic-Thomas, A. (2005). **Behind Bakhtin: Russian Formalism and Kristeva's Intertextuality**. In A Journal of Modern Critical Theory, 28(3), 1–20.

47. Maḥfūẓ, Najīb. (2015).**Bayna al-qaṣrayn**. 10ᵗʰ ed. Cairo: Dār al-Shurūq.

48. _____(2015). **Al-Sukkarīyah**. 6ᵗʰ ed. Cairo :Dār al-Shurūq.

49. _____. (2013). **Qaṣr al-shawq**. 6ᵗʰ ed. Cairo: Dār al-Shurūq.

50. Mubārakī, Jamāl. (2003). **Al-Tanāṣ Wa-jamālīyātih i fī al-shi'r al- Jazā'irī al-mu'āṣir.** Algeria: Hūmah House for publishing.

51. Murtāḍ, 'Abd al-Malik. (1998). **Al-kitābah Umm ḥiwār al-nuṣūṣ**.   Damascus: al-Mawqif al-'Arabī journal, issue no.3

52. Oke,E.(2021).**The Interface between Intellectual Property and Investment Law**: **An Intertextual Analysis**. UK. Edward Elgar Publishing.

53. Olshanskaya, N. (2011).**De-coding Intertextuality in Classic and Postmodern Russian Narratives**. In the Journal of the   American Translation and Interpreting Studies   Association, 6(1), 87-102.

54. Qāsim, Sīzā. (1984). **Binā' al-riwāyah dirāsah muqāranah fī thulāthīyat Najīb Maḥfūẓ**. Egypt : al-Hay'ah al-'Āmmah al-Miṣrīyah lil-Kitāb.

55. Qunūt, Mahā. (1991 : 261). **Suwayd Ibn Abī khl : ḥayātuhu wa- shi'ruh**. Michigan: Qunūt for publishing.

56. Riffaterre, M. (1978). **Semiotics of poetry**. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

57. _____. (1990) "Compulsory Reader Response: The Intertextual Drive." In Worton, M. & Still, J.(eds.) **Intertextuality: Theories and Practices**., Manchester: Manchester University Press, 56–78.

58. Straus,E.(2012).**Dictionary of European Proverbs**.Vol.1, London and New York Taylor &Francis.

59. Sulaymān, 'bdālmn'm .(2005). **Maẓāhir al-Tanāṣ al-dīnī fī Shi'r Aḥmad Maṭar**.MA thesis. Nablus: al-Najāḥ International Society.

60. Todorov,T.(1984).**Mikhail Bakhtin: The Dialogical Principle**.Wlad Godzich(trans), UK: Manchester University Press.

61. Venuti,L.(2009).Translation, Intertextuality, Interpretation. In Romance   Studies, 27(3), 157–173.

62. Wahbah, Majdī & al-Muhandis, Kāmil. (1984). **Muʻjam al-muṣṭalaḥāt al-ʻArabīyah fī al-lughah wa-al-adab**. 3rd ed., Beirut: Lebanon Library.

63. Zengin,M.(2016). **An Introduction to Intertextuality as a Literary Theory: Definitions, Axioms, and the Originators**. In Journal of Social Sciences Institute,25(1), PP. 299-326.