

KRISTEVA'S OPENNESS OF TEXT AND THE ISSUE OF CONTEXT

انفتاح النص عند كريستيفا وإشكالية السياق

Dr. Youcef ATTIA ^{*(1)}

¹ Echahid Cheikh Larbi Tebessi University, Tebessa, (Algeria),
youcefattia01@univ-tebessa.dz

Dr. Manel MIZAB ⁽²⁾

² Echahid Cheikh Larbi Tebessi University, Tebessa, (Algeria),
manel.mizab@univ-tebessa.dz

submission date: 29/03/2025 Acceptation date: 03/09/2025 Published date: 15/09/2025

Abstract:

When we invoke the Tel Quel group, we are immediately reminded of Julia Kristeva's contributions to critique. Such initiatives facilitated the transition from structuralist to poststructuralist assumptions, particularly through questioning the concept of closure. These modifications resulted in the creation of new categories (text productivity, text as ideologeme, phenotext, and genotext) as tools for explaining the text's openness while retaining the category of nothing out of the text. Therefore, a paradox emerges underlying the legitimacy of this problematic question: How can the relationship between the text's openness and nothing outside of text notion be justified? In other words, how did Kristeva link the text to history, society, and the subject without abandoning the premise of nothing outside the text?

key words: Kristeva, text's productivity, ideologeme, phenotext, genotext.

ملخص باللغة العربية:

حين نستحضر جماعة تال كيل Tel Quel تسترعي انتباهنا جهود جوليا كريستيفا النقدية، التي أهلت للانتقال من الطروحات البنيوية إلى الفرضيات ما بعد البنيوية، خاصة من

خلال مسألة مقولة الانغلاق، مما أسفر عن مقولات لعل أهمها: الإنتاجية النصية والنص كإيديولوجيم والنص الظاهر والنص المولد، وكل ذلك في سياق تبرير مقولة انفتاح النص، ولكن دون التخلي عن مقولة: لا شيء خارج النص. ولذلك تبرز مفارقة تبرر شرعية السؤال الإشكالي التالي: كيف يمكن تسوية العلاقة بين مقولة انفتاح النص ومقولة لا شيء خارج النص؟ أي كيف ربطت كريستيفا النص بالتاريخ والمجتمع والفاعل دون التخلي عن فرضية لا شيء خارج النص؟

الكلمات المفتاحية: كريستيفا، الإنتاجية النصية، الإيديولوجيم، النص الظاهر، النص المولد.

Introduction

Probably, the poststructuralist assumptions aimed to end the illusion of static and self-sustaining language, as text was viewed as a product that reiterates a given meaning but which is renewed in the context of its interactions with the limitless and ramified texts of culture and society. As a result, such writing is exposed to constant alteration in order to reach a productive phase. This could explain why poststructuralist ideas rejected the objectives of objectivity and scientific criticism, as well as the concepts of static meaning and objective exegesis. Kristeva believes that the text is made up of cultural or social texts; it is not isolated, autonomous, or self-sustaining. It is rather an assimilation, interpretation, and transformation of ramified illimitable and endless cultural texts that are dispersed and fragmented throughout history. The book is, thus, opened up to society and history as texts to engage in dialogue with and interpret according to a limitless number of interpretation processes.

These interpretations explore the effects in the infinite texts. This may validate the assumption that textual output must be situated within the larger text (the culture) in terms of mutual reference and dialectic relations. However, ambiguity remains tied to Kristeva's strategies of justifying and elaborating on earlier assumptions, which allowed her to shift from structuralist to poststructuralist propositions.

This study, therefore, becomes concerned with investigating Kristeva's poststructuralist assumptions, particularly in terms of the text's openness. Therefore, this critical debate seeks to provide answers to various questions, the most significant of which may be:

- How was the argument of the text's closedness questioned?
- How did Kristeva perceive the relationship between text and the world around it?

- What are Kristeva's most essential concepts for broadening the concept of closed text and its openness to the wider cultural text without being restricted by the laws of what is literary and self-sustaining?

1. From Literariness to Poetics

The structuralist concept of literary text was coined with the shift from literariness to poetics. In the context of seeking literariness and secularisation of literature, Russian formalism regarded the literary text as a specific linguistic usage that is independent of all external contexts and isolated from all forms of social consciousness. Language is used as a starting point, but form constitutes the element of originality and is the primary component of literariness. The topic has no relevance, while being trivial, because the literary composition is closed, self-contained, and does not require other elements. As a result, correct literary laws can be established, laying the groundwork for the science of literature.

Structuralism, which is seen as “final result of the formalist theorizing”¹, views the literary text as a manifestation of a larger system. It seeks, through a plurality of texts, a literary model intended to shorten all textual realisations and reduce them to static and abstract structures, as well as a comprehensive and holistic model viewed as the general rules of literature. As a result, structuralism had imprisoned the text within the boundaries of language and announced its isolation, independence, and closedness; it had removed the text from all that might surround it in order to focus solely on the internal system. It regarded literature as a simple linguistic phenomena, distinct from all other types and expressions of human knowledge. Thus, the text is self-contained at both the structural and formation levels.

Similarly to the linguistic paradigm, structuralist critical discourse has adopted the description of the general structures governing all types of existing and potential text productions. It also recognised that the literary text is independent and not identical or similar to the linguistic system. In other words, the literary text is closed and self-sustaining, operating within the language, and thus does not require any external components. The structuralist critical trend that has adopted the linguistic backdrop ignores context (production circumstances, reception circumstances, the author's idea, the external world, reality, and social, psychological, or historical expertise).

According to structuralists, the literary text may be a symptom of a larger system, a subconscious collective structure that predates people, a framework that governs their perceptions of themselves, the world they exist in, and their cultural, literary productions. One of the most fundamental

Saussurian viewpoints argues that the form of the language we speak determines how we perceive the world and interact with it.² As a result, humans can only see the phenomenon; their awareness of the world is thus indirect. Any human experience can only occur after the presence of a symbolic world that mediates the self and the world. This symbolic world is not transparent; it rather defines our vision of the world and of ourselves, as well as the human culture. Thus, "Straus' achievement may be the isolation of an autonomous system from reality, or a symbolic system that is independent of the things it represents and the humans who represent them. Cultural meanings are thus embedded in symbolic systems, yet they are independent of the external environment and exist before and for all humans. The world has an objective existence only in the symbolic systems that portray it"³.

The human being lives within symbolic systems. His knowledge is unable to transcend its boundaries, and he can never be aware of himself or the universe outside the symbolic world. The latter is a non-transparent mediator, but it includes notions and conceptions about ourselves and the world. Accordingly, structuralism seeks to investigate the objective meaning contained in symbolic worlds, rather than all types of subjective interpretations. Regardless how varied the literary texts are in terms of manifestations at the level of actual competence, they are linked together by various linkages that unite them within a larger system that regulates them at the level of the universal subconsciousness. Such a broad framework is abstract and controls all of literary output; it is considered prior to, and independent of, all actual experiences. As a result, structuralism ignored the contexts and situations surrounding production and reception. It has also implicitly announced the author's death. Furthermore, it has ignored situational meanings and conscious self-interpretations, which are considered subjective, delusional, and emotive interpretations. Accordingly, such interpretations should be transcended in search for the objective signification within the general system, detached of the proper subjective interpretation of such significations.

Structuralism departs hence from literary manifestations to reach its fundamental systems that operate in the universal subconsciousness within which real meaning is innate, and the laws required for the existence of literature are immanent. In other words, structuralism does not limit itself to the bounds of existing literary texts; it rather considers them as a manifestation of a larger system that includes what can exist, what may be attained, and what is potential. This general system pre-exists any usage and governs every usage. Thus, meaning is decided by its structure rather than

the circumstances of its creation or authorship; this is known as structuralist determinism.

Todorov's belief in the presence of two attitudes summarises the perspective embraced by formalists and structuralists. The first attitude considers the literary text as a sufficient, adequate source of knowledge, and the second attitude views each text as an expression of an abstract structure.⁴ Although these mindsets appear to differ in terms of justification, they are complimentary and interrelated. Both attitudes' theoretical conceptions confirm the text's autonomy and closedness. Indeed, the first ponders texts as mere productions while the second probes the literary production itself as a manifestation of an abstract structure, which is a virtual and conceptual structure that relates to research on potential literature. It also refers to the poetics, which “does not relate to examining the work in itself, but to put in the reps to wring out the literary discourse features seen as a manifestation of a general structure, where such discourse represents simply a unique potentiality of its infinite potentialities”⁵.

In general, the structuralist perspective is limited to investigating the strategies of constructing texts as a language, or how a text expresses its meaning.

The literary text remains completely closed; it is a mere independent linguistic entity composed solely of linguistic signs. It is, therefore, separated from experimental reality, all other cultural activity, and all other non-linguistic signs.

2. From the Closedness Argument to the Openness Argument

In the context of studying the language, the linguistics researcher's interest has been focused on the system of the sentence, which has been restricted to its borders. As a result, the sentence has been perceived as a set of closed conceptual relations that are thought to be self-sustaining and transcendental. This was the reason it used to confirm its independence from all kinds of pragmatic assumptions, and thus it was able, according to the Saussurian perspective, to have the honour of being the largest unit that linguistic research aspires to explore and the basic guardianship for producing meaning. The celebration of the sentence had most likely come at the expense of eliminating the employed language, whose contexts of usage had previously been regarded as a profanation of the myth of the transcendental linguistic system, which is viewed as the first and last method of imbuing the sentence with meaning. As a result, we realise that the meaning, according to the Saussurian perspective, gets its existence from the nature of relations inside the sentence structure itself. We also

recognise that pragmatic circumstances can only serve as a parasite, rendering scientific and objective research ineffective.

Around the end of the sixties, especially after the 1968 events, some researchers realised that scrutinising the sentence independently from its pragmatic uses and its actual and practical contexts would lead only to a set of metaphysical assumptions. Indeed, doing so would engender a holistic system that is similar to illusion, and that is exploited by the sentence itself in undermining it; yet it succeeds in exerting a rich meaning at each pragmatic context. Therefore, the premise of independence and the assumption of syntagmatic, formalist and relational guardianship on meaning was negated.

The arguments listed above may be the most valid ones for justifying the new victories in order to indicate a greater interest in investigating the essence of sentences in connection to the pragmatic circumstances from which they emerge. It is claimed that separating sentences from their speaker is useless, as is isolating the same speaker from the field of dialogic relations. As a result, the norms and structures are designed to be hidden inside the depths of social and dialogic processes.

The true foundation of textual science, which is one of the most recent disciplines of modern linguistics, historically dates back to the end of the 1960s. Text science has been viewed as a sign of the transition from a focus on sentences to a focus on texts. The goal of our earlier discussion was to reveal the ambiguity trap created by the transition from sentence to text, especially when we subsequently discover that the text itself may be a sentence. This reason encouraged us to describe such a transition through the detection of the view to sentence, which has been viewed as a created systematic decontextualised formula with total independence. However, this viewpoint has shifted to regard the sentence as a real unit whose existence and identity stem from the core of the pragmatic situations in which it appears. The sentence is thus viewed as a text. The recipient may have recognised the meaning of a text's potential to be a sentence, as well as the fact that a text is a linguistic practice rather than a theoretical sentence. Contemporary critical thinking defines the concept of text (without relating it to formal standards) as a single sentence, denoting independence, or a whole book. Contemporary critical thinking acknowledges the commonalities shared by a text and a language system, but it accentuates the distinctive features of each system.⁶ We can assume that a sentence is a term that relates to abstraction and the conceptual formula, whereas text refers to the language when it is saturated with contexts and charged with the fingerprints of its users.

The structuralist concept of a decontextualized, independent, closed system was replaced by the poststructuralist argument of openness wherein texts are open, linked, and engaging with other types of contexts. According to Said Yaktine, semiotics has allowed the expansion of texts to include non-linguistic signs⁷

The Tel Quel Group performed considerable work in bringing to light the theory of text that aimed at defining a text. Particularly, Kristeva made significant contributions to the field of semantics. She believed that a text is open to the outside world (the context), as the context is an important component of the text. The text can thus be viewed as a linguistic structure on the one hand, with its proper linguistic (empiric) borders (a structural and formalist closedness), but on the other hand, it is semantically open. Thus, the text is not limited to the denotative (general) meaning, nor is it constrained to the daily communication language customs. When a speaker (the actor) encounters the language, it transforms into a discourse through enunciation; at this point, the text becomes a meaningful practice because it is executed by the language user and the dialogism stemming from the elements of enunciations. Indeed, contrary to De Saussure's belief, the creation of meaning is not confined to the language abstract level, but it develops through the dialectic interaction between the language user, the other, and the context.⁸ However, in this context, the actor is not the united, Cartesian Ego that controls the meaning of its linguistic project. It is rather a fragmented, vanishing, and changing actor that is reproduced repeatedly by dialectical relations. The text may be the field that generates such dialectics, but this presupposes that the text is productivity rather than a product.

3. Textual Productivity

According to Roland Barthes, productivity refers to a field that creates mutual referential and relational interactions between the abundance of meanings offered by the text and the reader. It also refuses to cease its productivity to the point where the language of direct interaction is turned off and the text itself reshapes another language, producing new readings at each tie that transcend the author's intentionality or any other intentionality.

The product is not the text itself, but the set of psychological or social systems (laws) that exist independently of the literary work; thus, the literary work is considered as a representation of such systems. Todorov stated: "Indeed, we find here, side by side, psychological or psychoanalytic, sociological or ethnological studies, as well as those derived from philosophy or from the history of ideas. All deny the autonomous character of the literary work and regard it as the manifestation of laws that are

external to it and that concern the psyche, or society, or even the human mind.”⁹ Although we never claim the validity of recalling Todorov's words, and that he necessarily refers to the productivity argument, we are attempting to adapt or interpret his words in such a way that it is not possible to solely rely on describing the text's linguistic and appearing levels and the superficial relations between them. We should rather delve into the depths to discover the intangible level, such as the systems responsible for producing the tangible level, which are psychological or sociological in nature. It may explain Kristeva's quote, in which she stated that it is essential to consider the translinguistic role of the text in distributing the language order, denoting text as a productivity. This stands for the text's “(shocking/constructive)” redistributive relationship with language, accentuating the use of logic when reading texts, instead of simply relying on language. Productivity also relates to “textual interference and voyaging” that take place when different texts' utterances cross paths and reject one another in a particular text.¹⁰

As a result, productivity is seen as a factor in textual regeneration and the creation of possible new texts. The text is thus viewed as a penetrable space that constantly transcends the texts to which it is linked and transforms. It also transcends itself through its infinite interactions with other texts and readers. The text is intended to produce new readings that go beyond the pure limited intention of the straight information, the author's intention, or any given intention. The text becomes a productivity that deconstructs what is conventional (the denotative meaning and the direct communicative meaning), shaping endless semantic probabilities that strive to question everything by deconstructing, modifying, and recreating the signifying systems that have long been celebrated by collective memory. Kristeva coined two more concepts that stem from productivity, which are the phenotext and the genotext.

4. The Phenotext and the Genotext

Meaning is not the focal point of semantic analysis; in other words, it does not concentrate on the text's appearance or surface level. Its emphasis is on everything that is not directly stated or clearly indicated by the text. Such parts are regarded as demonstration cards that refer to the actor's involvement and interaction with the language while debating it. The language itself deconstructs the performer, causing him/her to become lost, playing a limitless number of roles.

The textual analysis extends the structuralist analysis, which concentrates on describing the phenotext. Barthes argued that “phonological, structural,

semantic description- in short, structural analysis are suited to the phenotext, because this analysis poses no questions about the subject of the text: it bears on statements not on enunciations”¹¹. The genotext may be the enunciative structure that generates the phenotext. Barthes emphasised that “genotext sets out the grounds for the logical operations proper to the constitution of the subject of the enunciation; it is the place of structuration of the phenotext”¹². The genotext refers to the dialectic dialogism characterizing the interaction that takes place between the subject, the signifier, and the text, denying the myth of language ownership by its actor. The genotext also emphasises how the text transcends the identity of an independent and ready-made product that refers only to itself. Instead, it is a symbol that refers to what is semantic, ideological, or psychological –to what is fundamentally non-linguistic but that can emerge only via the language. The genotext always requires an (undefined) actor who benefits from its signification and structuration by means of language. Meanwhile, the genotext provides such a language with meaning, which is always changing, distributed, and delayed. The linguistic speaker is fractured and structured by signifying systems. “However, as has been implied, the pre-symbolic subject, the subject of drives rather than of thetic language, constantly announces itself in poetic language by breaking apart, or restructuring, the signifying systems within which it speaks and writes. It is at this point that a theory of intertextuality is rearticulated in Kristeva’s work”¹³.

The poststructuralist perspective believes in the speaker’s loss in writing, entailing impersonality of the language and the loss and fragmentation of every speaker and utterer. Indeed, this idea is illustrated in the statement ‘I love you,’ which is pondered as a cliché that has been repeated millions of times, causing its users’ subjectivity to fade away when uttering these words.¹⁴

As a result, as soon as we begin writing, we realise that the language transcends us and extends beyond our intentions and goals. Furthermore, when dealing with a literary piece, we cannot pretend to be able to recognise a certain individual. “Even in confessional modes of writing, the ‘I’ of the text cannot be identical to the authorial ‘I’, as we are dealing with a subject of enunciation rather than a subject of utterance”¹⁵.

Kristeva is unconcerned about the person outside of the text; she is only interested in the motions of the always changing personal ego within the text. In order to reach the poetic language, she emphasises the scattered and fragmented ego. As a result, Freud and Jacques Lacan appear to have impacted her. To define how the self is divided and how the text swings

between logic and illogic, Kristeva refers to the phenotext and the genotext. Barthes defines the phenotext as “the verbal phenomenon as it presents itself in the structure of the concrete statement”¹⁶. It is understandable that the phenotext relates to a confessionally shared symbolic field, a predetermined structure, a logic language, and a distinct subject of utterance's voice. The symbolic discourse generally refers to the societal authority and dictatorship of the symbol, but the genotext relates to what Kristeva refers to as semantics, or the level of the text that originates from unconscious instinctual sexual power. The discipline of semantics is thus subjective, linked to innate motives and carnality. Graham Allen reiterated that “The subject, for Kristeva, is thus split between two signifying fields. The symbolic field involves socially signifying language operating under the banners of reason, communication and the ideal of singularity and unity. The semiotic involves the ‘language’ of drives, erotic impulses, bodily rhythms and movements retained from the infant stage prior to the subject’s splitting during the thetic phase”¹⁷.

Kristeva believes that the language of logic and the language of clear communication fail when the symbolic field is loaded with semantic patterns. Thus, the genius disappears, and the author’s unity myth vanishes. All that exists is a constantly divided self, scattered between what is social and logical and what is illogical, irrational, or non-subjective. As a result, the text itself pursues this trend of division. In terms of Allen, “Intertextuality has to do, for Kristeva, with desire and with the psychological drives of the split subject. For Kristeva, the subject is split between the conscious and the unconscious, reason and desire, the rational and the irrational, the social and the pre-social, the communicable and the incommunicable”¹⁸.

Kristeva semiotically describes a desire as unrelated to a specific person or experience. It is instinctive carnality, complete with disorder, disobedience, and illogical blindness. Because such desire is infinite, there is no rule that can restrict it. It refers to the zero degree of primitive subjectivity that exists before any appraisal, habilitation, or socio-cultural legislation. With such yearning, the text enters a realm of intertextuality known as subconscious power. Although the social order constantly strives to switch it off and constrain it, it frequently infiltrates through camouflaged and shifting modalities as a destructive power of the hegemony of the symbolic order.

The field of desires is a subjective pre-linguistic semantic field that arises from the experience of inferiority and loneliness. “This pre-linguistic subjectivity, although it does not itself possess a language, uses the

languages of the symbolic order (thetic language) to make itself heard and felt”¹⁹

Given the intertextual nature of the symbolic order's language and its drowning in dialogue, the chaos of the desire will find the domain suitable for its volatility and passions within the limitless linguistic and intertextual sites, “to the point that language appears absolutely alive with the carnal body”²⁰. The subconsciousness manifests itself through shifting sites between texts and by transforming them into alternatives, symbols, condensations, and metaphoric or metonymic encrypted references, all of which relate to the subconsciousness process and its transfiguration between writing sites. The self multiplies with the variety of writing and intertextual sites as a quest for the incomplete ego in the scattered other in the hope of discovering the perpetually postponed identity.

The desire may use the same symbolic order to express itself, but it does so only to destroy it and to fill it with its traces. As a result, the desire affects and transforms that order, bestowing onto it a new status. This is why intertextuality is considered as a transition of a sign system from one to another, with the utterer serving as both a product and a formation inside the text, being altered by the transformational sign systems that comprise such text. This means that the subject multiplies as it enters other texts (other contexts, preceding and different signifying systems) and takes on a role dictated by each context. As a result, it changes in response to its moves between contexts that require it to take on a specific role and attitude. As a result, the subject changes and becomes lost among the numerous subjects who have settled into the same environment and taken on the same role. However, while taking on a place and a role in such circumstances, this subject attempts to change and modify the texts as they are, but it also engages in dialogic relationships. The adoption of such dialogic roles (the voices), the term may apply to a variety of things, as each reading is a transformation of a previous reading, and each ego translates the same text from one sign system to another, declaring an attitude towards it. Dialogue, also known as intertextuality, is a process that involves the multiplication of the subject while also transforming preceding writings. In this sense Allen clarified that “texts do not just utilize previous textual units but that they transform them and give them what Kristeva terms new thetic positions”²¹.

5. The Text as an Ideologeme

Bakhtin has never used the term "intertextuality," but Kristeva coined it in relation to the Bakhtinian reference. Marc Angenot stated that "we have realised that the intertextuality was coined in 1966 only for the purpose of

determining another concept that would have less success, this concept was the ideologeme”²².

Probably, it is impossible to isolate the text from the broader cultural or social context in which and from which it is created, for they play a pivotal role its construction. Intertextuality refers to the text's emergence from the matrix of the social text, as well as its ongoing interaction with it. The work loses its cohesiveness while absorbed in the numerous discussions and fights. Although the texts retain an apparent uniqueness and unity of meaning, they are inevitably dispersed as ideological units or ideologemes throughout the text of society and history.

Kristeva has declared, in this sense, that “The concept of text as ideologeme determines the very procedure of a semiotics that, by studying the text as intertextuality, considers it as such within (the text of) society and history”²³, with all the meaning referred to by such concept of text (text of history and society). For instance, dialogues and conflicts about the meanings of words and utterances allude to other words and utterances with which they constantly interact and imply that they are filled with the other's views and replicated evaluations. As a result, texts are unable to give a cohesive, independent, self-sustaining meaning. We agree with Barthes when he decides that “We know now that a text consists not of a line of words, releasing a single “theological” meaning (the “message” of the Author-God), but of a multi-dimensional space in which are married and contested several writings, none of which is original: the text is a fabric of quotations, resulting from a thousand sources of culture”²⁴.

Here we realise the existence of an essential difference between structuralism, which is concerned only with the abstract system of signs that are isolated from the social life and the circumstances of enunciation, and Kristeva's poststructural hypothesis (semantic analysis), which accentuates the integrative role of context in interacting with the subject, the signifier, and the other. To put it differently, this view considers the sign and its transformation in the text of society and history, emphasizing the enunciation created from language usage in social and historical context, which further implies that text is componential in context as well. As a result, we believe Kristeva's theory justifies the text's openness by integrating society, history, and the subject into the text through relational and interactive processes in continual voyaging circumstances. All of these considerations support the concept of unending meaning and the hypothesis that there is nothing outside of the text.

Conclusion

At the end of this critical debate, we may notice that Kristeva is embracing a broader understanding of the text that includes, in addition to previously existent literary texts, non-literary semantic codes (nonverbal symbolic codes). Any text refers to other texts without literally replicating them in general. More specifically, a text does not evoke other texts for the sole sake of repetition or citation; it rather modifies and transforms them in order to rebuild and infuse them with new forms. As a result, locating a text within a cultural text implies that the cultural text itself cannot provide clear backgrounds for determining meaning and achieving clarity, because culture is chaotic and fractured.

From the perspective of Kristeva's hypothesis, the concept of author and the subject's total impartiality do not exist. A subject exists, but it is degraded, changeable, endless, and fractured. As a result, a text is not associated with a specific product because it is not considered as the outcome of exact relations and stable backdrops, both of which are ready available products.

A text indicates that it is a productivity; it produces countless interpretations because, within the text, we do not only perceive a set of interrelated cultural backgrounds that modify, distort and change each other. However, we also regard a text as a world that bustles with the entire human history with its interpretations, views, conflicts, debates, dialogues, traditions, sciences, religions, politics, and disputes, with everything. Nevertheless, nothing recounts to a definite interpretation; it rather refers to what is continuously postponed and scattered, to what is both present and absent at once.

According to Kristeva, the text refers to the sign's infinite process, denoting unstable links between the signifier and the signified, entailing perpetual shifts and interferences in defining the relationship between them, and causing the signified to be continuously deferred. As a result, the text has infinite value, and interpretations produce interpretations. The relationship between the text and such interpretations causes it to produce new interpretations; it never stops generating, just as the interpretation itself never does.

The text thus alludes to the interplay of its different component (subject, signifier, other, and context) that are all in a state of infinite becoming, constituting the same machine that produce several interpretations. Therefore, the text connotes the subject's immersion in the symbolic world, in which the subject and the symbolic world are always interacting and changing, with no centre, priority, stability, meaning, centrism, or common

language. The text thus refers to the subject's interpretations and their endless alterations within the symbolic order, which the subject charges with new meanings each time, and reciprocally, such a symbolic world charges the subject with new interpretations, resulting in an endless interpretation.

As a result, the symbolic world cannot be used to justify artistic talents or capabilities, nor can it be communicated or analysed objectively, because we cannot assume that it is just a manifestation of an external background, a preceding abstract structure, or a subconscious background. When a text references, it does not allude to its bounds, but it alerts us to the fact that there is no ultimate transparency, and that its linguistic allusions are initially a continuous voyaging.

References

- ¹ Victor Erlich, *Russian Formalism: History-Doctrine* (The Hague, 1955), p X.
- ² Buchbinder, David (2005), *the theory of contemporary literature and reading poetry*, Translated by Abdumaksud Abdulkarim, the Egyptian general institution for the book, Cairo, p 53.
- ³ Clark, Simon (2015) *the foundations of Structuralism*, translated by Said Laalmi, the national centre for translation, Cairo, PP 9- 10.
- ⁴ Tzvetan Todorov, *Introduction to poetics*, translated by Richard Howard, The Harvester Press, Britain, 1981, p 3.
- ⁵ Nadhim, Hassan (1994) *the concepts of poetics: a comparative study of basis, method and concepts*, the cultural Arabic centre, Beirut, p 17.
- ⁶ Khumri, Hussein (2007), *the theory of the text: from the structure of meaning to the semantic of the signifier*, Elikhtilaf publications, Algiers, p 43.
- ⁷ Yaktine, Said (2005) *from the text to the hypertext: an introduction to the creative aesthetic interaction*, the cultural Arabic centre, Casablanca, p 120.
- ⁸ Op cit, p 46.
- ⁹ Tzvetan Todorov, *Introduction to poetics*, p. 6.
- ¹⁰ Kristeva, Julia (1991) *Semiotiké*, translated by Farid Zahi, Tobcal publication, Casablanca, Morocco, p 21.
- ¹¹ Roland Barthes, *the theory of the text*, p. 38.
- ¹² Ibidem.
- ¹³ Graham Allen, *Intertextuality*, 2nd ed, Routledge, 2011, p. 51.
- ¹⁴ Graham Allen, *Intertextuality*, p 40.
- ¹⁵ Ibidem.
- ¹⁶ Roland Barthes, *the theory of the text*, p. 38.
- ¹⁷ Graham Allen, op. cit., p 48.
- ¹⁸ *Ibid*, p 46.
- ¹⁹ Graham Allen, op cit., p 50

²⁰ Bayazid, Fatima Ezzahra & Bouderbala Tayeb (2021), The linguistic Equivalent for the Self, the writing and the body in narrative samples, Social sciences and humanities magazine, vol 14, N O1, p156. <https://asjp.cerist.dz/en/article/160169>

²¹ Graham Allen, op cit., p 52.

²² Angenot, Marc (2013), Intertextuality in "Intertextuality perspectives: the concept and the perspective" translate by Mohammed Khir Elbiakaai; Djadawil for publishing, translation and distribution, Beirut, p 83.

²³ Julia Kristeva, (1980) Desire in Language: a semiotic approach to literature and art, Thomas Gora, Alice Jardine and Leon S. Roudiez (trans.), Leon S. Roudiez (ed.), Columbia University Press, New York, p 37.

²⁴ Roland Barthes, The Rustle of Language, translated by Richard Howard, New York: Hill and Wang, 1986, P 52- 53.

Bibliography

Allen, Graham (2011), Intertextuality, 2nd ed, Routledge, London and New York.

Angenot, Marc (2013), Intertextuality in "Intertextuality perspectives: the concept and the perspective" translate by Mohammed Khir Elbiakaai; Djadawil for publishing, translation and distribution, Beirut.

Barthes, Roland (1975), 'The Pleasure of the Text', trans. Richard. Miller, London

Barthes, Roland (1986), The Rustle of Language, translated by Richard Howard, New York: Hill and Wang.

Bayazid, Fatima Ezzahra & Bouderbala Tayeb (2021), The linguistic Equivalent for the Self, the writing and the body in narrative samples, Social sciences and humanities magazine, vol 14, N O1, June 2021. <https://asjp.cerist.dz/en/article/160169>.

Buchbinder, David (2005), the theory of contemporary literature and reading poetry, Translated by Abdumaksud Abdulkarim, the Egyptian general institution for the book, Cairo.

Clark, Simon (2015) the foundations of Structuralism, translated by Said Laalmi, the national centre for translation, Cairo.

Erlich, Victor (1955), Russian Formalism: History-Doctrine, The Hague.

Khumri, Hussein (2007), the theory of the text: from the structure of meaning to the semantic of the signifier, Elikhtilaf publications, Algiers.

Kristeva, Julia (1980) Desire in Language: a semiotic approach to literature and art, Thomas Gora, Alice Jardine and Leon S. Roudiez (trans.), Leon S. Roudiez (ed.), Columbia University Press, New York.

Kristeva, Julia (1991) Semiotiké, translated by Farid Zahi, Tobcal publication, Casablanca, Morocco.

Nadhim, Hassan (1994) the concepts of poetics: a comparative study of basis, method and concepts, the cultural Arabic centre, Beirut.

Todorov, Tzvetan (1981), Introduction to poetics, translated by Richard Howard, The Harvester Press, Britain, 1981.

Yaktine, Said (2005) from the text to the hypertext: an introduction to the creative aesthetic interaction, the cultural Arabic centre, Casablanca