

# Why Need Regenerative Criticism? Regenerative Reading According to the Theory of Analysis and Upgrading in the Regenerative Criticism School

Saad Abdul Zahra Al - Saadi , Iraq

[Saadalsaady49@gmail.com](mailto:Saadalsaady49@gmail.com)

**Abstract:** *This research paper describes in a very brief way the critical innovative way of writing in a clear stylistic style, away from all the complexities illustrated by the colors of what poems, stories, and some novels are depicted in; this is what we see daily from those who claim that they write literary criticism, drown themselves and mislead the reader by introducing terms that are again needed for an interpreter for them, although some consider them a summary of his thought, and the depth of his cultural experiences in what he presents as he reviews texts subject to his own self-vision and ideological as if he says: the state of access the climax of understanding the text is this point of view that may not be matched by others, including writing and philosophizing, and it rotates, and maneuvers within opposing axes, which have no connection and relationship with what is in his hands in a circle of word manipulation.*

**Keywords:** Criticism, Analysis and Upgrading, Critic, Regenerative, Writer, Text.

## The role of critic criticism

What we mean here is the reality of criticism of the calendar and upgrading above all, and then laying the foundations for reform if the writer needs it before the observational precedents are free of evidence, and thus the critic is another creator who added to literature and culture, and contributed to building with a different effort from what the writer proposed from theory or idea as a renewal; whatever, its type was useful fair by creating an integrated series that begins from the writer, the text, the reader, and the critic, or sometimes the critic advanced before the reader in the series if the writings occurred in his hand before or coinciding with the appearance of the text, regardless of the acceptance or rejection of both parties, the acceptance of the recipient, or rejecting the critic's criticism of what he wanted to deliver.

Regenerative criticism today must move away from attempts to question classic formalism according to what Descartes went for, for not accepting the work in recognition of it as creative production, and even though it called for reason, but there are psychological factors that are essentially rejected called dropping aggression in psychology, as long as the principle of suspicion was originally found as the first step from a disgruntled critic who carries his sword for analysis, because the critic will move away from his objectivity not for any reason, but simply because of stubbornness, and belittling the actor producer and his efforts. Hence, the critic must stand on the literary text as creativity that appeared to the public for the first time, and begins his job to reach its results after that; is this work really creative or not?

The course of analysis and interpretation according to this method is the real result of what the objective critic will reach with his constructive criticism with fairness and justice. This analysis will elevate the writer, or any other product, and raise the writer, and thus the critic will perform what is required of him faithfully.

Today, the regenerative critic should not resort to the old monetary approaches, and everyone who deals with them according to their rigid forms as far as they are side aids to him are not the first pillar and the peremptory constitution as far as it is adopted and renewed in line with the development of time, using a language inexhaustible certain even if it is not Arabic for non-native speakers, otherwise he is like someone standing between two rows of worn out graves; their owners are restored.

Because criticism is an important function that the critic proceeds with, it is thus a beneficial product for both parties: the writer, and the reader. Before reading the text, the reader may not reasonably visualize except for the tribal knowledge of the writer's writings, if any, or it is an implicit expectation from the recipient, who is motivated by a voluntary approach whose purposes are various.

In such a case, the writer must expect a renewed readiness as long as the writing productivity continues in order not to let his followers fail, and at the same time be attentive to what he then says his critics. Perhaps there is no willingness from those who

first read this writer other than to enter with him to get acquainted, and clarify what he wants, and what his intentions and aims are, or even is a method whose purpose is always reading only, whatever this writer or his directions and stylistic discourse according to his methodology that many readers do not care much about.

Once again, the reader's approach will be contrary to all of that if he wants to stalk a specific writer waiting for his outcome, and here the reader is not an ordinary person, so he falls into two categories: either an observant critic is different along the line with the writer, or he is a writer who contradicts the first, responding with a deterrent stalking with a biting tongue; the rapprochement between that critic and this subsequent writer has many factors; mostly ideological, or ongoing rivalry in order to create an unjustified objectively, or scientifically unjust, within the process of scientific research, or realistic discourse. What matters to us, in fact, is not what the two present in terms of response or criticism, but what is important is the necessity of having an ethical standard in the research, and the truth clearly evident in front of the reader.

### **How does the writer know how to respond to what he wrote, and has he achieved the aim?**

This comes before the results are known through two most important ways: constructive criticism as a sound research feature away from trends, and what the reader sees and says later if he is able to do so, and there are some readers who communicate with their writers sometimes without courtesy or praise if they find some mistakes, or going against the current what is expected of them and others, is accepted by the author, who is definitely not arrogant, and uses them as a free diagnosis from them.

In the science of communication and media studies, this case is called echo, or feedback, from which the subsequent written directions of the text are in the case of diagnosis, to strengthen the next with minimal losses, or without losses at all, and this enhances the writer's ability to create a series of creations free of weakness and fragility, he is the first beneficiaries from it, the general culture of the era local, and cosmic. From this the active role of criticism and what the critic offers as a subsequent literary production is caused by a text that occurred in his hands that improves the level of the writer away from the pent-up grudges, and the brutal adulation that the writer wears in the shafts of restraint as long as there are economic motives, or social benefits for both parties, and this method is not considered it scientifically, because it contradicts the taste of public research above all, and not with criticism. The critic must also start from real and sincere feelings that lead to what he criticizes, present them to a reader who may not be of the elite cultural level, and often they. Launching with a true, sincere spirit from the writer is the one who encourages the critic to truly interact with the text, while the opposite leads to counterproductive results that the writer will complain about, and he blames his critics, dropping the consequences of his mistakes on them, and this never pertains to literature and culture with anything.

### **Portuguese Critical**

The critic's endeavor must remain vigorous in order to highlight what is in the text from the hidden, burials, and aesthetic manifestations, outwardly or constructive, interspersed with textual points, the implicit contents, or the negatives of mediocrity that produced a fragile text that has no meaning and taste. The disclosure of missteps and errors and the flaws of the text does not mean a deliberate attack on the writer who criticizes him, as much as it is standing at real directions, means revealing the hidden between the lines and above them, not the scandal of what was concealed by defamation, or bitter criticism. This is the criticism that is required today to establish and build the new school of criticism, and not staying with the word and its meaning, using the linguistic dictionary to say this is a critical article, or that is a critical study. Not only in front of the literary production of poetry and prose, but with all the sciences, knowledge, arts and sayings produced by humanity. In order for us to find realistic and constructive criticism, we must adhere to strict conditions on those who claim to be a critic or who practice the critical process, while being armed with the science and knowledge that are necessary, and the simplest types:

Fully familiar with the language and correct writing it; it is very shameful for a critic to make a mistake when he diagnoses others mistakes, or to take the recipient to vague labyrinths, and it is also shameful to assign malicious charges to a text or advocate without detailed knowledge and a complete ability to that knowledge, and it is not absolutely necessary that the critic be a graduate of a specialized academic study with criticism and analysis in order to practice his art in order to trust himself to be a critic, or to fear that he is a highly capable critic, we often find that the most skilled critics did not graduate from a school or college dealing with criticism, but rather graduated from the school of cultural life after arming itself with its culture and what they found in life before them to follow a hobby, practice, and a real orientation stems from their sincerity in critical writing, as long as we find doctors, and engineers and those who do not have a high degree, they are one of the finest who wrote criticism.

So many specialists emphasized that the self-asserting writer must be one of the distinguished, he must ignore the negative criticism directed against him, and whoever hunted the pitfalls, in order to maintain his success first, and head for new creative production. For example, some systematic critics recommend some talented people in writing the novel to follow it with a second, more modern and powerful novel after a short while, lest they be exposed to harsh criticism that causes them to leave literature permanently, perhaps killing their creative souls, and thus not giving way to the miserable criticism that they are overthrown.

### **Commandments for practical application when operating critical regenerative**

In order to stop at a text or work, a critic working in the analysis according to the new critical school theory must follow the following steps to reach the results required in the analysis in the shortest way in writing his study or reading it in a smooth form, away from the complications used in the past from the critical methods that have become of the past is as follows:

1- Formation of a critical vision to study the product of a writer or artistic creator with objective intellectual propositions according to his general and private constructive perceptions of what he expects from subsequent influences that help in accepting and understanding the recipient.

2- Standing at the artistic language in which the text is written, or carefully observing any work provided by an actor within the various areas of life and knowing the essence of that language in order to extract all the values of meanings and images of beauty from it.

3- The critic has to stand on the work as creativity that appeared to the public for the first time, and starts his job to reach its results after that, and is this work really creative or not?

4- The critic should strive to highlight the contents, burials and aesthetic manifestations of the apparent formality, or constructive, implicit, interspersed with textual foci that may be more than one focus, in addition to analyzing the contents appearing, or hidden among the words, because the analysis of the content is the most important corner of the analysis Regenerative knowledge of the new media message, in addition to revealing the negativity of mediocrity, if any.

5 - Understanding and analyzing the psychology of the creative work or text through its connotations all as a comprehensive movement that brings together what is built on emotions and methodological stylistics, and the interstitial aesthetics being a new critical branch, such as interest in the generalization of the text in one go, and not fragmentation, or according to one approach only as it is applied and adopted by many the critics.

6 - Every work has a special philosophy that the critic must know by delving deeper into a critical situation or phenomenon, whether in literature or other formations, by analyzing and deconstructing the overall perceptions with general interpretations because the business philosophy here is an important corner of critical analysis. The philosophy of the work means the being and the essence that the producer sought, including how the critic enters an analyst describing the interpretation of the images that came in the sequence of the work context.

7 - As a defining role that the critic plays based on a working function, it is to think about how to prepare his own curriculum according to two ways that summarize his work more precisely, namely: knowing the focus of the work “the text” or the central focus, and trying to know the cultural and general background of the producer, and in their light the essence of the text and his idea becomes clear. The general aims and objectives of the actor of creative resurgence.

8 - In the writings regenerative appeared a discursive method through linguistic pragmatism, the regenerative critic must stand at it as something new that no one has dealt with in previous readings and studies in depth or detail.

10 - It is also important in critical and innovative readings to avoid inserting complicated, difficult foreign terms among the folds of critical writings as if they do not pass and complete without mentioning them, and the critic is not considered a critic if he does not adorn his article and study it with it.

11 - Finally, the regenerative critic must be broadly familiar with all the components of the rhetorical system, and the transition to a new work is criticism of criticism, or as it is called: after criticism, especially if the work or text was originally critical, or reveal what the criticism wanted that the cultural and literary arena still needs.