

Translating Meaning in the Text

Lakhdar Nour El Houda

Department of Translation, Faculty of Letters and Languages, Badji Mokhtar University – Annaba, P.O. Box 12,
Annaba 23000, Algeria

Email: nour-el-houda.lakhdar@univ-annaba.dz

Received : 26/09/2025 ; Accepted : 29/04/2026 ; Published :29/05/2026

Abstract

The text constitutes the fundamental building block through which an author's ideas are constructed and revealed. Authors engage in the act of writing with the aim of conveying a message to their readers. Such a text encompasses a multitude of meanings, both explicit and implicit, thereby requiring considerable effort in reading and interpretation. This article seeks to shed light on the importance of the text and its reading in the process of translation from one language into another. Since a text is composed of both form and meaning, special care and attention must be devoted to the reading of its surface and deeper meanings.

Keywords: text, reader, writer, reading, translator, interpretation, meaning.

Introduction

The process of translation is never devoid of the translator's effort in reading and interpreting the meanings of the text to be translated. Since texts are tightly woven fabrics of ideas conveyed through sentences and expressions, the translator finds himself faced with a dual task: first, reading and carefully contemplating the source text; and second, skillfully transferring its content to a reader who has the absolute right to enjoy and receive all the meanings and aesthetic qualities that the original reader obtained from the text. As this task is by no means easy, caution and vigilance must be exercised in carrying it out, for the responsibility is indeed immense.

The importance of the text and its semantic value lie in its ability to attract the reader's attention and interest, to make him eager to read it through to the end, and to desire further reading. Since the text is the largest linguistic unit, it has drawn the attention of linguists for half a century. They have devoted their efforts to studying it in both form and content, and have established criteria and rules for its study and analysis. Not everything written in the form of a text is necessarily a text; rather, it must meet certain conditions, which we shall mention later, after addressing some definitions of the text as a linguistic unit of utmost importance in linguistic studies in particular, and in the field of linguistics and discourse in general.

Al-Azhar Al-Zannad states that the text is: "The term text is applied to that through which meaning appears; that is, the audible phonetic form of speech, or its visible form when it is translated into writing" (Lahlouhi, 2012). This definition suggests that the text is of great importance, since meaning cannot appear to the reader without its mediation. It is a form that may be either audible or visible, through which meanings, significations, and the author's intentions, which he seeks to communicate to his reader, become manifest.

As for Nasr Hamid Abu Zayd, he maintains that the text "does not go beyond its basic central signification of the signifier 'text,' namely appearance and disclosure" (Lahlouhi, 2012). This means that the text is a body of meanings and information that appear only through it or by means of it, and that become clear only when the text fulfills the necessary conditions and structure, whether in terms of form such as the alignment of sentences and structures and their logical arrangement or in terms

of meaning or content, through the sequence, harmony, and coherence of ideas within their temporal and spatial context, in a manner that does not disrupt the process of communication between the author of the text and his readers.

Definitions of the text, as a tool or means for conveying meaning, have varied according to its use. Some have defined it on a syntactic basis, considering it a set of structures and sentences that carry both surface and deep meanings and significations, linked by logical relations and functioning as signifiers of signifieds. Among these scholars is Brinker, who defines the text as “a coherent sequence of sentences.” From this, it may be inferred that the basic unit in the formation of the text is the sentence, whether independent or interconnected with other sentences in both form and meaning. Not far from this definition are the definitions of Harweg and Weinrich, who regard the text as a sequence of linguistic units expressing content.

This concerns the syntactic aspect. As for the semantic aspect, some scholars, such as Van Dijk and Greimas, view the text as a surface structure motivated by a deep structure. From this perspective, signifieds become more important if not the very foundation upon which the text rests. No text has any value without access to its signifieds or deep structure, and without deriving its meanings through the coherence and cohesion that characterize its surface composition. Signification or meaning may, in the view of some linguists, be the most important condition or foundation in the analysis or study of texts.

Another group of scholars views the text from a pragmatic perspective, considering it a tool of contact and communication between writer and reader. This presupposes the existence of interaction between them so that the processes of understanding and interpretation may take place and the desired objective may be achieved. Among these scholars are Gülich and Schmidt, who regard the text as a tool of communication and define it as “a part objectively or thematically determined through a communicative event with a communicative, or performative, function” (Lahlouhi, 2012).

As for Kristeva, she defines it as follows:

“Nous définissons le texte comme un appareil translinguistique qui redistribue l'ordre de la langue en mettant en relation une parole communicatrice visant l'information directe avec différents énoncés antérieurs ou synchroniques” (Universalis, 2015, p. 6).

“We define the text as a translinguistic apparatus that redistributes the order of language by placing communicative speech, aimed at direct information, in relation with different prior or synchronous utterances.” Julia Kristeva, trans. Hussein Marzani, 2011, p. 86.

From this definition, we notice that Julia Kristeva paid attention to several elements, each no less important than the others: the semantic, communicative, and informational aspects, as well as the visible and hidden dimensions within a given text. The author's intentions may be direct, causing the reader no difficulty in reaching them; or they may be deep and indirect, requiring the reader to strive to understand and infer them through interaction with the author of the text, by means of a profound and analytical reading that may rely on prior background knowledge or on other texts, whether earlier or contemporaneous, which may suggest the extraction and inference of meanings.

From the preceding definitions, we may conclude that the text consists of an outer aspect represented in its form structures and sentences and an inner aspect, namely what these structures contain in terms of apparent and hidden meanings, or, more precisely, surface and deep meanings. Apparent or surface meanings are those that the reader notices or discovers at first glance, or upon the first or superficial reading, if we may say so, without effort or hardship in deriving them. They may also be called direct meanings.

Hidden or deep meanings, however, are discovered only after toil and effort, accompanying the exploration of the depths of the text, wandering through its meanings, and attempting to extract the various and diverse signifieds toward which the author or creator of the text intended to direct the reader. Hence, it becomes permissible to speak of the structure of the text, which is not limited merely to its apparent form, but extends beyond it to the deep or hidden meanings. One cannot determine with certainty whether their author deliberately concealed them or whether this occurred purely by chance. To trace the marks of hidden meanings, the reading itself must be as deep as the meanings it seeks to uncover.

There are certain conditions that must be met by any text (the textual subject matter), namely the standards of textuality that ensure the success of communication between the reader and the writer. Among the standards of textuality, as cited by Salah al-Din Salih Hasanein in his book *Semantics and Syntax*, drawing on de Beaugrande, are the following:

The First Standard: Cohesion

This refers to the connectedness and continuity of the elements of a text its words and sentences and their interdependence, enabling the reader to understand the textual message in a logical manner.

The Second Standard: Coherence

This concerns the elements that constitute the deep structure of the text, including the interrelationship of ideas and meanings and their logical progression, allowing the reader to follow events and arguments with ease.

The Third Standard: Intentionality

This refers to what the author intends to communicate to the reader according to the purpose and plan underlying the textual elements.

The Fourth Standard: Acceptability

This denotes the extent to which the recipient accepts the text through the perceived cohesion and harmony of its constituent elements.

The Fifth Standard: Informativity

This concerns the amount of new information and knowledge that the text provides to its recipients. It is generally preferable for information to be presented indirectly, as this tends to enhance the text's degree of informativity.

The Sixth Standard: Situationality

This refers to the consideration of the situation or context within which the events or facts of the text are presented.

The Seventh Standard: Intertextuality

This relates to the development of textual patterns and genres, based on the fact that texts possess prototypical characteristics and maintain relationships with other texts (Salih, 2005).

These are the standards that must be present in any text for it to qualify as an ideal text and to fulfill the communicative function that constitutes the primary purpose for which texts are produced. In dealing with texts, the translator must read them carefully and analytically, first with the aim of understanding them in a "correct" or "accurate" manner. It should be noted, however, that no human being can ever fully comprehend the exact meaning, intention, and purpose of another writer, since human thought can never be perfectly identical between two individuals. The translator must then endeavor to transfer these meanings faithfully to the target reader.

According to Nord, the factors that should be analyzed include:

- a. Subject Matter: the topic addressed by the text.

- b. Content: including shades of meaning, coherence, and semantic relations.
- c. Presuppositions: the factual and contextual factors related to the communicative situation.
- d. Composition: the overall and partial structure of the text.
- e. Non-verbal Elements: such as images, symbols, and other non-linguistic features.
- f. Verbal Elements: lexical items and supra-segmental features, including stress, rhythm, and stylistic punctuation (Anani, 2003).

The purpose of this systematic analysis of texts is to achieve the desired objective: ensuring that the original message reaches all readers and produces an equivalent effect. There may be thousands of hidden meanings underlying a single apparent meaning. All of this depends on the inclinations, intentions, and ideas of the author, who is himself subject to numerous factors that may influence the formulation of his thoughts and meanings. He may deliberately conceal or imply certain meanings for various reasons. In such cases, the reader's imagination is set free, engaging in interpretation on the basis of personal beliefs and prior knowledge, which serve as the foundation for the journey of understanding and explanation.

Meaning and Signification between Understanding and Interpretation

Arab scholars and thinkers throughout the world have long been concerned with the process of interpretation due to its importance in establishing connections between texts and in explaining and elucidating complex forms of discourse, particularly poetry and religious texts, with the aim of conveying their meanings to the wider public. Many interpretations have proven successful, while others have fallen short, for interpretation is an open-ended process whose outcomes can never be fully guaranteed. Its field is as vast as the limitless imagination of human beings.

Both exegesis and interpretation accompanied the development of the Arabic rhetorical tradition. Interpretation has occupied a prominent place in Arabic criticism throughout its various historical periods. Indeed, interpretation is born with the birth of the text itself. It is a literary and intellectual activity undertaken by the recipient, the reader of the text, and the seeker of its aesthetic significations and intellectual suggestions. Hence, interpretation may be described as a meticulous reading of the text (Mubarak, 1999).

As previously noted, interpretation is a complex undertaking whose path is fraught with risks that may lead to serious consequences, particularly in the interpretation of religious or legal texts. In contrast, the intellectual and literary domains remain open to conjecture and hypothesis. Interpretation can never be entirely free from subjectivity, which often exerts a strong influence upon it. At times, the reader relies on comparisons between texts; at others, he draws upon his ideological, intellectual, or doctrinal background. No matter how objective a reader strives to be, his judgments can never be entirely detached from subjectivity, which inevitably shapes his understanding.

Moreover, even when signifiers coincide or converge, this does not necessarily imply that the signifieds also coincide or refer to the same reality across different cultures and languages. The translator, however, bears an even greater burden than both the original author and the target reader. The translator is first a reader, second an interpreter, and third a producer of the target text. These three functions are, to say the least, exceedingly demanding.

The translator's primary role in the translation process is to convey the message faithfully. Such fidelity can only be achieved through a comprehensive understanding of all the meanings embedded in the text. This becomes possible when the translator possesses a thorough command of the linguistic, stylistic, cognitive, and cultural dimensions of discourse, enabling him to extract textual components

that might otherwise remain inaccessible. Furthermore, the translator must undertake a process of textual contextualization, situating the text within its temporal and spatial framework, comparing and connecting events, and examining their interrelationships. Only then can he uncover hidden meanings that may diverge from, or even contradict, the apparent meaning.

The translator's task, therefore, is one of scrutiny before transfer.

“Intellectual signification tends toward interpretation, and the very term ‘intellect’ implies the use of reflection and deliberation in understanding the text. Reaching the meaning behind the meaning is an effort undertaken by the recipient who reads the text and examines its significations. The role of the recipient in the overall process of interpretation and meaning discovery becomes clear through two essential points. First, the structure of contradiction: if interpretation is an effort carried out by the recipient, that effort can only proceed on the basis of a contradictory structure. The meaning behind the meaning points to contradiction, for the hidden or secondary meaning differs from and opposes the apparent meaning. If the two were identical, it would no longer constitute a distinct meaning, and interpretation itself would become unnecessary” (Mubarak, 1999).

In addition, meaning cannot be confined solely to linguistic means. Meaning may sometimes distance itself considerably from the language through which it is expressed, while the author's intention remains the driving force behind interpretation.

“Meaning does not correspond exactly to the signifieds associated with linguistic signs, nor does it encompass everything that the author intentionally seeks to express. The meaning of a sentence is not the reason for which one speaks, nor the causes and consequences of what is said. Meaning should not be confused with motives or intentions. The translator who turns himself into an exegete, and the interpreter who transforms himself into a commentator, may overstep the limits of their respective tasks” (Lederer, 2009).

Interpretation may at times be successful and at others mistaken, for language is merely a vehicle of expression crystallized in words, structures, and formulations intended to convey a message to a recipient. This reality makes translation fundamentally a communicative process rather than merely a linguistic one. Consequently, great care must be taken to transfer meanings accurately, a task that depends not only on linguistic competence but also on intellectual and cognitive resources.

Umberto Eco views the text as a fabric woven with gaps awaiting completion, thereby granting the work renewed life. According to him, these gaps exist for two principal reasons:

To regard the text as an economic mechanism that survives through the proportion of meanings added by the recipient.

To enable the text, in its aesthetic function, to encourage the reader to assume the initiative of interpretation (Ghafiri, 2012).

From this perspective, the text does not fully come alive as its author may have intended. Rather, it contains gaps whose meanings remain incomplete until they are filled by the reader. Eco argues that these gaps await the recipient's participation in weaving the textual fabric through the addition of personal insights that facilitate understanding. It is as though the author deliberately leaves spaces within the text, not out of deficiency, but in order to involve the reader in constructing a new meaning, thereby granting the text a renewed existence and an alternative significance.

The text thus continues to await the reader's contribution, to the extent that some may believe it to be the product of a collaborative effort: an author who sketches its outlines and a reader who participates in shaping both its general meaning and the subsidiary meanings that constitute it. The text achieves its full significance only through this interaction. It is as though the author expects

another participant to bestow an aesthetic dimension upon the work, a process that necessarily calls for interpretation capable of compensating for apparent “gaps” and completing the act of composition.

The more the reader is integrated into the text, the richer its meanings and interpretations become, depending on the recipient’s intellectual inclinations, cognitive background, and awareness of the events surrounding the text or its author particularly when reader and author do not belong to the same historical period. It is here that scholars recognize the reader’s creative potential through the act of interpretation. Interpretation opens new gateways to worlds that may remain hidden within the text and allows for multiple readings that enrich meaning with diverse possibilities. In doing so, it liberates the text from the constraints of a single reading or a single interpretive direction, which may otherwise restrict vision and diminish the text’s aesthetic richness.

The Manifest Text and the Generated Text

The Problematic of the Signifier and the Signified in Understanding and Interpretation According to Kristeva

Julia Kristeva is regarded as a pioneer of semantic text analysis. She was among the first scholars to advocate a new perspective on texts, viewing the text not merely as a translinguistic apparatus that redistributes the order of language by placing communicative discourse that is, direct information in relation to various prior or simultaneous utterances. Rather, the text becomes, in this way, a productive process. It is also considered an exchange or intersection of texts because of its resemblance to other texts in both form and content, a phenomenon referred to in contemporary studies as intertextuality.

In Kristeva’s conception, the text is simultaneously language and discourse. Consequently, it cannot be studied solely from a linguistic perspective; it must also be approached through semiology, the science concerned with textual signification and semantic analysis. For Kristeva, the text is not merely a linguistic phenomenon; it is a fragment of a larger text or framework, namely the culture to which it belongs and the literary genre within which it is situated.

Furthermore, the text is composed of a surface structure the manifest text which, through the act of reading, becomes a generated text characterized by both surface and depth. On this basis, Kristeva considers the novel to be a dialogue with a set of previous or contemporary literary texts. Consequently, textual productivity:

Makes the text a product, a site of production where the creator of the text encounters its reader.

Enables the text to function continuously throughout its historical existence, never ceasing to operate and generate meaning.

Causes the text to work through language, transforming it into a creative endeavor by dismantling the language of communication and representation and reconstructing a new, subjective, and potentially infinite language.

Allows the text to redistribute language when the reader engages with it through interpretation and textual play (Ben Aïssa, 2014).

This perspective opens the way to assumptions and possibilities that fill the gaps existing within the text. The reader deconstructs and analyzes the text’s surface structure and then moves toward new significations through personal experience and knowledge of reality. Potential discourse thus becomes a discourse that resembles reality itself. Such a conception opens the text to numerous possibilities and multiple readings, liberating it from the closure that characterized it in earlier periods.

Accordingly, the text may be viewed as a stage upon which the reader performs all acts of understanding, reading, and interpretation, drawing upon its constituent elements: the external form represented by the linguistic fabric, as well as the meanings and significations that constitute the text's general subject matter within a broader social, historical, psychological, and cultural framework. These factors collectively contribute to the construction of the text's semantic universe.

This approach allows for the emergence of new perspectives on the text beyond those originally imposed upon it by its author. Such perspectives constitute new interpretive horizons that encourage multiple readings by replacing the author's intentions, expressions, and concepts with possibilities projected onto the text according to logical relations perceived between the text and reality, as well as between the text and external frameworks such as historical, social, and cognitive backgrounds. It is through this process that new meanings are generated.

The text thus becomes a dynamic object of study for semantic analysis, benefiting from insights drawn from semiotics, psychoanalysis, mathematics, logic, and linguistics (Yaqtin, 2006).

The phenomenon of implicit or concealed information has attracted considerable attention from researchers in literature and the humanities in general, including sociology, psychology, and other disciplines concerned with individual behavior and its relationship to society and language. Van Dijk states:

“If the concept of revealing and concealing information is considered a category of inferred propositions not directly derived from a given discourse it may be generalized from representational information to actual reality, even though the boundaries separating the two are difficult to define with precision” (Van Dijk, 2000).

Consequently, linguists, psychologists, sociologists, and scholars from various fields have devoted substantial effort to studying the phenomenon of implication and its social, psychological, communicative, and other dimensions. Their investigations into implicit meanings generally begin with information explicitly present in the text, which serves as the foundation upon which hypotheses concerning hidden meanings are constructed.

Once a conclusion is reached, researchers often examine the possibility of generalizing it to phenomena or situations resembling those found in texts. Such generalization may appear to be governed by fixed laws and shared standards. However, these standards and laws remain largely inferential and speculative; they cannot be accepted as absolute truths nor employed as immutable foundations for hypothesis formation.

Indeed, despite similarities at the level of observable situations, these situations do not necessarily refer to the same hidden meaning. As Van Dijk further explains:

“Forms of inference, even when weak, may require another structure of events to which reference can be made. Such inferences are founded not only upon our knowledge of the conventional meanings agreed upon within language, but also upon our knowledge of the world” (Van Dijk, 2000).

Thus, the interpretation of implicit meanings depends not solely on linguistic competence but equally on cultural, cognitive, and experiential knowledge. Meaning emerges from the interaction between textual evidence and the reader's understanding of the world, making interpretation an open and dynamic process rather than a fixed and predetermined one.

Any conjecture, assumption, or inference remains dependent upon the external situation and the context in which the text emerged, as well as upon the reader's knowledge of the world and awareness of surrounding events. Such knowledge enables the reader to establish logical connections between what is explicitly stated in the text and the referential meanings that may be inferred from it. These

inferred meanings may either correspond to the realities represented in the text, approximate them, or diverge from them entirely, depending on the reader's familiarity with the subject matter under discussion.

During the process of writing, authors frequently resort to techniques of condensation and expansion. They may add, omit, abbreviate, or elaborate whenever necessity demands it. Thus, they may choose brevity in some expressions and prolixity in others, according to their individual preferences and expressive intentions.

Van Dijk observes that:

“Both deficient discourse and excessively complete discourse become conditions of incoherent speech, whereas incompleteness (ellipsis) is a natural phenomenon in concise expression for pragmatic reasons” (Van Dijk, 2000).

One of the essential features of literary writing is that authors carefully select their vocabulary, stylistic devices, and expressions according to the communicative situation and the literary, linguistic, and stylistic requirements of the text. Van Dijk argues that discourse becomes deficient when it lacks necessary expressions or meanings, and becomes equally problematic when overloaded with excessive words, expressions, and ideas. In both cases, the result is a disruption of semantic coherence and logical connectedness, forcing the reader to exert greater effort in understanding the text and following the progression of its ideas. Such discourse may expose the reader to ambiguity and intellectual disorientation.

Deficient discourse compels the reader to fill textual gaps and compensate for missing elements by drawing upon concepts and ideas derived from personal experience. These inferences may sometimes be accurate, yet they may also diverge significantly from the author's original intention. Similarly, overly elaborate discourse crowded with excessive expressions, stylistic embellishments, and ideas can distract the reader and prevent concentration on what is truly essential. As a result, the reader may become preoccupied with secondary matters while overlooking those aspects most deserving of examination and reflection.

On the other hand, when a text contains ellipsis or conciseness deliberately employed by the author, such omission serves important stylistic and pragmatic purposes. It enhances the literary value of the text, encourages the reader to participate actively in constructing meaning, and contributes to an interactive reading process that enriches knowledge and promotes critical engagement.

One of the defining features of literary composition is precisely the phenomenon of ellipsis. Ellipsis involves the omission of a segment of discourse for rhetorical and aesthetic purposes, encouraging the reader to draw inferences and formulate interpretations concerning both the overall meaning of the text and its subsidiary meanings. Such omission should not be regarded as a deficiency or flaw in discourse.

As Van Dijk explains:

“When we speak of incompleteness resulting from omission or deletion, we refer specifically to this type of deliberately chosen omission. In other cases, where events are necessarily conditioned by, composed of, or derived from other events to which reference can be made, we are dealing with what is implicit or inferred rather than with what is merely incomplete or omitted” (Van Dijk, op. cit.).

Thus, omission constitutes a deliberate strategy chosen by the author. At times, however, it may arise spontaneously, without prior planning or conscious intention, emerging instead from aesthetic considerations inherent in literary style. Such omissions may point toward implicit or concealed

elements that generate abundant new meanings, thereby contributing to the completion of the text's overall significance and enhancing the reader's understanding.

When these implicit elements are inferred accurately or at least in a manner consistent with the general or partial meaning of the text they become fundamental building blocks in the construction of a coherent and methodical interpretation of both explicit and implicit meanings. Consequently, they should not be regarded as deficiencies within the semantic structure of the text. Rather, they constitute aesthetic devices that enrich meaning, stimulate the reader's inferential efforts, and encourage the reconstruction of events and relationships.

Indeed, one of the most distinctive virtues of literary writing is its use of ellipsis, which generates curiosity and a desire to uncover what remains concealed and to infer what lies beneath the surface. Such qualities are hallmarks of successful literary expression, filled with surprises pleasant or otherwise that continually engage the reader's imagination throughout the reading process.

Authors often omit certain events or details from their texts, leaving readers free to infer them when they are significant or to disregard them when they are of lesser importance in relation to the progression of the main events. Yet these omitted details and events may possess varying degrees of importance. The reader may attend to them either for personal understanding or, in the case of a translator, for the benefit of others when transferring the text into another language. In such situations, the translator bears a special responsibility to identify, interpret, and convey these implicit meanings so that the target audience may experience the text with a depth comparable to that of the original readership.

Van Dijk observes that:

“Certain referential links to events may be omitted from discourse, either because such events are inappropriate to the context of communication or because they are referred to indirectly through the description of a higher-order event within which the elements of those events are either necessary or merely potential” (Van Dijk, 2000).

At this point, the translator's effort in understanding, comprehension, interpretation, and transfer becomes even more demanding. During the reading process, the translator is wholly immersed in the text, examining it with care and dedication, scrutinizing every detail in order to convey it faithfully into the target language. In this sense, the translator becomes a participant in the author's act of writing through close and attentive reading, which enables him to follow the progression of events and recreate them in the imagination of the target reader as the author intended them for the original audience.

Such a task is neither simple nor readily attainable. The original author may resort to indirect strategies for conveying ideas, including ellipsis, brevity, and condensation, in order to enhance the literary and aesthetic value of the text. These techniques increase the reader's curiosity and desire to discover further events and to penetrate the inner worlds of the characters whose roles are depicted. Through this engagement, the reader acquires a deeper understanding of the characters' thoughts and motivations and assumes the role of an observer for whom every event is significant. It is as though the reader acts as a judge who monitors and evaluates the movements of all the characters, ensuring that no event escapes attention. In this way, the reader reconstructs the semantic and implicit dimensions of the text.

Thus, omitted meanings are reconstructed and connected to the meanings explicitly present in the discourse until the comprehensive significance of the text is established. Only then can the text be

translated and transferred to the target reader without additions or omissions that might distort its overall meaning.

As Jean notes:

“When the reader establishes those interwoven relations between the past, the present, and the future, the text reveals a multiplicity of latent connections. These connections are the product of the reader’s mental activity upon the pure content of the text, although they are not the text itself, since the text is composed of sentences, statements, and information...” (Jean, 1998).

Through the act of reading, the reader engages in a variety of inferential and logical mental operations that ultimately lead to the discovery of the text’s concealed information, meanings, and events. These discoveries enrich the reader’s cognitive resources and simultaneously assist in organizing and relating information to corresponding events in reality or in the external world.

The reader therefore becomes primarily concerned with the content of the text its ideas and events upon which various cognitive processes operate. First, these processes aim at understanding and comprehension; second, they seek interpretation and explanation. Although such operations appear to be purely mental activities concerned with meanings and ideas, access to these meanings is only possible through passing across the text’s expressive means: its words, sentences, and paragraphs, namely the elements that constitute its external or manifest form.

Every text thus possesses both an exterior and an interior dimension. Any reader must engage with both dimensions equally if he wishes to handle information and content in a systematic and objective manner. Such engagement ultimately results in a thorough analytical study of the text’s elements and form, leading to the development of a methodology through which meanings may be accessed and understood with greater precision and ease.

References

- Lahlouhi, Fahima. (2012). Text Linguistics: Investigations into the Meaning and Pragmatics of the Text. *Journal of the Faculty of Letters and Humanities and Social Sciences*, pp. 207–234.
- Encyclopaedia Universalis. (2015), p. 6.
- Hassanein, Salah El-Din Saleh. (2005). *Semantics and Syntax*. Maktabat Al-Adab.
- Anani, Mohamed. (2003). *Modern Translation Theory*. Cairo: Egyptian International Publishing Company (Longman), p. 148.
- Al-Mubarak, Mohamed. (1999). *Text Reception among the Arabs*. Arab Institution for Studies and Publishing, University of Michigan, p. 222.
- Al-Mubarak, Mohamed. (1999). *Text Reception among the Arabs*. Arab Institution for Studies and Publishing, University of Michigan, p. 228.
- Lederer, Marianne. (2009). *Translation Today and the Interpretive Model*. Translated by Nadia Hafiz. Dar Houma for Publishing, Printing and Distribution, p. 250.
- Ghafiri. (2012). *The Authority of Language between Authorship and Reception*. Center for Arab Unity Studies, Beirut, Lebanon, p. 202.
- Ben Aïssa Al-Bukhari, Naima. (2014). *The Manifest Text and the Generated Text (Le Phéno-texte et le Géno-texte)*. Takhatub Forums, Morocco.
- Yaqtin, Said. (2006). *The Openness of the Novelistic Text*. 3rd ed. Arab Cultural Center, Casablanca, Morocco, p. 21.
- Van Dijk, Teun A. (2000). *Text and Context: Explorations in Semantic and Pragmatic Discourse Analysis*. Translated by Abdelkader Qnini. Ifriqiya Al-Sharq, p. 160.

Tompkins, Jane. (1998). Reader-Response Criticism. Translated by Hassan Nazim and Ali Hakim. General Authority for Amiri Printing Affairs, p. 119.