Intertextuality and Cognition

Behind the translator's knowledge and linguistic skills

Elyes DJIDJIK إلياس جيجيك

University of Boumerdès, Boumerdès, Algeria
l.djidjik@univ-boumerdes.dz

Abstract:

Any regular translator is generally considered bilingual, if not trilingual or polyglot; and trying to learn about his or her more-than-one language acquisition will certainly lead us to dealing with imitation: the most important process of skill-learning. As it is widely believed, more improved linguistic skills and further general knowledge - two main qualifications of a good translator - can only result from reading, practice, and experience. It is clear that both linguistic skills and general knowledge represent an input process, and reading, practice, and experience represent different sources for such inputs. This explains how cognition and learning can be connected. This makes me believe that most human learning – mainly language – is based on intertextuality since it is itself based on imitation. In this paper, I will try to give the concept of intertextuality a farther cognitive dimension rather than being merely related to literary criticism. This cognitive process is essential in the translation process and plays a crucial role in sharpening the translator's skills when he or she takes more care of the quality of his or her textual and informational sources in both source and target languages: the better books and texts he or she reads, the better linguistic - mainly writing - skills and more general knowledge he or she acquires. This will obviously help with improving the quality of his or her translation be it literary or scientific. The idea of giving such importance to intertextuality and taking advantage of it in translation stems basically from the assumption that translating is rewriting; subsequently, any kind of writing or rewriting is tightly related to the concept of intertextuality. Eventually, one question that must be posed here is whether translators, being students, teachers, or professionals, are even aware of this cognitive phenomenon so that they can develop both sensible and sensitive imitating skill which might make their reproduction read like a masterpiece rather than a literal translation.

Key words: Translation; Cognition; Intertextuality; Reading & Writing; Rewriting; Knowledge; Learning; Linguistic Skills.

Introduction

Suppose a translator is given Molière's[*] play *The Miser* (*L'avare* in French) to translate from its original version into Arabic. If this is the translator's first experience of translating a comedy, it will be such an inconvenient challenge to meet, and the final work will be seriously flawed. Methodologically speaking, since the translator is translating a comedy play into Arabic, he or she should first try to find a literature work which is akin to it. Eventually, he or she will find Al-Jahiz's[**] book *The Misers* (*Al-bukhalāʾ* in Arabic). Assumably, reading Al-Jahiz's work will tremendously help with the translation into Arabic. The reason behind that should be clear: *intertextuality*. Reading a model book for a later translation will undoubtedly and remarkably inspire the translator's mind and refresh his or her memory. For the translator is not a comedy writer himself or herself, it will be worth learning how a comedy sounds and reads in terms of vocabulary, structure, style, language, characters, and so forth. The translator will find himself or herself – perhaps subconsciously – forced to imitate some of those writing elements in order to fulfill his or her translation; their final work will be accomplished thanks to the translator's awareness of the similarities between the two works, i.e. the two works' intertextual aspect.

This paper aims to have a closer glance at the cognitive aspect of intertextuality in the translation activity as it has been seen as a mere production effect in literary criticism. The focus of this discipline when dealing with intertextuality is mostly on the written text and its relation(s) with the previous texts without pointing to its cognitive nature. The paper will be trying to reveal the dynamic connection that links learning, cognition, translation, and intertextuality all together. The research will fall in three parts: the first part will deal with learning and cognition. The second part will focus on learning and intertextuality; and as far as the third one is concerned, emphasis will be put on translation and intertextuality. Other issues will be discussed as well; such as translation and rewriting and how can the latter be related to intertextuality. Certainly, every part will have subheadings to give more details about its main point.

1. Learning and cognition

In this first part, I will try to demonstrate the link between learning and cognition and how their continuous functions are parallel with each other. Learning and cognition have been studied for many years mainly by psychologists, but have recently been given much attention by neuroscience with the significant advancement of technology. In fact, they are both complementary: the need to learn and the perception of any input is the only way to trigger cognition; and vice versa, cognition operates multiple processes to help the learning operation succeed. Learning is most of the time in the need of a second factor in order for it to proceed: imitation. Since my paper deals closely with the area of translation, I am shedding some light in the upcoming paragraphs on acquiring language skills and general knowledge which are part of our acquisitions and how they are supported by cognition and imitation. My claims and ideas will come under three subheadings: first, the cognitive aspect of learning; second, learning and imitation; and last, acquiring language skills and general knowledge.

1.1 Cognitive aspect of learning

According to Webster's New Universal Unabridged Dictionary, the term "cognition" is originally Latin (*cognition)*, which means Knowledge, and is used in English to mean: 1. The process of knowing and perceiving; perception. 2. The faculty of knowing; the act of acquiring an idea. 3. That which is known or perceived. It is also given a broader definition by Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English: cognition is the process of knowing, understanding, and learning something. It is clear that cognition is related to knowing, thinking, and learning; in other words, it is a brain-based process which can be stimulated by an input or piece of information to be dealt with. This is why in some disciplines, cognition is also termed "information-processing", and for this reason cognitive psychology is also called information-processing psychology since information can be synonym for knowledge (Glass & Holyoak, 1985:2).

Many experts have been interested in studying and understanding cognition. Seemingly, they all agree that it is of such complexity and effectiveness. This explains the diversity of their

theories, explications, and concepts. According to Foster (1966), Guilford (1959) identifies five operations of the human intellect: cognitive, memory, divergent thinking, convergent thinking, and evaluation. The cognitive factor or category within the operations dimension appears, for the most part, to concern the utilization of previous learning (Foster, 1966:7). The author mentions 13 processes identified by other investigators which would appear to fall within Guilford's cognitive category namely comprehension, application, reception of stimulus, acquisition of information, gaining information from the stimulus, assimilation, understanding, becoming aware of a problem, a concrete attitude, perceptual search, recognition, discrimination, and interpretation. He points out that 'some of these processes, however, such as "comprehension," "understanding," "interpretation," and "application" could conceivably be tested under circumstances which might require something new to be added or some change to be made.'(Foster, 1966: 8) Some state that "cognitive processes involve changes in the individual's thought, intelligence, and language," (Santrock, 1995:20) to reflect the dynamicity of this kind of human thoughtful intellect and that language is an important input to be cognitively processed. It becomes more obvious that cognition is behind the ability to learn.

Other researchers have tried to look outside of the human brain and connect its mechanism to the outside world. Stenberg and Pretz state that when talking about cognition at a representational level "it is more useful to think of representational-level thinking as emerging from the interaction between information processing capacities and the individual's social environment (2004:4). Carsetti points out that cognition (as well as natural language) has to be considered first of all as a peculiar function of active biosystems and that it results from complex interactions between the organism and its surroundings (2004:7). Sfard (2008) proposes to combine the terms *cognitive* and *communicational* to generate the new adjective *commognitive* and explains that "the term *commognition* was coined to stress that interpersonal communication and individual thinking are two faces of the same phenomenon (Ibid.:83, 262). For her, "the transition from cognition to commognition is not a mere replacement of one theory of human thinking with another. Commognitive research differs from both its predecessors, behaviorism and cognitivism, in its

epistemology, ontology, and methods: it is dialogical rather than monological; it makes away with time-honored splits between thinking and behavior, between thinking and speaking, and between discourses and their objects (or at least some of the objects); and it translates research on human development into the study of the growth of discourses (Ibid.:275).

What can be drawn from what has just been mentioned is that researchers believe that the environment – space of interaction and source of information – is the only stimulus for cognition; whereas knowledge and information are considered to be feeding ingredients in the process of learning, which is itself a fundamental dimension of cognitive work (Iandoli & Zollo, 2008: xix). This work is "promoted by brain operations that selectively respond to language input." (Mc Guiness, 2005:49) As Wimmer (2004:278) states – forming a basic hypothesis and paraphrasing a citation by I. Kant: "affects without cognitions are blind and cognitions without affects are empty."

1.2 Learning and imitation

It is quite noticeable that learning hinges in large part on imitation. Since learning is mostly related to schooling, it should be evident that pupils need their teacher to read the words for them first so that they can say them after him or her; the teacher must model the reading of a whole passage by reading it out loud and the pupils follow him or her along. This process of teaching (modeling) and learning (imitating) drags on for years during which students in different levels of learning are required to memorize passages – prose and poem – which will make them later on more capable of expressing themselves more fluently in both speaking and writing. Most skills – including speaking and writing – are learned either by imitating a model that is under observation or learned under the guidance of a model (Glass & Holyoak, 1985:86); in both ways the person is always learning in the presence of a model to learn from, which explains the source of knowledge that a person is able to acquire.

According to Sfard "imitation, which evidently is a natural human property, is (…) the only imaginable way to enter new discourse. The tendency to imitate others occurs hand in hand with the need to communicate, (…) it would often lead to what may appear as

the reversal of the "proper" order of learning (…). Imitation is not as simple a process as it may appear. No imitation is an exact reproduction of the model." (2008:250) The person will change, create, and innovate depending on the variety of the surroundings and environments he or she shares both knowledge and experiences with. Sfard goes on to stress that "modifications are inevitable in the process of individualization of routines. Knowing what to change and what to keep constant in the successive implementations is the secret of successful learning." (Ibid.:250) Though, some contend that "all this implies that failure and success in learning are shaped "from outside" not any less, sometimes even more, than they are shaped "from inside." (Ibid.:270) Thus, the outside affects the person's knowledge – and perhaps skills.

It is important to mention that imitation must be accompanied with practice. These two elements are necessary for knowledge to be learned and transmitted (Iandoli & Zollo, 2008:110); and speaking about more rhetorical skills, some say: "any art is learned partly by imitation and partly by practice" (Lamson et al., 1962: xiv); yet, this can also be true for any other regular skills. According to Fitts and Posner, skill learning goes through three phases: the cognitive phase, the associative phase, and the autonomous phase (Glass & Holyoak, 1985:86-87); meaning recognizing inputs, associating and linking inputs, then finally using them automatically to produce and create. The three phases through which the inputs go through indicate tacitly that skill learning requires a model to imitate, repetition, and guidance. However, what should be borne in mind is that imitation I am referring to in this paper is no perfect matching "because we are separate beings, because we inhabit separate bodies, we can never imitate anything exactly. We always transform what we imitate." (Robinson, 2003: 148)

1.3 Acquiring language skills and general knowledge

When talking about learning, one crucial question to be raised is "What is to be learned?". For a translator's activity, I believe that – in addition to translation strategies, methods, and techniques (Wills, 1996:154) - "two basic issues in translator behavior are (…) knowledge and skills (knowledge and experience). They are the pillars of information-processing procedures designed to determine the

conditions for situationally adequate translation processes and to substantiate them evaluatively." (Ibid.:37) In translation, three main different spheres are crossing: language, knowledge, skills – mainly language skills. Basically, any brain activity is considered cognitive and all what a human being says and writes is a thoughtful production. Thoughts are brain-borne and language is the words – in different patterns and combinations - used to express those ideas either in a spoken or written form. This clearly states that human - both written and spoken - productions are cognitive. Language is part of our knowledge, but, paradoxically, it is the most vital part that shapes our knowledge. This would not be confusing at all if we compare it to the brain in our body: the smaller and more fragile something is does not necessarily mean the less important it is. Knowledge includes everything we understand and learn about ourselves, other people, and the world in a massive space of endless interactions; and over years, people have been writing all what they know about life, the world, and universe using language.

Language has always been studied through the lens of research in different fields mainly linguistics, sociology, and psychology and other related disciplines. It is widely believed that human language is the most effective means of interaction and communication (Santrock, 1995; Glass & Holyoak, 1985). It is also "thought to be the humans' most remarkable cognitive ability, and the ease of learning it is part of what is so fascinating about it; yet, language appears to be a more complicated system." (Glass & Holyoak, 1985:445). It is now common sense that acquiring a language and learning its skills such as speaking and writing require – in addition to healthy cognitive abilities and positive interaction with other individuals - time and repetition. In the case of learning a language through reading - but also true when it comes to speaking – Mikulecky & Jeffries mention that "research has shown that in order to learn a word, you must encounter it many times. Each time you see the word in context, you build up a stronger sense of its meaning. The best way to increase the number of encounters with words and to learn how words are used is by reading extensively" and recommend that the reader should analyze the word and use it in both speaking and writing (2007:31); this reflects the assumption which explains that the origin of our language knowledge does not stem from within or nothing but from an

outer source: other people we share the world with. We actually copy and imitate the use of words and their meanings from the context we hear or read from. This is why some believe that good readers make good writers and that reading helps students develop writing skills, while writing experience helps students become better readers. (Lee & Gundersen, 2001, 2004).

Knowing that language skills include listening, speaking, reading, writing skills (the four common) and that listening and reading were often grouped together because they are receptive skills, and that speaking and writing were placed together because they are productive skills (Nunan, 2015:77) since the two first represent input items while the two last represent output items, some experts in translation point out that translation is itself a skill and "has been classified as the so-called "fifth skill", thus complementing the four skills reading, writing, speaking, and listening." (Wills, 1996:147). However, they also remind translators that they "may each possess translation skills, but possess different amounts of them (…). Translation skills can therefore be said to vary to a large extent from one translator to the next." (Ibid.:150)

2. Learning and Intertextuality

Before tackling the three next subheadings of this second part of the paper, I would like to introduce it by an overview about "intertextuality" since it is the core of this research. "The notion of intertextuality has received increasing attention in discourse analysis and sociolinguistics, linguistic anthropology, communication, and related fields." (Gordan, 2009:5) Apart from the earliest definitions of intertextuality mainly Julia Kristeva's in the 1960s developing the idea that "a text is constructed out of already existent discourse. Authors do not create their texts from their own original minds, but rather compile them from preexistent texts" (Allen, Graham, 2000:35), Some see intertextuality as "interaction of discourses" (Simon, 1996:26) starting from "the most basic conceptualization of intertextuality-the idea that all texts and interactions are metaphorical mosaics, literally made up of bits of other prior texts and interactions." (Gordan, 2009: 194) others state that writing in response to the work of others and interplaying ideas can also be called literarily "intertextuality" and that this is one reason why "almost all academic

essays and books contain within them the visible traces of other texts- in the form of notes, quotations, citations, charts, figures, illustrations, and the like." (Harris' 2006: 1-2)

My view in terms of finding a more appropriate perspective on intertextuality is that this concept is merely one aspect - among many others - of what is called "mimesis" based on influence and imitation. Some contend that some key terms such as influence, imitation, allusion, and pastiche diverge from the more general concept of intertextuality (Boyd & Palmer, 2006:7). Admittedly, they all seem connected to one concept; but knowing that intertextuality is mainly related to "text" - the root from which it was first generated, it would be clearer that this term is itself representing one aspect of a much broader notion: "mimesis". The idea was first suggested by Plato in the 4th century B.C. "For Plato, the painter is akin to a person holding up a mirror to nature. Mimesis, then, refers here to imitation without artistic intervention or conceptualization." (Mansfield, 2007:9) Looking up the word "mimesis" in Webster's New Universal Unabridged Dictionary will help us learn that it is originally Greek (*mimêsis)* and means imitation. We also learn that the word "mimesis" keeps the same meaning in English (imitation); specifically, (a) in art and literature: imitation or representation, especially of speech, behavior, etc.; (b) in biology, mimicry: close resemblance of one organism to another or to some object in its environment, as of some insects to the leaves or twigs of plants.

"In current English usage, "mimesis" generally denotes imitation through words, actions, sounds, or imagery. But in antiquity, the term referred to a more complex mode of representation. Not simply the imitation of something or someone, mimetic representation involved generalizing, modifying, or idealizing observed reality ((…)). Based on an accurate depiction of something seen in nature, mimesis depended further upon the artist's memory, biases, habits, and imagination. In this way, mimesis differed importantly from straightforward copying or imitation." (Mansfield, 2007:8)

The term has been used more in literary criticism, and many critics believe that it is the essence of any literary work. Klimovitch states: "if a piece of writing doesn't have this quality (intertextuality), it has no chances to be excepted into the world of literature.

Consequently, intertextuality is the quality of the literary text and represents the ability of a text to accumulate information not only directly from the personal experience, but also indirectly from other texts." (2014: 256) Undoubtedly, the focus here is on literary texts, and Klimovich is not excluding other types of text but he rather has literary ones come first for their linguistic richness. In this paper though, intertextuality is seen as internal and deep in mind rather than external out in texts, and some effort is put to generalize the use of the term and take advantage of it in the field of translation.

2.1 Cognitive aspect of intertextuality

As I mentioned earlier, the term "intertextuality" is specifically connected to literature - the realm of text. Hence, reading a given text or producing it requires the use of thinking: cognitive activity. The cognitive process of reading for example - but also writing - includes both skills and strategies: determining relative importance of information, comparing and contrasting, noticing similarities and differences, and drawing conclusions which are believed to be key thinking skills while previewing, predicting, summarizing, visualizing, connecting, and questioning are strategies (Gunning, 2010:1). Obviously, writing relies on intertextuality; yet, since reading and writing are tightly interwoven, it will be possible to claim that reading is intertextual as well. It is also plausible then to consider intertextuality to be cognitive.

What has just been said comes from the assumption that "in a great number of reading situations - probably even the majority of reading situations - readers do not produce a written text, at least not immediately or directly. But even in those situations in which readers do not write, they are still constructing a meaning, a meaning consistent with their understanding of "cues" provided by the text, their prior experiences with similar texts, their knowledge about the world, and the social constraints and cultural expectations of that world." (Haas, 1993:21) Arguably, both meaning and making meaning form the basis of all kinds of discourse in different interactions (Gordan, 2009). In an act as cognitively complex as reading (Haas, 1993:22; Sternberg & Pretz, 2004:12), intertextuality happens within the brain way before it happens on paper for it is a cognitive process.

Because both imitation and intertextuality are somehow two sides of the same coin, it is worth sharing that some "newly discovered "mirror neurons" seem to underlie the human ability to imitate other people - this approach views all the uniquely human capacities as resulting from the fundamental fact that humans are social beings, engaged in collective activities from the day they are born and throughout their lives." (Sfard, 2008:79) Therefore, imitation and intertextuality are cognitive and depend on what a person can remember - just like any "cognitive skill you might think of depends in some way on using information stored in memory (Glass & Holyoak, 1985:5).

2.2 Intertextual aspect of reading and writing

"There are four distinct 'levels' of language use that build together to create "language" as we know it: words, statements, text, and context. Words, statements, and text can both be heard and read" (Allen, 2004: 10). Though inputs come from both spoken or written language, I am focusing in this part on reading. Many studies point to the relationship between writing, imitation, and reading - subsequently, intertextuality. Relying on teaching experience and investigation, Stuart states: "reading has played an important role in the writing classroom because we believe that students can learn about writing through imitating models of well wrought prose." (1993: 34) Knowing that style is of such importance in writing, when for instance "a teacher decides to expand students' stylistic options by presenting Christensen's generative stylistics, one way to pass the cumulative pattern along is to have students imitate the sentences Christensen singles out, require them to generate sentences that fit the pattern, and then require them to produce such sentences in their own prose." (Rose, 1984: 97) This will be clearly an indirect intertextuality behind a direct imitation. Besides, such intertextuality may mean that even a work which is now scarcely ever read is still influencing the language in which we shape our ideas (Pirie, 1985:103). Nevertheless, this could not happen if there is lack of focus and understanding "because comprehension is a constructive process in which students create meaning based on their background knowledge," (Gunning, 2010:1). While Gunning explains the reason behind designing his book *Reading Comprehension Boosters*: it "has been designed to build

background knowledge." (Ibid.: 1), I assume he refers - perhaps subconsciously - to intertextuality in reading by stating three basic connections students do while reading, which seems clearly that these connections - another name given here to intertextuality- are cognitive: "text to text, text to self, and text to world. *Text-to-text connections* might consist of a connection made between two events or characters in a story or in the same article or connections made between a text being read now and one read in the past. The connection could also be to a TV show, movie, or Web site. The text could be visual or auditory or a combination. *Text-to-self connections* are those in which the reader makes a connection to an event, situation, or person in his or her life. *Text-to-world connections* are connections made between a text that is being read and something that is happening in the world. and he believes that making these connections "deepens students' comprehension and, if the connection is to: something in their lives, personalizes it." (Ibid.:4).

2.3 General knowledge and intertextuality

"The process of *socialization* is the means through which individuals acquire new tacit knowledge through shared experiences and processes of imitation (Iandoli & Zollo, 2008:103). Sharing experiences and imitating are two major factors of intertextual phenomena and "imitation implies detection of similarities between self and other." (Zahavi, 2005: 209); this can assumably explain how people acquire some knowledge about themselves as well as about others in an intertextual space.

A person's knowledge "comes primarily from three sources: themselves, other people, and such resources as books, films, magazines, television, and newspapers" (Pearson & Nelson, 1994:238). Also, "family and friends, books and magazines, films and television programmes, popular songs and advertisements are obvious influences; but think too of the structures within which you have met or made the various statements that you can understand and imitate." (Pirie, 1985:39) Knowledge does not exist objectively in the world (literally in the 'objects' that claims represent). Rather, it is created intersubjectively, that is, between people such as authors and their audiences (known, technically, as 'subjects'). Knowledge (consisting of claims and their relationships) does have an objective element,

since it represents, in another form, the actual reality of objects. However, the medium of that representation-the form in which knowledge is expressed-is language," (Allen, 2004: 121) for him Knowledge is said to be intersubjective (Ibid.: 179-180); such thought had already been stated by Julia Cristiva using the notion of "intertextual knowledge" (Eco, 1979:21).

Pearson and Nelson define communication "as the process of understanding and sharing meaning" (Pearson & Nelson, 1994:6) ; it is perhaps the same notion that Gordan wants to express through "making meaning" stating that different interdisciplinary fields such as linguistics, cognitive linguistics, Cultural anthropology, psychology, interactional sociolinguistics, and discourse analysis have been considering the process of meaning-making and proposing various assumptions and explanations but "meaning-making-whether it is analyzed through the lens of framing, conceptual blending, or another theory-crucially depends on prior experience and our abilities to remember, reshape, and create and recognize patterns. Meaning-making is thus inextricably interconnected with intertextuality." (Gordan, 2009:190) Pearson and Nelson believe that "even when we talk to ourselves, communication involves other people" by explaining that "the self we know is largely learned from others." (Pearson & Nelson, 1994:10) They are, perhaps unconsciously, referring to the idea that even self is considered intertextual since it builds up on interacting with others and that knowledge - being intertextual - expands thanks to communicating with them.

3. Translation and Intertextuality

This third - and last - part of the paper will be devoted to focusing on intertextuality from the perspective of translation. It will come in four parts: firstly, cognitive aspect of translation; secondly, intertextuality in translation; thirdly, Translation, rewriting and intertextuality; and lastly, reading and the translator's writing skill. Talking about intertextuality and translation will systematically include reading and writing because one is the reason for intertextuality and the other is its consequence. Furthermore, writing in translation is not a regular task since it must match a source text and it is entirely the translator's creation; however, some cognitive reactions to the text will affect its originality and the translator will

take part in the creation of the new text. This is why I will include the concept of rewriting. Intertextuality will have, of course, depending on the previous two parts the idea of imitation, for the translators' work "involves a great deal of imitation." (Robinson, 2003: 277)

3.1 Cognitive aspect of translation

It would be obvious that what is true for language is true for translation as well since the latter is the outcome of the crossing of two languages and viewed as a cognitive process which, broadly speaking, helps render the meaning of spoken or written language into another language. Yet, more precisely, translation deals only with written texts, and when it comes to spoken language, the term 'interpreting' is used instead (Dubois et al., 2002:486). Because in the field of translation there is always a difference between these two concepts, I should mention that in this paper translation is given a more written aspect rather than a spoken one.

Classical linguistics - for some - gave shallower analysis and description to translation processes; they used to be considered mundane. Now, translation is mainly seen much more differently from the literal standpoint. It is part of literature, and any piece of translation is a piece of literature; in fact, it is most of the time the heart of universal literature, for almost all cultures and nations of the world are sharing literature through this only channel. This stems from the fact that "all humans share a common reality and appear, through the words they use when properly translated, to have a common language to discuss and think about it." (Allen, 2004: 121) and being material with which we are reasoning, language is a cognitive process that has several subtleties and complexities (Ibid.: 10). This does not mean language is a problem to solve; on the contrary, it is powerful since it connects people from different parts of the world even if they speak different languages. This is possible because language is translatable. More accurately, there is no translation if there is no variety in languages: the variety seems to be a problem and translation is the solution. It is the genius of the human being which makes it possible to communicate between two or more completely different tongues, genius is brain-borne. In fact, "all our abilities – perceiving, remembering, reasoning, and many others- are organized into a complex system, the overall function of which is termed *cognition,*"

(Glass & Holyoak, 1985:2) this means that language skills which we use to communicate – among which translation belongs – are cognitive.

Some describe the translation activity as "intelligent activity" (Robinson, 2003) others as "behavior" (Wills, 1996) this is because it is a cognitive activity. Mind as a complex system that is able to process and choose incoming information (input) while transforming and making decisions about them (output) (Iandoli & Zollo, 2008:27), the translator can make decisions about what he or she reads and what he or she writes; more importantly, he or she can make decisions about how to read and how to translate: the process that is called "interpretation". It all depends on the translator's background knowledge. The translator, being a reader of the text to be translated, can truly understand the source text by using their storage of encyclopedic-knowledge which is intertextual knowledge (Eco, 1979:21). Stating some inferences by intertextual frames, Umberto Eco believes that "no text is read independently of the readers' experience of other texts reusing Kristiva's term "Intertextual Knowledge" (Ibid.:21). Wills thinks that "any practicing translator knows, of course, that translation involves more than just "reproduction". "Reproduction" is merely the final stage of a chain of mental operations in which processes of analysis, interpretation, comparison, analogizing, inferencing, weighing of possibilities, planning, combining, routinization, problem-solving, etc. all these operations are cognitive (Wills, 1996:43), while Robinson seems more skeptical and believes that translation is an intelligent activity involving complex processes of conscious and unconscious learning (Robison,2003:49). Moreover, it is uncertain that most translators are aware of the effects of language – perhaps languages in case of translation – on our thinking assuming that "language reflects and influences thought." (Murphy, 1993:8)

3.2 Intertextuality in translation

So far, we have come to deduce that intertextuality is part of every individual's thinking, knowing, and interacting: "repeating words, phrases, paralinguistic features, and speech acts across interactions serves as a means of creating meanings" and is one aspect of "what has been called intertextuality." (Gordan, 2009:5) Cynthia

Gordan, being a sociolinguist, concludes that everyday discourse and conversations are based on repetition which she calls "intertextual repetition" and that "intertextuality is a fundamental component of making and layering the subtle meanings composed in everyday talk." (2009:190)

"In the case of intertextual repetition, "shared background knowledge" refers to not only general cultural knowledge but also specific shared prior interactive experiences that interlocutors (and the analyst) are able to recall and relate to a new context. This differs from other ways of understanding the creation of intertextuality; for instance, other research demonstrates how intertextuality is created through genre features (Briggs & Bauman1992; Fairclough 1992); through shared narrative theme, evaluation, point, and style (Schiffrin 2000); through quoting (Matoesian 1999); through the replaying of recorded interactions (Matoesian 2000); and even through undertaking particular actions (Tovares 2005; Al Zidjaly 2006; Scollon 2007). However, viewing intertextuality as created through the intertextual repetition of shared prior text is compatible with these studies; all fit into the idea that texts are not isolated but interrelated and composed of bits of other (prior) texts and into the theme that intertextuality is fundamental in the creation and negotiation of meanings (Gordan, 2009:191).

In his Encyclopedia of Ancient Literature, Cook (2008) lists a myriad of ancient names of writers, poets, and playwrights who borrowed from others' works or imitated each other either within the same nation and period of time or different ones, such as the Roman playwrights imitating the Greek comedies. In such case, intertextuality is a factor in nurturing creativity in both literature and translation for "creativity and invention cannot emerge in a vacuum. They are the products of the past, of the capacity to reinterpret and reevaluate an ambiguous and contradictory past with a critical eye, and of the capacity to accumulate knowledge, and the courage to have doubts about it." (Iandoli & Zollo, 2008: 72) I assume that this would not be hard for translators since they are supposed to be "voracious and omnivorous readers, people who are typically in the middle of four books at once, in several languages, fiction and nonfiction, technical and humanistic subjects, anything and everything. They are hungry for real-world experience as well, through travel, living abroad for

extended periods, learning foreign languages and cultures, and above all paying attention to how people use language all around them: the plumber, the kids' teachers, the convenience store clerk, the doctor, the bartender, friends and colleagues from this or that region or social class, and so on." (Robison,2003:23).

Some claim that intertextuality come in three types: obligatory, optional, and accidental (Fitzsimmons, 2013). The last one occurs when the writer is unaware of it and does not mean to use it as a strategy while the two first occur with the writer's awareness. In case of obligatory intertextuality, the writer has no other option but to imitate or borrow; but in the optional one, it is the writer's decision to or not to proceed with the strategy. This is not the only case where the writer or translator can make a decision: the choice of words, style, metaphors, sentence structure, and many others represent the writer's or translator's choice. Hence, translators should not hesitate to intertextualize their work since they have plenty of choices to what to or not to imitate, and just like Duglas Robinson states: "to be a good translator, I need experiential exposure to and creative and imitative command of expressive modes, styles, registers, idiolects and sociolects, jargons, argots; cultures, subcultures, intercultures; people, interpersonal communication, human motivation; ideas, arguments, theses, philosophies; mythologies and traditional imageries; belief structures, conventions, traditions, norms; and when I imitate them, it's *me* doing it, not somebody else." (Robinson, 2001:163)

3.3 Translation, rewriting and intertextuality

According to Webster's New Universal Unabridged Dictionary, the word "rewriting" is 1. To write again. 2. To write in different words or a different form; to revise (correction, editing). 3. In journalism, to write news turned in by a reporter in a form suitable for publication. Whereas Longman Dictionary gives the most commonly used meaning: to change something that has been written, especially in order to improve it, or because new information is available (syn. *revise*). Both dictionaries agree on the meaning of writing in different words or different form. Authors and writers use this term in different ways; yet, they generally refer to the previous most common meaning: correcting and changing. In his book *Rewriting History* which is a corrective reaction to Senator Hillary Clinton's book *Living History*,

Moriss uses the word "rewriting" as changing and revising not the textual or stylistic part but the historical one. The author criticizes the previous book for not revealing much of her real personality and says about *his* book: "*Rewriting History* offers a kind of annotation of Hillary 's memoir, to tell more of the story she hides and the facts she omits. For much of *Living History* is not history, and much of Hillary 's history is not in her book." (2004:1)

The term "rewriting" is fundamentally related to sacred texts; the terms 'primary text' and 'secondary text' (Pirie, 1985 :36) can be used to refer respectively to 'Source text' and 'rewritten text' (De Troyer, 2003:1). A great deal of discussion has been said and written regarding rewritten sacred texts such as *Biblical Antiques* which dates from the first century of the Common Era and was written Jewish Palestine. In his book, Murphy tries to defend Pseudo-Philo's book's genre by stating that his work is not meant to replace the biblical text: "Pseudo-Philo builds a new narrative on the foundation of the biblical stories, using other traditional materials as well. The new narrative has a life of its own and does not just clear up inconsistencies in the biblical account or preserve various traditions (…) Using traditional stories that he assumes his audience already knows, Pseudo-Philo enables readers to experience them in new ways." (Murphy,1993:5). Murphy entitled his book *Pseudo-Philo: Rewriting the Bible*, trying to match Vermes's categorization of Pseudo-Philo's work as "rewritten Bible" by finding suitable explanation to the chosen term in Herrington's definition: "The expression "rewritten Bible" is used simply to refer to those products of Palestinian Judaism at the turn of the era that take as their literary framework the flow of the biblical text itself and apparently have as their major purpose the clarification and actualization of the biblical story." (Ibid.:5) It seems then that the term rewriting is used here to mean clarification and actualization rather than modification or distortion. Yet, surprisingly, the author himself starts out his introduction by saying: "The *Biblical Antiquities* of Pseudo-Philo retells the Hebrew Bible from Adam to the death of Saul. Its retelling is quite free and extensive. It does quote the biblical text at times, but more often it paraphrases, condenses, summarizes, omits material, and adds much that has little or no corresponding material in the Bible. Many of the additions take the form of speeches, prayers, and conversations among the characters." (Ibid.:3) This is

quite confusing, but we can assumably admit that Pseudo-Philo's rewriting is not a mere copy of the original text; in fact, it is the same content in a new fresher style. It does not distort the message but changes the text just like translation. This is why some like to call translation "rewriting"; mainly when it is not a literal one: "The process of rewriting is also visible in translations (…) When it comes to ancient and modern translations of the biblical text, two extreme positions can be taken: a translation can be literal and faithful to the source text or free and respectful of the target text (De Troyer, 2003:5). Still, the two terms are distinguished at times from one another, and De Troyer uses rewriting in translation as a result of interpretation: "The Greek translator of the Hebrew biblical book of Esther not only translated the book but also interpreted the book. Whereas God seems to be absent in the Hebrew book, the translator created a Greek story in which God plays a prominent role. In the Old Greek of Esther, it is God who will save the Jews. The Greek translator has rewritten the biblical Hebrew book of Esther (…) The Greek translator of the Hebrew book of Esther not only translated but also rewrote the sacred Hebrew text. (Ibid: 27, 127) This kind of translation leads obviously to a new reading of the book of Esther.

The term can be looked at from another angle. in Harris view "rewriting" is intertextual for it means "drawing from, commenting on, adding to the work of others". He also insists on the fact that rewriting a text is somehow tampering with it. The author states explicitly why he has opted for the term and, actually, entitled his book so: "rewriting I value has nothing to do with simply copying or reciting the work of others. Quite the contrary, my goal is to show you some ways of *using* their texts for your purposes. The reason I call this *rewriting* is to point to a generative paradox of academic work: Like all writers, intellectuals need to say something new and say it well. But unlike many other writers, what intellectuals have to say is bound up inextricably with the books we are reading, the movies we are watching, the music we are listening to, and the ideas of the people we are talking with. Our creativity thus has its roots in the work of others- in response, reuse, and rewriting." (Harris, 2006:2). It is clear that he not only justifies the use of the term but also binds "intertextuality" and "rewriting" together, then later he goes on further with the notion and notes that rewriting a text is exactly "translating its language into

your own" (Ibid., 2006:5) since for him translation is rewriting. This will lead us to say that translation is intertextual writing (rewriting) since writing in literature, which certainly includes translation, is an infinite process of rereading and rewriting; any new understanding to a given text leads to a new interpretation, and then to a new writing (rewriting). By giving the example of the biblical text, De Troyer says it "is the result of a continuous process of redactional activity. Literature produced by one person, group, or school was reread and rewritten by later readers and writers." (De Troyer, 2003:1) This is why he suggests that "literary criticism and redaction criticism should take into account the results of a renewed text criticism." (Ibid. 127)

3.4 Reading and the translator's writing skill

Translators are readers and writers; and mostly being readers before being writers as they must read a given text before they translate it and put it down in a written form. Lamson states: "it should be evident that there is a relation between the art of reading and the art of writing" and "any art is learned partly by imitation and partly by practice." (Lamson et al., 1962: xiv) Reading is an important cognitive skill (Sternberg & Pretz, 2005:12, 309) and it is "a complex activity that involves a wide variety of skills. Your ability to understand and remember what you read depends in large part on your ability to apply these skills to your reading. (Mikulecky & Jeffries, 2007:VI) part of these skills depends on background knowledge; a vast amount of knowledge (Glass & Holyoak, 1985:5) that is itself based on intertextuality, i.e. background knowledge and intersubjectivity (Allen: 2004).

Perhaps many writers and readers admit that "the purpose of most literature is to give pleasure' (Lamson et al., 1962: xiv), but uncovering the reader's brain will make it obvious that a subconscious cognitive process is always happening; and according to expert Stephen Krashen, University of Southern California, "reading for pleasure is the major source of our reading competence, our vocabulary and our ability to handle complex grammatical constructions." (Mikulecky & Jeffries, 2007:3). Additionally, as some other experts claim, extensive reading can help the reader a lot with reading faster, increasing their vocabulary, improving their grammar and their writing skills as well as gaining a broader knowledge of the

world (Mikulecky & Jeffries, 2007:vi, 2). This is the reason for calling some reading tasks "reading-to-write" tasks and they help build endless relationships with a massive number of different texts. "These reading-to-write tasks are familiar in academic settings: students respond to literary texts … synthesize disparate texts in science classes, analyze theoretical texts in history classes. Many of their exams include short answers or essay questions that draw explicitly and directly (some might say *too* explicitly and directly) from assigned readings. In such tasks students of all ages build upon, and depart from, texts they have read as they compose their own texts. In one sense, any document a writer produces can be seen as the product of innumerable historically previous texts, as writers write and readers read in an "intertextual space" (Porter, 1986) of ongoing meaning-making. (Haas, 1993:21)

Some studies focus on the idea which states that the ability to read well and critically depends on both what is read and how it is read; thus, for them, many student readers fail to be good or critical readers for they do not 'pay attention to those elements of language, imagery, and form; of style, scope, approach to material, attitude, proportion, and emphasis which reveal "the intention" of the work' (Lamson et al., 1962: xiii-xiv) Translators ought to get involved in the same process for they are themselves both readers and writers at the very same time. "writing is not simply a series of actions, but a series of decisions -a thinking process. Notice that when we speak here of "writing processes," we are referring not to overt actions or stages such as outlining or editing, but to the cognitive processes of setting goals, choosing strategies." (Penrose & Sticko, 1993: 8) This makes reading tasks and assignments play an overwhelming role in the writing classroom since it is believed that students will be more capable of producing better pieces of writing through imitating models of selected well wrought prose (Stuart, 1993: 34). But even if some might say: "be the process of imitation as thoughtful as it may, it rarely succeeds in the first trial," (Sfard, 2008:250) repetition will be necessary. "A number of recent experiments have shown that repetition can improve memory performance even when people are not deliberately trying to remember the input (Glass & Holyoak, 1985:269).

Conclusion

As it had been assumed before starting working on this thematic area, the translator's activity is - not only believed but proven to be - a cognitive process, and anything related to it will naturally be cognitive as well. This mental activity, which itself requires cognitive abilities to transmit meaning or a message from one language to another, depends in large part on language skills and background knowledge - apart from method, techniques, and strategies. These two important elements are primarily based on another dynamic cognitive process: "intertextuality". At one end of the translation process, part of the translator's knowledge and language skills are intertextual with the source language; and at the other end, part of their knowledge and language skills are intertextual with the target language. The translator's - and all people's - language skills and knowledge are intertextual since they are learned and acquired from others through continuous imitation and interaction. Most importantly, imitation does not kill creativity; they always run in parallel with each other: learning and creativity are the fundamental dimensions of cognitive work (Iandoli & Zollo, 2008:110, xix).

Thus, the translator's cognition is controlling all inputs and outputs and making them part of the whole cognitive process within which - as it has become obvious - intertextuality in its three different aspects (obligatory, optional, accidental) plays a prominent role in shaping the translator's creativity. However, being aware of the phenomenon, translators will take better care of their intertextual knowledge and intertextual linguistic skills by selecting what to imitate and what to eliminate, i.e. they will be more capable of controlling their cognitive intertextuality by selecting what to read and how to write; just like writers: some investigators "have uncovered some of the complex cognitive processes writers employ as they write and revise. Writers search and organize their prior knowledge; they set goals for their texts and test their developing draft against their goals" (Bowen, 1993:189). Translating, reading, writing, imitating, and intertextuality are all cognitive processes and inextricably interwoven together, and together are crucial and inevitable in the translation activity. It is up to the translator to make good use of them all to be himself or herself a masterpiece writer.

Notes:

- *Molière (1622 -1673 Paris) French actor, writer, and playwright.

- **Al-Jahiz (776-868/869, Basra) Iraqi theologian, intellectual, and litterateur.

References

- Allen, G. (2000) Intertextuality, Routledge: New York & London

- Allen, M., Smart Thinking: skills for critical understanding and writing, 2004, 2nd ed, Oxford University press: New York

- Bowen, B. A. (1993) Using Conferences to Support the Writing process, in *Hearing Ourselves Think: Cognitive Research in the College Writing Class, Ann M. Penrose and Barbara M. Sticko*, ed., Oxford University Press

- Boyd, D. & Palmer, R. B. (2006) After Hitchcock: influence, imitation, and intertextuality edited by David Boyd and R. Barton Palmer. by the University of Texas Press: Austin, USA

- Carsetti, A. (2004) Seeing, Thinking and Knowing, Kluwer Academic Publishers: Netherlands, USA

- Cook, J. W. (2008), Encyclopedia of Ancient Literature, facts On File, Inc., New York: USA

- 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

- Dubois et al. (2002) Dictionnaire de Linguistique, Larousse : Paris, France

- Eco, U. (1979) the Role of the Reader, Indiana university press: USA

- Fitzsimmons, J. (2013). Romantic and contemporary poetry: readings. Retrieved from CQUniversity e-courses, LITR19049 - Romantic and Contemporary Poetry, http://moodle.cqu.edu.au

- Foster, H. (1966) Categories of Cognitive Skills, Center FOR THE study of Evaluation of instructional prorgams, California Univ., Los Angeles: USA

- Glass, A. L. & Holyoak, K. J. (1985) Cognition, Random House: USA

- Gordan, C. (2009), Making Meanings, Creating Family: Intertextuality and Framing in family Interaction, Oxford Univetsity Press: New York

- Greene, S. (1993), Exploring the Relationship Between Authorship and Writing in Hearing ourselves think, Penrose & Sticko (eds.), Oxford University Press: New York

- Gunning, T. G. (2010) Reading Comprehension Boosters, Jossey-Bass A Wiley Imprint: USA

- Haas, C. (1993) Beyond "Just the Facts": Reading as Rhetorical Action in Hearing ourselves think, Penrose & Sticko (eds.), Oxford University Press: New York

- Iandoli, L. & Zollo, G. (2008) Organizational Cognition and Learning, , 1st ed, Information Science Publishing, Hershy, New York: USA

- Klimovich, N. V., Phenomenon of Intertextuality in Translation Studies, Journal of Siberian Federal University. Humanities & Social Sciences 2 (2014 7) 255-264

- Lamson, R. et al., (1962) The Critical Reader: Essay, Stories, Poems, WW. Norton & Company, Inc.: New York

- Lee, L. & Gundersen, E. (2001) Select readings: intermediate, Oxford University Press: New York

- Lee, L. & Gundersen, E. (2004) Select readings: upper-intermediate, Oxford University Press: New York

- Longman dictionary of contemporary English new edition, (2009) Pearson- Longman: England

- Mansfield, E. C. (2007) Too beautiful to picture: Zeuxis, myth, and mimesis, the University of Minnesota Press: USA

- McGuinness, D. (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.

- Mikulecky, B. S. & Jeffries, L. (2007) Advanced Reading Power, Pearson Education: New York.

- Nunan, D. (2015) Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages: an introduction, Routledge: New York & London.

- Pearson, J. C. & Nelson, P. E. (1994), Understanding & Sharing: an Introduction to Communication, 6th edition, Brown & Benchmark: USA

- Pirie, B. D. (1985) How to Write Critical Essays: A Guide for Students of Literature, Routledge: London & New York

- Robinson, D. (2001) Who Translats?, State University Of New York Press, Albany: USA

- Robinson, D. (2003) Becomimg a Translator, Routledge: London and New York

- Rose, M. (1984) Writer's Block: The Cognitive Dimension. Studies in Writing & Rhetoric, Southern Illinois University Press: USA

- Santrock, J. W. (1995) Life-Span Development, 6th ed., Brown & Benchmark Inc.: USA

- Sfard, A. (2008) Thinking as communicating, Cambridge University Press: New York

- Simon, S. (1996) Gender in Translation, Routledge: London & New York

- Sternberg, R. J. & Pretz, Jean E., (2005) Cognition and Intelligence, Cambridge university Press: New York

- Sternberg, R. J. & Pretz, Jean E. (2004) Cognition and Intelligence, Cambridge University Press: New York

- Webster's New Universal Unabridged Dictionary, 2nd ed, Simon & Schuster: New York

- Wills, W. (1996): Knowledge and Skills in Translator Behavior, volume 15, John Benjamins Publishing Co.: Philadelphia and Amsterdam

- Wimmer, M. (2004) Emotion-Cognition Interaction and Language in Seeing, Thinking and Knowing, A. Carsetti (ed.), 277-292. Kluwer Academic Publishers. Printed in the Netherlands

- Zahavi, D. (2005), Subjectivity and Selfhood, Massachusetts Institute of Technology: USA