

The Joys of Reading and the Pains of Text A Modern Critical View of Roland Barthes' Thought A Critical Aesthetic Approach

Lahcene Azouz*

University of Batna 1

lahcene.azzouz@univ-batna.dz

Date of submission: 29-11-2025

Date of acceptance: 10-06-2026

ABSTRACT:

On the horizon of modern critical studies, accompanied by an explosion of knowledge in communication sciences, anthropology, epistemology, and knowledge, many approaches and concepts have reshaped the critical textual vision in a new light. These were produced by multiple readings of literary texts and dictated by the nature of frequent epistemological changes, while the critical view of the text remained for a long time based on a partial, grammatical, or linguistic view, or perhaps dealt with the text from outside based on historical, social, or psychological data. Contemporary critical studies have thus opened up new horizons for dealing with creative texts.

The aim of this research is to reproduce the text's evolving meaning and challenge a single interpretation, to liberate the text from the author's sole control, to shape the text through a continuous dynamic process, and to transform it from a static entity into a living cognitive experience that expands with the flexibility of the reader's perception. It also seeks to involve the reader in the creative process.

Roland Barthes's methodology is a pioneering critical and philosophical approach grounded in semiotics (the study of signs) and the deconstruction of cultural, literary, and media discourses. His approach aims to uncover the deeper meanings and ideologies that shape society by analyzing texts, images, and everyday objects as semiotic systems through the study of signs, symbols, discourse, and suggestion, and ultimately cultural patterns.

KEYWORDS: Text, Roland Barthes, Interpretation, Transcendent Reader, Semiotics, Signification, Creativity, Breach, Third Meaning, Dialogism

* _ corresponding author.

Introduction:

The emergence of modern critical studies, accompanied by an explosion of knowledge in the fields of communication sciences, anthropology, epistemology, and knowledge, has given rise to numerous approaches and concepts that have reshaped the critical textual perspective in a new light. These were produced by multiple readings of literary texts and dictated by the nature of frequent epistemological changes, while the critical view of the text remained for a long time based on a partial, grammatical, or linguistic view, or perhaps dealt with the text from outside based on historical, social, or psychological data. It is linked to the text or its internal levels; thus, contemporary critical studies have opened up new horizons for dealing with creative texts.

The literary process, then, is a “creative process,” that is, a process of creation, and the creator—or producer—is the author, and therefore the literary work remains the property of its creator. Roland Barthes summarized his critical approach in an important essay entitled “The Theory of the Text,” in which he says: The encounter between the referent or agent and language takes place through the text, for the text is a semantic practice in which it employs all its energies. The text is intertextual, and intertextuality is the reader's perception of the relationships between the text and previous or subsequent texts. The text is the actual presence of one text in another text.... The text is not a veil for meaning, but rather the meaning lies within it... The text is a “semantic” production that depends, without interruption or delay, on the commitment to the process of production, and its domain is always language, which builds and destroys it at the same time... The text is like a fabric, and the agent (writer and reader) is positioned within it and dissolved.

The process of analyzing literary texts tends to follow two theories. The first theory tends to approach the text from within, where we can discuss any text by referring to its structure and constituent

elements, such as narrative, characters, or metaphors. The second theory tends to analyze the text by describing its external structures. The term “external” refers to things other than the structure of the text, such as the author's life; that is, resorting to the author's biography, for example, to explain a particular event in the literary work. External structures play an important and significant role alongside the structure of the text. "The author's biography may be of great importance, and it is the duty of the literary historian to examine it with great care, to see in each particular case what it can provide in terms of lessons and explanations; but he must never forget that, when it comes to a more in-depth analysis, the biography will be a partial and secondary factor.

In this research paper, we attempt to present an aesthetic vision of what French critic Roland Barthes and other critics have presented as foundations that point to the author's remarkable presence.

Let us also address the most important questions

Does the idea of the “death of the author”—the liberation of the text and the complete separation of the literary text from the author's life, personal history, and intentions—mark the birth of a new element: the reader

Is the true meaning of the text born at the moment of its reading and reception, or at the moment of its writing

Does the multiplicity of readings reveal endless interpretations of the text

And to what extent did Roland Barthes rely on semiotics and the deconstruction of “everyday myths” to establish structural semiotics—that is, the study of signs and symbols in society

And did popular culture contribute to deconstructing aspects of contemporary life (such as advertising, fashion, and wrestling) and exposing ideology

1-The Illuminated Rooms of Interpretation at Barthes (The Life of the Author):

Based on Roland Barthes's rich cognitive sensitivity, his tremendous aesthetic taste, and his interaction with and transcendence of numerous fields of knowledge and science (sociology, psychology, philosophy, ethnology, anthropology, linguistics, and epistemology), we find him resorting to interpretation as a central point, connected to modern critical approaches. Indeed, these approaches originate from him and branch out from him as readings of new levels of writing, for two reasons. The first is that

language is the womb of the writing laboratory, as it consists of infinite textual practices that have led to multiple ways of searching for a different and distinctive textual modernity.

The second reason is that the reality of the text lies in its reading, which is what modern critical currents have presented, when they broke with the traditional view of the structure of literary text by moving from a discussion of duality, form and content, to a consideration of the meanings of the text and the signs that compose its structure. Instead of standard reading, modernist criticism became a reading that reveals the levels of meaning production and opens them up to their possibilities.

The literary process, then, is a “creative process,” that is, a process of creation, and the creator—or producer—is the author, and therefore the literary work remains the property of its creator. (1) When “meaning is transformed into form, it loses its potential for occurrence. It empties itself and becomes impoverished, and history evaporates, leaving only letters behind.” (2). Perhaps the process of analyzing writing and text tends toward two theories; the first tends to approach the text by describing it from within, as indicated by Iraqi researcher Dr. Adnan Khalid Abdullah when he said: “We can talk about any text by resorting to its structure and constituent elements, such as narrative, characters, or metaphor...” (3) The second approach tends to analyze the text by describing its external structures, “and external expression refers to things other than the structure of the text, such as the author's life; that is, resorting to the author's biography, for example, to interpret

828

a particular event in the literary work" (4). "The language before literature and style is almost what comes after it, as images, delivery, and vocabulary are generated from the writer's body and past to gradually become the mechanisms of his art itself. Thus, under the name of style, a self-sufficient language is formed that draws only from the individual and secret mythology of the writer." (5) As Barthes asserts, external structures play an important and significant role alongside the structure of the text. "The writer's biography may be of great importance, and it is the duty of the literary historian to examine it with great care, to see in each particular case what it can provide him with in terms of teachings and explanations; but he must never forget that, when it comes to a more in-depth analysis, the biography will be a partial and secondary factor "(6).

From all of the above, it appears to us that the saying "the death of the author" is nothing more than a completely incoherent critical fallacy; "the literary text is a complex phenomenon, subject to a set of sociological, historical, psychological, cultural, and contextual factors that cannot be reduced to a single factor." (7). How can critics and readers understand the experiences of romantic poets such as Shelley, Lorca, Keats, Amal Dunqul, Ali Mahmoud Taha, Nizar Qabbani, Al-Sayab, Al-Bayati, and Salah Abdul Sabur without considering the rich experiences of these writers' personal and social worlds? "The critical process must move with vigilance and flexibility between the various components and elements of the literary phenomenon, particularly between the author, the text, and the reader, without neglecting the context, code, and channel of communication, in order to extract the creative vision of the text and the creator, and that any transformative treatment will inevitably fall captive to a narrow, one-dimensional understanding."(8).

2-The third dynamic of meaning (contemporary dialogical vision):

The text is not only an event that immediately opens up to creative exploration, but also stores identities whose meanings increase and bet on the concerns of the world. "Compared to the level of communication and signification, there is another level, the level of meaning, which is a word that refers to the signifier (not the signified)

and is completely linked to the approach opened up by Julia Kristeva, who proposed the term 'textual semiotics' (9). So, "the dynamic we are talking about is the generation of meaning according to dual activity or double-forbidden Oedipal desire, meaning desire for the mother/construction/love and desire against the father/destruction/death; establishing an erotic relationship with the mother/texts, and destruction and an aggressive relationship towards authority/the linguistic system/the father. According to the dual nature of the text (deconstruction and construction), the multi-level text is considered productive, as Julia Kristeva sees it, aiming to produce continuous meaning. (10). The language of this writing has become a field of contemplation with the escalation of signifiers in the construction of the text; as the creator's experience expands, the signifier engraves its course in the construction of the text, and restored to words that had been worn out by frequent use by tongues and pens, giving them new meaning and breathing the spirit of the age into them. Everyday language has become an aesthetic material from which the writer creates his text and adds another kind of experience. "Starting from reality, the text opens up to the possible" (11).

Writing, first and foremost, in its initial formation and conception—breaking with convention—raises the question of language when it collides with its inherited rules and traditions, which extend throughout the course of textual discourse, beginning with a new perspective on narrative or poetic language as a transitive language; Its function is creation; that is, it is a language that is self-sufficient and, with its elements, builds a new textual world, unprecedented before, whose primary elements play their linguistic game from the unity of opposites. On the one hand, and on the other hand, its function lies primarily in magic and allusion; it is a language that does not reveal or declare, a language of ambiguity and interpretation, meaning that the function of writing is creation, not expression, and thus, "the contemporary concept of reading is connected to research, within the law of concealment, in order to arrive at a cognitive product that reveals the capabilities of the reading self, relying on the secondary symbolic system of literature, which is based on the linguistic system; but which transcends it, due to the connection

of its semantic appearance to other phenomena with which the literary text is intertwined" (12).

Bart increases his extreme sensitivity to the multiple influences of writing in his enchanting work *The Bright Room* and his photographic reflections, saying: Writing is like an image (and in Latin, a photograph was called *imago lucis opera expressa*, meaning a revealing image emitted, extracted like lemon juice by the action of light). If the photographic image belongs to a world that still has a degree of sensitivity to myth, we cannot fail to rejoice at the richness of the symbol. (13).

If language is "the dwelling place of being," as Martin Heidegger put it, then it is an opening onto being and the possibility of existence. Through language, humans journey from silence to eloquence, from the familiar to the new and beautiful, from the signifier to the signified, "and it is up to the recipient to create his own experience," as John Dewey put it. Bart went further in his provocative book *Writing at Zero*: "Another solution is the creation of a white language, free from all dependence on a system that limits language systems."

Language, in this sense, transcends the text as a possibility, opening up to more than one interpretation, resulting in multiplicity and difference. The truth of the text lies in its reading, which is what structuralism and semiotics have presented. When it broke with the way literary texts were viewed, moving from talking about duality (form, content/expression, meaning) to looking at the meanings of the text and the signs that make up its structure, and instead of standard reading, modernist criticism became a reading that reveals levels of meaning and opens them up to their possibilities. The contribution of structuralism lies in the fact that it provided criticism with a methodological approach based on the aesthetics of the text, capturing its components and internal relationships. "Things should not be viewed as they are in themselves, nor as they are known by those who

control or write about them, but rather in relation to what is known about them by those who only read or hear about them.” (16).

3-The pleasure of reading and the reader's mills:

From these premises, the reader has come to play a key role in revealing the secrets of the text through reading it. If we try to imagine literary existence, we can only touch it when the reader encounters the text, for literature is text and reader. but the text is an ambiguous existence, and this existence is only realized through the reader. Hence the importance of the reader and the significance of reading as a fundamental activity for the existence of literature.

Since its inception, reading has been a process that determines the fate of the text, and the fate of the text is determined by our reception of it and the extent of our interaction with it. Reading is no longer a single act, but has become multiple readings with different theories. One of the most important of these readings is what Tzvetan Todorov called (poetic reading), which is: "reading the text through its code, based on the data of its artistic context, and the text here is a living cell, moving from within, propelled by an irresistible force to break down all barriers between texts; Therefore, poetic reading seeks what is hidden in the text and reads beyond what is present in its wording, which makes it more capable of revealing the truths of the literary experience and enriching the data of language as a human, civilizational, and valid acquisition." (17) Here, Roland Barthes overlaps with Gérard Genette when he observes, along with Roman Jakobson and Claude Lévi-Strauss, that “humanity can know itself through its ability to create secondary meanings that can use multiple patterns of meaning.” (18).

Everyone may be familiar with the French philosopher Louis Pierre Althusser, who, in some of his readings of literary works, employed a particular method of reading, which he termed “detectivism.” In this type of reading, Louis Althusser starts from the premise that the text does not reveal everything it contains, nor does it directly articulate its contents; rather, it is the reader who makes the discovery. The critic Rivater, on the other hand, pays special attention

to the function of “semiotic reading” in his book *Semiotics of Poetry*. This critic believes that the literary phenomenon is a “dialogue between the text and the reader, and that before reaching the meaning, the reader must decipher the structural code of the text, then proceed to a second, retrospective reading, which is the stage at which the second interpretation takes place to achieve a true interpretive reading.” (19).

The text is linked to its cultural and linguistic reality and creates its own symbols, which constitute reality and language. “The reader/recipient contributes to the production of the text's meanings and the generation of meanings by receiving the text's vision of the world; he acts as a participant and interlocutor” (20). Here, poetic reading becomes one of the dimensions of the text and one of its many possibilities. “Hence, the interpretation of the text comes as a critical description, not of the text as essence, but of our understanding of the text... Therefore, there is no way to find a single interpretation for any text, and the text will continue to accept different and multiple interpretations, as many times as it is read” (21). Therefore, reading theories are nothing more than “guidelines for dealing with the text; the first reading of the text is often what determines the types of references that the reader is expected to use, as they will differ from one text to another. When dealing with literary texts, it is not expected that the result of reading will be the same for a number of readers, This has allowed some texts to be read multiple times, and each time, new insights into their referential data are revealed (22).

This does not mean, however, that poetic reading should be reduced to a sterile mechanical exercise based on a comprehensive statistical analysis of all the grammatical and rhetorical structures and linguistic constructions of the text. As we know, a sentence can be described linguistically on several levels: phonetic, phonological, syntactic, and contextual. We note that these levels are hierarchical, because if each level has its own units and unique interrelationships and requires an independent description, then realize that no level can produce meaning on its own (23), which makes some studies mere statistical data on text structures without any soul, as Abu Deeb did in his book *The Dialectic of Concealment and Manifestation*, in which he conducted structural studies of many classical and contemporary poems

using mathematical equations and graphs, turning living poetic texts into dry mathematical calculations! "Structural analysis limits meaning," asserts Roland Barthes in his famous book *Structural Analysis: Applications to Texts from the Torah, the Gospel, and the Short Story* (24).

In their study of one of Baudelaire's poems, Jacksbon and Levi-Strauss counted all the structures, leaving no internal composition in the poem unnoticed, and did not attempt to distinguish between what was artistic and what was ordinary composition. This is what made Rivater to approach the same poem with study and analysis, contradicting the approach of Jacksbon and Strauss, which was comprehensive stylistic statistical observation.

In this study, Rivater presents an alternative approach, which he calls the ideal reader approach, or

the model reader approach, in which he focuses on the subjective response that begins with the reader and ends with the text. Rivater thus presents us with the text as a "response issue" from the reader, and the poetic word is the "motive" for this response. However, this only happens after the reader takes it in and allows it to enter his mind to meet with his mental context. Thus, the starting point is from the reader to the text, not from the text to the reader. This is the most important difference between Rivater's reading of Baudelaire's poem and Jakobson and Lévi-Strauss's reading of it ; That is why Roland Barthes insists that "the image of literature that can be found in popular culture is mainly centered around the author, his personality, his history, his tastes, and his whims "(25) We know that "the text does not arise from the arrangement of words that generate a single theological meaning, if I may say so (the message of the author-god), but rather it is a multidimensional space in which multiple writings blend together and the text's contradictions result from quotations drawn from multiple cultural sources." (26). For this reason, Rivater did not fall into the trap of mechanical observation, because he realized that the reader does not actually respond to the structures of the poem, and therefore it is not necessary to observe every poetic structure in it. Any structure that does not have an effect on the reader is not worthy of observation. By

attempting to distinguish between the structures of the text, the scholar can distinguish between what is borrowed from another literary genre. Let us then move from description to judgment. Structures do not explain creativity (because every statement is constructive), but this does not mean that every statement is creative. If we try to deduce, for example, structural systems for Ibn Malik's *Alfiyah* that correspond to the systems of the poetic text (*Wahir Qalbahu*) by Al-Mutanabbi, we would fail to do so, but this does not place them on the same level. This means that structures do not precede creativity and are not the cause of it, but rather the result of it.

4-The tremors of pleasure, enjoyment, and love in contemporary criticism:

What Bart criticizes in our presentation of a single meaning leaves us confused, and this confusion may lead us to question the ability of criticism to analyze creativity. However, once we reach this point, we find that criticism comes to our aid with solutions to this dilemma, rescuing us and saving its rope from breaking. Through language, the lover expresses his encounter with the beloved under the weight of love itself with a romantic deviation, for the lover loves love and not the beloved (27). It is the principle of “reflective balance,” and this principle is based on the inevitability of balance between intellectual and ideological aesthetic taste and textual structure, meaning that in order for the structure to be “particularly poetic and productive,” it must be a reflection of the intuitive sense that arises in the reader as a result of their reception of it, or what is known as the term “horizon of expectation” (28), defined by critic Johann Wolfgang von Goethe as the set of orientations that the text displays towards a particular reader at a specific moment. In other words, it is the text that suggests its readings to the recipient, which also means that the reader does not encounter the text in isolation and alone, but rather through the textual systems deposited in his subconscious and through his reading memories, which is what the Bulgarian critic Julia Kristeva refers to as intertextual reading. A literary text is a productive text based on intertextuality, for a text is not a closed structure but one that is open to other historical and philosophical texts, etc. etc.

Thus, the principle of balance (reflective balance) establishes reading as the basis from which analysis and criticism proceed in an attempt to prove correct taste, or as Strauss says: "The goal of the structuralist is to discover: Why do literary works captivate us?) In other words, captivation comes first, followed by the process of discovering the reasons for captivation.

Hence, the value of the text lies in the reader's interaction with the elements of writing, which are "the clever tricks that involve the reader in the problems of his human condition as the primary creator of textual meaning and as the creator and reader of signs. For this reason, literary skill becomes the basis for a rule adapted to reflexive interpretation." The text we write here must give me evidence that it desires me, and this evidence exists. It is writing that lies in this science of the pleasure of speech, which is Kamasutram or Kama Sutra (*). The situation here with the text is like the situation with a love relationship. Both are charged with a powerful meaning that cannot be interrupted, and the lover finds himself, in another eloquent expression, in a crucible of meaning because of his unbridled need to interpret the mysterious symbols he sees in the behavior of his beloved. In other words, the lover is also a reader, but he is a reader of a special kind, the kind that deserves the text when it is written by a sincere author. "The death of the father deprives literature of much of its pleasure " (29) and that the response to the text must be pleasure (plaisir) and enjoyment (jouissance). It is an interactive, restless, turbulent life that shakes the reader, the lover, and the author, shaking the soul, memories, and language "in a cultural movement that is neither flat nor linear" (30).

The question here is also: How can we protect the text from falling victim to extremism by opening the door to free reading?

How can we protect it from readers who may not be qualified to perform this role?

The real protection for the text is context. A thorough knowledge of context is a prerequisite for correct reading, and we cannot consider a reading to be correct unless it is based on the principle of context. Context does not only mean what the writer intended, but also what the reader can prove. The reader is no longer a metal vessel whose only role is to absorb what is poured into it, and the correct reader no longer accepts the role assigned to him. The writer has formulated the text according to his own lexicon, and every word in this lexicon carries with it a long and varied history, some of which the writer was aware of and some of which he was unaware of. But what is absent is only absent from the writer's mind and not from the word, which remains pregnant with all its history. The true reader is the one who receives the text according to his own evolving lexicon, in which meanings diversify and multiply, enabling the text to acquire new values that change even for a single reader from one reading of the same text to another.

As for the inadequacy of this reading awareness, it fails to interpret the text stylistically or poetically, and the fault then lies not with the text but with the reader himself. This reminds us of an example given by Ibn Sina, which applies to all those who are incapable, who are like someone who is unable to make a chair out of wood, for this is not due to the wood itself, but to the maker himself).

Reading, then, is the process of entering into the context, an attempt to classify the text in a context that includes similar texts.

We must understand that the phrase “the correct reader” refers only to the reader and is not a description of reading. We do not propose anything called correct reading, and there is no such term in linguistic and stylistic criticism and its schools, because the interpretations of the correct or ideal reader, as in Rivater, cannot be described as correct, because this description implies the possibility of describing them as incorrect, and this is never the case. Whenever the reader is proficient in the literary context of the text, and whenever he understands the movement of signs and their grammatical structure, his interpretation of it is entirely acceptable. As long as there is no fixed or essential meaning, there will be no room for judgment or for judging its

correctness or incorrectness, and every reading of a text is an interpretation of it.

5-Textual Pulse and the Philosophy of Temporal Deconstruction:

The critical trends with which Roland Barthes interacted transformed the reader from a follower of textual codes to a true producer of text. This gave rise to studies of interpretation and exegesis, leading to the emergence of a new critical trend revolving around exegesis and multiple readings, which was termed *Hermenetique*, which is linked to another critical movement, *Intertextuality*. This movement posits that the present text cannot be understood without referring to dozens of texts that preceded it and are stored in our memory. The correct reader establishes a legitimate relationship between the text and the knowledge heritage. *Intertextuality* is the reading of multiple statements in a single literary discourse, which refers us to multiple other discourses that may correspond to the literary text in question, because the poetic code cannot be hostage to a single code, but rather intersects with several codes, each of which negates the other. (31). According to Roland Barthes, this paved the way for the emergence of “*paragrammatisme***,” which is possible in historical speech, i.e., double writing that includes textual dialogue with other texts “(32) Roland Barthes defines literary text as geological accumulations or layers that have piled up on top of each other over time. In this sense, it is an accumulated fabric of previous texts and other present ones, which is called “*intertextuality*.” He adds that the text is not a presence of the author, but rather a metaphor, a transformation, and a selection. Thus, it becomes a fabric (*Tissus*) of quotations, references, and echoes, as well as a composition of past and contemporary language that permeates it entirely.

In other words, *intertextuality* is “the internalization of a previous text in the context of a subsequent text, whereby this process generates renewed meanings that cannot be explored in the previous text, and which may have a distinct semantic presence in the subsequent text.” (33) By reviving a number of texts in the new text and bringing them together in the horizon of the new poem (34), or as

M. Riffaterre says: (Intertextuality is the set of texts that we find to be similar to the text we are reading; it is the sum of the texts that come to mind when reading a particular passage) (35) or it is (the presence of absent texts that interact with the text being read) (36).

Intertextuality, then, is the study of the present text through its relationship with previous texts, especially complex relationships that can only be discovered through the cultural background of the scholar or recipient. It is necessary to acquire special textual mechanisms in employing the heritage background – negatively, positively, in agreement, and in disagreement, which complicates the research into tracing the true sources of the text and writing. Ferdinand de Saussure says in *The Use of Poetic Language* (which is the absorption of a number of texts in the poetic message that presents itself, on the other hand, as a field of central meaning ... Intertextuality grows through a complex movement of affirming and negating other texts (37), meaning that “every text stands at the crossroads of several other texts, and is at once a rereading, an intensification, a condensation, a transmission, and a deepening of them,” as Philippe Sollers (38) .

The process of intertextuality is the absorption of texts, with additions, omissions, changes, and alterations, which makes a single text contain countless other texts, because writers are products of their environment and do not create their work from a vacuum. but rather tries to give it a kind of uniqueness that amazes us with these new texts according to the new production, after exploding the previous texts into fragments and leaving nothing that fits his vision, which generates new meanings in a specific context, whether “intentionally” or subconsciously—through the stock – according to the artistic construction mechanisms of his creative text and its implications, correspondences, and references to previous or contemporary texts (intertextuality is a means of communication without which no linguistic discourse can achieve its purpose) (39) or, as Hassan Muhammad Hammad says: “Intertextuality necessarily overlaps with other texts at varying levels... texts from previous cultures and texts from current cultures, for every text is a tapestry of old threads.”(40) Or, as Roland Barthes put it “A text is made up of fragments of terms

and formulas, patterns of rhythm, fragments of social speech, and so on, which are incorporated into it and redistributed in a new way. There is always speech before and around the text.” (41)

Froland Bart expanded the intertextual circle in form and content, and it is this explanatory expansion that helps the true reader to attempt to disconnect a subsequent text from previous texts, whether in terms of structure or meaning, in order to place the new text in its proper place, highlighting what the creator has added, omitted, or contradicted in the texts that are intertextual with the present text, because (the text is not an expressive space, but rather a space of “Action Writing,” as Barthes himself argued in his theory of reading (42), or as Julia Kristeva said that the text (is a collection of utterances taken from other texts, one of which invalidates the other), and not as Gérard Genette argued that intertextuality: (merely a relationship of coexistence between two or more texts; that is, the confirmed presence of one text within another) (43) and limited it to quotation, allusion, and plagiarism (44) because intertextuality goes beyond content to form, weight, vocabulary, phrases, and works. The writer's task is an artistic task of construction and destruction, as well as an aesthetic task that expands the scope of life and the recipient's vision, which makes him create an effect that is unlike the previous effect, taking him out of the circle of repetition and similarity and into the circle of creativity through imagination, imitation, and so on, because humans change and evolve, and does not shrink. The more he keeps up with the times, the more his creativity grows and his circle of knowledge expands, enriching the creative process and enriching the human literary movement.

Hence, poetic reading (semiotic, revelatory, stylistic, intertextual, deconstructive) is a creative reading that reproduces the text in light of a series of intertwined intertextual relationships. Thus, we find that the general framework of reading effectiveness expands beyond the principle of aesthetic pleasure or the process of artistic appreciation to become a reader who produces the text. This, of course, depends on the nature of the reader himself, his level of cultural and philosophical qualifications, his taste, and the extent of his intelligent methods in discussing the text!

6-The reality of the text, structural criticism, and beyond:

Poetic language does not convey the world literally, but rather contributes to reshaping and forming life. In other words, it is a language that deviates from the familiar and the ordinary. Stylistic texts need to be interpreted and reinterpreted. This intersects with ancient Arabic texts, where Ibn Rushd says: "It is the removal of the meaning of the word from its real meaning to its figurative meaning." In other words, interpretation that relies on the openness of the linguistic structure to all questions. Ibn Hazm considers interpretation to be a deviation from the text and its true image.

The new written language has escaped from the external to the internal, the esoteric, and the purely subjective, thereby changing the use of language and acquiring a new identity, where "the language of poetry is not a means of conveying ideas, but rather is one with ideas." Adonis confirms this by saying: "The language of ancient Arabic poetry is a language of expression, I mean a language that is satisfied with reality and the world, touching them with a delicate, fleeting touch. Modern poetry strives to replace the language of expression with the language of creation and production." The value of the poetic stylistic text lies in its artistic effectiveness, such that it reproduces itself, creating a network of relationships between its words or elements, referred to as (mediators or semantic intersections).

It is not behind poetic reading, isolating language and structure from human civilization's destiny, from vision, and from human problems. In his book *The Dialectic of Concealment and Manifestation*, Kamal Abu Deeb believes that poetry is an approach to seeing the world and penetrating its shell to reach the sharp contradictions that weave themselves into its fabric and substance, giving human existence a profound duality, the tragedy of birth and the joy of death (45)! !

Language is a language of signs, with new connotations, and thus the entire text becomes a sign of signs in terms of its form in its new construction, which involves the mystical experience associated with

human existence and contemplative vision with intellectual and philosophical tendencies, making the contemporary text a generative text, a productive text that does not begin at a specific point and end at a specific point. It is a text that opens up to past texts that are absent and to multiple readings.

Conclusion:

The text of interpretation is the most pressing question in modern critical consciousness. It touches upon and delves into contemporary poetic texts, attempting to penetrate its boundaries not to capture a single meaning, but to test the reader's intuition, contemplation, anticipation, and intelligence by touching on the transparency, beauty, and rhythm of meaning and delving into its twists and turns. The text is the creator of the self, and the reader is nothing but another self searching for a new text, which opens up a wider field for a stylistic approach that is full of openness, diversity, difference, creation, and production, crystallized through questions of constant concern.

Writing remains “a way of destroying the world and recreating it” (46), as Roland Barthes asserts in his book *Criticism and Truth*....

References:

(1)- Fadel Thamer, The Second Language (on the problem of method, theory, and terminology in modern Arab critical discourse), Arab Cultural Center, Casablanca, Morocco, Beirut, Lebanon, 1st edition, 1994, p. 132.

(2)- Roland Barthes, Myths (The Myth of Daily Life), translated by: Qasim Al-Miqdad, Nineveh House for Studies, Publishing and Distribution, Damascus, Syria, 2012, p. 235.

(3)- Adnan Khaled Abdullah, Applied Analytical Criticism, General Directorate of Cultural Affairs, Ministry of Information, Baghdad, Iraq, 1st ed., 1986, p. 15.

(4)- Ibid., p. 16.

(05)- Roland Barthes, Writing at Zero Degree, translated by: Muhammad Nadim Al-Khashim, Center for Cultural Development for Studies, Translation and Publishing, Aleppo, Syria, 1st ed., 2002, p. 17.

(6)- Lucien Goldman, Formative Structuralism and Literary Criticism, Arab Research Foundation, Beirut, Lebanon, 1st ed., 1984, p. 16.

(7) - Fadel Thamer, The Second Language (on the problem of method, theory, and terminology in modern Arab critical discourse), p. 133.

(8) - Ibid., p. 133.

(9)- Roland Barthes, *The Third Meaning and Other Articles*, translated and introduced by: Aziz Youssef Al-Mutalibi, House of Wisdom, Bab Al-Muadham, Baghdad, Iraq, 1st ed., 2011, p. 56.

(10) - Hussein Khamri, *Text Theory, From the Structure of Meaning to the Semiotics of the Dal*, Arab House of Science Publishers, Lebanon, and Difference Publications, Algeria, 7th edition, 2007, p. 276.

(11)- Adonis (Ali Ahmed Saeed), *Introduction to Arabic Poetry*, Dar Al-Awda, Beirut, Lebanon, 4th edition, 1983, p. 119.

(12)- Wahb Ahmed Roumieh, *Our Old Poetry and New Criticism*, World of Knowledge Series, National Council for Culture, Arts and Letters, Kuwait, Issue 207, Shawwal 1416 AH/March 1996, pp. 23, 25.

(13) - Roland Barthes, *The Luminous Room (Reflections on Photography)*, translated by: Hala Nimr, reviewed by: Anwar Mughith,

National Center for Translation, Egypt, No. 1464, 2010, p. 75.

(14)- Shaker Abdel Hamid, *Aesthetic Preference, (A Study in the Psychology of Artistic Taste)*, World of Knowledge Series, National Council for Culture, Arts and Letters, Kuwait, No. 267, Dhu al-Hijjah 1421 AH/March 2001, p. 403.

(15) - Roland Barthes, *Writing at Zero Degree*, translated by: Muhammad Nadim Al-Khashim, p. 100.

(16) – Roland Barthes, Philippe Hamon, Ryan Watt, and Michael Rivater, *Literature and Reality*, translated by: Abdul Jalil Al-Azdi and Muhammad Mu'tasim, Al-Ikhtilaf Publications, Algeria, 2nd ed., 2003, p. 43.

(17)- Abdullah Muhammad Al-Ghadami, *Sin and Atonement*, (From Structuralism to Anatomical), Dar Suad Al-Sabah, Kuwait, 3rd ed., 1993, p. 76.

(18) – Roland Barthes and Gérard Genette, *From Structuralism to Poetics*, translated by: Ghassan Al-Sayed, Nineveh House for Studies, Publishing and Distribution, Syria, 1st ed., 2001, p. 17.

(19)- Fadel Thamer, *The Second Language* (on the problem of method, theory, and terminology in modern critical Arab discourse), p. 53.

(20)- Abdul Qader Abbou, *The Centrality of Interpretation for Communication and Dialogue with the Contemporary Poetic Text* (From Al-Jurjani to Todorov and Jacobson), Magazine, Contemporary Writings, Beirut, Lebanon, Issue 41, August / September 2000, Volume 11, p. 101.

(21)- Abdullah Muhammad Al-Ghadami, *Sin and Atonement*, (From Structuralism to Anatomical), p. 83.

(22)- Abdul Aziz Al-Sabil, *The Dual Text* (A Reading of the Elegy of Malik bin Al-Rayb), World of Knowledge Series, National Council for Culture, Arts and Letters, Kuwait, Issue 1, September 1998, Volume 27, p. 64.

(23) – Roland Barthes, *Introduction to the Structural Analysis of Stories*, translated by: Munther Ayashi, Center for Cultural Development, Syria, Dar Lusoy, Paris, 1st ed., 1993, p. 35.

(24) – Roland Barthes, Textual Analysis (Applications to Texts from the Torah, the Bible, and the Short Story), translated and presented by: Abdel Kabir Al-Sharqawi, Dar Al-Takween for Authorship, Translation, Publishing, and Al-Zaman Publications, Syria, Morocco, 2009, p. 76.

(25) – Roland Barthes, Semiology Lesson, translated by: Abdel Salam Benabdelali, Toubkal Publishing House, Morocco, 3rd edition, 1993, p. 81.

(26) – Ibid., p. 85.

(27) – Roland Barthes, Fragments from a Discourse on Love, translated by: Elham Salim Hattit and Habib Hattit, National Council for Culture, Arts and Letters, International Creativity Series, Kuwait, No. 324, 1st edition, 2001, p. 40.

(28) Hussein Al-Wad, in Methods for Literary Studies, Saras Publishing, Tunisia, 1st edition, 1985, p. 77.

(29)- Roland Barthes, The Pleasure of the Text, p. 85.

(30)- Roland Barthes, Structural Criticism of the Story, translated by: Antoine Abu Zaid, Oweidat Publications, Beirut, Paris, Sushbers, Morocco, 1st edition, 1988, p. 88.

(31)- Kristena julia, sémiotica, trad madrid 1981 page 66

******- Paragrammatisme: absorbing multiple texts (meanings) within the poetic message

(32) – Roland Barthes, The Hissing of Language, translated by: Munther Ayashi, Center for Cultural Development, Aleppo, Syria, 1st ed., 1999, p. 194.

(33) Youssef Ziedan, Contemporary Sufi Poetry, Fusul Magazine, Volume Fifteen, Issue Two, Summer 1996, p. 154.

(34)- Hatem Al-Sakr, Prose Poem and Modern Poetics, Fusul Magazine, Volume Fifteen, Issue Two, Summer 1996, p. 85.

(35) Hassan Muhammad Hadd, The Interference of Texts in the Arabic Novel, Egyptian General Book Authority/Egypt 1998, p. 17.

(36)- Ibid., p. 17.

(37) Salah Fadl, The Style of Intertextuality between Al-A'raf and Intertextuality, p. 76, taken from Kristeva julia, sémiotica, page 66.

(38)- Tzvetan Todorov and others, On the Origins of the New Critical Discourse, House of General Cultural Affairs, translated by Ahmed Al-Madini, 1st edition, 1987, Iraq, Baghdad, p. 105.

(39)- Muhammad Muftah, Analysis of Poetic Discourse, "The Strategy of Intertextuality", Arab Cultural Center, Casablanca, Morocco, 3rd edition, 1992, p. 134.

(40) Hassan Muhammad Hammad, The Interference of Texts in the Arabic Novel, p. 28.

(41) - Roland Barthes, Text Theory, translated by: Mongi Al-Shamli, Abdullah Sulla, and Muhammad Al-Qadi, Annals of the Tunisian University, Faculty of Arts and Humanities, Issue 27, 1988, p. 81.

(42)- See: Omar Okan, Introduction to the Study of Text and Authority, East Africa, Casablanca, Morocco 1991, pp. 50, 51.

(43) See: Ibid., pp. 50-51.

)44) Hassan Muhammad Hammad, The Interference of Texts in the Arabic Novel, p. 30.

(45) Kamal Abu Deeb, in Poetry, Arab Research Foundation, Beirut, 1987, p. 143.

(46)- Roland Barthes, Criticism and Truth, translated by: Munther Ayashi, Center for Cultural Development, Syria, 1st ed., 1994, pp. 115, 116.