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Abstract
Western critical theories, like every scientific effort, are a human product that seeks to provide reading strategies that can be drawn upon to comprehend meanings of the read text. This does not hide their composition in a cultural, intellectual and literary soil specific to them. At the hands of many of our Arab critics - in dealing with Arabic literary texts, they fabricated the text in order to fit with the Western critical theories. This observation was the motive for assuming that the literary text has the right of its people to derive from its cultural soil a reading strategy that suits its aesthetic ambition and its semantic loads within what we call the “personality of the literary text.” In such a context, the researcher proposed reading solutions as a reading approach to understand our Arabic literary texts in which two goals are mixed i.e., an interpretive and a creative goal.
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Introduction
It seems that the history of literary critical theories is just a history of the atrophy of the glow of the critical theories themselves which help in the emergence of new and brilliant theories. This seems a contradictory statement, but it is a contradiction that diminishes when we familiarize ourselves with it in Compagnon’s (2014) book “Le Démon de la théorie”.

Compagnon (2014) metaphorically claims that a demon appears in every period of time, and whispers to theorists and critics that the theory circulating among them is incapable of fulfilling the needs for reading texts. The demon also says, according to Compagnon, that there is another theory that can be explored and is capable to answer all peoples’ questions on comprehending any reading texts.

Western theories of literature, like any other scientific effort, are a common product among all peoples. However, this does not hide the
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excesses of their practitioners in dealing with Arabic literary texts by modifying the Arabic text in order to fit their underpinnings.

This is an observation that the researcher has explored its elements in two previous books (Al-Sallami, 2017, 2019). This paper assumed that we have to derive a literary reading vision of the Arab literary text based on its literary tradition which suits its aesthetic ambition, semantic loads, and its cultural affiliation. This is basically ascertained that each literary text written on a specific people has a culture that represents its literary personality that differs from the personalities of other texts written by other people.

In order to test the above assumption, this paper will be divided into three sections. The first section discusses the status of current Arab literary criticism. In the second, the paper studies the character of the Arabic literary text, and in the third it proposes reading solutions, a reading path, in which literary criticism mixes with the critic creativity. Therefore, the critic then becomes the creator who breaks through the logic of the general understanding of the texts. He demolishes the interpretive systems that govern its existence which he considers burdensome. He then opens wide explanatory horizons suitable for the artistic, semantic, and cultural signification of the text.

Status of current Arab literary criticism

Observation indicates the conversion of Arab critical practice into a “confessional act”, whereby the reading texts enter the reading space. They sit humbly in front of the critic to reveal its technical and semantic defects in the hope of being purified from at the critic hands. However, the “purity” of Western approaches should not hide from us the intra-conflicts they are witnessing. Each approach seeks to refute the relevance of other approaches in order to prove its authentic perceptions. Hence people will perceive it as the only approach that guides to the interpretive reading truth (the savior from error).

What can the critical approach do in the field of narration other than speeches for people who claim their ability to reveal the meanings of texts in order to hide their inability to write them? Didn’t Genette, (2006), one of the theorists of modern narratology, publish a book with the crude title "Bardadrac" and it received a great "narrative" failure. Are there any readers who heard of this book and accepted it, except for those who praised Genette at the time? Didn’t Roland Barthes wish to write a novel called "Vita Nova", but his wish was prolonged and not fulfilled until the hour of his death? Doesn’t Roland Barthes postpone the title of his last lesson at the College de France (La Préparation du roman) to his desire in telling the novelists that he knows the conditions for writing a novel, but he is an ascetic in doing so?
We have to be aware that every literary approach is a production of a specific cultural environment, and when it reaches us, the translation does not purify it from its culture, but it connects with the crises of its reality, history and ambition that differ from social crises, history and ambition. Therefore, any imported literary approach is hardly valid to interpret our Arabic text. If we assumed that such imported approach understood our Arabic texts, such understanding would only be applicable by dominating its meanings and forcing them to say what they did not intend to say.

Perhaps formalism is one of the best approach which depicts that critical theories are loyal to their cultural environments. The formalist approach was not coined because of the texts’ artistic need for it, but rather it appeared because of a well-known intellectual context that made critics of literary texts prefer to search in its forms without digging into its implications in order to ward off the dangers of collision with the Soviet Union regime which was not satisfied at the time of the meanings except what serves its ideology.

My belief does not mean a rejection of the literary theories and approaches, but rather it is an invitation to recognize their philosophies and their procedural limits. This is confirmed with the opinion of many critics that the literary criticism approach is the one that resurges from the texts and needs them to prove its credibility. Yet, the creative text does not need a literary theory to prove its literariness. This is what the Arabic critic did not take into his account during the practicing of criticism.

The Arabic critic chooses to be an employee of knowledge, with all that the occupation implies in terms of commitment to accomplish certain tasks that are fenced with strict caveats. As long as Arabic critic is loyal to his job; he believes in the delusions of its cognitive joy and defends its ethics and laws with the ferocity of the lessees, he obtains the approval of the critical institution that hires him and considers him in its records among critics. Due to his blind obedience to those critical approaches, the Arab criticism gave up its esthetic and valuable function. He also miscommunicates with the literary texts that he reads. This miscommunication happens, because the critic does not drink from its esthetic values, or the critic is in fact unable to read critically. He does not represent in such texts the main goals beyond its writing.

Furthermore, when the Arab critic abandoned all that, literary criticism became nothing more than a collection of imported theoretical machines, with which the critics used the strength to force some texts - from those that conceal their meanings due to their cover-up culture - to admit their meaninglessness, as Dr. Mabrouk Al-Mannai said in one of his lessons, or to justify their forms have intolerable revelations, and even to empty the text of its literary essence with all its values.
confirmed by the Arabic language. In sum, our current critical achievement is mostly nothing more than an inventory of the components of a novel, story, or poem written in a declarative language that is far from the personality of our literary texts.

Characteristics of the Arabic literary text

Is it possible to confirm the idea of existing a “cultural personality” for the literary text, which represents, in relation to the texts, their identity that distinguishes them from each other within the geographies of human culture? Does the reader’s alertness to the nature of this personality have a role in the purity of his communication with the text?

I pose these two questions with in my mind, at least now, that some people will hasten to accuse those who ask such questions of literary ethnocentrism. They also say that the personality of a text is mostly determined by its affiliation to a particular literary genre, or to a specific type of it. This affiliation is what gives each text a unity of meaning on the one hand, and enables it to penetrate those geographies on the other hand, as if we say, for example: This text belongs to the narration genre because it fulfills its conditions, and that belongs to poetry, and the third belongs to the theater, and a fourth belongs to the genre of the romantic novel, and so forth. However, the cultural affiliation has weak influence on the essence of these texts. For example, we cannot talk about a “Western” text, another “Arab”, a third “African” and so forth, because creativity is human and cross-continents. The previous belief is valid for a while. There is another ideology stating that the text, in all its conditions, cannot get rid of the presence of its culture in it except with Sisyphean hardship. Therefore, it will not travel to other geographies unless it is colored with the culture of its geography. There is no better evidenced than the fact that the eastern geographical space was present with its events and revelations in the tales of “A Thousand and One Nights”, and the tale in turn, did not abandon the task of chronicling the culture of its eastern geography. The reader could not comprehend its meaning unless the eastern context and geography is presented. I believe a modern reader is unable to understand the meaning of Antara’s poem, “Have the poets left Mttardem” unless the tribal reality of ignorance and the system of morals governing the behavior of the individual in it are represented, because “literature, or rather moralities, are patriotic in the first place” (Compagnon, 2006).

The Arabic novel may be translated, and it may be read all over the world, but it will remain Arab in spirit wherever it is read (it has an Arabic tasteful identity in Gerard Genet’s phrase). Rather, what Arab and African immigrants write, for example, in their countries of residence is Arab or African literature within the literature of those countries. Even if such literary production was written in the recipient
country tongues, it remains secondary literature within the new geography, and is always described as “the literature of the other.” The writer's emigration, and all emigration in my estimation, takes place only in geography. It is basically a physical transition. As for emigration outside culture, it is very unlikely, because culture clings to the being of the emigrating writer, so it never leaves it. It does not atrophy until after many generations.

The writer bears the history and present of his geography wherever he goes. In this regard, Mahmoud Darwish wrote poem “Tabaq” about Edward Said in 2005, in which he said: “If I were not from there, I would have trained my heart to raise the deer of metaphor ... so carry your country wherever you go and be narcissistic if necessary”. And if I wanted to summarize the issue of the literary text personality, I would say, for example, that the narrative explosion that the Arab literary scene is experiencing now represents an imaginary Arab present parallel to the physical present. It observes it, adjusts its movement, and identifies with it at times to opposes it at other times. Each novel is a text of fiction written with the personality of a non-fiction text.

I claim that the texts of Amin Maalouf, Fouad Al-Aroui, Kamal Daoud, Leila Soleimani, Yasmina Khadra and other Francophone writers are Arabic texts written in the French language, even if these writers refuse to acknowledge that (they are Arabic texts with something Arabic coloring them). The literary text may have a cultural gene that gives it its literary privacy within the literature of the world. Deleuze and Félix (1975) described this condition with an elegant and famous phrase in which they said that minor literature is not literature written in a minor language, but rather that which is produced by a minority [of people] in the language of the majority.

What matters here is that the affiliation of a text to a literary genre remains very weak in defining its objectives compared to its affiliation with culture. No matter how much a literary text fulfills the conditions of its affiliation with its creative genus of a certain type, such affiliation only grants it alignment under the name of the genre only, I mean it meets the technical conditions of that genre. However, its meaning and course of significance safeguards its cultural personality because it is the incubator of its values and the horizon of its imagination, and it does not belong to that host culture. Even if the literary text travels far from its geography, it still communicates with the rest of its many, direct or indirect content to create its civilizational glory. Or only the genre, I mean its availability on the technical conditions of that gender, as for its meaning and the course of its significance, they remain declaring its cultural personality because it incubates its values, and the horizon of its imagination, and what is from that culture - even if it is far from its geography - but a term that communicates with the
rest of its many vocabulary directly or indirectly. Direct to the industry

Although the text is always classified in terms of its belonging to a
literary genre, it is a classification that Aristotle originated its pillars in
order to understand the movement of creativity in his time. Such a
classification then turned after Aristotle into an artistic destiny among
critics with a collective awareness that is governed by the duty to
return the singular to the group and dissolve in it (this is an issue that
transcends literature to cast its shadows and misguidance on many
intellectual issues). What presents at the moment of reading is the text
not its genre. The genre remains attached to the cover of the work and
does not enter the text. It is absent from the moment of reading. I am
astonished by Todorov et al. (2007) on the effect that literary genres
constitute the life of literature itself, and the source of truth and
power lies in the complete identification of these genres, and going to
the point of reconginzing the meaning of each of them. The reason
beyond my astonishment is that this theorist missed that the literary
genre does not exist except in the text. Therefore there is nothing in
the text except the individual text or the text of the individual that has
its own cultural entity, and there are only text entities with potentials
in literary creativity of their meanings and the nature of their cultural
personality. As for the genres, they neither make a meaning, nor do
they tell about it or indicate it, because they are old and deaf
theoretical structures that are suitable for history not to literary
criticism. To sum up, I say that the text is what is found in literature
while its genre is the transcendent contingent, and the transcendent
is always fragile in formation, otherwise it would have stayed on earth
with people. If it is difficult to talk about a literary genre without texts
by which it is built and returned to it, then it is possible to talk about a
text without referring it to a certain genre, because the major texts are
those that penetrate the walls of genres and are liberated from them.
So, isn’t the task of the literary genre to domesticate the text and
surround its dreams? One of the text functions is to enrich the literary
genre, but its’ dream is to rebel against it, due to such a matter,
reading must reduce the weight of the genre on its “subjects” of the
texts. Rather, reading is called upon to “migrate the circles of genre”
so that it can liberate its focus on the literary production relationship
to its textual entity and its reality, in order to search for human values
that filter the channel of his communication with himself and with the
other.

Perceiving in mind that cultural peculiarities of literary texts should not
be a reason for preferring one text over another, according to what
has become widespread among people of false exaltation of certain
cultures at the expense of other cultures. Rather, the possible truth is
that some cultures may impose, in times of their civilizational
flourishing on other cultures some concepts and intellectual visions that benefit the latter's creative paths, and the opposite is also possible. Those peculiarities of each text are only a path which colors the garden of literary creativity within the circle of its cultural community on the one hand, and within the community of human culture on the other hand. Literature is always local; due to its devotion to its locality, it is able to address the human in man, and thus it is universal, in the sense that it represents a flower from the bouquet of human literature. So, the personality of the literary text is not the result of its belonging to a literary genre, but rather it is the outcome of the intense debate that the past and present of the society of that text achieves with its various elements of living: geography, history, belief, art, appearance, cuisine, social mentality, unity of conscience, forms of communication, and other features that distinguish it from other societies. It is a space for the totality of society's visions of its world with all its objects and neighborhoods, and its methods of communicating with it in transformation and interpretation.

The literary text is a living being that walks in the markets and showers the silence of passers-by with questions. It is more than the elements that make up its internal order, it is the unforeseen reality, the unfulfilled past, and it is also the concrete outside. The text is the outside when it is hidden in the language or in the music or in the colors that writes the language or the music or the colors. It is the other texts that whisper with it.

The literary text is the writer's innovation by which he saves us from the fire. It is the outside world, the language and the human being. It is the paradise. While I read the writer's text, I am basically reading the author of the text in his communication with the world. The writer is not only found in the text, but he is the text itself; the miracle of the text. This, in my opinion, is what the structuralists were obsessed with and kept silent about, or kept silent about for their earthly disteny. Perhaps one of the different forms of personalities in literary texts is their different vision of literature itself. It is a well-known small detail, but it seems to me significant for this purpose. Western culture, for example, does not call literature what it calls Arab culture. It calls it a name referring to its instrument (the: how), unlike Arab culture, which calls it a name indicating its purpose (the: why?). Yet, the difference here is clear between the instrument and the purpose of the same thing. I claim that the question “why” includes the question “how” and the opposite is not true.

This is confirmed that Western dictionaries agree that the word “Littérature” (i.e. literature) comes from the Latin word littera (the letter, in French lettre), which is a form by which the linguistic utterance is drawn without any indication in it of a moral,
psychological or social burden. It is an act of hand. (French theory prevailed - with Barthes (1984) - writing over literature). It is an act in which al-Jahiz’s (2002) description of the science of speech is validated as “the knowledge of the art of speech” and it also includes his warning of it in his saying: “And know that the art of speech has many pests and various forms of disliked and wondrous.” (P. 54).

The varieties types of concerns and frustrations cast a shadow over the most famous literary approaches that emerged in the West and were directed by well-known destinations that do not deviate from most of their functions from the task of tracking the meaning within the text away from the circumstances of its writing. The Western literary theorists do not pay much interest in the presence of the writer in his text with all his intellectual and aesthetic stances from the reality of his social group. This perhaps increased the tendency of the most famous theories of contemporary Western criticism to pour out its theoretical effort on the system of the text alone: its structure, relations and signs, so it does not look for values in its connection with the outside world. Except when this serves to confirm the presence of the system in it. This permits us to say that the horizon of Western culture is the horizon of action and devising the means (the: how?), because “the critic, when confronted with the creative effect, does not ask: What does this [effect] mean? Rather, he asks: How was it written? (Barthes, 1984).

The aforementioned difference between the two personalities of the Western text and the Arabic text regarding their vision of literature allows me to say that Western literary criticism is loyal to the nature of its culture, the culture of “confession.” Therefore, it is inclined, in most of its interests, to research the structure of the written text, all of which is reassured that the form of the text will subjectively confess and without external coercion in the sense of its text, no matter how complex the metaphorical discourse is. In addition to this, the generality of civil laws that govern all areas of the Western individual’s life, and their transformation over time from obligation to optional behavior. This transformation does not need a legislative or creative basis are implemented by two things in which I might find an incentive for Western writing to return to itself: to its structure, language and style (this is what the new novel did in France, for example). Meanwhile, modern Western criticism was keen to root this “artistic” tendency in its reading practices. It sought to market it in other cultural spaces as a solution to addressing the meanings of literary texts in them. In my opinion, this contradicts what is the case with the modern Arab critical achiever. It reads texts that seem distressed by their reality. Hence, making meaning rises in some of our countries to the heights of major sins, calamities and misguidance.
Therefore, the literary text is keen to hide its “blessings” and “values” within the circles of its ambiguity and the sharpness of its metaphors, and it does not wish to reveal them to the reader. Rather, you see the reader prefers to follow the strategy of (secrecy): "Take help in fulfilling your needs by concealing them. For indeed every favoured person is envied." narrated by Aws bin Abdullah bin Buraydah and authenticated by Al-Albani (1995). But, I do not think that the text has a blessing that can be envied and benefits people except for its system of values and the aesthetics of its composition. In this context, our literary criticism is called upon to renew its awareness of its literary functions. One of the renewing awareness manifestations is to leave the lecture halls and going to the texts, and to get rid of the illusion of its authority over texts. Literary criticism should also change the belief that its existence depends on the quality of its argument management with it. Criticism should also not feel proud over text and invoke itself an assessment power of the text. Rather, literary criticism argues with the text in order to reach the highest goals of creative writing in its social group. I mean replacing people’s outdated artistic and social values with others that guarantee them the unity of their collective conscience, and enable them to participate effectively in the making of human civilization.

What I aspire to through my argument is to confirm the relevance of the following matter: texts have their own cultural personalities that distinguish them from others and represent for them the source of their literature. They have their living, growing dreams that do not stop their movement within the space of their social group. There is no place in literary texts for a fixed meaning whose address can be known. Texts with fixed meanings are dead; texts are a land of earthquakes and mines.

Every wave in such a land brings out its meanings, and turns every meaning into a signification, and the signification is the legitimacy of every human meaning, and it is what fills literary texts with life and pleasure: Its pleasure is on the one hand, because it is always required and always abstained, and the reader's pleasure is on the other hand, because he is always a seeker of it, and is not reassured that he will always obtain it. Writing and reading are really desire and reluctance, and really argumentation and argument, and really calmness and movement, and it is foolish to plead with a fixed approach to reach the meaning of a text whose connotations are constantly moving.

Reading solutions

Our Arab literary history is not devoid of biographies of poets and prose writers who rose up against the prevailing tastes and living conditions of their societies. They have achieved through their writings artistic and value additions that represented a qualitative impetus for the movement of reality in their time that still has an echo that knocks
on the doors of our reality. It seems to me that in this soft confrontation that the creator achieves with his reality in a highly literary manner. This foretells the fact that there is no literary text that is out of people’s lives with all its issues and dreams that they struggled to achieve, and then it becomes necessary for the people of reality to be present at the event of reading the text itself. In this regard, it is permissible to agree with Barthes (1984) that a writer will not succeed in confronting the familiar world with writing unless he declares at the same time his war against the regularity of everything, even the regularity of writing discourse: that is, the writer dreams of transcending the established arts, and liberating them from their familiar contract with the reader.

He also makes the texts deviate by the horizon of his expectation towards the horizons of the possible. This affirms that every creative text is but the preparation of meanings that are committed by their linguistic nature to the reading manifestation, so there is no specific content in the literary text that is complete and clear, but there are possibilities of a certain content. Any initial paste that suggests its significance as shown by the reading. In the meantime, the writer liberates for imagination a vast sky in which he drags its clouds to its fullest meaning, dragging them to where he wants them to rain, not to “rain wherever you want.” Reading, which I aspire to be rooted in our critical achievement, is nothing but the most gentle state of human existence and the most capable of revealing its meanings with its objects and reviving it in its silence and in its words. It is a reading in which the reader enjoys the text at a time when the text enjoys the consciousness of its reader (this is how I understand the “pleasure of the text”) (Barthes, 1975).

The liberation of the Arabic literary text from its restrictions and contracts is now only achieved by the reading bias to it, the bias of affiliation and the bias of meaning. That is: to read and love it together at the same time, and other than that, every reading is a great injustice to the text. To read a text and love it means two combined things: the first is that I defend all its literary rights: its right to its artistic ease from the prevailing styles of writing in its time, its right to freely communicate with its reality, its right to suggest its meanings without systematic coercion, and its right to a free reader. The second is that I defend at the same time to all my reading rights: my right to read a rogue text about its genre conditions, my right to the love of receiving it, and my right to how to write that reading love and make meaning out of it. Therefore, I do not write novel criticism - for example - unless I am in the place of their writers (which is an old demand for critics, and for novelists it is a hidden, constant, and increasing demand!).
These solutions is what motivates every novel to dissolve in me, so I write it in me and I write me in it at the same time: i.e., I write to the world about the conditions in which I dwell in that novel with the imagination of a novelist, because when I read a novel, I am only telling the story of reading it. I benefit from Jauss and Benzinger's (1970) opinion on reception. They confirm the endeavor that was preceded by the builders of the Prague circle (Trubetzkoy, Jacobson) represented in restoring consideration to the reader in the history of literature and in the literary act itself within their talk for the first time about the concept of reception, in his saying: “The researcher (the reader) will then be creative, and can be compared to the writer, in that he is the creator of new expectations. This which is a central idea in two articles by Barthes (1967, 1974), he first is labeled “The Death of the Author” and was first published in English in 1967, and the second is labeled “Theory of the Text” and was published in 1974.

It is true that the reader is a treacherous lover; he is created to be unfaithful, moving without moral remorse from the love of one novel to another. However, their reading of any novel is a reading that does not betray the dreams of what they read. This reading realizes such dreams in the text of reality, or seeks to realize them in it by bringing them out of hiding and into the realm of manifestation in daily behavior. A reader who does not leave an impression on the text or does not create an effect that indicates their relationship with the text is a sterile reader. Yet, a text that does not leave an impression on its reader or does not create a voice that refers to the reader is a sterile text. I agree that what academics call "methodical reading"; it is in my opinion, an educational reading that only trains students to approach texts. Outside of education, it corrupts literary readings because it abuses the text and realizes the criticism dreams rather than the reader's dreams. If I were to use Ibn Sina's opinion in his book "Logic" for my benefit, I would say that the goal of reading approaches is to search for truth in the text, meaning what the text sees as truth, based on the extent to which the text itself is suitable for any of these signs, voluntarily or by force.

However, the proponents of reader-response theory emphasize the synthesis of artistic and moral elements in the text that demands a lively and free debate with the reader, both affecting and being affected together. I write with love about what I read, I mean, I love to express through my writing about everything that is written with love. Sometimes, I may criticize a text for its technical or content-related flaws, but my criticism will always be that of a lover. There is no objectivity in literary criticism, no matter how much methodologies claim. As it is mentioned, even the pillars of what is called "objective" criticism, such as Barthes and Thody (1987), wrote a book called "Sollers Writer" at a time when Philippe Sollers had not written
anything of value except for being Arab in the Latin Quarter. Only the
dead may write with high objectivity if they write about texts.

Therefore, it can be said that methodical reading is a reading that talks
about the text according to Todorov et al's (2007) opinion and does
not talk to it and with it at the same time. It relies on several reading
tools made for all texts on earth. But what is suitable for all texts is not
suitable for a particular text. By doing so, it isolates me from it and
prevents me from interacting with it with my mind, body, and dreams

perhaps I can find in Al-Roumi’s (2002), story mentioned
something that explains this methodical reading. The image depicted
is that of a man sent his son to a group of knowledgeable people to
teach him their sciences. The boy learned and became a professor.

Upon the boy’s return, his father tried to test his level of knowledge
and understanding, so he held a ring in his hand and asked him: "What
is in my hand?" The boy replied: "The thing you are holding is round,
yellow, and hollow." His father replied: "Since you provided the
correct answers, decide now what that thing is." The boy said: "It
should be a sieve." His father replied, "Indeed, you have given many
precise signs that confuse minds. And since you have this level of
knowledge and understanding, how did you miss that the sieve does
not fit in the palm of your hand?" How many critical teachers rely
on categories of criticism and see a wooden sieve in a gold ring!

I completely agree with the perception that communicating with texts
is similar to communicating with people because every text has its own
creative and cultural mood that requires the reader to have a unique
style of reception. When the reader successfully understands the
mood of the text, a harmony is created between them, and loneliness
disappears. The approach to every reading is based on the reader's
state of mind towards a particular text at a particular moment. It is an
approach that intersects the rights of the text and its dreams with the
rights and dreams of the reader within a certain cultural context. It is
essentially an intersection of freedoms, blends, desires, and
perspectives. This intersection liberates the reader from the contract
imposed on him by official criticism institutions that oblige him to
understand the text in one way. The text itself makes the reader an
entity at the moment of reading, a textual entity with a free and
passionate spirit that reveals its meanings and joys from the second
direction.

When the reader enjoys the rhythms of the text, which excite his
language, style, scenes, silence, and rebellion, and when the text itself
responds to the flow of the reader's desire with all his knowledge and
dreams and previous readings, the reading event is created. It is a text
that blends with another text, a soul that celebrates another soul, a
tongue that solves a knot of another tongue, and values that confront
another context of values. It is only the selfish person who enjoys the
dawn without glorifying it, a reader will not enjoy what he reads if he only demands that the text grant him the secret of its possibilities without daring to grant its meanings to the reader through his linguistic, narrative, aesthetic, social, philosophical and other knowledge. Knowledge that Jauss (1977) confirms is an important condition for reception, and we have relied on it in writing this research paper).

The question here is if the reading event requires the text to have high competencies in selecting language and its content, what is the fate of non-literary texts? I say that texts described as non-literary can also be read literarily because their existence among us motivates us to pay attention to what hinders writing movement in our time from weakness or strength and what governs it from regularity or chaos. They are a cure for reading itself from its deceptive tranquility to the concept of creativity and the function of the creator. What appears weak to us now may be the seed of literary renewal that we may die before tasting its fruit! We must realize that reading a novel is an act of storytelling because the novel only tells what its reader says, that is its destiny. Therefore, the one who narrates in the novel, expresses its meanings, is the reader because when he stops talking, it stops revealing. I can call this the "reading solutions" the event that is the subject of reading and its method at the same time. It is every reading in which the reader solves the desire in the readable text armed with a flexible and non-pessimistic imaginative novel and has a passion for searching in that readable text for possibilities of light that illuminates the world outside it. This means that the reader follows the dream of the writer carried in a technical and/or thematic model, then he runs it with his personal consciousness in the reality of people, indicating them through his possible output from the possible subconscious to the powerful conscious that the senses reach and the idea represents. So people consider it in their behavior with acceptance or rejection. Every fictional text is a space of possibility, a space for what is unexpected, and hence the richness of texts outside their context, that is, in the space of reading. The history of literature tells us that immortal texts have only been immortalized by what we have found in them of renewed technical and/or human models related to people's living and aesthetic vision of the world over time, like the models of Al-Jahiz (Ma'ad Al-Anbariya), Al-Hamadani (Issa bin Hisham), Naguib Mahfouz (Said's father), Mahmoud Al-Mas'adi (Abu Hurairah), Tayeb Saleh (Mustafa Said), George Orwell (Big Brother), Cervantes (Don Quixote), and many others. Is there anything in literature except what we discover in it from models of great characters that we relate to or they relate to us, so we run their conditions in our lives through representation and proverbs?
I cannot imagine that there are specific methods for understanding a text, the only way is to read the text without a ready-made method. I mean that the reader himself is the approach to reading. From this perspective, reading only occurs when the reader activates their role. It means that the reader becomes a space for reading and an actor in it at the same time, provided that he is proficient in the language arts, such as grammar, morphology, and figurative language. The reader should also understand the cultural background that colors the spirit of the text being read and be aware of the living conditions of the people around them. Bakhtin (1997) affirmed that studying discourse in and of itself, without knowing towards anything that looks outside of it, is like the absurdity of studying moral torment away from the reality on which it is fixed and determined.

The future of reading lies in freeing from chemicals methodologies. It should return to its original innocence where wonder, amazement, confusion, revelation, fusion, dissolution, and disappearance arise. Can we talk here about Bio reading literature? Therefore, this type of reading can only be achieved when the reader gets rid of the ready-made reading categories; they should abandon the "terms and conditions" that have governed the theoretical and prohibitive aspects of reading and its destiny. The true reader is invited to abandon the critical "roba vecchia" (old neglected things) that have burdened texts with their false promises and destroyed the joy of their existence. Reading should be transferred into an act which fuse the reader's body and the text merge, leaving no room for a third party to exercise the function of control, prohibition, or guidance. During this fusion, their situations are revealed, and they experience joys and connotations that do not require the complexity of theories to interpret them but rather require a personal literary sensibility that explores the read (as an art and goal) with passion and writes it with elegance.

Summary
This paper concludes that it is useful for the Arab reader to realize that the era of major reading approaches has ended, and that they are now called upon to be their own approach as they read. They should approach texts with their hearts and minds and not leave any distance between themselves and the text, as every distance is a space that is occupied by others (systems or laws) to impose their rules on them, and how much have the rules of others corrupted love stories! A novel does not benefit much from a reader/critic who is overwhelmed by the echoes of narrative statements and theories, a critic without literary emotion, a hybrid of words, awkward in rhetoric when describing rhetoric, he describes is not what he knows, and as if what he points to is not what it indicates," in the words of Al-Tawhidi. Such
a reader only sees a corpse in the text that can be divided and measured with a ruler and a compass, and in that, he is no more than a machine for implementing an approach according to the Saudi critic Mohammed Al-Abbas, a machine that does not think but only applies what its theoretical software operators dictate to it: it applies its approach in literature without literary awareness.

Therefore, a fact must be emphasized that the reader is not just a fictional character outside of the text, but rather the character that awaits to enter its world and make its meanings travel from the symbolic space to a realistic horizon. According to the structuralists and reception aesthetics, it is now possible to say that the reader writes their own text as they read. The reader even becomes the protagonist of the story. Readers are the character that the novelist does not write, but expects to write the life of their novel, revealing its convincing creativity by bringing it down to artistic and moral realities. These realities multiply the meanings of the novel and come to life among people, reviving their desire to defend their right to tangible life. From this perspective, reading is nothing but the final stage of writing a novel, and the reader is simply the hero of their reading experience.

Conclusions
1. Every literary text is a carrier of the reading act, and no literary criticism approach can claim to decipher all the meanings of any text;
2. Relying on critical theories without awareness of their procedural limits can lead the critic to become a reader who follows the approach rather than reading the text with their own thoughts;
3. Every literary text has a cultural and civilizational personality that arises from the history of its society, distinguishing it from other texts written by other peoples;
4. Reading is a creative literary act.
5. "Reading solutions" is a critical proposal that can reconnect our criticism with our literary texts, so that the critic merges their knowledge, culture, and mood with the text to become an entity of knowledge, culture, and mood.
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