



ISSN 1989–9572

DOI:10.47750/jett.2024.15.03.020

The Text: Between its Conceptual Changeability and Infinite Meaning

Dr. Hafida Bengana

Journal for Educators, Teachers and Trainers, Vol. 15 (3)

<https://jett.labosfor.com/>

Date of reception: 06 2024

Date of revision: 08 2024

Date of acceptance: 09 2024

- **Dr. Hafida Bengana (2024). The Text: Between its Conceptual Changeability and Infinite Meaning. *Journal for Educators, Teachers and Trainers*, Vol.15(3).231-243.**

The Text: Between its Conceptual Changeability and Infinite Meaning

Dr. Hafida Bengana

University Mohamed El Bachir El Ibrahimi of Bordj Bou Arreridj, National Culture Laboratory in
Modern and Contemporary Algerian Literature, Algeria. hafida.bengana@univ-bba.dz
orcid: <https://orcid.org/my-orcid?orcid=0009-0001-3306-046X>

Abstract

The present research paper aims to explore the concept of the literary text in relation to the diversity of critical approaches, whether textual or interpretative. The main objective is understanding how these approaches have created a rich academic foundation for various critical perspectives. This raises the question of whether prevalent critical methods such as formalism, structuralism, stylistics, and semiotics have succeeded in developing a methodological strategy that effectively defines the text's meaning?

Keywords: text, concept, infinite meaning, diversity, approaches, literary criticism.

Introduction:

The text is regarded as a dynamic creation, not reliant on stable, structured forms, and its functions are never realized fixedly. It continuously adapts, sometimes by disrupting its internal cohesion and altering its appearance to align with evolving critical approaches. Its effectiveness stems from encapsulating diverse past perceptions of visions and beliefs while integrating the contemporary era's science and culture. The text is a tapestry of coordinated, unified systems that are not static; its fluidity is evident through the changeability of its concept and the boundlessness of its meaning.

In general, this field of research has long captivated the attention of critics and scholars. Moreover, this interest spans various trends related to the history of thought and ideas, providing rich material for study, analysis, and contemplation. How, then, has this conceptual difference in the text been embodied with each shift in critical orientation?

1. Definition of textual formal and structural approaches

"Viewpoints on defining 'text' varied among linguists, critics, historians, philosophers, interpreters, and theologians" (Khamiri, 2007, p. 35). However, there is consensus that the text is a common entity that can be examined within multiple orientations.

The critical analysis of texts has undergone various practices, shaped by the differing orientations within the field of study. This has led to a fertile methodological movement, invigorated by the academic disagreements that the text provokes. Indeed, critical visionary disagreement is more productive than agreement, as it uncovers contradictions and inconsistencies within the studied field, paving the way for new discoveries (Jakobson, 1988, p. 23).

The theory emerged in the field of literary criticism, focusing on the literary text itself. **Formalism** pioneered a new approach by secularizing literature, leading to the development of various academic theories with different orientations within this framework. Among these were **structural criticism**, **semiotics**, and **stylistics**.

Poetics serves as the foundation that encompasses various critical transformations, enabling the study of relationships that coexist within the text. These relationships involve interactions between the text's constituent elements at one stage and between these elements and the act of reading at a more advanced stage.

Regarding "the transformation that poetry signifies within the realm of studies, it derives its subject from within the structure of literature itself. Its focus is not on individual literary works or literature as a collection of works, but rather on the literariness of literature—the abstract quality that distinguishes a work as literary" (Al-Harbi, 2003, pp. 28-29).

In essence, poetics shifted its focus towards the inherent power within the literary text, which exerts an influential energy that resonates for its own sake. Within the framework of language that defies ordinariness, literature performs a function that transcends direct communicative purposes.

It focuses on language, which is inherently evocative, refusing to be diminished to anything less than its poetic function. This function predominates not only within poetry, where it reigns over other linguistic functions but also outside poetry, where other functions may take precedence at the expense of the poetic function (Jakobson, 1988, p. 25).

Therefore, the researcher emphasizes the literary text for its intrinsic value, as it stands in contrast to ordinary language, typically seen as a tool to achieve external communicative goals. "Poetic language, on the other hand, justifies itself—and thus derives all its worth—from within. It exists as an end in itself, no longer merely a means. It is therefore autonomous and **self-justifying**" (Todorov, 1986, p. 24).

This perspective implies that examining the literary text distances itself from external, objective reality, particularly through expressive statements that diminish the importance of direct representation. Instead, as **Tzvetan Todorov** suggests, it aims "not to name meaning, but to understand the general laws that govern the creation of every work". (Todorov, Poetics, 1990, p. 23).

What makes this poetic nature intrinsic to the literary elements of the text is that they are dispersed throughout all its parts, rather than being confined to a single section. Consequently, poetics is considered "the

fruit of the entire structure of the text, even if it outwardly appears as a specific section... The literariness of the discourse is the result of the overall structure of its linguistic apparatus, grounded in the existing connections and governing its structural characteristics" (Al-Sadd, 1997, p. 89).

Poetics seeks to uncover the laws governing relationships within the entirety of the literary work, accomplished through a set of tools for observing the internal dynamics of the text and describing its meaning-related issues. Based on this, poetics aims to establish the boundaries of the cognitive system within which literature is read. This system is formed by the general laws and theoretical rules that operate in the field of literature, functioning as a semiotic system within which the text operates" (Al-Atrash, 2004, p. 72).

Poetic formalism is considered the approach that steered literary study in an unconventional direction, where form became the method for synthesizing the elements of a literary work and observing the emergence of meaning. On the other hand, structural poetics undertook a different task, bringing about "an important change in perspective by prioritizing the formulation of a comprehensive theory of literary discourse" (Tompkins, 1999, p. 197).

This implies an absolute transparency that integrates the construction of the literary text with the analytical process of clarifying the conditions of this construction. The ambition of poetics extends beyond merely describing the generation of a single meaning in a literary text. Instead, it has evolved continuously through a series of methodological advancements. For instance, in the field of semiology, poetics has become associated with "the total theory of signs, that is, with general semiology" (Jakobson, 1988, p. 24).

On another front, in stylistic poetics, **Michel Riffaterre** highlights two inseparable aspects as the essence of the poetic process: linguistic play and intertextuality (Al-Sadd, 1997, p. 23) In other words, the literary text strives to achieve the highest degree of influence through linguistic shifts and cultural dialogue among the various texts encompassed within its boundaries. Consequently, this type of poetics tends to focus intensely on the internal reality of the text.

Based on the above, "we can practically distinguish between two models of critical discourse that rely on poetics. The first model is the discourse that transitioned from the poetics of the author to the poetics of the text. The second model is the approach that established its critical discourse on the relationship between the poetics of the text and the poetics of reading" (Al-Atrash, 2004, p. 73)

Starting from the first model, we notice that the **formalists** considered the text to be a linguistic structure independent of reality, perceived primarily through its form. It serves as the vessel that contains the various literary and aesthetic elements constituting the text. The text began to take its first steps towards secularization by focusing on its inherent literariness. According to **Jacobson**, it was a "compositional discourse in and for itself" (Al-Sadd, 1997, p. 11).

Thus, **Roman Jakobson** laid the foundation for moving beyond the focus of literary textual analysis within ideological and historical contexts. He introduced new perspectives on literary form, presenting it as an independent, dynamic unit imbued with meaning in itself. This shift gave the literary form a different concept, highlighting its role as an essential, additional element.

Among **structuralists**, the text is viewed as a structure comprising various cohesive units, ranging from the smallest unit, the letter, to the overarching structure of the entire text that determines its meaning. This structure is part of a larger framework that transcends societal boundaries. Roland Barthes was a prominent advocate for this concept, promoting its spread and defense. According to **Barthes**, the literary text becomes a "**genre**" within the social institution, sharing its general characteristics while being distinguished by specific norms, literary codes, and recognized traditions. This makes the literary text a branch of the broader social institution of writing in general (Al-Ruwaili & Al-Bazghi, 2002, p. 260).

Among structuralists, the concept of text was closely tied to writing, which adheres to unified laws shared by all texts while allowing for a unique space of freedom within each text. This uniqueness stems from a distinct structure that is not replicated in other texts, thereby justifying the diversity observed among various literary works due to differing writing methods, even within the works of a single author. This relationship between the author's freedom to choose how to write and subject their text to established customs and laws, while also adhering to inherited style and language, presents a paradox that shapes the literary endeavor profoundly. The choice of institutional writing as a framework governing the text and granting it literary legitimacy undermines the author's role as the sole creator and owner of the text. Once the text enters this institutional framework, its freedom is constrained, and the institution begins to shape its meanings, propositions, interpretations, and treatment. (Al-Ruwaili & Al-Bazghi, 2002, p. 261)

Thus, the text has asserted its complete authority by officially declaring the "death of the author," as it exerts its influence over meaning that arises exclusively within its own laws. Meaning is generated solely within the framework of the relationships among its units—that is, within the text itself.

The text is thus characterized by two major axes: a static axis encompassing the signifier and its various elements, and a dynamic and mobile axis involving the signified with its multiple layers (Fadl, 1996, p. 161).

The significance of structuralism in understanding textuality lies in examining the relationships among its constituent elements, prompting some scholars to extend their focus beyond these internal dynamics to explore the text's connections with other texts of its kind, whether from previous eras or contemporary times. This expansion led to the formulation of the theory of intertextuality by figures such as Gérard Genette and Julia Kristeva. These theorists emphasized the primacy of the text, granting it supreme authority in the process of communication. (Al-Harbi, 2003, p. 13)

Although the term **intertextuality** first appeared through **Julia Kristeva** in 1969, she drew upon ideas formulated earlier by **Mikhail Bakhtin**, particularly his concepts of polyphony and dialectics, although Bakhtin did not explicitly use the term "intertextuality." This concept was later embraced by French structuralism and subsequent semiotic and deconstructive trends, as evident in the works of Kristeva and Roland Barthes, Tzvetan Todorov, and other pioneers of critical modernism (Azzam, 2001, p. 28).

Before developing into a formal theory, credit for recognizing the view of the text belongs to the Russian Formalists. Shklovsky asserted: "Artistic works are perceived concerning other works, and based on the connections we establish between them, not in isolation." He emphasized that every work of art is created in

parallel and in opposition to specific models. However, it was **Bakhtin** who first fully formulated a theory regarding the multiplicity of overlapping textual values. Bakhtin proposed that every new style contains elements of reaction to previous literary styles (Todorov, Poetics, 1990, p. 41).

Therefore, according to this theory, the text functions as a convergence point for intellectual, formal, and aesthetic structures that do not arise ex nihilo but are instead born through a process where genetic or hereditary codes from the past overlap with the present. The extent to which these genetic traits manifest in texts varies from one text to another.

The author "grows up in a world full of other people's words and navigates through them... The voices of others inhabit their speech, rendering it 'multi-valued'" (Todorov, Poetics, 1990, pp. 41-42).

Thus, every text is continuously written and rewritten on both internal and external levels. Internally, this involves phonetic and linguistic structures, functions, and connotations. Externally, it extends from the intertextuality within an author's works to broader cultural interactions and influences as a whole.

Michel Riffaterre, in his book *The Production of the Text* (1979), explores a field closely related to structuralism with his stylistic concept of the text. He argues that "the concept of the (literary text) depends on the problem of literature, and that there is no literature outside the scope of the text." Thus, he searches for the (literary) within the (literary text), viewing it as a science based on generalizing phenomena extracted from texts. However, he cautions against over-relying on the literary phenomena that underpin the literature of literature, as its foundation is the generalization that amalgamates individual effects into the generality of literary language (Azzam, 2001, p. 20).

Based on this perspective, **Michel Riffaterre** equates the text with its literature, emphasizing the individuality inherent within each text. He focuses his inquiry not on the external textual surface, where literary and non-literary elements blend, nor solely on the techniques of literary and linguistic writing. Instead, he delves into the internal worlds of the text and its relationships, seeking to uncover individual characteristics within the literary text, which he defines as style. Therefore, he concludes that "the style is the text itself" (Azzam, 2001, p. 20).

2. The concept of text in post-structural critical approaches:

In the **semiotic approach**, the text remains aligned with the structural concept as it is viewed as a sign comprising both a signifier and a signified. This emphasis on the textuality of the text seemed to enclose it within a closed circle, suffocating it with the unilateralism of meaning. To avoid the declaration of its death, scholars opened up "kinetic horizons that transcend the idea of the text by focusing on its dynamism" (Fadl, 1996, p. 156). They opted for vitality through multiple readings by employing post-structuralist critical mechanisms such as deconstruction, aesthetics of reception, and reader-response theory.

Amidst this mosaic of sometimes problematic and often contradictory text concepts, the text emerges as a creative act endowed with the authority to shape aesthetics through its specific laws and systems. It also manifests, through its interaction with the broader cultural institution, as an evolving aesthetic entity. This

evolution occurs as the text engages in intertextuality with preceding works, contemporary texts, and those yet to come.

In addition to the above, the text directs its focus towards the reader as a collaborator in the co-production of aesthetics, recognizing this as an ongoing process rather than a final manifestation. This shift is evident through the transformative movements observed in the analysis of literary texts under formal and structural approaches. These approaches viewed the literary text as a self-contained structure, which emphasized the text's control over critical perspectives. Consequently, this led to the text's isolation from the reasons for its creation and the factors influencing its reception.

Although structural trends initially directed critical attention toward the reader, they often focused on a singular reader. This was due to the understanding that "the method of structural comprehension cannot proceed without a minimum level of interpretive understanding [thus necessitating]... integration between comprehension (interpretation) and interpretation (structuralism), urging us to move beyond thinking in terms of opposition between structuring rationalization and the utilization of meaning" (Hasane, 2002, p. 41).

In response to the mechanical reduction of the literary text to a singular analytical perspective, interpretation shifted from theoretical nature to practical application, blending the activities of understanding and interpretation. As Gadamer "proposes and accepts, interpretive activity represents a threshold that evades the constraints of linguistic obscurity, avoiding reducing language to mere linguistic constructs and the enchantment of words alone. Instead, language is viewed as a dialogue and a means of communication" (Gadamer, 2002, pp. 21-22)

This dialogue and communication invite the reader to engage freely, rejecting the model of the reader constrained by rigid, reductionist programs that pre-determine the meaning of the text in a closed, circular manner originating from and returning to the text itself. Structuralism, exemplifying an extreme approach to textual analysis, "is fundamentally a scientific method predicated on reducing meaning to a level of logic and excluding the self as a bearer or creator of meaning... Consequently, structuralism completely obscures meaning and the self" (Hasane, 2002, pp. 38-39) .

In response to this situation, critical trends emerged seeking to enhance the communicative relationship between the text and the self, aiming to liberate meaning through reception poetics. These trends focused on analyzing the aesthetics of interaction between the text and its reader, thereby broadening the scope of comprehension. Their objective, as Gadamer emphasizes, is "to enable the concept to speak within the fabric of a living language." This underscores the active engagement of the art of interpretation (Gadamer, 2002, p. 190)

Therefore, the text was redefined as a dialogue chain that connects the present with its past, prompting poetry to evolve mechanisms for analyzing literary texts from the standpoint of reading and reception. This paved the way for the development of reception and reader-response theories, deconstruction, and the sociology of literature. **Roland Barthes** famously linked the "death of the author" to the multiplicity of meanings that arise through effective reading.

In this critical framework, the text has been recognized as open and infinite in its meanings, with its layers multiplying to the point where only a flexible, creative critical approach can adequately explore its aesthetic depth by actively seeking its implicit meanings. Consequently, there has been a shift towards interpreting the text as an activity rooted in the dynamic interaction between the text and the reader. This evolution has propelled the text towards a dynamic aesthetic grounded in multiple interpretations and readings.

Based on this foundation, the post-structuralist movement emerged to address what "*structuralism*" had overlooked: placing the literary process within the realm of human communication, considering its inherent nature, and shifting the analytical focus from the author-text relationship to the text-reader dynamic (Fadl, 1996, p. 139). Despite advocating for reader participation, it acknowledges that "every text contains signs and various codes, inviting scrutiny of how these are deconstructed and their hierarchical relationships". (Khamiri, 2007, p. 39) Thus, while it rejects the closure and unilateralism of meaning, it asserts the non-arbitrary nature of interpretations and empowers readers with liberated interpretive capabilities.

In this complex movement, the text reveals its multiple layers, encompassing the structured framework of the written institution and accommodating the act of reading. One representation of these layers is the distinction between the surface level and the deep level within each text, described by **Julia Kristeva** as the apparent text and the generative text. According to Kristeva, "the apparent text serves to display the spectacle of relationships," while the generative text delves into the text's components, uncovering its secrets and ambiguous areas to ultimately reveal its meaning (Khamiri, 2007, p. 252).

It appears that the evolution of the relationship between reading and writing, following the text's embrace of infinite interpretations, brought forth Roland Barthes' concept of the "readerly text" and the "writerly text," alongside Umberto Eco's distinction between the "open text" and the "closed text." Eco is credited with popularizing these concepts in his book "The Open Work" (Al-Ruwaili & Al-Bazghi, 2002, p. 272).

Megan Al-Ruwaili and **Saad Al-Bazghi** noted that Eco's open text aligns closely with Barthes' readable text, while Eco's closed text corresponds to Barthes' written text (Al-Ruwaili & Al-Bazghi, 2002, p. 272).

The concepts of the open text by Umberto Eco and the readerly text by **Roland Barthes** converge in their acceptance of a single intended reading. Similarly, **Eco's** closed text and Barthes' writerly text share a characteristic of allowing multiple interpretations. Despite their similarities, their connotations diverge on the notion of closure.

According to **Umberto Eco**, a closed text can paradoxically become highly open (Eco, 1996, p. 71) , whereas Roland Barthes argues against this idea, asserting that writing which closes in on itself does not generate new meanings beyond its initial form (Barthes, 1986, p. 50).

To surpass the difference in the significance of closure between **Umberto Eco and Roland Barthes**, it is important to note that for Eco, "closure" holds a positive value, unlike Barthes. According to Megan Al-Ruwaili and Saad Al-Bazghi, Eco views the closed text as one that remains open to all possible interpretations, each of which seeks to elicit a particular response from the actual reader (Al-Ruwaili & Al-Bazghi, 2002, p. 273). In this

view, closure in Eco's sense does not restrict meaning but rather opens up the text to a multiplicity of interpretations and engagements with the reader.

Thus, the closure of the text aims to entice the reader by its codes, prompting them to discover multiple keys, even within a single code, to unlock its world of endless meanings. Its secrets unfold gradually, allowing for a continuous interaction characterized by ebb and flow. Through this dynamic, the text seeks to rejuvenate its essence with each reading and interpretation. This perspective aligns closely with Roland Barthes' concept of the writerly text, where the reader actively participates in its production and generates new meanings with each encounter (Al-Ruwaili & Al-Bazghi, 2002, p. 257). In contrast, the open text, as defined by Umberto Eco, presents a singular, predetermined meaning that does not accommodate multiple interpretations but instead unfolds according to a specific and imposed plan. The authors of this type of text "act in such a way that every phrase, every stylistic circumvention, and every encyclopedic reference becomes what their [typical] reader hopes for it, according to Every Possibility is perceived by him" (Eco, 1996, p. 70).

Through its stability and lack of movement, the closed text offers only one level of reading and a singular direction from the writer to the reader. The reader is not enticed by codes or captivated by ambiguities; rather, the text's meaning is fixed and concluded with a single reading. In this sense, it aligns with what Roland Barthes termed the "readerly text," where interpretation is constrained within the author's intended framework without room for multiple layers of engagement or reinterpretation beyond the initial encounter.

The readable text, as per Roland Barthes, "was written with the intention of conveying a specific message and transmitting it, just as it assumes the existence of a passive reader whose task is limited to receiving and comprehending the message. This reader is only a consumer, asserting himself by following fixed patterns of meaning... and he is in This process of consumption is a serious, rigid, 'sterile' person, and the role of the author is also limited to the role of the actor who presents or presents the supposed real 'reality'" (Al-Ruwaili & Al-Bazghi, 2002, p. 274)

However, modern texts have moved beyond this passive consumerism to engage with reality, exploring its complexities and grappling with its issues and ideas. This shift is particularly evident in the context of the intellectual evolution accompanying the development of computers and the Internet, which have deeply intertwined with human realities, including creative expression. This has given rise to the concept of electronic texts, where multiple texts or even collections of books are aggregated and presented to readers almost instantly. As such, these texts are characterized by non-linear, branching narratives that allow readers to navigate through various paths, crossing over and exploring different ideas and issues related to the topic at hand. This flexibility enables readers to leap beyond, around, and outside the text, fostering a dynamic interaction with the content (Al-Ruwaili & Al-Bazghi, 2002, p. 270).

This text presents a complex nature, involving a reading that intertwines multiple texts to construct a unique textual structure. It gathers scattered ideas and images from the cultural sphere, forming a network of open connotations distributed across various, non-hierarchical levels. Unlike traditional texts, this structure is not predetermined from the outset and does not follow a singular path leading to a definite conclusion. As Roland

Barthes defines this type of text, "It has no beginning, is reversible, and we can access it from multiple entrances, none of which can be described as the main entrance" (Al-Ruwaili & Al-Bazghi, 2002, pp. 270-271).

The concept of this text involves a dynamic fabric open to renewal, addressing issues related to reality through effective writing that combines skill with readability. It embraces Umberto Eco's notion of the "open" text, which invites multiple interpretations, and Julia Kristeva's "deep" text, which reveals hidden meanings. Kristeva emphasizes the ongoing process of interpretation, echoing Roland Barthes's idea of the instability of meaning in "The Writerly Text." **George Landow** expands on this by discussing electronic connectivity, a facet of intertextuality that incorporates Kristeva's views, Bakhtin's emphasis on diverse voices, **Michel Foucault**'s networked power concepts, and *Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari*'s ideas on "migratory thought" (Al-Ruwaili & Al-Bazghi, 2002, p. 271).

It appears that the concept of the text, encompassing both the realms of writing and reading, has evolved significantly in modern critical studies. Initially associated with the notion of a "work," defined as a completed entity containing written sentences or phrases within the confines of a book (Tompkins, 1999, pp. 8-9), it has since transcended mere textual analysis to encompass broader discursive dimensions. This expanded concept now intertwines with the notion of discourse, a term whose significance extends beyond individual texts. As **Michel Foucault** defines it, **discourse** represents a complex network of social, political, and cultural relations that shape how speech is produced, highlighting both its role in domination and its potential dangers. (Al-Harbi, 2003, pp. 43-44)

In essence, the cluster of texts that contribute to shaping discourse is interconnected through shared relationships that present a specific intellectual perspective, exerting influence over various facets of this discourse and consequently over its audience. This necessitates that recipients equip themselves with awareness regarding the potential hazards associated with any dominance of new ideas, as they can significantly alter prevailing norms. Literary discourse exemplifies one such complex discourse, emerging from a network of interconnected concepts that often remain obscured even within individual texts. These complexities are typically revealed only through parallel discourses that engage critically with these issues, transcending superficial levels of understanding. The critical discourse, embodied by the reader, is invited by the literary discourse (the text) to participate in this intricate activity, a task often beyond the reach of other intellectual discourses.

This critical discourse encompasses intertwined mechanisms and issues. To effectively unravel the complexity of the conceptual network within literary discourse, it must be equipped with awareness to confront various hegemonic practices that influence its creation and reception. Each critical approach or school of thought develops its discourse, branching from a broader discourse framework. Critics themselves contribute to these discourses through their concepts and the influence they wield within their respective fields of production (Fadl, 1996, p. 153).

Therefore, the concept of text within the expansive and interconnected realms of discourse plays a crucial but indirect role in shaping cultural thought. This influence is structured to mitigate the risks associated

with dominant innovations imposed on prevailing fields of knowledge. It ensures that any changes introduced are legitimate and contribute positively to the evolution of ideas. Beginning with the text itself, extending through literary discourse and critical discourse, and ultimately influencing cultural thought, this organized construction aims to guide and validate transformative influences within intellectual and cultural contexts.

At the level of discourse, which arises from a collection of diverse texts interconnected by a shared field of knowledge, connections are forged that unite fragments of meaning scattered within a complex network of concepts. This activity fosters understanding, manifesting as a dialogue that breathes life into texts and their interrelations within discourse (Al-Harbi, 2003, pp. 43-44)

Meaning, whether it emerges from textual intersections within an individual text or through interconnected sequences across the network of texts comprising discourse, is characterized by a dialogue that pulsates with vitality within the boundaries of shared themes, whether they belong to a single text or span across various parts of the discourse.

The discussion above illustrates the conceptual pluralism inherent in the notion of the text. Some explanations delve into the general concept of the text, while others explore its various levels and meanings. Additionally, approaches such as structuralism and semiotics contribute to understanding texts from distinct perspectives.

Notably, within these concepts, there is no single framework characterized by absolute legitimacy universally recognized by scholars in the field. Instead, conceptual pluralism acknowledges the diversity of interpretations and perspectives that contribute to the infinite possibilities inherent in the concept of the text. This plurality emphasizes that the understanding and analysis of texts are multifaceted and can be approached from numerous angles, each offering unique insights and interpretations.

The concept of "textual science" emerges from the fragmented nature of critical orientations, reflecting diverse approaches and varying opinions. Recently introduced, it is considered the most current and comprehensive curriculum to date. This designation is not only due to its recent emergence at the end of the previous century but also because it represents a crystallization and synthesis of preceding statements and ideas. "Textual science" aims to unify and systematize scientific knowledge that was previously dispersed in fragmented forms. By incorporating and integrating diverse perspectives, it seeks to provide a cohesive framework for understanding texts within contemporary discourse (Fadl, 1996, p. 153).

This indicates that textual science focuses on gathering fragments of the concept of text scattered across critical insights, aiming to reformulate them into a coherent scientific structure. This approach integrates internal elements of textual formation with their external frameworks, revealing how these elements interact and shape textual meaning. Unlike external digressions into historical, social, and psychological contexts, textual science emphasizes the presence and analysis of textual content within these contexts, aiming to elucidate their data and significance (Fadl, 1996, p. 155).

Textual science indeed aligns with linguistic approaches that focus on the construction of textual language within the framework of language distribution systems. It involves observing how linguistic

construction materials are deconstructed and redistributed across various stages within each linguistic critical approach. Moreover, textual science explores the relationship between a text and its external textual surroundings, emphasizing the intersections defined by *textual interplay—intertextuality—as Roland Barthes* describes it: "Every text is intertextuality... because language exists before and around the text, thus intertextuality imbues text theory with its social dimension"(Al-Sadd, 1997, p. 31). This perspective underscores how texts are not isolated entities but are interconnected within broader linguistic and social contexts.

Textual science prioritizes the act of reading texts within their own constructed realities rather than merely reflecting external realities. It emphasizes interpreting texts through critical approaches that scrutinize these readings, aiming to advance its position within the landscape of critical discourse. As Barthes contends regarding this interplay between internal and external textual dynamics, text theory fundamentally critiques any descriptive language, viewing it as a discourse process that seeks genuine scientific transformation (Fadl, 1996, p. 155). This approach asserts the importance of active engagement with texts to uncover deeper meanings and contribute to the evolution of textual understanding.

Roland Barthes' concept, particularly articulated in 1971, offers a profound deconstructive perspective on the nature of the text. It posits that the text is a liberating force that transcends established genres and hierarchies, creating an alternative reality that challenges conventions and rules of sense and understanding. The text, according to Barthes, echoes diverse languages and cultures, completing a map of semantic multiplicity (Fadl, 1996, p. 156). Importantly, the text lacks a definitive beginning or end, and it defies spatial and temporal sequences. It rebels against linguistic norms and surpasses any singular truth or attachment to reality. By encompassing multiple paths and layers of meaning, it offers readers numerous levels of interpretation and engagement. This view underscores the text's dynamic and expansive nature, emphasizing its capacity to provoke thought and redefine conventional boundaries.

Conclusion:

Contemporary critical studies have been shaped by two significant trends in response to the prevalence of textuality over historical, social, and psychological references that once centered on the author. One trend asserts that texts transcend the alienation of meaning inherent in external frameworks, viewing them as aggregates of critical approaches dispersed across their textual landscapes. Concurrently, another trend rooted in post-structuralist thought advocates for post-textuality, encouraging readers to actively participate in the process of liberating meaning from texts. This approach emphasizes reader engagement and co-creation of meaning, moving beyond structuralist limitations that focus narrowly on textual structures and authorial intent. Together, these trends highlight a dynamic shift towards interpreting texts as interactive and multi-dimensional entities, reshaping how meaning is perceived and constructed in contemporary literary and critical discourse.

List of references:

1. Umberto Eco. (1996p.). *The Reader in the Story (Interpretive Collaboration in Story Texts)* (1st Edition). (Antoine Abu Zeid, the translators) Casablanca - Beirut: Arab Cultural Center.

2. Tzvetan Todorov. (1990). Poetics (2nd edition). (Shukri Al-Makhbut, and Raja Ben Salama, the translators) Casablanca: Toubkal Publishing House.
3. Tzvetan Todorov. (1986). Criticism of Criticism (Learning Novel) (1st Edition). (Sami Suwaidan and Lillian Suwaidan, translators) Lebanon: National Development Center.
4. Jane B. Tompkins. (1999). Reader response criticism (from formalism to post-structuralism). (Hassan Nazim and Ali Hakim, translators) Supreme Council of Culture.
5. Hasane Ben Hasane. (2002). Interpretive theory according to Paul Ricoeur (2nd edition). Algeria: Difference Publications.
6. Hussein Khamiri. (2007). Text theory (from the structure of meaning to the semiotics of the signifier) (1st edition). Lebanon-Algeria: Arab House of Science, Publishers, Difference Publications.
7. Roland Barthes. (1986). Semiology lesson (2nd edition). (Abdel Salam Ben Abdel Ali, translators) Casablanca: Toubkal Publishing House.
8. Roman Jakobson. (1988). Poetic Issues (1st ed.). (Muhammad Al-Wali and Mubarak Hanoun, translators) Morocco: Dar Toubkal Publishing.
9. Salah Fadl. (1996). Contemporary criticism methods. Arab Horizons House.
10. Farhat Badri Al-Harbi. (2003). Stylistics in Modern Arab Criticism (A Study in Discourse Analysis) (1st Edition). Lebanon: University Foundation for Studies, Publishing and Distribution.
11. Mohammad Azzam. (2001). The absent text (manifestations of intertextuality in Arabic poetry - a study). Damascus: Arab Writers Union.
12. Megan Al-Ruwaili and Saad Al-Bazghi. (2002). The Literary Critic's Guide (Illumination of more than seventy contemporary critical trends and terms) (3rd edition). Morocco: Arab Cultural Center.
13. Nour El-Din Al-Sadd. (1997). Stylistics and Discourse Analysis (A Study in Modern Arabic Criticism) (2nd Edition). Algeria: Dar Houma.
14. Hans Jeon Gadamer. (2002). Philosophy of interpretation (origins, principles, goals). (Muhammad Shawqi Al-Zein, the translators) Algeria: Difference Publications.
15. Youssef Al-Atrash. (2004). The poetics of contemporary critical discourse (reading in the Western tributaries). Contemporary Arab criticism - reference and reception - (contemporary Arab critical discourse, its issues and trends). Algeria: Publications of the University Center Khenchela.