



RESEARCH ARTICLE

Transtextuality” in Modern Critical Studies: Bakhtin and BeyondAysha Alhenzab^{1*}, Mahrous Mahmoud Alkolaly²^{1,2}Department of Arabic Language and Literature, Sultan Qaboos University, Muscat, Oman**ARTICLE INFO****ABSTRACT**

Received: Aug 16, 2025

Accepted: Oct 29, 2025

Keywords

Transtextuality
Modern Critical
Studies
Bakhtin and Beyond

***Corresponding Author:**

aalhenzab@qu.edu.qa

This research examines the ideas of the Russian theorist (Mikhail Bakhtin) and those who followed him regarding the concept of textual transcendence, and questions its authority. The treatment relies on Western and Arab sources to examine these sources through the criteria of reception in both Western and Arab fields. It is well known that the theory of "textual transcendence" traces its origins to Mikhail Bakhtin, upon whom we rely primarily in this research to answer two fundamental questions: How did contemporary critics view Bakhtin's ideas? Was the readership sufficiently critically aware to accept his concepts regarding the novel, textual interactions in their various forms, and their overlapping terminology? Contemporary French critics in France were capable of critical study, bridging the aesthetic gap between the source (Bakhtin) and the reading time. Was this also the case for Arab scholars who explained Bakhtin's terminology, translated his works, or used them in their applied studies of Arabic texts? This research will include a dialogue with various sources and prominent critical figures, both Arab and non-Arab, enabling us to answer the research questions. Keywords: Bakhtin, dialogism, Roland Barthes, textual transcendence, pluphonism

1.INTRODUCTION

The theory of textual transcendence dates back to the early works of the Russian theorist and philosopher Mikhail Bakhtin, who occupies a unique and important position in modern Western critical thought. This is perhaps due to the enormous diversity of his texts and the fields of research to which they can be traced. Bakhtin wrote under numerous pseudonyms, and most of his early work appeared under the signatures of several of his students and disciples. His signature appeared only on a few books and studies, most notably the first edition of his book "On Dostoevsky," published in 1929. As for his other fundamental writings: "Marxism and the Philosophy of Language," "Freudianism," and "The Formal Method in Literary Study," the first two were published under the name Voloshinov, and the third under the name Medvedev. Both were Bakhtin's interlocutors and members of his circle. This has created a dilemma in authenticating and attributing these texts to him. Nevertheless, Bakhtin is considered one of the voices who made significant contributions to literary theory, as attested by a number of contemporary critics, including the French critic Tzvetan Todorov, who describes him as "one of the most fascinating and enigmatic figures in mid-twentieth-century European culture." This is perhaps due to the breadth of thought from which Bakhtin's works proceeded; he drew on the fields of the humanities in his theories and works, making them open to broader fields and areas. The most important feature of Bakhtin's thought and fundamental achievements is that they contain a number of ideas and concepts upon which post-structuralist movements are founded. These ideas had a profound impact on the formation of literary theory in general and French criticism in particular. Bakhtin was able to crystallize a number of concepts and ideas in a number of different fields, such as the history of literary genres, narratives, semiotics, and stylistics. The English critic Terry Eagleton stated that "Mikhail Bakhtin gives these post-structuralist ideas and concepts a historical basis." The Bakhtinian sphere of thought was characterized by a vitality that made it a broad field encompassing a number of human knowledge and critical trends that emerged later. Thus, we can say that Bakhtin's thought was located at the intersection of a number of different critical approaches and trends. The influence of his ideas and theses extended

to a large number of contemporary critics who worked in the field of the novel and attempted to theorize about it. They adopted these ideas and followed the approach he followed in studying the novel's discourse, working to develop these theses in their critical studies. It must be noted that this Bakhtinian legacy remained hidden and unknown for a long number of years. French criticism was not aware of any of these works, considering them the central ones that constitute the basic starting point for modern critical theories, and it was not paid attention to until much later. Perhaps the credit for introducing the French reader, and the Western reader in general, to this great achievement goes to three prominent figures in modern Western thought: Julia Kristeva, T. Todorov. Todorov, in France, and Michael Holquist, in America, were credited with translating Bakhtin's works into French and English.

(2) The First Insights into the Works of Mikhail Bakhtin

The French critic Todorov translated the works of the Russian Formalists into French, in addition to some of Bakhtin's studies. The Bulgarian-born critic Julia Kristeva translated "The Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics," in which she credits Bakhtin with pioneering the concept of intertextuality in a number of his studies of the novel genre. Michael Holquist also contributed to translating Bakhtin's works into English. Bakhtin's works were widely celebrated for their important critical insights and views, characterized by their ability to transcend and inspire, and they had an impact on changing the course of modern Western critical thought.

In his book, *Critique of Criticism*, Todorov argues that Mikhail Bakhtin is "the most important Soviet thinker in the field of the humanities and the greatest literary theorist of the twentieth century." Bakhtin drew on various humanities in his theoretical studies. He worked on a number of great literary works and addressed a number of the most problematic critical issues in his studies. Todorov asserts that Bakhtin is the most formalist critic of the formalists themselves. Bakhtin paid great attention to textual analysis, attempting to establish a critical school or movement that combined formalism and Marxism. It is a formalist school in its focus on the linguistic structure of literary works, but at the same time, it is influenced by Marxism, which holds that language cannot be separated from ideology. Bakhtin attached great importance to ideology in the literary works he studied, arguing that "the speaker in the novel is always, to varying degrees, a product of ideology, and his words are always an ideological specimen." Bakhtin insisted on rejecting such an arbitrary view of expressive and literary genres. Therefore, we find him often criticizing the Formalists, not for their formalism, but for their materialism and their materialistic view of literature. Thus, in the field of theorizing about the novel, Bakhtin was able to "provide a different understanding, based on the study of the novelistic form (especially style or language) as a form distinct from other literary forms, as a polyphonic or multi-voiced form." This linguistic plurality in the novelistic text is an embodiment of the social conflict witnessed by societies and the conflict between different ideologies within society. His starting point was a philosophical background that embraced a Marxist orientation, and therefore we notice him viewing literary genres differently from the Russian Formalists. He raised the question of "the poetics of the novelistic discourse in a manner different from the concept of poetic discourse." In many of his studies, Bakhtin sought to clarify the concept of dialogism, a key term in his critical and intellectual work, and his view of the relationship between the self and the other through the interaction that arises between them. This term also constitutes the first seed upon which later critics built the term intertextuality, which a number of critics have embraced with approaches in various critical fields, leading to the formulation of a theory of textual transcendence, which has been considered a subject of poetics, through which one can understand the poetic aesthetics that encompass creative literary texts. Dialogue, as a key concept for Bakhtin, which he uses in his reading of the literary text, is based on a type of relationship. According to Bakhtin, these relationships are linked to discourse, not to language itself. He asserts that "dialogic relationships are possible between linguistic styles and dialects..., but they must be understood as positions with a specific meaning, as linguistic viewpoints of their kind, i.e., not through studying them according to the method of pure linguistics." These styles and dialects represent the conflicting ideological patterns in the novel's text, including the novelist's visions and ideas.

- Hybridization: Bakhtin defines it as "the blending of two social languages within a single utterance, even though they belong to two different eras or two disparate social milieus. This pattern is usually used in the fields of popular satire and satire, or what is called carnival.

- The intertwined, dialogic relationship between languages. This is embodied, for example, in indirect ideological and cultural dialogues. Novels frequently use this expressive genre today.
- Pure dialogues: This refers to the ordinary dialogue between narrative characters, whether in the novel or the theater. It is well known that dialogue often occurs intermittently in the novel due to the presence of narration."

Bakhtin's theorization of the genre of the novel marked an epistemological break with most of the theories presented by critics before him in their introduction to the theory of the novel. He abandoned the familiar association between the novel and the bourgeois class, which relies on highlighting individualism and its values, trying to find its roots in the bosom of popular culture - especially carnival rituals - and to explore its textual components in some ancient Greek and Roman prose texts, as well as in medieval novels. While Hegel and Lukács linked the emergence of the novel genre to the epic and bourgeois society, we find Bakhtin trying to change the course of this vision to make the novel genre a genre more closely linked to the popular class and expressive of the concerns and culture of those popular groups. He also paid more attention to the artistic and technical issues of the novelistic discourse, which had been neglected by theorists of the novel before him. The relationship between the self and the other through dialogic interaction between them is the obsession that dominated Bakhtin's thought in a number of his studies. It becomes clear to us that "this golden idea, which dominated Bakhtin's thinking for nearly three-quarters of a century that he lived, is what made him a thinker in a state of becoming, a thinker who has not yet reached completion, just as the novel is, which he always considered a literary genre in a state of becoming, a genre that is not completed but rather develops, absorbing the elements it borrows from other genres." Bakhtin believes that there is no expression that is not connected to other expressions, and that such a relationship is an essential relationship that lies in all expressive genres. Thus, he set out to extract these expressive genres in the novelistic discourse. Bakhtin tried to prove the existence of such relationships in his book entitled (*Esthétique de la création verbale* 1984) and he went on to say that "the subject of a speaker's discourse, whatever it may be, is not the subject of discourse for the first time in a given utterance, and the speaker cannot be the first to speak of it. The subject, so to speak, has been spoken, opposed, clarified and paradoxically judged; it is the place where different points of view, visions of the world, orientations intersect, meet and separate. The speaker is not the Adam of the Bible confronted with virgin, as yet unnamed subjects, and is the first to name them."

Bakhtin's definition of dialogism suggests that it refers to the interpenetration of "two verbal acts, two expressions, in a special kind of semantic relationship that we call a dialogical relationship. Dialogic relationships are (semantic) relationships between all expressions that fall within the sphere of verbal communication." Based on Bakhtin's argument, it becomes clear that the concept of dialogism was the starting point or first stage from which a number of procedural terms and concepts would later emerge, developing this concept. Critics later drew on this Bakhtinian legacy in their reading of the novel genre in particular, and worked to formulate a theory of textual transcendence, which attempts to uncover the extent of interaction and dialogue that arises between texts, thereby denying and refuting the foundations upon which structuralist theories were based in their reading of literary writing. (3) Shklovsky and Utdorf: Bakhtin's Reading of Works of Art

However, this does not mean that critics before Bakhtin were not aware of the relationships that arise between expressive works, or what is called the principle of dialogism. They had some initial hints of this idea, including, for example, the Russian critic Shklovsky, one of the leaders of the Russian Formalist group, who pointed to this type of interaction that is the fate of every creative work. He argued that "a work of art is perceived in its relationship to other works of art, and based on the connections we establish between them. It is not only the opposing text that creates in parallel and contrast with a particular model, but rather every work creates in this way." Shklovsky thus refers to the relationships that arise between discourses, which Bakhtin discussed in some detail. Shklovsky argued that the creation of any text occurs through opposition to another text, and that the identity of any text can only be determined through understanding the relationship of interaction and dialogue that arises between it and the other texts embedded within its layers. Every text contains texts that are dissolved and intertwined with it, which the creator's memory calls upon to reproduce in a new text that bears the visions of its creator. This does not mean that Bakhtin is not a pioneer in this field, as his efforts were characterized by methodology. Todorov asserts that Bakhtin is the first to formulate a complete and integrated theory of the multiplicity of intertwined

textual values. Bakhtin pointed to the multiplicity of enunciation in the novel genre through the internal dialogue that the language of the novel establishes with other languages. Bakhtin defined the forms of this interrelation as follows:

- "Stylization: the stylization of a "foreign" linguistic material by a contemporary linguistic consciousness, through which it discusses its subject matter: (Contemporary language sheds a pure light on the language being stylized, extracting some elements from it and leaving others in the shadows.)
- Variation: a type of stylization characterized by the stylizer introducing the raw material of the language being stylized, its contemporary "foreign" material (word, sentence form), with the goal of testing the stylized language by inserting it into new, seemingly impossible situations.
- Parody: a basic type of stylization based on the incompatibility of the intentions of the personified language with the purposes of the personified language. The first language resists the second language, resorting to exposing and destroying it. However, parodical stylization requires that the destruction of the language of others not be simple and superficial, but rather It must "recreate a parody language as if it were an essential whole possessing its own internal logic and revealing a unique world closely linked to the language in which it was written."

Through these formulations, Bakhtin asserts that the only literary discourse that enjoys a dialogical form is the novelistic discourse, where "the creator's consciousness lives in a world crowded with the utterances of others, bearing specific viewpoints about the world and forms of verbal interpretation. His consciousness searches within this world for its path, reshaping it and stylizing the methods of others, to then produce a literary discourse that carries not only his own voice and worldview, but also the other, semantic and controversial perspectives that coexist and dialogue, complementing each other." Perhaps this is primarily due to the nature of writing in this literary genre, which is replete with multiple and conflicting voices, and discourses that are preserved in the collective memory of the creator. In his study of the novel genre, Bakhtin distinguished between two basic types. He argued that there are two stylistic lines in the Western novel, particularly the European one:

- The first is the polyphonic novel. Bakhtin used Dostoyevsky's texts as a model for this genre, which he considered the best novel for him. It represents a qualitative leap in the field of novel writing, which is characterized by multiple voices and the exclusion of the author's self. Bakhtin made Dostoyevsky a pioneer of this style of novel writing, which allows for the inclusion of a number of discourse styles in a state of conflict without bias toward one style over another.
- The second is the monophonic novel, represented by the writings of Tolstoy and Madame de la Fayette. These are texts in which a single voice is embodied or predominates, that of their creator. The text thus appears to follow a single line and pace, guided solely by the vision of the creator, in contrast to the polyphonic novel, which is replete with conflicting and intertwined voices. The first type of novel, according to Bakhtin's analysis, includes a mixture of voices, including the author's voice. His voice is among "the multiple and conflicting voices from the beginning of the novel, but all of these voices seem to be of equal value, so that it is completely impossible to determine the position adopted by the writer, as long as he conducts the ideological conflict in almost complete neutrality." The second type, on the other hand, is more dominated by the author's voice, his vision, aspirations, and ideology, and is not neutral in the way that is found in the dialogical novel.

(4) Julia Kristeva and the Coining of the Term Intertextuality

The second stage in the process of developing the theory of "transtextuality" is represented by the efforts of the Bulgarian critic Julia Kristeva in the late 1960s and early 1970s. Her critical achievements constitute an important turning point in the foundation of this theory, particularly those works that benefited from the critical corpus presented by Bakhtin in his study of novelistic discourse and his coining of the term "dialogue." Kristeva built on Bakhtin's initial indications of the meaning of the concept of intertextuality, which she later adopted in her critical studies. Kristeva provided a methodological clarification of the idea in the late 1960s and adopted a number of Bakhtin's propositions and ideas in his analysis of the genre of the novel, developing and adapting them in accordance with new critical visions and ideas that question the validity of the philosophical and intellectual foundations upon which structuralism was based. Kristeva believes that although

Bakhtin did not employ the term *intertextuality* in his critical research and studies, he was the first to emphasize the dialogical nature of literary texts, particularly narrative discourse. Thus, his ideas served as the cornerstone upon which Kristeva built her project to coin the term "*intertextuality*" in her critical studies. She argued that "*intertextual work is a 'cutting' and a 'transformation,' and generates those phenomena that belong to the axioms of speech, belonging to an aesthetic choice that Kristeva, drawing on Bakhtin (1963), calls 'dialogic' and 'polyphonic-dialogism.'*" This simplified concept Kristeva presented of the meaning of *intertextual work* reveals that she incorporated the key concepts relied upon by Bakhtin and declared their adoption, making *intertextuality* the equivalent of the concept of *dialogism*. Kristeva acknowledged Bakhtin's contribution to the critical theorization of the concept of *intertextuality* within the framework of the "Russian Formalism" group. Bakhtin expanded "the concept of dialogue in the novel in his search for the components of the textual novel in some ancient Greek and Roman prose texts. He believed that the novel allows all literary expressive genres, including stories, poems, odes, and comedic passages, to enter into its entity." Therefore, in his study of *novelistic discourse*, he concludes that the novel is a literary genre constantly in a state of becoming and formation, and is still in the process of formation as an independent literary genre that draws from all other literary genres and is independent with its own characteristics that achieve its distinction and uniqueness among this group of other expressive genres. What distinguishes this stage in the formation of the theory of "*textual transcendence*" is the methodological transition from the concept of "*dialogic*", which Bakhtin established in his studies of *novelistic discourse*, particularly in the works of the novelist Dostoevsky, to the term "*intertextuality*," which was crystallized by Kristeva. This is confirmed by Marc Angenot, who stated that "the word *intertextuality* was invented, if we may say so, by Julia Kristeva in many of the essays written between 1966 and 1967, which appeared in the magazine *Tel quel* and *Critique*, which were republished in *Semiotike*, in her book *Le Du Textedu Roman*, and in the introduction to Bakhtin's book *Dostoevsky*." Through these studies, Kristeva attempted to make "*intertextuality*" a term that transcended the concept of *dialogism* to which Bakhtin referred. Kristeva referred to the fundamental idea upon which the term "*intertextuality*" was based in a study she published in 1969 entitled "*Word, Dialogue and Novel*." She argued that "every text is a mosaic of quotations, and every text is an absorption and transformation of other texts." Based on this brief statement, which reflects Kristeva's vision of the nature of the literary text, it becomes clear to us that the idea of *intertextuality* is based on the principle of demolishing and rejecting the notion of the text as closed in on itself, by refuting the concepts that structuralism has worked to establish in modern critical studies. This is achieved through Kristeva's emphasis on her view of the text as the convergence of a number of intersecting and generated texts to create new, creative texts. In her book (*Semiotike*), Kristeva argues that "*intertextuality*" does not simply mean the meeting of a number of texts, or that it is merely the restoration of a text to other texts, previous or contemporary to it. It is a very broad term: "Not only allusion, parody, and pastiche belong to '*intertextuality*', but also every form of reminiscence, rewriting, and forms of exchange that can take place between a text and the sum of contemporary language." Literature is ultimately nothing but a group of *intertextualities* that arise between a number of texts and express the cultural and civilizational stock possessed by the producer of the text. From here, we can consider "*intertextuality*" a primary component of any literary and creative text, confirming the critical proposition that sees literature as imitating literature, and that any literary text necessarily calls for other texts and enters with them into a state of generation, reproduction, and interaction.

In Kristeva's critical project, the term "*intertextuality*" is linked to *textual productivity*, "meaning that it is then linked to the *generative text*, which concerns how texts are generated and created according to a work built on a previous or preexisting structure." Thus, the text becomes a reproduction of other texts, whether preceding or contemporary. Through these preexisting texts, new texts are born and created, in which new imaginary worlds are created. From here, we can consider the term "*intertextuality*" as a methodological leap from the concept of *dialogism* to the concept of *intertextuality*, which emphasizes the openness of the literary text to other texts and discourses. Kristeva made the term "*intertextuality*" a counterpart to the concept of "*dialogic*," which Bakhtin constructed primarily based on the genre of the novel. Meanwhile, Kristeva made *intertextuality* a broad concept encompassing all literary discourses, whether poetry or prose. From here, Kristeva created a qualitative shift at the level of critical discourse in his view of all literary genres. The term "*intertextuality*" marked the shift from "a closed system, a self-sufficient existence,

or self-existent structures to the idea of an open system, an existence that belongs to other existences, and structures that are constructed from other structures." Kristeva, in her vision of the concept of the text, states through a number of her semiotic studies that she presents, that the text is a "translinguistic device that redistributes the system of language (langue) by linking (interrelation) a communicative speech (parole) that aims to inform directly, and various types of utterances that precede or coincide with it. The text is thus productive, which means:

1. Its relationship to the language within which it is situated is one of redistribution (destructive/constructive), and therefore it can be approached through logical categories rather than purely linguistic categories.
2. It is a transmigration of texts and textual overlap. Within the space of a given text, numerous utterances extracted from other texts intersect and conflict." Through this concept introduced by Kristeva, we can credit her with coining a number of operational terms that later shaped text theory or text science, one of which is the concept of intertextuality*, which Barthes attempted to formulate. Barthes, Kristeva, and a number of leaders of the Tel Quel group sought to establish a new theory in critical study that focused on the text and its details. They called it "text theory" or "text science."

(5) Approaches to the Term Intertextuality in the Writings of Some Critics

The 1970s represented the third phase in the process of forming the theory of "transcendental texts," through the first approaches critics presented to the term intertextuality, after Kristeva announced its birth. Thus, the term "intertextuality" migrated from Kristeva's writings and the works of the Tel Quel group to everywhere else. The term received great attention within the critical scene at the time, receiving significant interpretations that worked to adapt and refine the concept by critics and scholars. The term "intertextuality" has been employed by a number of critics belonging to different critical trends and movements. From here, we will attempt to trace the emergence of the conceptual field of intertextuality in critical discourse, the manner in which it spread in the field of critical studies, its evolution in the works of critics and linguists, and the most important changes and additions that have occurred to it.

Mark Angenot claims that Sollers was the one who coined the term "intertextuality." Angenot presented an article entitled "Intertextuality," which served as a historical tracing of the birth of the term intertextuality in the field of critical studies. He sought to trace its emergence and development with a clear and precise methodology. Hence, this article has gained its importance, as it serves as a fundamental reference for this topic.

The term "intertextuality" was mentioned by the French critic Roland Barthes in his book **The Pleasure of the Text** (1973). Barthes attempted to provide a simplified definition of intertextuality when he said, "Intertextuality, in its essence, is the impossibility of living outside the infinite text—whether that text is Proust, the daily newspaper, or the television screen. The book makes meaning, and meaning makes life."

Barthes continued Kristeva's vision of the term intertextuality, which she incorporated into "text theory," in which Barthes is one of the practitioners. His views came to adopt and support the theses presented by Kristeva. He asserted that "every text is intertextual, and other texts appear in it at varying levels and in forms that are not difficult to understand in one way or another, as the texts of previous and current culture are recognized: every text is nothing but a new fabric of previous citations." In this way, he agrees with Kristeva's view that every text is a fabric of quotations and citations.

Barthes emphasizes the intertextual nature that surrounds all literary texts in his analysis of Balzac's story "Sarrazine" in his book *Z/S*, he argues that "the text is a multidimensional space in which different writings intermingle and conflict, without any of them being original." Every text is essentially a "texture of statements resulting from a thousand cultural foci." Barthes worked to develop and deepen the term "intertextuality," and intensified research into it. The term "intertextuality" entered into "the theory of reading and reception," in which the shift toward the reader, who represents the third pole of the creative triangle alongside the author and the text, heralded a new phase in the history of literary theory. The center of gravity in the creative process shifted from the author and the text to the reader, whose effectiveness begins with the death of the author. Thus, the idea of the death of the author leads to intertextuality. By reading a literary text,

the reader naturally calls upon his cultural storehouse and historical memory to explore its depths and decipher its codes. He thus becomes another producer of the text through the texts summoned.

Barthes's term *intertextuality* is linked, on the one hand, to the idea of the death of the author. On the other hand, Barthes emphasized that it also eliminates the concept of the text's paternity, through its belonging to "an intertextual field that should not be confused with the origins or sources from which the text originates. This is because the search for the sources from which the text originates, and the influences active within it, aims to satisfy the myth of paternity and to identify ancestors." Thus, the term *intertextuality* came to shatter this mythical and banal vision of the concept of the text, which limits it to the search for sources and influences. *Intertextuality*, "which every text includes, can never be considered the origin of the text: the search for the 'origins' of the text and the influences to which it has been subjected, is a surrender to the myth of lineage and descent." Thus, the text was freed from the trap of searching for a form of paternity that preceded it in existence. *Intertextuality* became a fundamental key to reading, understanding, and analyzing texts. From here, the reader gained his effectiveness and legitimacy in deconstructing, reconstructing, and producing the text. From all of the above, we conclude that Barthes did not deviate from the path Kristeva outlined for the term *intertextuality* in critical study, nor from Kristeva's vision of the concept of a text that "coexists in some way with other texts and is therefore rooted in *intertextuality*." According to Barthes, the text is composed of a geology of writings. Barthes emphasizes the intertextual role played by the reader in this regard. In addition to the *intertextuality* that the author establishes in his text with other texts, the reader, on the other hand, evokes other texts. Thus, the issue becomes more complex and ambiguous, as the *intertextuality* that the reader evokes from his cultural storehouse may differ from what the author intended while writing. Among the critics who have made efforts to spread the concept of *intertextuality* in the critical field and its approach is Todorov, within the scope of his interest in the critical writings presented by Bakhtin and his translation of Bakhtin's book "The Dialogical Principle" into French. In his introduction, he indicates that "the most important aspect of enunciation, or at least the most neglected aspect, is its dialogism, that is, its intertextual dimension." Thus, the concept of Todorov equates *intertextuality* with Bakhtin's concept of dialogism. Thus, he considers all relationships that connect one expression to another to be within the sphere of *intertextuality*. Todorov acknowledges that "*intertextuality*" is a law governing all texts, as they are a fabric of infinite quotations and references. He agrees with Barthes on the difficulty of defining "*intertextuality*." It is not easy to trace the *intertextuality* established by a text back to its origins or the reference from which it was formed. Since "the present text does not call forth another text, but rather an unnamed set of discursive characteristics, we find ourselves faced with a multiplicity of values." Todorov followed the lead of Kristeva and Barthes in defining the concept of *intertextuality* and analyzing it as a phenomenon embedded in the philosophy of writing literary texts. Among the critics who have attempted to introduce the term *intertextuality* into their critical work is Pierre Zima, one of the most prominent representatives of the socio-textual movement. Zima "seeks to crystallize a sociological science of the text, giving *intertextuality* a sociological concept and making it a link between the interior and exterior of the text. Through his interpretation of *intertextuality*, he reconsiders the text's relationship with society." Zima thus expanded the scope of his view of the concept of *intertextuality* by moving beyond the textual relationships that arise between texts to the relationship between the text and society, focusing on the social and historical dimensions of the text and how they are manifested. He viewed *intertextuality* as a sociological concept par excellence. Critic Laurent Jenny proposed a redefinition of *intertextuality* in order to transcend studies that focus on source criticism and the study of influence. Thus, *intertextuality* becomes an act "performed by a central text to transform and represent multiple texts, while retaining the leadership of meaning." In this sense, *intertextuality* becomes a process of merging texts into a central focus, or what is called a double focus. This focus is concerned with the new text, "The texts fused in this focus illuminate the new text and then become subordinate to it because they are part of it." According to what Genie argued, every text contains within its depths echoes of absent and implicit texts lying within its layers. Jenny also proposes expanding the intertextual field of texts to include "all that is literary, all social discourses, visual arts, music, and others, which is what Kristeva aspired to." In doing so, he attempts to open the concept of *intertextuality* to the external contexts of texts and the circumstances surrounding them, resulting in the crystallization of the concept of *intertextuality* and the text as well, according to a vision of infinite openness to all that is literary and non-literary.

The term intertextuality has also been able to travel and migrate outside of Europe, which was considered the center of critical theories exported to the Americas. In 1975, the American critic Fredric Jameson called on critics to approach literary genres based on the concept of intertextuality and its view of literary texts. He considered intertextuality to be the key that helps in reading texts, deciphering their codes, and exploring their depths by examining the network of relationships that texts establish among themselves. The limits of intertextuality as a term do not stop at revealing the relationships between texts, but also at identifying the transformative effect that texts have on these absent texts.

Among the critical pens that have sought to present an accurate conception of intertextuality by the American researcher Vincent Leitch, in the context of his introduction to the concept of the text. According to him, the text is "not an independent entity or a unified material. Rather, it is a series of relationships with other texts. Its linguistic system, with its grammar and lexicon, all draw upon it as traces and excerpts from history. Thus, the text is like a cultural salvation army with countless groups of ideas, beliefs, and references that do not harmonize. The genealogy of the text is inevitably an incomplete network of borrowed excerpts, consciously or unconsciously. Heritage emerges in a state of irritation. And every text is inevitably: an intertextual text." Thus, Leitch, through his definition of the text, acknowledges the inevitability of intertextuality in all texts.

Based on the above, many critical writers have attempted to approach the concept of intertextuality. However, their definitions, despite their differences, have remained focused on the fundamental idea presented by Kristeva, which relates to the production of a text and its relationship with preceding texts. Since Kristeva announced the birth of the term intertextuality as a new critical concept, the concept has evolved freely and fluently. It has been approached from various critical currents and trends, such as semiotics, linguistics, stylistics, poetics, discourse analysis, and the aesthetics of reception. This has led to the recognition of the transformation of intertextuality from a critical concept to a phenomenon encompassing all texts. Perhaps what unites these critics, despite the different critical schools they represent, is their view of the creative process—literary writing or text alike—in that almost no literary text is free of the infiltration, intersecting, and infiltration of a number of texts. No work, writing, text, or work can exist in isolation from previous writings, the cultural reading, or the historical memory of the text's producer and creator. In addition to all the above aspects, there is agreement among this group of critics that the majority of them have moved from the stage of structuralism and its advocacy to post-structuralism, which called for liberating the text from the captivity of structuralist ideas that view it as a closed text and an independent entity in itself. It is as if the concept of intertextuality came to undermine these ideas from which structuralist movements were launched, and what structuralism does in ignoring "the external context surrounding the literary work, and contenting itself with viewing it as a closed structure and an entity finished in itself, complete within its framework, in time and space. It is only concerned with revealing the system of the text without considering its content or its social, psychological, or moral functions." Thus, it becomes clear to us that the concept of intertextuality was born during a decisive transformation in Western critical thought.

(7) From the Concept of Intertextuality to "Textual Transcendentals": Gérard Genette

In the 1980s, the term intertextuality entered a new phase, experiencing greater development and maturity. This is achieved through the contributions made by a number of critics, perhaps the most important of which are the efforts and achievements made by critics Michael Riffaterre and Gerard Genette, which reflect more systematic, specific, and precise efforts, both at the level of theory and practice. Thus, this will be the final station that this chapter will address, and it is the station that will constitute the theory of "textual transcendence" in its final form within poetic studies. The stylistic critic Riffaterre, for his part, also contributed to clarifying the term intertextuality in a number of his critical studies published in the late 1970s and early 1980s. These included his books "The Productivity of the Text," "Textual Interdependence," and "The Effect of Intertextuality" (1979) and "The Semiotics of Poetry" (1982), in which he attempted to present a conceptualization of the concept of intertextuality. Despite the importance of these studies and the significant position they occupy, the concept of intertextuality appeared vague in them, according to Genette, who would work to further explore the concept of intertextuality in several of his books. As one of the most important figures in the stylistic movement, Riffaterre adopted the concept of intertextuality in his later books, particularly those on stylistics. He used it extensively, and through this, he arrived at

giving the concept of intertextuality an operational value that differed entirely from the old philological criticism of literary sources and influences, which no longer holds much significance today. Riffaterre asserts that "intertextuality is the specific mechanism of literary reading, since it alone produces meaning, while the linear reading shared by all texts, whether literary or non-literary, can only produce meaning." Riffaterre thus gives the concept of intertextuality "an interpretive character, which has made it a specific mechanism of literary reading and a level of literary interpretation." He has made it a fundamental mechanism for revealing the literariness of texts. Perception of the intertextual relationships that texts establish with each other can only be achieved through reading; It "calls in, in particular, the reader's 'intertextual' memory, without which no text is readable." Reading is the fundamental key to understanding intertextuality, and the reader alone is capable of perceiving the relationships and overlaps that occur between texts. This is what Riffaterre sought to clarify in his distinction between two types of reading:

- The first level of reading: exploratory reading, which "requires linguistic competence to decipher the poem when reading it from beginning to end."

- The second level of reading: "Where poetic intertextual significance is achieved, it requires literary competence, 'based on the reader's knowledge of descriptive systems, themes, and myths combined, and of other texts above all else.' This literary competence, depending on the intertextual person with whom it is intertextual, covers gaps or condensations in the text."

The concept of intertextuality, according to Riffaterre, plays a fundamental and important role in "disguising meaning and transforming it toward the text's potential for signification, depending on the type of reading and the diversity of readers. It also invalidates the notion of criticism." The classicist who always sees that texts have meanings predetermined by the writers, thus the concept of intertextuality gives the text an infinite number of meanings and readings, and refutes the classical critical ideas in their view of the text and literary writing, therefore, "the characteristic of a text worth reading is that it does not carry within itself a ready and final meaning, but rather it is a semantic space and interpretive possibility. Therefore, it is not separate from its reader and is not realized without the reader's contribution. Every realization is a semantic possibility that has not been realized before." From here, every reading of a text becomes a new discovery, as the reader explores an unknown and implicit dimension of the text.

The most important contribution Riffaterre made to expanding the concept of intertextuality was his attempt to make the concept of intertextuality equivalent to the concept of literariness. He equates the concept of intertextuality with the concept of literariness of literature formulated by the linguistic theorist Roman Jakobson, which means that the subject of literary scholarship is not literature, but literariness—that is, "what makes a work a work of literature." He even expands this concept further, making it broad enough to include everything Genette calls textual transcendentals, which are the textual relationships that Genette made the subject of the poetics of literary texts. Genette undertook a comprehensive review of the concept of intertextuality among critics before him, based on a new conception of the subject of poetics. After benefiting from the bulk of the efforts of previous critics, he devoted himself to developing the concept until it reached a stage of maturity and completion. He put the finishing touches on the subject in his book "Palimpsestes," which enabled him to develop a comprehensive theory for reading and deconstructing texts, which he called the theory of "textual transcendence." He made the concept of intertextuality one of five patterns that comprise this theory, thus transforming it from a mere term and a phenomenon encompassing all texts into a specific theory for revealing textual overlaps and relationships. Genette previously stated, at the end of his book "Introduction to the Textual Whole," that the subject of poetics for him was no longer linked to the textual whole, through the distinction between types of discourse, forms of expression, and different literary genres. Rather, it had become linked to a broader and more comprehensive sphere, which he called "textual transcendence," with which the textual whole became a pattern. He indicated that the literary text was no longer of interest to him except in terms of its "textual transcendence," and that he needed to know everything that placed it in a hidden or explicit relationship with other texts. Genette devoted his research efforts to understanding the poetics of literary texts. He often investigated what makes a work a literary work. In his book "Atrás" (1982), Genette stated that the textual transcendences that characterize any text are "everything that places it in an explicit or implicit relationship with other texts; it therefore transcends and includes the 'comprehensive text' and some other types specifically related to transcendental

textuality." From here, Genette makes the subject of poetics a counterpart to the theory of textual transcendences. He asserts that poetics does not lie in the uniqueness of the text, but rather in the relationships that any text establishes with other texts, through a network of textual transcendences that he referred to in his book.

(8) Illuminating the Concepts of the Five Types (Textual Transcendences)

Based on the fact that defining terms and concepts is a matter of utmost importance and is necessary for controlling and organizing the intellectual, analytical, and interpretive process, and for framing critical practices within an organized methodological context, given that terms are the keys to the sciences and their ultimate fruits, as many claim. Students, emphasizing critic Jaber Asfour's view that the most difficult thing in furnishing the human mind is defining concepts and terms, Genette, in formulating his theory of "textual transcendence," attempted to provide a cognitive conception of each of the five types upon which the theory rests.

Genette provided a definition for each type of textual transcendence in his book "Paragraphs," which he "arranged according to an ascending system based on abstraction, comprehensiveness, and totality." These are:

The first type: Intertextuality

This term was coined by Kristeva, "then reformulated by Genette, who considered it to be the simultaneous presence between two or more texts, or the actual presence of one text within another." Thus, intertextuality typically manifests, as Genette explains, through three manifestations:

1. Citation: This corresponds to the highest degree of the clear and literal presence of one text in another, whether or not quotation marks are used.
2. Plagia: This is also a literal borrowing, but it is not Announced. Despite the entrenched nature of the term "plagiarism" in criticism, many critics avoid using it, suggesting the term "borrowing," or merely pointing out the term's inappropriateness for the literary phenomenon of intertextuality. The author of "Al-Atras" says, "Isn't such a situation a moral tendency that has been unable to rid itself of the sediments of old values? Or isn't this a blow to the concept of textual coherence, where texts move and interact? As long as the identity of texts has disappeared, and has been obliterated by the fusion of multiple texts within them, then speaking of plagiarism, with the apparent hybrid charge this term carries, contradicts the concept of textual coherence."
3. Allusion: This involves less literalism and overtness, but even the slightest effort on the part of the reader can lead to establishing a relationship between the current text and the text to which it is inspired, such that the former cannot be accurately understood without understanding the relationship between it and the latter. The second type: Paratext

It is "a generally less explicit and more extensive relationship that the text establishes within the literary work, with what we might call the parallel text, or paratexts, such as the title, the individual title, subtitles, introductions, appendices, notices, prefaces, footnotes, quotations, embellishments, drawings, dedications, acknowledgments, ribbons, and other types of secondary signs, written or other references that provide the text with a diverse medium."

A number of researchers and scholars in the field of semiotics, who view literary texts as a meaningful practice, have distinguished between two types of parallel texts or paratexts, dividing them as follows:

- Internal Paratext (Péritexte)
- External Paratext (Epitext)

The third type: Metatextuality

This is the relationship of interpretation and commentary that connects one text to another that discusses it, without citing or invoking it. It can even go so far as to not mention it... This relationship often takes on a critical character, and thus we can consider it a process of integrating the critical dimension into the structure of the literary text, by activating the level of writing about writing.

The fourth type: Hypertextuality

This is the type Genette specifically studied in his book "Plates." It refers to any relationship that brings together a text (B) (Hypertext) with a previous text (A) (Hypotext). Thus, text (A) is the original text, and text (B) is the branched or subsequent text. This relationship between the preceding and subsequent texts is either a transfer or an imitation of the original text. Genette developed a general concept for this, which he called "second-degree literature." While discussing the pattern of textual attachment in his book "Plates," Genette studied three types of these genres known in classical rhetorical literature:

- Parody: This relies on semantic transference, transforming serious topics into comic ones. Genette argues that it is a transfer of the subject, not the style.

- Travestissement: This relates to a transfer of the style, not the subject.

- Pastiche: While the first two types rely on a fundamental relationship between the preceding and subsequent texts, namely the transference relationship, the third type is based—as is clear—on a mimetic relationship, under which Genette also includes comic exaggeration. The Fifth Pattern: Textual Architecture

This is the most abstract and inclusive pattern. It is a deafening relationship, taking on a paradoxical dimension, and is linked to the genre (poetry-novel), i.e., the literary genre to which a text belongs. Distinguishing between literary genres helps guide the reader's horizon of expectations during the reading process.

From here, it becomes clear to us from the above that, despite their differences, these patterns have close relationships, as if they were a network of textual relationships. Perhaps the most important feature of Genette's formulation of transcendentalism is that he attempted, as much as possible, to capture all the relationships that texts can establish with each other. His work was also characterized by precision and methodology. This conceptual apparatus he formulated removed much of the ambiguity and confusion that had surrounded the concept of intertextuality and its critical practice.

CONCLUSION

Terms expressing the idea of textual transcendentalism have proliferated in the French critical field. This resonance was noticeable, even immediate, in the writings of French critics in particular. It can be noted that the aesthetic distance between the initial emergence of the terms and the French audience in this field was an aesthetic distance expressing the recipient's awareness of the axes of discussion surrounding each term and its philosophical dimensions. We witnessed this in the various stages of the research, particularly with Bakhtin's term "dialogica," which was received remarkably positively by critics. This demonstrated the awareness of French recipient commentators of the magnitude of the critical issue, despite the growth of the idea of textual transcendence until it reached its full form in Gérard Gibet's five axes. This development and identification with the initial term by Bakhtin, through Kristeva and Barthes, only served to demonstrate these critics' awareness of the necessity of responding to critical terminology and its evolution.

In contrast, Arab critical studies have emerged in abundance in the field of Arab cultural criticism, and there is not enough space to present them here. However, it can be concluded that most of these studies rely on direct translation from French or English sources, and thus scholars rely on translations, which in turn do not reflect the extent of the product in the French source. The critical distance between the source and the Arab recipient can be described here as a long one, one that does not reflect the extent of true knowledge of the original concepts in their source. Therefore, we fall into the trap of the intermediate source.

REFERENCES

- Tzvetan, Todorov. Mikhail Bakhtin: The Dialogic Principle, translated by Fakhri Saleh, 2nd ed., Arab Institution for Studies and Publishing, Beirut, 1996, p. 5.
- Tzvetan, Todorov. Critique of Criticism, translated by Sami Suwaidan, revised by Lilian Suwaidan, 2nd ed., General Directorate of Cultural Affairs, Baghdad, 1986, p. 73.
- Tzvetan, Todorov. Mikhail Bakhtin: The Dialogic Principle, translated by Fakhri Saleh, p. 9.
- Ibid., p. 11.

- Al-Ahmad, Nahla. *Intertextual Interaction: Theory and Method*, 1st ed., General Authority for Cultural Palaces, Cairo, 2010, p. 98.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail. *The Narrative Discourse*, translated by Muhammad Barada, 1st ed., Dar Al-Fikr for Studies, Publishing and Distribution, Cairo, 1987, p. 18.
- Al-Bahrawi, Sayyid. *Sociology of Literature*, 1st ed., Egyptian International Publishing Company, Egypt, 1992, p. 50.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail. *The Narrative Discourse*, translated by Muhammad Barada, p. 14.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail. *Issues of Creative Art in Dostoevsky*, translated by Jamil Nassif al-Tikriti, 1st ed., General Directorate of Cultural Affairs, Baghdad, 1986, p. 269.
- Lahmidani, Hamid. *Reading and the Generation of Meaning: Changing Our Habits in Reading Literary Texts*, 2nd ed., Arab Cultural Center, Beirut, 2007, p. 22.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail. *The Narrative Discourse*, translated by Muhammad Barada, p. 15.
- Tzvetan, Todorov. *Mikhail Bakhtin: The Dialogic Principle*, translated by Fakhri Saleh, p. 10.
- Biegi, Nathalie-Gross. *Introduction to Intertextuality*, translated by Abdul Hamid Bourayou, 1st ed., Ninawa House for Studies, Publishing, and Distribution, Damascus, 2012, p. 34.
- Tzvetan, Todorov. *Mikhail Bakhtin's Dialogic Principle*, translated by Fakhri Saleh, p. 122.
- Tzvetan, Todorov. *Poetics*, translated by Shukri Al-Mabkhout and Raja Ben Salama, 2nd ed., Toubkal Publishing House, Casablanca, 1990, p. 41.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail. *The Novelistic Discourse*, translated by Muhammad Barada, p. 18.
- Waad Allah, Lydia. *Cognitive Intertextuality in the Poetry of Izz al-Din al-Manasra*, 1st ed., Majlawi Publishing and Distribution House, Amman, 2005, p. 26.
- Lahmidani, Hamid. *Novel Criticism and Ideology: From the Sociology of the Novel to the Sociology of the Novelistic Text*, 1st ed., Arab Cultural Center, Beirut, 1990, p. 36.
- Angenot, Mark. *Intertextuality*, in the book *Horizons of Intertextuality: Concept and Perspective*, by a group of authors, translated by Muhammad Khair al-Baq'a'i, 1st ed., Jadawel Publishing, Translation, and Distribution, Beirut, 2013, p. 83.
- Al-Adwani, Mu'ajab. *Writing and Intertextual Erasure in the Novelistic Works of Raja Alem*, 1st ed., Arab Diffusion Foundation, Beirut, 2009, p. 13.
- Angenot, Mark. *Intertextuality*, in the book *Studies in Text and Intertextuality*, translated by Muhammad Khair al-Baq'a'i, 1st ed., Center for Civilizational Development, Aleppo, 1998, p. 58.
- Al-Ghadami, Abdullah. *Sin and Atonement: From Structuralism to Anatomy: A Theoretical Introduction and Applied Study*, 3rd ed., Dar Suad al-Sabah, Kuwait, 1993, p. 322.
- Biegi, Nathalie-Gross. *Introduction to Intertextuality*, translated by Abdul Hamid Bourayou, p. 16.
- Baqshi, Abdul Qadir. *Intertextuality in Critical and Rhetorical Discourse: A Theoretical and Applied Study*, p. 19.
- Bayoumi, Mustafa. *Intertextuality: Theory and Practice*, p. 29.
- Ibid.*, p. 21.
- See: Angino, Mark. *Intertextuality*, in *Studies in Text and Intertextuality*, translated by Muhammad Khair al-Baq'a'i, p. 55, with some modifications.
- Ibid.*, p. 66.
- Barthes, Roland. *Text Theory*, in *Studies in Text and Intertextuality*, translated by Muhammad Khair al-Baq'a'i, 1st ed., Center for Civilizational Development, Aleppo, 1998, p. 38.
- Barthes, Roland. *Critique and Truth*, translated by Munther Ayachi, 1st ed., Center for Civilizational Development, Aleppo, 1994, p. 21.
- Barthes, Roland. *The Hiss of Language*, translated by Munther Ayachi, 1st ed., Center for Civilizational Development, Aleppo, 1999, p. 80.
- Hamad, Hassan Muhammad. *Intertextuality in the Arabic Novel: A Study of Selected Models*, p. 19.
- Hafez, Sabry. *The Horizon of Critical Discourse: Theoretical Studies and Applied Readings*, 1st ed., Dar Sharqiyat for Publishing and Distribution, Cairo, 1996, p. 52.
- Barthes, Roland. *Semiology*, translated by Abdel Salam Ben Abdelali, 3rd ed., Dar Toubkal for Publishing, Casablanca, 1993, p. 63.
- Angenot, Mark. *Intertextuality*, in *Studies in Text and Intertextuality*, translated by Muhammad Khair Al-Baqaei, p. 58.
- Tzvetan, Todorov. *Mikhail Bakhtin: The Dialogic Principle*, translated by Fakhri Saleh, p. 16.
- Tzvetan, Todorov. *Poetics*, translated by Shukri Al-Mabkhout and Raja Ben Salama, p. 42.

- Hamad, Hassan Muhammad. *Intertextuality in the Arabic Novel: A Study of Selected Models*, p. 12.
- Angenot, Mark. *Intertextuality*, in the book "Afaqat Al-Tanassa: Concept and Perspective," by a group of authors, translated by Muhammad Khair Al-Baqaei, p. 94.
- Nahem, Ahmed. *Intertextuality in the Poetry of the Pioneers: A Study*, p. 31.
- Abdul-Wahid, Omar. *Textual Attachment*, 58.
- Angeno, Mark. *Intertextuality*, in the book "Studies in Text and Intertextuality," translated by Muhammad Khair Al-Baqaei, Center for Civilizational Development - Aleppo, 1st ed., 1998, p. 72.
- Al-Ghadami, Abdullah. *Sin and Atonement: From Structuralism to Anatomy: A Theoretical Introduction and Applied Study*, p. 321.
- Khalil, Ibrahim. In *Literary Theory and Textual Science: Research and Readings*, 1st ed., Arab Scientific Publishers, Beirut, 2010, p. 105.
- Dubiazzi, Pierre Marc. *The Theory of Intertextuality*, translated by Al-Mukhtar Hasani, on the website of Fikr wa Naqd magazine. Full link: http://www.aljabriabed.net/n28_09hasani.htm
- Angeno, Mark. *Intertextuality*, in *Studies in Text and Intertextuality*, translated by Muhammad Khair al-Baqaei, p. 71.
- Ibid.*, p. 74.
- Baqshi, Abdul Qadir. *Intertextuality in Critical and Rhetorical Discourse: A Theoretical and Applied Study*, p. 20.
- Roger, Jerome. *Literary Criticism: Barthes, Eco, Genette, Bakhtin, Goldman, Lanson, Moron, Richard*, translated by Shakir Nasir al-Din, 1st ed., Dar al-Takween for Authorship, Translation, and Publishing, Damascus, 2013, p. 136.
- Waad Allah, Lydia. *Cognitive Intertextuality in the Poetry of Izz al-Din al-Manasra*, pp. 32-33.
- Waad Allah, Lydia. *Cognitive Intertextuality in the Poetry of Izz al-Din al-Manasra*, p. 33.
- Lahmidani, Hamid. *Reading and Generating Meaning: Changing Our Habits in Reading Literary Texts*, p. 27.
- Touma, Aziz. *The Concept of Intertextuality in Contemporary Critical Discourse*, Al-Rafid Magazine, Sharjah, Issue 31, March 2000, p. 21.
- See: Al-Manasra, Ezz El-Din. *Comparative Intertextuality: Towards an Interactive Spider-Manual Approach*, 1st ed., Majdalawi Publishing and Distribution House, Amman, 2006, pp. 153-154, adapted.
- Dubiazzi, Pierre Marc. *The Theory of Intertextuality*, translated by Al-Mukhtar Hasni, on the Fikr wa Naqd magazine's website. Full link: http://www.aljabriabed.net/n28_09hasani.htm
- See: Genette, Gerard. *Introduction to the Comprehensive Text*, translated by Abdul Rahman Ayoub, p. 90, adapted.
- Genette, Gerard. *Atras (Literature in the Second Class)*, translated by Al-Mukhtar Hasni, on the website of Fikr wa Naqd magazine. Full link: [http://www.aljabriabed.net/n16_11atras.\(2\).htm](http://www.aljabriabed.net/n16_11atras.(2).htm)
- Jaber Asfour's lecture "The Challenges of the Contemporary Arab Critic" on YouTube. Full link: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZZWPwWglvVw>
- Baqshi, Abdul Qadir. *Intertextuality in Critical and Rhetorical Discourse: A Theoretical and Applied Study*, p. 22.
- Ibid.*, p. 22.
- Adhrawi, Salima. *The Poetics of Intertextuality in the Arabic Novel: The Novel and History*, 1st ed., Ruya Publishing and Distribution, Cairo, 2012, pp. 78-79.
- Hamdawi, Jamil. *The Poetics of the Parallel Text: Thresholds of the Literary Text*, 1st ed., Dar Al-Maaref Publishing, Rabat, 2014, p. 9.
- See: Genette, Gerard. *Atras (Literature in the Second Class)*, translated by Al-Mukhtar Hasni, with some modifications.
- Baqshi, Abdul Qadir. *Intertextuality in Critical and Rhetorical Discourse: A Theoretical and Applied Study*, p. 22.
- Yaqtin, Saeed. *The Novel and Narrative Heritage for a New Awareness of Heritage*, pp. 43-44.
- Abdul Wahid, Omar. *Textual Attachment*, p. 72.
- Yaqtin, Saeed. *The Openness of the Narrative Text: Text and Context*, p. 97.