

RESEARCH ARTICLE

OPEN ACCESS

Diplomacy Between the Lines: A Multilayered Reading Approach in International Relations

Fatih Sayin^{1*}

¹ Georgian National University, Georgia

* Corresponding author: fmsayin@seu.edu.ge

Abstract: This study explores the interpretive misalignments that frequently occur within the domain of international relations, diplomatic communications, and the drafting and analysis of official state documents. Focusing on the nature and quality of diplomatic critique, it investigates the implications of multi-layered textual reading in international affairs. Specifically, it dissects the operational definitions, scope, interrelations, and distinctive features of four interpretive modes literal, allegorical, ethical/moral, and anagogical (long-term strategic or transcendental) readings within the framework of diplomacy. The article posits that the varying cultural, educational, and professional backgrounds of diplomats, international legal scholars, and state officials significantly contribute to divergent, and occasionally distorted, interpretations of diplomatic language. In response to this challenge, the study advocates for an internationally responsible model of reading, wherein diplomatic actors are intellectually grounded in global history, comparative literature, jurisprudence, and political theory. Overreliance on narrowly sourced frameworks or monolithic diplomatic traditions, it argues, can induce conceptual tunnel vision and superficial engagement in international negotiation an idea metaphorically illustrated through the example of “rhododendron honey.” Drawing on Dante Alighieri’s fourfold reading schema (Alighieri, 2024), Cassianus’s interpretive classifications (Cassian, 1997), and the normative discourses from multiple diplomatic cultures, the paper proposes a teleological (goal-oriented and peace-centered) lens for interpreting state communications and international treaties.

Keywords: Diplomatic reading methods, literal interpretation, allegorical diplomacy, strategic (anagogical) reading, teleological diplomacy, interpretive depth in IR.

INTRODUCTION

Within the complex and often contested realm of international relations, policymakers, scholars, legal advisors, and diplomatic practitioners routinely find themselves at the center of criticism. These critiques may target not only the policy content of their communiqués, treaties, resolutions, or public statements but also the style, semantics, and deeper ideological implications embedded in their language.

As international affairs are fundamentally discursive driven by formal statements, communiqués, declarations, position papers, and treaty texts the role of language is not secondary, but central. Rhetoric in this domain serves both as an instrument of persuasion and as a projection of power, prestige, and normative influence. In such an environment, criticism is not merely inevitable;

it is necessary. Indeed, without the pressure and scrutiny of critique, international norms could not evolve, institutions would stagnate, and diplomacy would remain unresponsive to the dynamic complexities of the global system.

Nevertheless, a persistent and deeply consequential problem endures: much of the interpretive criticism directed at international texts appears to reflect not the intellectual acumen or policy insight of the critic but rather the depth or alarming superficiality of the reading methodologies applied. The act of reading itself is not a neutral process; it is epistemic, methodological, and often political. This is especially true in international contexts where language not only informs but often performs political functions. Misreading a diplomatic text is not just a theoretical error it can have material consequences in shaping foreign policy responses, undermining negotiations, or triggering miscalculations in statecraft.

In diplomatic and international legal practice, textual interpretation cannot be reduced to a mechanical or merely grammatical exercise. Words especially in the language of diplomatic correspondence are not empty vessels of fixed meanings. They function simultaneously as referents of legal commitment, conveyors of strategic intent, signals of national interest, and sometimes as tools for ambiguity or strategic opacity.

They are laden with historical memory, cultural codes, and institutional norms. As Umberto Eco (1992) famously argued, texts are fields of meaning, not boxes of truth. A diplomatic statement is rarely what it appears to be on the surface alone; it often functions in multiple registers literal, symbolic, performative, and even philosophical.

This multi-functionality of diplomatic texts is not incidental but structural. Diplomatic communication often thrives on ambiguity, nuance, and coded language. Whether in the carefully calibrated prose of a UN Security Council resolution, the intentionally vague formulations of a ceasefire agreement, or the ceremonial yet symbolically potent language of a state visit communiqué, words in diplomacy are used to accomplish goals, not merely to convey facts. As a result, the interpretive act becomes a high-stakes endeavor. Misreading such texts, or applying an overly rigid interpretive lens such as reducing all meaning to the literal surface can produce significant strategic missteps. It may undermine trust between actors, distort the intent of multilateral agreements, or escalate rather than de-escalate conflict.

Nowhere is this complexity more apparent than in fields such as international law, multilateral negotiations, peacebuilding efforts, and strategic communication. In these domains, the stakes of interpretation extend far beyond academic debate. They encompass geopolitical consequences. A failure to discern the symbolic, cultural, or strategic subtext of a diplomatic message can lead to more than just theoretical misunderstanding it can provoke diplomatic fallout, policy paralysis, or even an unintended escalation of tensions. Hence, diplomacy requires not only linguistic competence but also interpretive discipline.

What, then, do we mean by a multilayered reading in the context of international affairs? At its core, such a reading process moves beyond mere literal parsing the immediate, surface-level meaning of the terms employed. Instead, it requires engagement with deeper interpretive layers, progressing through allegorical (symbolic), moral (ethical or normative), and anagogical (teleological or long-term strategic) dimensions. Each of these interpretive registers reveals different facets of the text: literal readings clarify direct meaning; allegorical readings reveal encoded symbolism; moral readings interrogate ethical commitments; and anagogical readings discern the long-term aims and higher purposes embedded within the message.

The central argument, then, is that diplomatic texts are not unidimensional. They are not composed merely to inform, but to perform. They operate at multiple levels, simultaneously communicating content, intention, and strategic posture. To treat such texts as transparent or reducible to a single mode of interpretation typically literalism is to fundamentally misread their function. And the consequences of such misreading are often severe.

Importantly, this is not a new or novel concern. Throughout the history of international relations and diplomacy, misinterpretation has frequently served as both the spark and the accelerant of conflict. Misreading treaties has led to wars; misinterpreting speeches has broken alliances; and misunderstanding declarations has undermined peace initiatives. Legal scholars, diplomats, and political theorists have long wrestled with the challenge of interpretation of how to extract meaning from politically charged language within unstable or contested contexts.

In many ways, the interpretive challenges in diplomacy mirror those faced in classical philosophy. As with philosophical or sacred texts, diplomatic messages are often misappropriated when taken too literally or, conversely, over-symbolized when they were meant to be plain.

This dual danger of reducing symbols to brute literalism or of inflating plain language into unintended allegory remains a constant hazard.

A striking analogy often invoked in this context illustrates the problem well: a head of state gives a direct instruction "Bring me water." But rather than fulfilling the request, aides and diplomats begin to question its deeper meaning: Did the leader mean spring water? Holy water? Mineral water? Perhaps a ceremonial offering? In the process of semantic deconstruction, the simplicity of the original intent is lost entirely.

When transposed to international relations, such interpretive distortions can derail serious diplomatic initiatives. Consider peace talks that stall over disputes in wording whether a clause is "binding" or "recommendatory," or whether a statement of "concern" signals imminent action or mere symbolic displeasure. These are not abstract semantic games; they are the battlegrounds upon which power, credibility, and legitimacy are contested. Therefore, the practice of accurate and layered reading becomes more than just a scholarly virtue it becomes a diplomatic imperative.

The success of international engagements whether they be bilateral dialogues, regional frameworks, global summits, or legal arbitrations depends profoundly on the interpretive rigor with which diplomatic texts are approached. Reading, in this context, is not simply a passive reception of information; it is an active form of political participation and strategic engagement.

In conclusion, this study argues that misinterpretation in diplomacy is not only a frequent occurrence but a structurally embedded risk within the practice of international relations. To mitigate this risk, diplomatic actors must cultivate interpretive depth, intellectual flexibility, and methodological awareness. It is only through a disciplined, multilayered reading practice one that is sensitive to language, context, history, and strategic purpose that diplomacy can fulfill its highest aspirations: preventing conflict, advancing cooperation, and maintaining international peace.

Audience Diversity and Diplomatic Responsibility

Diplomatic texts, by their very nature, are disseminated to and interpreted by a heterogeneous audience a globally dispersed and epistemologically diverse group that includes policymakers, legal analysts, international relations scholars, regional experts, civil society advocates, diplomats, and media professionals. These audiences are anchored in vastly different cultural, ideological, and educational traditions, shaped by distinct institutional logics and interpretive norms. Such diversity is not incidental but foundational to the structure of global affairs. It represents both a powerful asset fueling pluralistic interpretations and constructive dialogue and a persistent risk, introducing ambiguity, fragmentation, and potential miscommunication.

From an epistemological standpoint, this diversity enables multi-vocality in global governance. Stakeholders interpret international texts through different cultural lenses, institutional frameworks, and normative values, leading to broader, often more creative understandings of key global issues. Whether it's conflict mediation, refugee protection, climate diplomacy, or the implementation of human rights treaties, interpretive diversity allows for multiple models of meaning-making to coexist. It fosters inclusivity and offers a deeper pool of symbolic and conceptual resources from which diplomatic actors can draw. In this way, it enhances the legitimacy and reach of international initiatives.

Yet, the same interpretive plurality can turn volatile when core diplomatic messages become susceptible to distortion or when divergent audiences engage with international texts using incompatible hermeneutic approaches. Consider, for instance, a clause in a multilateral treaty that states, "Parties shall undertake all reasonable efforts to uphold democratic institutions." For one party, this may be interpreted as a legally binding obligation enforceable through compliance mechanisms.

For another, it may be read as a normative aspiration a political statement of intent rather than an enforceable provision. A third party may see in it a strategic delay tactic, meant to deflect immediate responsibility under the guise of long-term commitment. Such multiplicity of interpretation is not rare. On the contrary, it is a recurrent challenge in multilateral diplomacy, particularly in consensus-based forums like the United Nations, where compromise language is often intentionally ambiguous.

This semantic ambiguity, while at times diplomatically useful, underscores the urgency of promoting multi-layered reading competencies in international relations. Without disciplined, context-aware, and theoretically grounded reading practices, diplomatic actors risk entrenching misunderstanding rather than mitigating it. Effective diplomacy today requires more than fluency in the technical language of international law or policy. It demands intellectual versatility, cultural fluency, and an interpretive imagination that is attuned to metaphor, symbolism, historical memory, and ideological subtext.

In light of this, the modern diplomat can no longer afford to be shaped exclusively within the narrow confines of legalistic education or national policy orthodoxy. While technical training in foreign service institutions remains essential, diplomatic excellence in the 21st century requires something broader: an intellectual pluralism rooted in deep engagement with diverse traditions of thought from literature and theology to philosophy, comparative politics, and cultural studies. This breadth not only strengthens analytical capacity but also enhances the diplomat's ability to recognize and reconcile competing worldviews. In an increasingly multipolar world, the ability to translate across ideological divides and negotiate between culturally encoded meanings is not an asset it is a necessity.

However, the current information ecosystem poses a major obstacle to this ideal. A growing number of public intellectuals, policy influencers, and even diplomats consume information through narrowly filtered channels, curated by digital algorithms and reinforced by ideological echo chambers.

These filters often shield readers from alternative perspectives, reducing exposure to unfamiliar ideas and critical counterpoints. As Wolf (2007) insightfully observes, such intellectual isolation breeds superficiality and weakens both diplomatic cognition and public discourse. The result is an erosion of interpretive depth, a narrowing of intellectual horizons, and an increasing inability to engage productively with difference.

The metaphor of rhododendron honey captures this danger vividly. In nature, bees that feed exclusively on the nectar of the rhododendron flower produce honey that is toxic to humans. Though the flower itself is beautiful and fragrant, its overuse becomes a source of harm. This metaphor aptly illustrates the risks of mono-source intellectual nourishment in diplomacy. When diplomats or analysts build their worldviews on a single ideological, civilizational, or academic foundation no matter how

esteemed it can produce knowledge that is seductive but ultimately dangerous. Like toxic honey, it may taste sweet but proves poisonous in practice. Intellectual resilience, much like physiological health, depends on variety, balance, and critical filtration.

Therefore, both diplomatic education and practice must actively seek to expand interpretive capacity through exposure to diverse epistemic traditions not only across North and South, East and West, but also across disciplinary boundaries. Such diversity not only enhances conceptual dexterity but also fosters empathy, cross-cultural literacy, and interpretive agility all of which are indispensable in a diplomatic arena increasingly shaped by complexity, ambiguity, and interdependence (Gadamer, 2004; Ricoeur, 1976). In short, reading diplomatically today requires reading widely, deeply, and pluralistically.

Layered Meaning and Hermeneutic Depth in Diplomatic Practice

Dante Alighieri, in his canonical works, articulated a four-tiered interpretive framework originally designed for sacred texts: literal, allegorical, moral, and anagogical readings (Alighieri, 2024; Kaske, 1958). While developed in a theological context, this model provides a compelling heuristic for reading international texts from UN resolutions and peace treaties to diplomatic communiqués and bilateral declarations.

Literal Reading

Literal reading refers to the direct, surface-level interpretation of a diplomatic statement where words are taken at their face value, according to their denotative meanings. This approach is often essential in international legal contexts, such as interpreting treaty provisions, ceasefire agreements, or binding resolutions under international law.

In these instances, the precise wording of commitments, obligations, and prohibitions forms the basis for legal accountability and operational clarity. A literal reading thus serves as the first and often foundational layer of interpretation in diplomatic practice.

However, exclusive reliance on literalism is fraught with risks, especially in politically sensitive or multi-party negotiations where language is deliberately crafted to allow for flexibility, ambiguity, or strategic ambiguity. Diplomatic texts are seldom fully transparent; they are typically the product of intense negotiation, compromise, and often, deliberate semantic vagueness.

As Dridi (2024) and Steiner (1975) argue, diplomatic language is coded and contingent, often embedding deeper meanings that cannot be extracted through surface reading alone.

Take, for instance, phrases commonly used in multilateral settings such as “an unwavering commitment to peace.” While this may appear to be a routine expression of procedural diplomacy, a more careful analysis may reveal underlying strategic caution, hesitation, or even symbolic posturing meant to satisfy domestic audiences while avoiding concrete action. Without attention to such latent meanings, literal readings risk oversimplifying complex intentions, thereby distorting diplomatic meaning and undermining effective policy responses. Literalism is, therefore, necessary but by itself, insufficient for comprehensive diplomatic understanding.

Allegorical Reading

Allegorical reading involves uncovering the symbolic, metaphorical, or representational meanings embedded in diplomatic language. Rather than interpreting a statement at its surface level, this approach seeks to understand what is being implied beyond the literal words. In this interpretive register, phrases like “building bridges” do not refer to physical infrastructure but signify efforts toward rapprochement, reconciliation, cultural diplomacy, or norm diffusion between states or communities (Kaske, 1958; Brown, 2000). These expressions often serve as diplomatic shorthand for complex policy agendas or long-term aspirations that may be politically sensitive if articulated too directly.

Allegorical language in diplomacy often reflects a state's national identity, civilizational narrative, historical memory, or strategic ambitions. Leaders may invoke metaphors rooted in literature, religion, mythology, or cultural heritage to frame their positions in a way that resonates both domestically and internationally. However, such allegories are not universally legible; they require context-sensitive interpretation that accounts for cultural, historical, and political nuances.

A failure to accurately decode these allegories particularly in diplomatic environments rich with cultural signaling, such as ASEAN summits or Middle Eastern peace processes can lead to misunderstandings, symbolic missteps, or even diplomatic offense. As Shockro (2008) warns, misreading culturally embedded metaphors can obscure intent and undermine negotiations, emphasizing the necessity of allegorical competence in contemporary diplomatic practice.

Moral (Ethical) Reading

The moral or ethical layer of interpretation examines the normative dimensions embedded within diplomatic communications. This mode of reading transcends the literal and symbolic to engage with deeper questions of justice, moral obligation, solidarity, and international responsibility (Nussbaum, 1997; Smit, 2015).

It asks not only what is being said, but what ethical commitments are being implied, upheld, or violated in the process of communication. In this regard, ethical reading functions as a critical filter, allowing diplomats, analysts, and scholars to evaluate whether the values proclaimed in international statements are consistent with the underlying political behavior and policy decisions of the actors involved.

Consider, for instance, a state's pledge to offer "support for democratic institutions" in a fragile or transitioning political context. A moral reading demands more than a surface-level interpretation of goodwill; it requires inquiry into the form, intent, and sincerity of such support. Is the commitment backed by tangible action, capacity-building, or rule of law promotion? Or is it merely rhetorical a performative gesture aimed at enhancing legitimacy without genuine follow-through? Does the actor's own domestic behavior reinforce or undermine the principles they promote abroad?

This form of reading is particularly relevant in post-conflict transitions, humanitarian interventions, peacebuilding operations, and debates over global governance. It functions as a bridge between strategic diplomacy and normative internationalism, providing the conceptual tools to assess the alignment or contradiction between diplomatic rhetoric and ethical practice (Brown, 2000). Ultimately, moral reading enhances the accountability of international actors by holding discourse to the standard of values it claims to represent.

Anagogical (Strategic/Transcendental) Reading

Anagogical reading represents the highest and most strategic level of interpretation, focusing on the teleological dimensions of diplomatic texts that is, the long-term, transcendental, or ultimate purposes that underpin official statements, treaties, and foreign policy initiatives. Unlike literal or symbolic readings, which focus on immediate content or representational meaning, anagogical interpretation asks: What is the overarching goal or intended historical trajectory embedded in this diplomatic act? Is the statement merely tactical, or does it reflect a deeper vision for the international system such as sustainable peace, global justice, strategic dominance, or normative leadership? (Aligheri, 2024).

For example, when leaders or institutions invoke phrases like a "new world order" or a "rules-based international system," the anagogical reading compels us to look beyond rhetorical flourish or symbolic coherence. Such phrases must be interrogated for their long-range geopolitical implications.

Are they signaling a shift in global power configurations? Do they aim to entrench certain norms or values within the fabric of international law and governance?

Or are they expressions of hegemonic ambition cloaked in universal language? Anagogical interpretation also requires a sensitivity to the moral and philosophical architecture of foreign policy.

It demands that diplomatic actions be situated within broader historical arcs and ethical frameworks, recognizing that today's agreements often reflect visions for future world orders (Gadamer, 2004; Ricoeur, 1976). In this sense, anagogical reading is not only strategic it is normative, encouraging deep reflection on responsibility, legacy, and the long-term human consequences of diplomacy.

Applying a Layered Hermeneutic Framework to a Diplomatic Text: The Case of the IPCC 2021 SPM

To concretize the need for multilayered textual interpretation in international relations, the Summary for Policymakers (SPM) from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change's (IPCC) 2021 report serves as an illustrative and analytically rich example. This document is not merely a scientific synthesis; it is also the product of line-by-line diplomatic negotiation between state representatives and scientific experts. Accordingly, meaning production within the SPM operates simultaneously within technical and political registers (IPCC, 2021).

At the literal level, the statement "It is unequivocal that human influence has warmed the atmosphere, ocean and land" articulates a clear scientific finding. However, beyond its evidentiary value, this assertion functions as a normative declaration with implications for the international distribution of responsibility.

At the allegorical level, terms such as "very likely" and "high confidence," while derived from scientific calibration, serve as rhetorical devices that mediate uncertainty through a politically acceptable discursive frame. These expressions enable consensus-building among states with divergent risk perceptions and policy positions.

At the moral level, the central emphasis on anthropogenic impact implicitly foregrounds historical emissions and differentiated responsibilities—principles embedded in climate justice, burden-sharing, and global solidarity discourses.

At the anagogical level, the SPM articulates a long-term strategic vision centered on sustainability, global cooperation, and climate resilience. In this respect, the text operates not only as a diagnostic tool but also as a diplomatic instrument projecting a normative trajectory for the international community.

This application demonstrates how a multilayered interpretive method—moving beyond literalism—can uncover the symbolic, normative, and strategic dimensions embedded within diplomatic-scientific texts.

CONCLUSION

In the realm of diplomacy and international relations, reading is never a neutral act. It is a deeply political engagement, a methodological choice, and an ethical responsibility. Diplomatic texts whether multilateral declarations, bilateral agreements, speeches at the UN General Assembly, or communiqués following peace negotiations are not passive containers of information.

They are strategic instruments crafted to convey meaning, signal intent, project power, and sometimes deliberately obscure contested truths. To read such texts is to engage in an interpretive process that has tangible consequences for global governance, foreign policy formulation, and the prospects of peace or conflict.

As demonstrated throughout this article, diplomacy demands a layered and nuanced interpretive approach one that moves systematically through multiple levels of textual meaning: the literal, allegorical, moral, and anagogical. Each of these layers serves a distinct function. Literal reading provides the surface structure of diplomatic communication, grounding interpretation in denotative meaning and formal commitments. Allegorical reading reveals the symbolic and often culturally coded language that infuses diplomacy with narrative, identity, and historical memory. Moral reading interrogates the ethical values and normative claims embedded within foreign policy rhetoric. Finally, anagogical reading probes the teleological or long-term goals both strategic and ideological behind a given diplomatic statement or action.

Together, these interpretive lenses enable a more comprehensive understanding of international texts. Without such rigor, misreadings are inevitable. And importantly, these misreadings often arise not because of the ambiguity of the text itself, but because of the methodological limitations of the reader their unwillingness or inability to apply interpretive depth, cultural sensitivity, or philosophical reflection (Eco, 1992; Ricoeur, 1976).

Consider the consequences of interpretive failure in international affairs. When a peace agreement is read only in its formalistic language, without consideration of the symbolic concessions embedded in its phrasing or the historical grievances it implicitly acknowledges, parties may misjudge the commitment of the other side. Similarly, when a state's declaration of intent such as a pledge to uphold human rights is interpreted literally but not morally or teleologically, observers may miss signs of performative diplomacy or strategic image management. Such oversights weaken diplomatic judgment, invite cynicism, and can contribute to the breakdown of trust and cooperation in international settings.

Moreover, in today's hyper-mediated global environment, where states operate within an ecosystem saturated by information overload, algorithmic filtering, and ideological polarization, the challenges of accurate interpretation have grown exponentially. Diplomatic discourse is often consumed, shared, and reframed within narrow echo chambers, where selective readings reinforce existing biases. In such a climate, literalism can become weaponized, and nuanced diplomatic signals can be drowned out by populist noise or strategic disinformation.

This is why a teleological orientation to diplomatic reading is more crucial than ever. Reading with a teleological mindset means going beyond the question of what a text says to ask what the text is designed to achieve. What are the underlying objectives, long-term interests, or normative visions embedded in this statement or agreement?

Is the text a tool for legitimizing power, facilitating reconciliation, or advancing global norms? Is it attempting to rewrite a geopolitical narrative, reposition a state's identity, or deflect responsibility? These questions cannot be answered through surface reading alone. They require critical inquiry into intent, context, and consequence the foundational elements of a mature diplomatic hermeneutic (Zizek, 2009).

This interpretive maturity also demands an awareness of the power of discourse in shaping international realities. As constructivist theorists in IR have long argued, language is not merely reflective it is constitutive. Diplomatic texts do not just describe the world; they participate in making it. Declarations define new legal norms, speeches realign alliances, communiqués shift public opinion, and treaties set the architecture for regional and global governance. To misread these texts, therefore, is not a trivial error it is a misstep with real-world consequences, whether in the form of failed peace efforts, stalled negotiations, or the erosion of institutional credibility.

Furthermore, the ethical dimension of diplomatic reading must not be overlooked. In a world marked by deep asymmetries of power, representation, and voice, how we read international texts can either reinforce or resist these inequalities. Superficial or literalist readings often privilege dominant narratives while silencing marginal perspectives.

A moral and anagogical approach, by contrast, invites readers to consider who benefits, who is excluded, and what values are being advanced or obscured in the text. It urges diplomats and analysts to read not only for meaning but for justice, not only for strategy but for responsibility.

In this light, reading becomes a form of diplomatic ethics an act of recognition and accountability. It becomes a way to hold powerful actors to the standards they espouse, to uncover contradictions between rhetoric and practice, and to elevate the normative aspirations of diplomacy above mere strategic calculation. A diplomat who reads only to confirm prior assumptions fails in their duty; one who reads critically, broadly, and with openness to layered meaning becomes a true custodian of peace and international order.

In conclusion, diplomacy requires more than reading what is written; it requires discerning what is meant, implied, and projected across time, culture, and political context. Literalism risks rigidity, reducing the complexity of international engagement to fixed legalisms or technocratic language. Superficiality invites miscalculation, opening space for misinterpretation, missed signals, and diplomatic missteps. But a mature, layered, and context-sensitive reading practice one that integrates literal, allegorical, moral, and anagogical dimensions have the power to illuminate diplomatic intent, enhance mutual understanding, and advance the higher aspiration of diplomacy itself: the preservation of peace and the pursuit of a just international order.

In an age when diplomacy is challenged not only by geopolitical shifts but also by interpretive failures, reading well is not just a virtue it is a strategic necessity.

REFERENCES

- Aligheri, D. (2024). *The divine comedy*. BoD-Books on Demand.
- Cassian, J. (1997). *The Conferences* (B. Ramsey, Trans.). Cistercian Publications.
- Eco, U. (1992). *Interpretation and overinterpretation*. Cambridge University Press.
- Wolf, M. (2007). *The Art of the Essayist*. Penguin.
- Gadamer, H.-G. (2004). *Truth and Method* (2nd ed., J. Weinsheimer & D. G. Marshall, Trans.). Continuum.
- Dridi, T. (2024). The art of biblical hermeneutics: The story of the Canaanite woman.
- Steiner, G. (1975). *After Babel: Aspects of language and translation*. Oxford University Press.
- Kaske, C. (1958). Dante's allegory of love. *Modern Language Notes*, 73(2), 83–93.
- Brown, W. P. (2000). Seeing the Psalms: A theology of metaphor. *Interpretation: A Journal of Bible and Theology*, 54(4), 339–353.
- Shockro, S. (2008). Reading Bede as Bede would read.
- Nussbaum, M. C. (1997). *Cultivating humanity: A classical defense of reform in liberal education*. Harvard University Press.
- Smit, D. (2015). Reading the Bible through the ages? Historical and hermeneutical perspectives. *Stellenbosch Theological Journal*, 1(2), 551–574.
- Brown, W. P. (2000). Seeing the Psalms: A theology of metaphor. *Interpretation: A Journal of Bible and Theology*, 54(4), 339–353.
- Gadamer, H. G. (2013). *Truth and method*. A&C Black.
- IPCC. (2021). Summary for Policymakers. In V. Masson-Delmotte, P. Zhai, A. Pirani, S. L. Connors, C. Péan, S. Berger, N. Caud, Y. Chen, L. Goldfarb, M. I. Gomis, M. Huang, K. Leitzell, E. Lonnoy, J. B. R. Matthews, T. K. Maycock, T. Waterfield, O. Yelekçi, R. Yu, & B. Zhou (Eds.), *Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* (pp. 3–32). Cambridge University Press.
- https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar6/wg1/downloads/report/IPCC_AR6_WGI_SPM_final.pdf
- Ricoeur, P. (1976). *Interpretation Theory: Discourse and the Surplus of Meaning*. Texas Christian University Press.
- Eco, U. (1992). *Interpretation and overinterpretation*. Cambridge University Press.
- Ricoeur, P. (1976). *Interpretation Theory: Discourse and the Surplus of Meaning*. Texas Christian University Press.
- Zizek, S. (2009). *First as Tragedy, Then as Farce*. Verso.