

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36719/2706-6185/46/179-189>

Asma Yahi

University Center – AbdelhafidBoussouf – Mila. Algeria

<https://orcid.org/0009-0001-0886-4861>

a.yahi@centre-univ-mila.dz

Literary Meaning as the Product of Dialogue between the Reader and the text through Hans Robert Jauss's Theses

Abstract

The theses of reading and reception theories have contributed to activating the movement of Western thought, thereby activating the reader's practice in the critical perspective of postmodernism, and due to the conflicting opinions and studies on the different aspects of meaning. Both Iser and Jauss who has legitimacy in owning and producing it, tried to establish a relationship between the reader and the text based on the principles of interaction and dialogue. Unlike critical studies of formalism or modernism that recognize the existence of a meaning as being either clear, not subjected to concealment attempts as if the text is a transparent glass vessel that reveals what is inside it not needing any effort, or a meaning that has been subjected to attempts of concealment. The reader's task is to merely remove the "curtains" and reveal what is hidden. Through these two visions, the text has a meaning-bearing presence / authority, and the reader is only a passive medium that transmits meaning in light of the transparency of the text, or a positive medium that removes those "curtains"; in both cases, he is subject to the authority of the text, being the focus of reading / study. So, the literary meaning still moves between intentions / authorities, the intentionality of the author, the intentionality of the text and the intentionality of the reader without any of them being able to catch it or put it under its authority.

Keywords: *reading, dialogue, Jauss, text, horizons of waiting*

Əsma Yahi

Universitet Mərkəzi – AbdelhafidBoussouf – Mila. Əlcəzair

<https://orcid.org/0009-0001-0886-4861>

a.yahi@centre-univ-mila.dz

Hans Robert Jaussun tezləri vasitəsilə oxucu ilə mətn arasında dialoqun məhsulu kimi ədəbi mənə

Xülasə

Oxuma və qəbuletmə nəzəriyyələri tezləri Qərb tənqidi düşüncəsinin hərəkətini aktivləşdirməyə, bununla da oxucu praktikasını postmodernizmin tənqidi perspektivində aktivləşdirməyə töhfə vermiş və mənanın müxtəlif aspektləri ilə bağlı ziddiyyətli fikir və araşdırmalara görə, ona sahib olmaq və istehsal etməkdə legitimliyi olan həm İser, həm də Yauss mətnin tənqidi dialoq, tənqidi dialoq əsasında qurulmasına çalışmışlar. Bir mənanın varlığını ya aydın, gizlətmə cəhdlərinə məruz qalmayan mətn — sanki heç bir şeyə ehtiyac duymadan içindəkini üzə çıxaran şəffaf şüşə qabdır — ya da ört-basdır cəhdlərinə məruz qalmış mənə kimi qəbul edən formalizm və ya modernizm araşdırmaları; oxucunun vəzifəsi sadəcə "pərdələri" çıxarmaq və gizlədilmişləri üzə çıxarmaqdır. Bu iki baxış vasitəsilə mətn mənə daşıyan varlığa/səlahiyyətə malikdir və oxucu yalnız mətnin şəffaflığı işığında mənasını ötürən passiv bir vasitə və ya həmin "pərdələri" götürən müsbət bir vasitədir; hər iki halda o, oxumaq/öyrənmək məqsədi ilə mətnin səlahiyyətinə tabedir. Deməli, ədəbi mənə hələ də niyyətlər/səlahiyyətlər — müəllifin niyyəti, mətnin niyyəti və oxucu niyyəti — arasında hərəkət edir; onlardan heç biri onu tuta bilmir və ya öz səlahiyyətinə salır.

Açar sözlər: *oxu, dialoq, Jauss, mətn, gözləmə üfqləri*

Introduction

Classical studies have been looking hard for how to reach the final meaning that the texts carry within them. Sometimes the author has the best of luck, where the text turns into a simply psychological or social document of the life of its author; at other times, it is that mirror that reflects the economic and historical conditions of society...But at the end of the sixties, new ideas emerged research and studies that changed the concept of the text, where many questions arise: What makes ancient texts still pregnant with connotations and meanings despite the change in circumstances that first gave birth to them? And before this, what is a text? What makes it so and not something else?

Research

The Controversy of Meaning between the Authority of the Reader and the Authority of the Text

If the concept of the text before was before a linguistic form characterized by a certain length, with the contemporary linguistic revolution, this concept exceeds external formal standards, as the text can match a word or sentence as it can match an entire book. In addition, it has become characterized by its independence and self-isolation, thus forming its own linguistic system. This independence was not officially announced until after the declaration of the death of the author as the first creator of the text in Barthes's article "The Death of the Author" in 1968 –even if this death was accompanied by the birth of another person. The attention of post-modern critics is no longer focused on the process of criticism or the science of literature or the author and his intention, but is focused on the text, its meaning and recipient. Thus, the critical scene is ready for a new shift due to the presence of variables limited by Abdul Aziz Hamouda in three main ones (Hamouda, 2003, p. 111).

First is the fall of the god of science, and then the collapse of the structural project and its failure to achieve scientific validity and universality.

Second is the destruction of the metaphysics of presence which was achieved by the philosophers, starting with Nietzsche and ending with hermeneutics.

Third is the inability of the linguistic sign to achieve significance after the relationship of unity between the signifier and the signified turned into an elusive relationship through the transformation of the signified to another signifier in an infinite game. With the combination of these factors, the text has become unable to bring about a specific meaning or even multiple meanings, so the attention moved from the text itself and its author to its reader because the text does not exist without its reader. If so, then the meaning that the text holds cannot be within the text, that is, it is not achieved without a response, which means that the meaning is only the reader's response and does not exist except during the process of perception/awareness that the reader undertakes towards the text.

As such, the shift of interest to the reader was the collection of the results of previous critical doctrines, where the critical readings at the beginning of the twentieth century, with the rise of the star of modern linguistics and its uneven influence on the formalist critical schools (Russian formalism, criticism, new criticism and structuralism), were based on the recognition of the existence of "meaning" in the text. "The meaning was either clear, not subjected to deliberate or unintentional concealments, as if the text were a transparent glass vessel that reveals at first sight what is inside it and does not require any real effort on the part of the reader to reveal it... [Or] the text has a hidden meaning, and the task of the reader or critic is to uncover the hidden meaning of the text and to remove the layers that and obscure" (Hamouda, 2003, p. 115). Through these two visions, the text has a meaning-bearing existence / authority, and the reader / critic is only an intermediary. He is either a passive carrier of this meaning in light of the transparency of the text or an active revealer of meaning. The reader / critic in both cases only has to submit to the authority of the text – the latter being the focus of reading / study, but the perspective of this formal vision remains incomplete as the text does not have an actual existence and must be read first to be discussed. This reading entails a difference in methods and therefore a difference in interpretation, "because it is the reader who applies the code in which the message [i.e., the text] was written, and

realizes its meaning; otherwise, this meaning remains only a possibility, and if we consider the simplest examples of interpretation, we find that the recipient is often actively immersed in the formation of meaning” (Selden, 1991, p. 182). Through this, the reader has an active role in the production of meaning through strategies and structures provided by the text to the reader (which will be clarified later). The problem that arises, however, is whether these strategies are launched by the text towards the reader, or whether they are mechanisms for the reader to try to open the closed doors of the text?

This is how the argument shifted from author/text authority to text/reader authority. Although the text is the same, its concept is different, in that text is no longer closed (Al-Bazie, Al-Ruwaili, 2005, pp. 272-273). In structure and self-sufficient, but has become an open text that hosts the reader to create interaction with him by filling in the blanks, analyzing and deciphering the codes... in order to produce meaning in an aesthetic way. This is the role of the reader who is looking for the aesthetic pleasure that generates texts. Reading, therefore, is no longer a traditional simple act whose only concern is to find the final meaning of the text, which is believed to be “definitively drafted and defined, so all that remains is to find it as it is, or as it was in the writer's mind, reading [here]... is like the philosophers’ reading of existence; it's a creative act that combines symbol to symbol, sign to sign and walks in very twisted paths of semantics” (Ismail, 2002, p. 16). In an endless series of convergence of the reader and the text in the absence of truth / meaning that previous studies have bothered to grasp, as there are only echoes of traveling /transcending meanings within the texts. If the text itself is a collection of overlapping texts and moves from one recipient to another through different times, how can it have one or even multiple meanings? This does not mean in any way falling into nihilism or the chaos of reading and interpretations. During the act of reading, the reader must be armed with some mechanisms to enter the endless world of the text; on the other hand, the text must confront and show resistance, thus breathing life into it again with each reading, for it can be said that “text is dead” by simply grasping its only and final meaning or by claiming to have done so.

Based on this, Barthes differentiated between consumer reading texts that end as soon as their meaning is reached. “It was written with the intention of delivering and conveying a specific and precise message, and it assumes a passive reader whose task is limited to receiving and perceiving the message ... by tracing the fixed patterns and structure of meaning. In this process of consumption he is rigid and sterile, and the role of the author is limited to that of the actor who presents the supposed actual reality” (Al-Bazie, Al-Ruwaili, 2005, p. 274). As for the written texts that are produced and rewritten with each reading, there are continuous, constantly changing interpretations, thus transforming “the role of the reader into an active positive role, a productive and constructive role where he participates (though does not exceed) the author in the production of the text” (Al-Bazie, Al-Ruwaili, 2005, p. 274).

Therefore, the existing and raging conflict between the text and the reader and the quest of each to control the other led to a change in the methods of studying artistic texts where the reader took the most important role, in that he is no longer satisfied with silent reading and negative reception, but has become a participant / questioner / actor / producer of the text. This approach of studies directed at the reader almost represents “an organized attack on the foundations of a critical endeavor that sees meaning as inherent in the text” (Ismail, 2002, p. 26).

From here, it is important to emphasize that the study of literary work should not be concerned with the text only, but also with the act of reading, as the text has gaps through which the aesthetic subject of the literary work can be produced. Ingarden’s concept of literary work formed an appropriate framework for establishing Iser’s hypotheses. It is necessary to “distinguish between the text in its ontological state, that is, as a set of ‘calligraphic appearances’ through which the aesthetic subject is constructed, and the acts of investigation as epistemological activities by which the reader ends up producing the aesthetic subject... If so, the literary work cannot be reduced to the text or to the act of investigation, but rather to the convergence of the text and the reader” (Shorfi, 2007, pp. 180-181). This means that the literary work is the same as the aesthetic subject – in Ingarden’s view – to which the text refers, and his can only be achieved by the interaction between it and the reader.

He also sees that the literary work has two poles: an artistic pole belonging to the text as produced by the author and an aesthetic pole belonging to the action of the text reader (Shorfi, 2007, p. 181).

Thus, it is clear that the pendulum of Western thought does not stop searching for new methods that bring a correct understanding of what is read, as required by the changes that occur in the intellectual arena, so the problem of reading has become a forgotten / marginal problem to which theories of thought turned a blind eye. This reading entity was born when the “death of the author” was announced. The latter, which was the focused of most of the previous studies that took interest in its sanctification as well as the extent of his impact on what he writes, was the center of understanding / reading / interpretation and center of the creative process as a whole; therefore, the research was subject to the so-called “author’s authority”, but the studies have been looking for another factor, the factor of novelty and aesthetics; that was the “text”.

New movements such as New Criticism and Structuralism emerged that were associated to varying degrees with the modern linguistic revolution. New criticism argues that “the critic should pay attention to the work itself... He lets feelings take charge of themselves” (Ragheb, 2003, p. 685).

That is, they focus on the literary work itself away from the application of ready-made general rules and the issuance of value judgments. Its critics, therefore, “seek above all to analyze the work and enlighten it from within” (Ragheb, 2003, p. 286). Hence, the movement of new criticism moved attention to the text and its internal structure, thus helping to free it from the author’s authority.

As for structuralism, it went further when it popularized the idea of “death of the author” not as a being of flesh and bone, but as a being that is transcendent / knowledgeable, claiming to own the truth/meaning. His presence disrupts the effectiveness of the text and kills its being. In doing so, structuralism gave the virtue of producing meaning and producing significance for the text as a system / linguistic structure / system formed by the relationships of words to each other without relying on an external reference such as the author or the reader. In doing so, it has excluded the role of the active/creative self, whether it is the producer or recipient of the text, because “for structuralists, the meaning is to reveal the character of this system” (Khider, 1998, p. 134).

This is the case on the surface, but a closer analysis reveals that it does not cut the role of the reader. “Perhaps it is the focus on the text that will lead to initial assumptions about reading... For the most important component that structural studies have chosen without stopping at it or looking at it... is the reader and reading, the sign of the text and the reader and the interaction between them” (Ismail, 1992, p. 29). In this process of detection and the recipient’s understanding of the patterns of linguistic structures through his experiences, in addition to the fact that the birth of the reader with as a project to establish a new understanding / interpretation is contingent on the death of the author. As approved by Sussurian linguistics – being the most important basis –the text is a linguistic construction that does not open its doors except through language, and since the signifier is a sound image and the meaning is a mental image that refers to the imagined “the language of the text expresses an absent not a present and the multiplicity of connotations for one meaning” (Bara, 2008, p. 335). This is what most of the trends agreed on later, such as the theory of reception and the strategy of deconstruction. Through these principles, the author’s authority and centrality were undermined, but despite the absence and neglect that the author was subjected to in various research and subsequent studies, they could not exclude him at all because the author of the text remains its author.

Based on the foregoing, it can be said that the authority to achieve meaning has passed from the text to the reader, as he was given all the powers to determine/reproduce it, but on what basis or philosophical legitimacy do the proponents of the theory of reception rely to assign power to the reader? All studies have unanimously agreed that the Hermeneutics of Gadmir, the phenomenology of Husserl and Ingarden had a prominent impact on the reception poles Hans Robert Jauss and Wolfgang Iser respectively, although they differed in practice/ methodology, as Jauss was interested in the series of actual receptions of the literary creative work throughout history, while Iser based his thesis on the “act of reading” in itself by focusing his attention on how a text interacts with its reader and the extent of the influence it exerts on him, but both constitute a theory of reception

interested in the reader in its comprehensive concept. Therefore, is it not possible to say that the process of grasping meaning has moved from a dialectical relationship between the authority of the text and the authority of the reader to a dialogue/interactive relationship between them, thus moving from trying to grasp it to trying to construct it?

But this transition and the absence of the author in trying to reach meaning and in light of those views that provoked a wide debate amid the intellectual movement, such as the strategy of deconstruction, which popularized/advocated (no) concepts all pouring into the mold of infinite significance or infinity of meaning, and various philosophical hermeneutic trends (Heidegger, Gadamer...) which made both the author and the reader a linguistic being who cannot impose his authority over the language or the text, in the midst of that a tone rose to reduce relativism, nihilism and the chaos of interpretation in order to establish an interpretation of texts on objective grounds and to give credit back to the intention of the author, whose death was declared by structuralism and who did not receive attention from philosophers of interpretation and difference. This project was adopted by Hirsch, who believes that the meaning of the text cannot be determined in isolation from the intention of the author.

The traditional hermeneutics (Schleiermacher, Delthey) saw understanding as a process of renewal or psychological reconstruction, and the object of understanding was to reach the original meaning of the text that brought it to the present from a past that had become inaccessible. Since the text is an expression of the author's ideas and intentions, reaching them through understanding is reaching and grasping the meaning of the text and thus achieving an objective interpretation that limits the exaggeration of multiple interpretations and the chaos of infinite significance. Perhaps this is what prompted Hersh to make two claims "concerning literary meaning by saying that there is no objectivity (in interpretation) unless the meaning itself is unchanged, and therefore ... meaning is considered a matter of consciousness, not words" (Couznez Hoy, 2008, p. 28). Thus, the attempt to trace the author's intention in the process of reading and interpretation is aimed at overcoming the relativism/formalism in the possibility of a valid interpretation or objectivity in interpretation, which Hersh sees as residing in a "radical historicity, evident in the works of Heidegger and Gadamer" (Couznez Hoy, 2008, p. 29). where objectivity insists that "there is a meaning that in principle does not change, which we should presuppose as the object of all interpretation, if some interpretations are to be believed to be more true or correct than others" (Couznez Hoy, 2008, pp. 29-30). But by putting this forward, Hersh is closer to falling into the dogmatism of ideas/meanings than to achieving objectivity as an undefined goal that may never be achieved, and thus falling into the illusion of objectivity or imagined reality, the reality of capturing meaning.

Hirsch proceeds from the linguistic character of the text as the legitimate entrance in every hermeneutical approach, as the text in his view is the bearer of the verbal meaning that the author intended and meant, so it is "in the end a meaning that can be determined in principle and remains constant through time, and can be recovered and produced by every competent reader. Moreover, the verbal intent of the author is not the entire mental state of the author at the moment of writing, but only one of the manifestations of this situation, which came into existence through expression depending on the abilities, possibilities, customs and traditions of language, and therefore it is a common meaning among readers who have the ability to know the same customs and traditions and apply them in their interpretive practice" (Al-Bazie, Al-Ruwaili, 2005, p. 90). As long as this is the case, the meaning of the text remains undetermined unless the reader makes a process of linking it to the author's intention and he can only do so by reusing the same logic adopted by the author during writing (the norms and traditions of language, internal and external references...) or what he calls the "principle of participation". "This understanding that captures this specific and unchanged meaning is completely neutral and impeccable, because it is not one of the normative objectives of the interpreter or one of his own views of the importance of work" (Couznez Hoy, 2008, pp. 29-30). This is impossible to achieve in practice/application, for limiting the significance/meaning to a historically changing reader and a chronologically moving text is a form of risk.

To overcome this contradiction, which was not lost on Hirsch's mind, he tried to differentiate between the meaning and the signification. Meaning "is what a text represents, what the author

means by using a sequence of special evidence, meaning what the evidence represents, and the significance means the relationship between the meaning and the person, the concept, the situation or anything imaginable, and the meaning is fixed and unchanging because the author's intentions from which the meaning was issued are given in a final way, while the variable is the significance given by each interpreter according to his intentions" (Muftah, 1990, p. 105).

Thus, the meaning is fixed related to the intentionality of the author, while the significance is changing linked to the intentionality of the reader. Accordingly, in Hirsch's view, a distinction should be made between the goal of the field of interpretation and the goal of the field of literary criticism, for "the field of literary criticism aims to reach the meaning of the literary text [significance] for an era, while the theory of interpretation aims to reach the meaning of the literary text ... Meaning is based on some kind of relationship between the text and the reader, but meaning is based in the work itself" (Abu Zeid, 2005, p. 48).

But what if the meaning changes for the author himself? Hersh answers, "When we claim that the meaning of the text has changed in relation to its author, we mean the significance on the basis that the author in this case became a reader and thus his relationship with the text changed" (Abu Zeid, 2005, p. 48). Through this, cannot the meaning be considered the same as the significance from Hirsch's point of view and therefore both are changing?! This is what led him to attach, on the other hand, between the meaning intended by the author and the full meaning in the text. What is important from his point of view is not what the author intended or what he expressed and meant as much as it matters the meaning as expressed by the text, "and this meaning can be reached by examining the many possibilities that the text can mean and the interpretation or hermeneutics must take upon itself this task or leave the field of meaning of the text for the reader or for the age or for criticism" (Abu Zeid, 2005, p. 48).

If this is the case, the meaning is the subject of understanding and interpretation. He also distinguishes between understanding and interpretation, where the former includes the construction of meaning while the other includes its interpretation, but both have the meaning of the text itself as a prescriber. On the other hand, he argues that the confusion between understanding the text and its interpretation is a grave mistake, and that the result is doubts about the possibility of reaching a correct understanding of the text, which is mainly found in the philosophies of Gadamer and Heidegger (Couznez Hoy, 2008, pp. 30-31). (Hermeneutics) while the significance is the subject of criticism as the ruling, which makes the text alive and has the ability to lure its readers. This distinction between the two fields of hermeneutics, whose purpose is to interpret the meaning, and literary criticism, whose purpose is signification, is an implicit recognition of the inevitability of multiple interpretations associated with the reader and the impossibility of accessing or taking note of the author's intentions, which, although they are one, are related to the multiple internal/external world of the author of the text, on the one hand, and on the other hand, the text was in Hirsch's view just a template or a repository in which the author's intentions hide, waiting for the excavator of the competent reader who can imagine the life that the author lived to resurrect the original meaning that lies between the folds and cracks of the text. But if so, the reader here has turned into a passive reader whose only concern is to find and identify with the author's lost image through time.

The text also loses its own being and horizon that makes it different from its author and reader. "Hirsch sensed this problem and tried to solve it by distinguishing between the realistic author as a historical subject, and the speaker in the text as a determinant of textual (linguistic) meaning... This duality of the same author is only an expression of other dualities... This critic resorts to it to give a rational logical character to his arguments and analysis, and then to the validity of interpretation that reveals the meaning of the author and the monolithism of the text and reading. Among these dualities are those related to understanding, evaluation, interpretation, criticism, and those related to the central role of meaning and significance... Meaning, therefore, is a matter of consciousness, not of linguistic constructs, and each consciousness necessarily refers to the person" (Ezzahi, 2003, pp. 110-111). This person is an author or reader. Thus, it relies on the most important basis on which phenomenology was based in its Husserlian version, which is the independence of the subject as an intended subject for itself, and then linking between consciousness and the intentionality of

meaning, forgetting that the basis of the process of perception is that every consciousness is awareness of something intended by the reading or interpreting self, “and that the intention is to transform and give to the phenomena the meaning that they lack before” (Ezzahi, 2003, p. 111).

So, based on the foregoing, the literary meaning is still moving between intentions / authorities: the intentionality of the author, the intentionality of the text, the intentionality of the reader without any of them being able to catch it or subject it to its authority. It is elusive and moving and refuses to obey, or it can be said that it is a spider web that turns its prey into a linguistic being with no choice. Either it coexists with it within the text in dialogue/interaction or it is rejected.

2. Meaning as a Dialogue between the Text and the Reader

Literary history has known a neglect of meaning, which negatively affected the historical nature of literature, and most of the curricula that dealt with it with study and analysis turned into a historical curricula characterized by their strictness, such as structuralism, semiotics, linguistics, Marxism... Within this climate, Jauss tried to draw attention to the fact that the hallmark of the literary phenomenon lies in its historical dimension, excluding traditional questions and replacing them with more powerful and creative ones in an attempt to establish a new vision for writing literary history.

Jauss began by studying and discussing the approaches and theories in whose light literature was treated, starting with literary history in its traditional form, Marxism, German idealism, historicism, history of thought... “It is characterized either by the separation of the aesthetic from history so that pure literary history is not concerned with the relationship of literary phenomenon with general history, while general history links the literary phenomenon with historical events without paying attention to it in its own aesthetics, or it is characterized by separating the past from the present, or goes beyond the historical feature of the literary phenomenon in the first place and treats it as a set of “jewels” and “wholes” that transcend time and history [in addition to] their neglect of the recipient and the successive receptions of the literary phenomenon that give it precisely the characteristic of the historical process” (Shorfi, 2007, p. 151).

Hence, the need arose in Jauss’s view to develop new means and procedures that give a different concept to the history of literature, different in its foundations and orientations, by proposing some concepts such as the series of receptions with its aesthetic and historical dimensions, the horizon of waiting... Since the literary meaning is inseparable neither from the literary phenomenon nor from its recipient, it lives by reviving them and dies by their death. From here, it lies in literary history and in its horizon.

2.1 Literary History as a Series of Receptions

Various studies have proven that changing research models and methodologies is self-evident, as no method that has proven its ability to guide the course of research one day is not soon discarded because it has become unable to keep pace with what is happening in the field of studies, leaving its place for another new approach. The same is in the study of the history of literature, which, according to Jauss, had entered into the bottleneck, as it did not recognize the creativity of a literary work, unless it was subjected to a series of comparisons with previous works that were old than it, recognized for their quality. Works that have succeeded in emulating classical works are judged to be of quality and are met with acceptance, while works that have gone out and deviated from the classical models are judged poorly and are not shown acceptance and satisfaction (Al-Zahi, 2003).

This is what the old historical school has always done, which “resorts to classifying literary works, and critical judgments issued on them, according to general trends, schools and currents, or according to inter-literary genres, without abandoning in its treatment of these literary facts the chronological treatment based on a purely chronological sequence” (Shorfi, 2007, p. 152). The task of the literary historian/reader is then only to compare the works according to established standards/laws, describing things as they were, without any aesthetics or pleasure in order to achieve objectivity. This objectivity to which the historian of literature/ reader commits himself “leaving his own literary judgment and the era that is not yet over ... bound by the safe order of masterpieces, he remains in his historical distance... lagging behind a generation or two from

literary developments, and at best participating in contemporary interaction with the literary phenomenon... as a passive reader” (Ismail, 2002, p. 57). This vision of literary history and the various practices applied to the literary phenomenon in light of the continued reverence of “classical masterpieces” deemed history as a mere compilation of dead truths.

As a reaction, a new model emerged, called the “teleological model”, which Schiller founded under the influence of German idealism, “and this model requires that the movement of events and reality be interpreted from a certain ideal ‘end’ or ‘idea’ that governs world history as a whole and thus governs the development of all humanity throughout world history” (Shorfi, 2007, p. 153).

However, this model quickly showed its shortcomings and ended up in a real crisis, for how can this “end” be caught or represented – Abdul Karim Shorfi adds – at a time when the process of events is still ongoing and has not yet ended, and if these events are found finished, they have often reached the peak point or achieved the goal. The historian will not then look at the post-stage because it expresses a state of stagnation or marching towards decadence, but at the same time, this stage is part of the process of history and the continuity of events, thus dropping the idea of “purpose” (Khader, 1998).

In this sense, historicism sought to transcend the idea of the existence of a final end and was concerned with the study of eras as independent, complete entities, and thus it not only eliminates “temporal continuity and the interdependence of events and facts with each other... but also breaks the continuity between the past and the present because it says that the historian must be stripped of the point of view of his own age and obliges him to be erased before his subject in order to show it in its full objectivity” (Shorfi, 2007, p. 154). But can the historian abstract and detach himself from the perspective of his time to be able to possess his subject in his past? If the present emerges and imposes itself as a self that has the right to exercise its being, then it cannot be abandoned in order to delve into the past, and the meaning of the old work or the past cannot be seen in its past; on the contrary, the meaning of the past work is determined by the questioning of the present of it.

That is, it achieves its meaning only as being an important source of mediation between the past and the present. This is what Jauss asserts in that the process of producing heritage texts is not “devoid of the tendencies of the interpreter and the deposits of his reading experiences, and then resorting to choice or selection, as an interpretive procedure that gives the interpreting self the opportunity to reproduce the past... not to obliterate its features or make it forgotten, but to work within the present reception to perpetuate it and revive it anew as if it were born of this time alone”. (Bara, 2008, p. 296). Under the influence of Gadamer, he also emphasized the role of prior knowledge or prejudices in the formation of the reader’s consciousness that allows him to dialogue/understand/communicate.

Thus, in order to overcome the dilemma of historical practice, positivism investigated and highlighted the external imperatives and influences that caused the emergence of literary works, applying the principle of causal interpretation, borrowing this from the exact sciences. This reductionist status of the literary work and its limitation to a set of influences and causes led to the exclusion of the aesthetic value that distinguishes it, which the history of thought tried to search for in the temporal ideas and concepts, that is, those “jewels” involved in literature, which do not change with the change of its eras away from the historical understanding of its production / function; hence, classical literature had the right of paternity to these ideal aesthetic values. As a result of this approach, a gap was created between the aesthetic approach and the historical approach, and it has widened further with the Marxist and formalist theories, where the former considers the literary work as a testimony / reflection of a certain state of society, that is, it is a simulation of the infrastructure (social, economic) in its historical process, which made literary history inseparable from the social/ economic process; thus, the reception of literary work is limited to knowing the previously known image of reality that it reflects within it, but Marxist critics such as Croas, Roger Garaudy and Karl Koszeck, stressed that literary work is a process that opens up to the future because of its ability to influence. How and why can a literary work survive despite the demise of the social context that created it? From this point of view, the historicity of a literary

work does not lie in its representative function, but in the influence it exerts on the recipient (Shorfi, 2007, pp. 155-158).

Thus, through the transcendence of Marxism of itself, Jauss deduced two visions to establish a new literary history based on new rules: first is that the life of literary works does not result from their existence in themselves, but in the interaction that takes place between them and humanity, and therefore cannot be arranged in an organized history except in light of the relationship of overlap between production and reception. Second is that the revolutionary function of literary works can only be perceived if their vision goes beyond a simple simulation to a means of transforming and creating perception (Shorfi, 2007, p. 158). As such, it looks like a cognitive system that forms another/different line.

As for the formalist theory, it focused its attention on the aesthetic feature of literature alone, so they defined the literary work formally and functionally, and saw it as a closed pattern in a process of total exclusion of the historicity of literature in terms of production/reception (external context), but in its later stages and during the development of the concept of “literariness”, it realized that it – i.e. literariness as a displacement of aesthetic language from ordinary language is not only defined synchronically, but also diachronically, through the constantly renewed formal differences and conflicts between new literary works and their predecessors in the literary continuum. Hence, formalism returned to history, resulting in the replacement of the classical concept of tradition with the concept of “literary development”. However, according to Jauss, this transition remains within the bounds of personal history rather than history as a whole (Shorfi, 2007, pp. 159-160).

From the foregoing, Jauss believes that the synthesis between the Marxist school (the historical approach) and the formalist school (the aesthetic approach) – in other words, transcending the duality of the inside / outside – is the best way to build a new literary history if we add another dimension to it or add the determining factor for the existence of the literary phenomenon, which was ignored before, which is the dimension of “reception” or the “receiving audience”, so the history of literature can only be successful when it takes into account the moment of encounter between the text and the reader, where he is effective/productive/ creative. Then, the best understanding of how literary works succeed occurs. Therefore, the new literary history that Jauss wants to establish will be nothing but a “history of reception” based on the continuity created by the series of successive receptions in a dialogical relationship between the literary work and successive generations of readers, or an awareness of the “activity of history” in the formation/understanding of the self and the realization of its historical being – in the footsteps of Gadamer – for trying to interpret literary works objectively in a scientific manner is what cannot be achieved, as man and what he produces as a historical being, is not understood /interpreted except within a historical situation of his own. Thus, Jauss sought to meet the need of the Marxists to put literature in a broader context than the sequence of historical events, and the need of the formalists that the development of awareness of the aesthetic dimension of the reader is inseparable from the awareness of the rest of the readers in a dialogical relationship that constitutes reading experiences and tools of knowledge through which the reader enters the text for researching / forming the meaning that keeps moving, leaving its traces, which in turn forces him to modify his horizons or presuppositions so that the process continues as a way to form this meaning / meaninglessness that exist at the same time.

2.2 Horizons of Waiting

The new concept of literary history is based on a series of receptions, where it is difficult to distinguish those of the past from those of the present. Additionally, it is impossible to understand the literary development in the aesthetic and historical dimension without procedures and mechanisms that help in understanding and interpretation, so Jauss resorted to developing a procedural concept called “horizons of waiting”, which he used under the influence of various German philosophies (Shorfi, 2007, pp. 163-164). especially Gadamer’s hermeneutics. The latter defines it as “the range of vision that surrounds everything that can be seen from a privileged private position” (AbdelMohsen, 2009, p. 244).

To say that the history of literature is based on a series of receptions has come to mean that literary works are not transcendent/a historical truths that confer the same appearance to each recipient, that is, it is the recipient who brings them into existence through his or her precipitated experience, in other words according to his “waiting horizon”. Thus, Jauss defines his concept as “a system of standards and values that coincide with the emergence of a literary work and that constitute the literary and historical experience of its first readers. When it comes to successive receptions of subsequent generations, the horizon of waiting means the context of the prior aesthetic experience shared by the subjects, on which every individual understanding of the text and every influence exerted by this text is based” (Shorfi, 2007, p.165).

Thus, the process of receiving and the influence that the text exerts on the recipient according to a certain horizon is built from a set of standards and rules accustomed to from previous texts. Then, there will be fusion between the horizons of the reader and the horizons of the text to generate dialogue / understanding in order to produce literary meaning.

Therefore, the concept of ‘waiting horizon’, which was associated with the name Jauss, does not differ in its meaning from the concept of “interpreting community” of Stanley Fish, for while reading the text, the reader during an interpretive moment belongs to a group that “bestows on his reading strategies the character of collectivism and thus reduces his role as an individual who expresses absolute privacy” (Hamouda, 2003, p. 141).

Whenever he changes the group, his interpretation of the text changes as well. thus, the horizon has the property of overthrowing all perspectives and trends and allows consciousness to perceive different connotations that roam its field of vision. From here, we can differentiate between a reader who has a narrow/closed, self-sufficient horizon that does not leave its own center and does not look forward to horizons that enrich his visions and experiences that allow him to understand himself, and a reader who has a broad / open horizon that allows him to understand himself by formulating appropriate answers to critical questions and cumbersome problems. That is why Gadamer tried, through the call for dialogue/understanding between past and present horizons and the concept of historical distance, to enable interpretive awareness to understand/perceive the texts of the past/heritage, and meet it and include it in the appropriate context for it. Awareness, then, does not remain centered on its horizon or stands as a spectator; rather, it roams the horizon of heritage to revive its facts. For “How many texts were confiscated by the people of its time and killed in its cradle, and today these texts express a unique genius in creativity; it and others will remain on a continuous journey as long as there are readers who will resurrect them again based on their expectation or the critical school to which they belong” (Bara, 2005, p. 105).

In this sense, the moving consciousness that leaves its self-centering to temporarily occupy the place of the other would constitute in the consciousness an acknowledgment of the other’s otherness and difference historically and in terms of existence; as long as this is the case, the semantics are renewed and changed in light of the dialogue and fusion of broad and rich horizons, the horizons of the text/heritage with the horizons of consciousness (overlapping the horizons of the interpreter with the horizons of the text). Or it can be said that the text will not dialogue with any reader or give him some of its connotations unless he is an “expert reader” who is proficient in the game of question and answer.

Conclusion

So, based on the foregoing, the literary meaning is still moving between intentions/ authorities: the intentionality of the author, the intentionality of the text, the intentionality of the reader without any of them being able to catch it or subject it to its authority. It is elusive and moving and refuses to obey, or it can be said that it is a spider web that turns its prey into a linguistic being with no choice. Either it coexists with it within the text in dialogue/interaction or it is rejected.

As for the textual spaces / blanks and areas of negation, it is thanks to them that both the reader and the text can enter into an interactive/dialogical relationship to build meaning that remains hidden and tied to the text. This text has its own decision and cannot be reached by any reader,

whether he is informant, ideal, implicit, expert reader... or to make it say what it does not accept saying. Although the theories directed to the reader sought to give the latter powers in approaching texts, they collided with a fortress that is difficult to penetrate. Even the deconstruction strategy that changed and developed several of its predecessors' tools could not penetrate, as all its concepts: diffusion dispersion: absence of meaning infinity of significance... stress the central position in which the non-central text stands.

References

1. AbdelMohsen, H. M. (2009). *The concept of aesthetic consciousness in philosophical hermeneutics*. Dar Al Tanweer.
2. Abu Zeid, N. H. (2005). *Problems of reading and mechanisms of interpretation* (7th ed.). Arab Cultural Center.
3. Al-Bazie, S., & Al-Ruwaili, M. (2005). *A guide for the literary critic, illuminating more than seventy critical trends and terms* (4th ed.). Arab Cultural Center.
4. Al-Zahi, F. (2003). *Text, body, and interpretation*. East Africa.
5. Bara, A. Gh. (2008). *Hermeneutics and philosophy: Towards an interpretive mind project*. Difference Publications; Al-Dar Al-Arabiyya; Science Publishers.
6. Bara, A. Gh. (2005). *The problem of rooting modernity in contemporary critical discourse: A dialogic approach to epistemological origins*. The Egyptian General Book Authority.
7. Couznez Hoy, D. (2008). *The critical circle: Literature, history, and philosophical hermeneutics* (K. Hamid, Trans.). Al-Jamal Publications.
8. Hamouda, A. A. (2003). *Exiting the maze, a study in the authority of the text*. National Council for Culture, Arts and Literature.
9. Ismail, S. (2002). *Aesthetics of reception: A study in the theory of reception according to Hans Robert Jauss & Wolfgang Iser*. Supreme Council of Culture.
10. Khader, N. O. (1998). *The cognitive origins of reception theory*. Dar Al Sharq.
11. Muftah, M. (1990). *Unknown statement*. Dar Toubkal Publishing House.
12. Ragheb, N. (2003). *Encyclopedia of literary theories*. Egyptian Scientific Publishing Company; Longman.
13. Selden, R. (1991). *Contemporary literary theory* (J. Asfour, Trans.). Dar Al-Fikr for Studies and Distribution.
14. Shorfi, A. Bk. (2007). *From philosophies of interpretation to theories of reading*. Difference Publications; Arab House Science Publishers.

Received: 30.11.2024

Accepted: 04.03.2025