

Intertextuality: A Strategic Approach in Translation

Mohamed Ansri¹, Ramdan ghalem²

¹ University of Algiers 1 – Benyoucef Benkhedda. (Algeria).

m.ansri@univ-alger.dz

² University of Algiers 1 – Benyoucef Benkhedda. (Algeria).

r.ghalem@univ-alger.dz

Received:17./10/2025

Accepted: 20./12/2025

Published:26./01/2026

Abstract:

Intertextuality, the intricate relationship between texts and the ways in which they reference, influence, or even transform one another, has emerged as a significant concept in translation studies. This paper explores the role of intertextuality as a strategic tool in the translation process. Drawing on both theoretical frameworks and practical examples, the paper delves into how translators navigate the complex web of intertextual references in source texts to convey their full meaning and impact in the target language. By examining various techniques and approaches employed by translators, such as adaptation, localization, and cultural mediation, this paper aims to shed light on the dynamic interplay between intertextuality and translation strategies. Furthermore, it discusses the implications of intertextual translation for preserving cultural nuances, maintaining fidelity to the original text, and fostering cross-cultural understanding. Through an interdisciplinary lens encompassing literary theory, linguistics, and translation studies, this paper contributes to a deeper understanding of the multifaceted nature of translation and highlights the strategic importance of intertextuality in bridging linguistic and cultural divides within the translation process.

Keywords: Intertextuality, Translation process, Translation Studies, Translation Strategies.

1. INTRODUCTION

Intertextuality, a concept coined by literary theorist Julia Kristeva in the late 1960s, has become a cornerstone of contemporary translation theory. It refers to the intricate relationship between texts, where one text is shaped by and makes reference to other texts, both implicitly and explicitly (Kristeva, 1980). As translators navigate the complex terrain of intertextuality, they encounter a myriad of challenges and opportunities in rendering the meaning, style, and cultural nuances of the source text into the target language. This paper seeks to explore the strategic role of intertextuality in the translation process, examining how translators harness intertextual references to effectively convey the richness and depth of the original text while accounting for cultural and linguistic differences.

Imagine a translator tasked with translating Molière's comedic play "The Stingy Man" (*L'avare* in French) into Arabic, or vice versa. Facing this challenge for the first time would undoubtedly present a formidable obstacle—potentially resulting in significant flaws in the final work. Methodologically, when translating a comedy into Arabic, the translator should seek out literature similar in genre. In this case, Al-Jahiz's book "The Stingy" (*Al-Bukhala'a* in Arabic) serves as a suitable model. Reading Al-Jahiz's work would greatly aid the translation process by inspiring the translator and refreshing their understanding. Since the translator is not inherently a comedy writer, studying the nuances of comedy in terms of vocabulary, structure, style, language, and characters becomes essential. Subconsciously, the translator may find themselves compelled to imitate certain elements of Al-Jahiz's writing, enriching their translation through an awareness of the intertextual similarities between the two works. The same thing would be true for translating Dante's "The Divine Comedy" (*La Divina Commedia*) into Arabic or translating a sacred text such as the Quran into English. Reading "Risalat al-Ghufran" in Arabic ("The Letter of Forgiveness" or "The Epistle of Forgiveness" in English) by Jalal ad-Din Muhammad Rumi will undoubtedly help with translating Dante's work into Arabic, and reading the Bible in English will help with translating the Quran into English.

2. Theoretical Framework of Intertextuality in Translation

Intertextuality, a concept rooted in literary theory, refers to the

relationship between texts, where one text is shaped by, refers to, or influences another. In the realm of translation, intertextuality adds layers of complexity, as translators must grapple with not only linguistic differences but also cultural nuances and intertextual references inherent in the source text. This paper aims to explore the theoretical underpinnings of intertextuality in translation, examining how translators engage with intertextual elements and negotiate their transfer across languages and cultures.

Furthermore, Gerard Genette's taxonomy of transtextuality provides a comprehensive framework for understanding the various ways in which texts relate to one another, including hypertextuality, paratextuality, and metatextuality (Genette, 1997). These theoretical insights offer valuable tools for translators to identify and analyze intertextual elements in source texts, guiding their translation strategies accordingly.

2.1 Theoretical Framework: The theoretical framework of intertextuality in translation draws from various disciplines, including translation studies, literary theory, and semiotics. At its core, intertextuality posits that texts are not isolated entities but are interconnected through a network of references and meanings. In translation studies, theorists such as Antoine Berman and André Lefevere have emphasized the importance of considering the socio-cultural and intertextual dimensions of translation (Berman, 1992; Lefevere, 1992). Berman's concept of "deforming tendencies" highlights how translators may either accentuate or attenuate intertextual elements in the process of translation, influenced by cultural and ideological factors.

Moreover, drawing upon literary theory, Mikhail Bakhtin's notion of dialogism elucidates how texts are imbued with the voices of other texts, forming a dynamic interplay of meanings and interpretations (Bakhtin, 1981). Roland Barthes' concept of the "death of the author" emphasizes the multiplicity of meanings that emerge through intertextual references, challenging the notion of originality and autonomy in texts (Barthes, 1967). These theoretical insights underscore the intricate relationship between translation and intertextuality, where translators function as mediators between source and target texts, navigating the complexities of cultural and intertextual transfer.

2.2 Challenges and Strategies: Translating intertextual elements poses several challenges for translators, including the fidelity to the source text, the preservation of cultural references, and the adaptation of intertextual nuances to the target language and culture. One of the key strategies employed by translators is the use of footnotes or glosses to elucidate unfamiliar references or cultural contexts for target readers. Additionally, translators may resort to cultural substitution or adaptation, replacing specific cultural references with analogous ones that resonate with the target audience.

The theoretical framework of intertextuality provides valuable insights into the complexities of translation practice. By acknowledging the interconnectedness of texts and the dynamic nature of meaning-making, translators can better navigate the challenges posed by intertextual elements in translation. Through a nuanced understanding of intertextuality and its theoretical underpinnings, translators can strive to preserve the integrity of the source text while making it accessible and meaningful to target readers.

3. Translation and Intertextuality

This section of the paper will focus on examining intertextuality within the context of translation. It will be divided into four main parts: firstly, exploring the cognitive aspect of translation; secondly, discussing the role of intertextuality in translation; thirdly, analyzing the relationship between translation, rewriting, and intertextuality; and finally, addressing the importance of reading and the translator's writing skills. The discussion on intertextuality and translation will inherently encompass both reading and writing, as reading initiates intertextuality while writing reflects its outcomes. Moreover, writing in translation is not merely a mechanical task, as it requires aligning with a source text while also allowing room for the translator's creativity. However, the translator's cognitive responses to the text may influence its originality, thus emphasizing the concept of rewriting. Intertextuality, as discussed in the preceding sections, may entail a form of imitation in the translator's work, as highlighted by Robinson (2003: 277).

3.1 Cognitive aspect of translation

Translation, the interaction between two languages, is a cognitive process aimed at conveying meaning from one language to another, primarily dealing with written texts, while 'interpreting' refers to spoken language

(Dubois et al., 2002: 486). This paper focuses on written translation. Historically, some scholars viewed translation processes as mundane, but contemporary perspectives see it as integral to literature, contributing to universal literature shared globally. All humans share a common reality, expressed through language, bridging cultural gaps (Allen, 2004: 121). Language is a cognitive process with subtleties that connect people worldwide (Ibid.: 10), and translation overcomes linguistic diversity, reflecting human cognitive genius (Glass and Holyoak, 1985: 2).

Translation is described as an 'intelligent activity' (Robinson, 2003) or 'behavior' (Wills, 1996), highlighting its cognitive nature. The mind processes information, enabling translators to interpret and transform text (Iandoli & Zollo, 2008: 27). Translators use intertextual knowledge to understand source texts, as readers interpret texts based on their experiences with other texts (Eco, 1979: 21; Kristeva, 1986). Translation involves analysis, interpretation, comparison, and problem-solving, culminating in 'reproduction' (Wills, 1996: 43). Robinson views it as an intelligent activity involving conscious and unconscious learning (Robinson, 2003: 49). There's uncertainty about translators' awareness of how language influences thought, as language both reflects and shapes thought (Murphy, 1993: 8).

3.2 Intertextuality in translation

Our exploration reveals that intertextuality permeates individual cognition, knowledge, and interaction. Sociolinguist Cynthia Gordan asserts that repetition of words, phrases, paralinguistic features, and speech acts in interactions creates meaning, a phenomenon known as intertextuality (Gordan, 2009: 5). Gordan argues that everyday discourse is characterized by this 'intertextual repetition,' which imbues talk with nuanced meanings (2009: 190). 'Shared background knowledge' includes both general cultural knowledge and specific prior interactive experiences, recalled and applied in new contexts. This view aligns with other interpretations of intertextuality, such as genre features (Briggs & Bauman, 1992; Fairclough, 1992), shared narrative themes (Schiffrin, 2000), quoting (Matoesian, 1999), replaying interactions (Matoesian, 2000), and performing particular actions (Tovares, 2005; Al Zidjaly, 2006; Scollon, 2007). These studies highlight that texts are interconnected, composed of fragments of other texts, and underscore the

role of intertextuality in creating and negotiating meanings (Gordan, 2009: 191).

Cook (2008) in his *Encyclopedia of Ancient Literature*, lists numerous ancient writers, poets, and playwrights who borrowed or imitated others' works. Roman playwrights, for instance, often imitated Greek comedies. Intertextuality fosters creativity in literature and translation, as Iandoli and Zollo (2008: 72) argue, creativity involves reinterpretation and reevaluation of past narratives and knowledge. Translators, described as 'voracious and omnivorous readers' (Robinson, 2003: 23), immerse themselves in diverse literary and cultural landscapes, engaging with multiple languages, genres, and perspectives. This engagement enriches their translation practice with linguistic and cultural insights.

Intertextuality is categorized into three types: obligatory, optional, and accidental (Fitzsimmons, 2013). Accidental intertextuality occurs unconsciously, while obligatory and optional intertextuality involve conscious decisions. Obligatory intertextuality compels imitation or borrowing, whereas optional intertextuality allows for discretion. Beyond intertextuality, translators make numerous choices regarding words, style, metaphors, and sentence structure. As Douglas Robinson suggests, proficient translators require experiential exposure and creative command over expressive modes, styles, cultures, and interpersonal communication. When they imitate these elements, it becomes their own creative endeavor (Robinson, 2001: 163).

3.3 Translation, rewriting and intertextuality

The term "rewriting" encompasses various meanings, including altering text, revising, or editing, as defined by dictionaries. Moriss, in his book *Rewriting History*, critiques Hillary Clinton's *Living History* for a perceived lack of transparency and offers annotations to reveal concealed aspects (Moriss, 2004: 1). In the context of sacred texts, 'rewriting' refers to the process of clarifying and modernizing biblical narratives without seeking to replace them. Pseudo-Philo's work, classified as 'rewritten Bible,' aims to clarify and update biblical narratives rather than supplant them, according to Murphy's analysis (Murphy, 1993: 5).

Some scholars draw parallels between translation and rewriting,

suggesting that rewriting often involves interpretation. For example, the Greek translator of Esther not only translated the Hebrew text but also interpreted it, significantly altering the narrative to convey a different understanding (De Troyer, 2003: 5). Harris provides a broader perspective on rewriting, viewing it as inherently intertextual and involving the appropriation of others' works for new purposes. He links "intertextuality" and "rewriting," suggesting that rewriting a text is essentially translating its language into one's own, thereby equating translation with rewriting (Harris, 2006: 2).

3.4 The translator as a reader and writer

Translators fulfill dual roles as both readers and writers, initially engaging with the text as readers to comprehend it before translating it into written form. This interconnection between reading and writing is underscored by Lamson et al., who assert that skill acquisition involves imitation and practice (1962: xiv). Reading is considered a critical cognitive skill involving various competencies, heavily reliant on diverse skills and background knowledge rooted in intertextuality (Glass & Holyoak, 1985: 5; Allen, 2004).

While literature is primarily meant for pleasure, the cognitive processes of readers involve subconscious activities that contribute to competence, vocabulary expansion, and grammatical proficiency, as noted by Stephen Krashen (Mikulecky & Jeffries, 2007: 3). Extensive reading offers numerous benefits, including increased speed, vocabulary, grammar skills, and broader understanding (Ibid.: vi, 2). In academic settings, tasks like responding to literary texts or synthesizing diverse texts in science classes allow students to engage with a wide array of texts, shaping their own compositions (Haas, 1993: 21).

Effective reading involves engagement with various aspects of content and approach to unveil the underlying intention of the work (Lamson et al., 1962: xiii-xiv). Similarly, translators engage in this process as both readers and writers, making decisions based on cognitive processes rather than overt actions or stages (Penrose & Sticko, 1993: 8). Writing tasks in classrooms often draw upon reading assignments, aiming to enhance writing abilities by emulating well-crafted prose (Stuart, 1993: 34). Despite initial challenges,

repetition is essential for skill improvement, as demonstrated by recent experiments in memory performance (Glass & Holyoak, 1985: 269).

4. Strategies for Handling Intertextuality in Translation

Intertextuality, the relationship between texts where one text references, influences, or echoes another, is a fundamental aspect of translation. Translators encounter numerous intertextual elements, including cultural references, allusions, and quotations, which pose challenges for faithful rendition into the target language. This paper examines the strategies employed by translators to effectively handle intertextuality in translation, exploring how they negotiate the transfer of intertextual elements across linguistic and cultural boundaries.

Translators employ various strategies to navigate intertextual elements in source texts while ensuring fidelity to the original meaning and style. One such strategy is adaptation, where translators modify intertextual references to make them more accessible or relevant to the target audience (Hermans, 1999). For example, cultural references may be replaced with equivalents familiar to the target culture, allowing for a smoother integration of intertextual elements into the translated text. Another strategy is localization, which involves adapting the translation to the linguistic and cultural norms of the target audience (O'Hagan & Ashworth, 2002). In cases where direct translation may result in loss of meaning or cultural misunderstanding, translators opt for localization to preserve the intended effect of intertextual references. Additionally, translators may employ techniques such as explicitation or glossing to clarify intertextual references for the target audience without compromising the integrity of the original text (Baker, 2011). By carefully balancing fidelity to the source text with the demands of the target audience, translators effectively negotiate intertextual elements in translation.

4.1 Transliteration and Borrowing: In cases where direct translation may obscure intertextual references, translators may opt for transliteration or borrowing of terms from the source language. This strategy preserves the original form of intertextual elements while making them accessible to target language readers (Venuti, 1995).

4.2 Footnotes and Explanatory Notes: Translators often utilize footnotes or

explanatory notes to elucidate unfamiliar intertextual references for target language readers. These annotations provide context and background information, enabling readers to appreciate the significance of intertextual elements (Newmark, 1988).

4.3 Cultural Substitution: When cultural references in the source text are untranslatable or unfamiliar to target language readers, translators may employ cultural substitution. This involves replacing specific cultural references with analogous ones from the target culture, ensuring that the intended meaning is conveyed effectively (Nida & Taber, 1969).

4.4. Paraphrasing and Adaptation: When direct translation fails to capture the essence of intertextual elements, translators often resort to paraphrasing or adaptation. By rephrasing intertextual references in a manner that resonates with target language readers, translators can maintain fidelity to the source text while ensuring coherence and readability (Hatim & Mason, 1997).

The handling of intertextuality in translation demands careful consideration of linguistic, cultural, and literary factors. Translators employ a variety of strategies, including transliteration, footnotes, cultural substitution, and adaptation, to effectively convey intertextual elements across languages and cultures. By delving into the analysis of these strategies and their implications for translation practice, this paper contributes to a deeper understanding of the challenges and complexities inherent in translating intertextuality.

5. Cultural Implications of Intertextual Translation

Intertextuality, indicating the interconnectedness of texts through references and allusions, is intricately linked to culture. In translation, intertextual elements bear significant cultural connotations, posing notable challenges for translators. This paper explores the cultural implications of intertextual translation, analyzing how cultural factors shape the adaptation of intertextual references across linguistic and cultural boundaries using case studies and theoretical frameworks.

Intertextual translation entails linguistic transfer and cultural mediation to ensure relevance and authenticity in the target culture (Bassnett & Lefevere, 1998). Translators navigate complex cultural nuances, considering

historical context, social values, and literary traditions. Moreover, intertextual translation is pivotal in shaping cultural identity by interpreting symbols across diverse contexts (Baker, 2006). As cultural intermediaries, translators facilitate cross-cultural communication. However, intertextual translation faces challenges when references lack direct equivalents in the target culture (Venuti, 2008). Translators must employ creative strategies to convey cultural significance while maintaining the original text's integrity.

5.1 Cultural Equivalents: Translating intertextual references requires identifying cultural equivalents that resonate with target language readers. However, what constitutes a cultural equivalent may vary depending on cultural context, historical background, and socio-political factors. Translators must navigate these complexities to ensure that intertextual elements are effectively conveyed in the target culture (Snell-Hornby, 2006).

5.2 Cultural Sensitivity: Intertextual translation necessitates cultural sensitivity and awareness of cultural nuances and taboos. Translators must consider the potential impact of intertextual references on target language readers and adapt them accordingly to avoid misinterpretation or offense. This requires a deep understanding of both the source and target cultures and the ability to mediate cultural differences effectively (Robinson, 1997).

5.3 Cultural Adaptation: In some cases, direct translation of intertextual references may not adequately convey their cultural significance to target language readers. Translators may need to adapt intertextual elements to align with the cultural norms and preferences of the target culture. This involves balancing fidelity to the source text with the need to make intertextual references accessible and meaningful to target language readers (Katan, 2004).

6. Challenges and Limitations of Intertextual Translation

Intertextuality presents challenges for translators despite enriching texts. This paper explores intertextual translation complexities.

While fostering creative exchange, intertextuality poses challenges. Ambiguity in references can lead to multiple interpretations (Tourney, 1995). Maintaining coherence in multi-modal texts is challenging (Pym, 2010). Translators navigate this interplay for effective conveyance. Intertextual translation raises ethical concerns (Hermans, 2014); and balancing creative

freedom and ethical responsibilities is crucial.

6.1 Linguistic Differences: Translating intertextual references requires navigating linguistic differences between the source and target languages. Idioms, wordplay, and cultural-specific expressions may pose challenges for faithful rendition into the target language, leading to loss of nuance and ambiguity (Munday, 2008).

6.2 Cultural Barriers: Intertextual references often carry cultural connotations and references that may be unfamiliar or inaccessible to target language readers. Cultural barriers hinder the effective transmission of intertextual elements, leading to misinterpretation or loss of meaning (Venuti, 1998).

6.3 Ambiguity and Polysemy: Intertextual references are inherently ambiguous and polysemic, open to multiple interpretations and meanings. Translators face the challenge of preserving the ambiguity and richness of intertextual elements while ensuring clarity and coherence in the target text (Bassnett & Lefevere, 1998).

6.4 Translator Subjectivity: Translators bring their own subjectivity and interpretation to the translation process, influencing their selection and interpretation of intertextual elements. Translator subjectivity introduces variability and unpredictability into intertextual translation, affecting the fidelity and accuracy of the target text (Toury, 1995).

7. CONCLUSION

Intertextuality is a cornerstone of translation, requiring translators to balance fidelity to the source text with adaptation to the target culture. It offers opportunities for creativity and cultural exchange but also presents challenges. Embracing intertextuality enhances cross-cultural communication, bridging linguistic and cultural divides with skill. It was hypothesized that translation is a cognitive process, inherently intertextual, relying on language proficiency and background knowledge (Iandoli & Zollo, 2008: 110, xix). The translator's linguistic abilities intersect with both the source and target languages, acquired through imitation and interaction. Creativity and imitation coexist, with learning and creativity being fundamental cognitive facets. The translator's cognition integrates all inputs and outputs, with intertextuality significantly shaping creativity. Awareness

of intertextuality allows translators to control their knowledge and skills, discerning what to emulate or discard. Translation involves complex cognitive processes similar to writing and revision (Bowen, 1993: 189). This exploration highlights intertextuality's strategic significance in translation. By understanding relationships between texts and cultures and employing appropriate strategies, translators facilitate cross-cultural communication. Intertextual translation involves linguistic nuances, cultural intricacies, and interpretative challenges, requiring sensitivity and insight.

8. Bibliography List :

1. Allen, Graham (2000) *Intertextuality*, Routledge: New York & London
2. Allen, Matthew, *Smart Thinking: skills for critical understanding and writing*, 2004, 2nd ed, Oxford University press: New York
3. Baker, M. (2006). *_Translation and Conflict: A Narrative Account._* Routledge.
4. Baker, M. (2011). *_In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation._* Routledge.
5. Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays* (C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Eds.; M. Holquist, Trans.). University of Texas Press.
6. Barthes, R. (1967). *Death of the author*. In *Image-Music-Text* (S. Heath, Trans.). Hill and Wang.
7. Barthes, R. (1977). *_Image-Music-Text._* Fontana Press.
8. Bassnett, S., & Lefevere, A. (1998). *Constructing Cultures: Essays on Literary Translation*. Multilingual Matters.
9. Berman, A. (1992). *Translation and the trials of the foreign*. Edinburgh University Press.
10. Bowen, Betsy A. (1993) *Using Conferences to Support the Writing process*, in ... (Penrose & Sticko, 1993)
11. Boyd, David & Palmer, R. Barton (2006) *After Hitchcock : influence, imitation, and intertextuality* edited by David Boyd and R. Barton Palmer. by the University of Texas Press: Austin, USA
12. Carsetti, Arturo, (2004) *Seeing, Thinking and Knowing*, Kluwer Academic Publishers: Netherlands, USA

13. -Cook, James Wyatt (2008), Encyclopedia of Ancient Literature, facts On File, Inc. , New York: USA
14. De Troyer, K. (2003), Rewriting the Sacred Text: what the old Greek texts tell us about the literary growth of the Bible, The Society of Biblical Literature: The Netherlands
15. Dubois et al. (2002) Dictionnaire de Linguistics , Larousse : Paris, France.
16. Eco, Umberto (1979) the Role of The Reader, , Indiana university press: USA
17. Fitzsimmons, J. (2013). Romantic and contemporary poetry: readings. Retrieved from CQUniversity e-courses, LITR19049 - Romantic and Contemporary Poetry,<http://moodle.cqu.edu.au>
18. Foster, Harriet, (1966) Categories of Cognitive Skills, Center FOR THE study of Evaluation of instructional prorgams, California Univ., Los Angeles: USA
19. Genette, G. (1997). _Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation._ Cambridge University Press.
20. Glass, Arnold Lewis and Holyoak, Keith james, (1985) Cognition, Random House: USA
21. Gordan, Cynthia, (2009), Making Meanings, Creating Family: Intertextuality and Framing in family Interaction, Oxford Univetsity Press: New York
22. Stuart, Greene (1993), Exploring the Relationship Between Authorship and Writing in Hearing ourselves think, Penrose & Sticko (eds.), Oxford University Press: New York
23. Gunning, Thomas G. (2010) Reading Comprehension Boosters, Jossey-Bass A Wiley Imprint: USA
24. Haas, Christina (1993) Beyond "Just the Facts": Reading as Rhetorical Action in Hearing ourselves think, Penrose & Sticko (eds.), Oxford University Press: New York
25. Harris, Joseph (2006). Rewriting: How to do things with texts. Utah, USA: Utah State University Press
26. -Hatim, B., & Mason, I. (1997). The Translator as Communicator. Routledge.

27. Hermans, T. (1999). *_Translation in Systems: Descriptive and System-oriented Approaches Explained._* St. Jerome Publishing.
28. Hermans, T. (2014). *_Translation in Systems: Descriptive and System-oriented Approaches Explained._* St. Jerome Publishing.
29. Iandoli, Luca & Zollo, Giuseppe (2008) *Organizational Cognition and Learning*, 1st ed, Information Science Publishing, Hershy, New York: USA
30. Katan, D. (2004). *Translating Cultures: An Introduction for Translators, Interpreters, and Mediators.* St. Jerome Publishing.
31. Klimovich, Natalya V., *Phenomenon of Intertextuality in Translation Studies*, Journal of Siberian Federal University. Humanities & Social Sciences 2 (2014 7) 255-264
32. Kristeva, J. (1980). *_Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art._* Columbia University Press.
33. Kristeva, J. (1986). *Word, dialogue, and novel.* In T. Moi (Ed.), *The Kristeva reader* (pp. 34-61). Columbia University Press.
34. Lamson, Roy et al., (1962) *The Critical Reader: Essay, Stories, Poems*, WW. Norton & Company, Inc.: New York
35. Lee, Linda & Gundersen, Erik, (2001) *Select readings: intermediate*, Oxford University Press: New York
36. Lee, Linda & Gundersen, Erik, (2004) *Select readings: upper-intermediate*, Oxford University Press: New York
37. Lefevere, A. (1992). *Translation, rewriting, and the manipulation of literary fame.* Routledge.
38. Longman dictionary of contemporary English new edition, (2009) Pearson- Longman: England
39. Mansfield. Elizabeth C. (2007) *Too beautiful to picture: Zeuxis, myth, and mimesis*, the University of Minnesota Press: USA
40. McGuinness, Diane (2005) *Language Development and Learning to Read: the scientific study of how language development affects reading skill*, A Bradford Book The MIT Press Cambridge, Massachusetts, London.
41. Mikulecky, Beatrice S. & Jeffries, Linda (2007) *Advanced Reading Power*, Pearson Education : New York.
42. Moriss, Dick (2004), *Rewriting History*, ReganBooks, New York: USA

43. Munday, J. (2008). *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*. Routledge.
44. Murphy, Michael (1993). *Pseudo-Philo: Rewriting the Bible*, Cambridge, UK: Cambridge university press
45. Newmark, P. (1988). *A Textbook of Translation*. Prentice Hall.
46. Nida, E. A., & Taber, C. R. (1969). *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. Brill.
47. Nunan, David (2015) *Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages: an introduction*, Routledge: New York & London
48. O'Hagan, M., & Ashworth, D. (2002). *_Translation-mediated Communication in a Digital World: Facing the Challenges of Globalization and Localization*. Multilingual Matters.
49. Penrose & Sticko (eds.) (1993), *Hearing ourselves think*, New York, Oxford University Press: USA
50. Pirie, B.David, (1985) *How to Write Critical Essays: A Guide for Students of Literature*, Routledge: London & New York
51. Pym, A. (2010). *_Translation and Multimodality: Beyond Words*. Routledge.
52. Robinson, D. (1997). *Translation and Taboo. The Translator*, Illinois, USA: Northern Illinois University Press
53. Robinson, Douglas (2001) *Who Translates?*, State University Of New York Press, Albany: USA
54. Robinson, Douglas, (2003) *Becoming a Translator*, Routledge: London and New York
55. Santrock, John W., (1995) *Life-Span Development*, 6th ed., Brown & Benchmark Inc.: USA.
56. Sifard, Anna, (2008) *Thinking as communicating*, Cambridge University Press: New York
57. Simon, Sherry, (1996) *Gender in Translation*, Routledge: London & New York
58. Snell-Hornby, M. (2006). *The Turns of Translation Studies: New Paradigms or Shifting Viewpoints?* John Benjamins Publishing Company.
59. Sternberg, Robert J. & Pretz, Jean E., (2005) *Cognition and Intelligence*, Cambridge university Press: New York

60. Toury, G. (1995). *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
61. Venuti, L. (1995). *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. Routledge.
62. Venuti, L. (1998). *The Scandals of Translation: Towards an Ethics of Difference*. Routledge.
63. Venuti, L. (2008). *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. _ Routledge.
64. Webster's New Universal Unabridged Dictionary, 2nd ed, Simon & Schuster: New York
65. Wills, Wolfram, (1996): *Knowledge and Skills in Translator Behavior*, volume 15, John Benjamins Publishing Co: Philadelphia and Amsterdam
66. Wimmer, Manfred (2004) in *Seeing, Thinking and Knowing*, A. Carsetti (ed.), 277-292. Kluwer Academic Publishers. Printed in the Netherlands.
67. Zahavi, Dan, (2005), *Subjectivity and Selfhood*, Massachusetts Institute of Technology: USA