

In The Fragmentation Of Linguistic Discourse

Fadel Khalil Al-Sheikh Hasan¹,
Ahmed Ibrahim Saleh Ahmed²

¹Al al-Bayt University
Department of Arabic Language - Full-time Lecturer

Email: rorofadel2002@gmail.com

²University of Jordan
Language Center - Part-time Lecturer
Email: ahmed.ourimail@gmail.com

Abstract

This research attempts to collect fragmentation and stereotype overlapping in several concepts and signs that take care of the concept of discourse «clarify its ambiguity and fill in the looseness in it «with the contrast of this term to its users from word «sentence and text to a contrast that combines juxtaposition and distance. The research was in several chapters: The first approached what scholars and critics tried to describe and clarify the process of communication between the originator and the recipient «and the framework of this communication and its social heritage and cultural horizons. The various fields of knowledge accompanying this term «and this chapter historically stopped at the early nineties and the most important names of researchers who shared their opinions. The second chapter dealt with three trends in discourse analysis «structuralism and pragmatics «and Lieberman's article. In the third chapter «we built approaches to the concept of the text and its qualitative characteristics «the most important of which are the context «the term towards the sentence and towards the text «and the attempt by Bloomfield and Chomsky. The discussion ended in the fourth chapter about the text «its unity «the structure of its components «and the approaches to its definitions by the most important researchers and lastly «the urgent question about our Arab heritage and the steps of its intellectuals about the discourse of some of the notables of this heritage. We wanted this to be noted with results that reach the hoped-for.

Key Words: Arab Heritage, Bloomfield, Chomsky, Discourse, Linguistics.

1. Introduction

Analyzing linguistic discourse is a challenging and fascinating adventure, especially when delving into its contemporary Western path, which follows two main lines: the stylistic linguistic line and the narrative line, introducing some novel historical uses known as cultural studies. The fragmentation in these attempts is evident in the intermingling of the concept of sentence and text, as well as the text's reflections, perspectives, and contextual

connections. These factors have contributed to the ambiguity and looseness of the discourse concept, particularly in the clear representation within the linguistic revolution. The term “discourse” varies among its users; for some, it is the unity that transcends the sentence, while for others, it encompasses both spoken and written language. This variability results in different multiple meanings. Consequently, the presentation of the analysis varies, sometimes with intense convergence and at other times with significant divergence.

In the analysis of discourse, all studies aim to answer this question: How does communication between parties A and B occur, whether linguistically, regulating written or spoken texts, or dialogues within social, heritage, and cultural frameworks, referred to as “ethnography of discourse”? Consequently, Julia Kristeva suggested studying textual forms within the context of history and culture, similar to the critical visions of Michel Foucault and Edward Said concerning the concept of creation, which dominates discourse. Some of the various cognitive structures that contributed to the lack of a definitive definition for the term include rhetoric, style, psychological, social, linguistic, aesthetics, and poetic studies. Among the manifestations of this revolution, one inquiry stands out: whether the term “discourse” has a place within linguistic theory or also belongs in the humanities?

Perhaps Pierre Leman’s 1958 article on structuralism and discursive analysis represents essential trends in linguistic discourse analysis, as it introduced concepts such as sentence and text, the sufficiency and interactional approaches, and the contextual meanings, deeply rooted in the Arabic linguistic heritage. What is a text? What constitutes its integrated unity? What makes a text a text? What are the completeness and deficiencies in the text, which are questions about the complex underlying structure of the discourse concept?

We were introduced to some opinions that defined the text, such as those of Hartman, Brinker, Harweg, and Al-Azhar Al-Zanad. Some have called for the availability of an integrated textual theory, as Yoos suggested, while others believe that the textual theory is limited only to the text and communicative event. We paused at the most important of these researchers, Van Dijk, and his concept of macrostructures of the text. In his introduction to his book “The Text and the Context,” we summarized the main points he presented. Before concluding, we found ourselves facing an essential question about the Arabic linguistic heritage: Did they have anything that we could call descriptive approaches to the coherence of the text? We followed this briefly and concisely, looking at the works of Abdulqahir Al-Jurjani, Al-Jahiz, Ibn Tufail, and Hazim Al-Qurtajani. In conclusion, we present some observations and results, hoping for success behind them.

2. On the Analysis of Linguistic Discourse

The connotations of this term in contemporary Western criticism can be categorized into two main lines. The first relates to the linguistic and stylistic aspect known as discourse analysis, while the second pertains to some usages in post-structuralist criticism, particularly in the new historicism and

cultural studies”¹. As commonly translated, the term implies the use of language, not just as a mere system, and it encompasses various meanings within the field of linguistics. In his book “Discourse Analysis” (1983), Michael Stubbs comments on the terms ‘text’ and ‘discourse,’ which are specific to analysis. He states, “It often tends to be vague and confusing. Discourse often suggests that it is longer, that it may or may not include interaction.”² This includes what some linguists may consider verbal communication and mutually exchanged ideas in a research context as discourse. Linguists have different opinions on the possibility of collecting discourse, whether it can be termed “discourses,” and thus quantified, or if it can only be collected in specific entities. “If discourse is collected, the next problem would be determining the boundaries defining a single discourse. A specific discourse unit can be defined in terms of structure or function.”³ Perhaps the primary meaning that the term “discourse” refers to is “any speech beyond a single sentence, whether written or spoken.”⁴ The philosopher Grice in 1975 noticed the possibility of achieving meaning without explicit, clear indicators that both the speaker and listener can comprehend. Thus, the concept of discourse gained a new dimension, leading to what is known as discourse analysis, which has been developed in the critical studies by some contemporary thinkers.

Michel Foucault stands at the forefront of these thinkers, as he was able to carve out a distinctive semantic context for this concept through extensive theorization and usage in many of his writings. Within this semantic context, he explored what is known as the “archaeology of knowledge” in 1972 and in many of his lectures on discourse systems, he delved into the complex network of social, political, and cultural relations, where speech emerges as discourse imbued with power and risks. According to Foucault, discourse represents a large collection of statements or expressions within a linguistic space governed by organized rules and subject to what he termed “strategic possibilities.” Consequently, we face the problem of defining the boundaries of a specific discourse. Here, discourse takes on a physical and ongoing presence, raising concerns about its material existence as both spoken and written language. This brings about a sense of anxiety regarding the perceived powers and risks that accompany discourse, conjuring images of battles, victories, wounds, domination, and subjugation through its extensive and manipulative usage. However, the danger lies not merely in people speaking and discourse multiplying; it lies in the exercise of control on both conscious and unconscious levels⁵. How does a society produce its rituals, and how does power, embodied by the state – in its various forms – invest in those rituals? In the discourse system, power is present everywhere, exercised and produced by any field of knowledge or profession. Foucault’s concern deepens when he highlights

¹ Saad Al-Bazie and Megan Doyle, “Guide to Literary Criticism,” p. 88.

² Mohammed Anani, “Modern Literary Terms,” p. 19.

³ Same source, p. 20: from Stubbs.

⁴ Saad Al-Bazie and Megan Doyle, “Guide to Literary Criticism,” p. 95.

⁵ Nietzsche, *Beyond Good and Evil*, p. 8.

the intricate intricacies and intertwining relationships that clearly indicate that the production and distribution of discourse are neither free nor innocent as they may seem superficially. The cognitive foundation from which Foucault embarked was the point where the first philosopher of power, Friedrich Nietzsche, ended. Nietzsche criticized all philosophers for not wanting to understand that human beings are products of circulation. The power of perception is also a product of circulation. Thus, their original sin, according to Nietzsche, was their belief that they had reached their desired goal through their analyses and that they were stable amidst the vortex of things.

3. Orientalism: Knowledge and Power, Creation⁶

Some of the most influential works that brought about a new revolution in the human sciences, rooted in Marxism, linguistic revolution, and structuralism, have had a clear impact, particularly in Edward Said's concept of discourse. This revolution encompasses multiple aspects, most notably the notions of power and the hidden network of relationships woven through knowledge, manifested in written creations and the concept of human relationships in all its forms and dimensions.

The field of cultural discourse stands out with terms such as truth, representation, control, formation, production, documentation, displacement, economy, essence, and creation. It provides a comprehensive and radical analytical tool to understand humans, culture, society, and the foundational structures of relationships. This is evident in the application of Said's most important propositions in his book "Orientalism," where he considers the East an integral part of Europe's material and cultural civilization. He examines the Western texts that have been able to interpret and produce the East politically, socially, militarily, ideologically, and subconsciously in the post-Enlightenment era.

In this regard, we will explore the analysis of linguistic discourse and its connections with various disciplines in contemporary Western criticism. This will be pursued in its first aspect, linguistic analysis, commonly known as discourse analysis. We will delve into the most significant definitions and the names of researchers who have left a significant impact in this field.

The Discourse:

The term faces numerous obstacles in linguistic analysis, primarily related to the lack of consensus on a single meaning. This divergence arose from various sciences and conflicting components associated with it. The terms 'text,' 'context,' and 'discourse' have received special attention in contemporary linguistic studies, especially with the emergence of what is known as discourse analysis and discourse linguistics. Various studies have attempted to answer questions about the relationship between text and context in different linguistic discourses and the impact of the social framework surrounding the communicative situation on the formulation of linguistic messages in all its aspects. This is evident in a considerable series

⁶ See Chapter One, adapted.

of research, significantly influenced by linguists such as Saussure, followed by Firth, Malinowski, and Saper van Dijk⁷.

Some scholars have linked the concepts of 'text' and 'discourse' as one entity, as van Dijk did in his article 'Aspects of Text Grammar,' 1971. This article presented several fundamental ideas in textual study, wherein he stated that "the text/discourse can simply be described through reflexive rules or structural patterns, as it represents a sequence of sentences."⁸ The discourse or speech, in de Saussure's concept, is "equivalent to a sentence or larger than it – it is a sequence conveying a message with a beginning and an end – language being a social product of the power of speech."⁹

According to (Mafinou), discourse has an "extended and disconnected sequence with the concept of Harris or the concept considering the outcome in which productivity is exercised, and this outcome is the contextual character that defines new values for linguistic units¹⁰. In the dictionary sense, the term discourse refers to speech and discourse in speech¹¹, and this is what gives it its connection to the social context. As for Roland Barthes, in his discussion of the analysis of myth, he linked the text, discourse, and story together. In this context, the researcher clarifies the meaning he gives to the text in terms of its connection to other texts to crystallize its meaning. The text is understood as a linear product compared to structural oral analysis. The textual analysis does not aim to describe the structure of a work, but rather seeks to produce a continuous dynamic structure of the text throughout history¹². Among the researchers who linked the text to the concept of discourse is Paul Ricoeur, who applied the term to any discourse that has been fixed through writing. From the above, it is possible to trace the main trends that associated discourse with the science of text linguistics, most of which benefited from the science of linguistics to arrive at an approach that deals with this term as a new science where diverse sciences and components intersect. This involves absorbing the available rules, models, and strategies, and going beyond them to explore other possibilities that are made available through the expansion of knowledge, broadening horizons, imaginative interplay, inclusiveness, and the study of the language beyond the levels of readers and multiple interpretations¹³. The linguistic revolution had a profound impact on various knowledge fields, including literature, social sciences, and humanities. Since the Russian formalists, there has been a close connection between linguistics and literature, with linguistics defining the sentence as the largest unit subject to grammatical description¹⁴. Hence, the linguistic

⁷ hulood Al-Amoush, *The Qur'anic Discourse: A Study of the Relationship between Text and Context*, p. 1.

⁸ Sa'id Hasan Bahiri, *The Science of Text Linguistics*, p. 221.

⁹ De Saussure, *Lectures on General Linguistics*, p. 23.

¹⁰ Suleima Mudlifat, *The Analysis of Narrative Discourse in the Holy Quran*, p. 3.

¹¹ See "Arab Tongue", *Speeches material*.

¹² Salimah Madlifat, *Analysis of Narrative Discourse*, Page 3.

¹³ Said Hassan Bujairy, *The Science of Textual Language*, Page 9.

¹⁴ Saeed Yaqteen, *Analysis of the Narrative Discourse*, Page 15

researchers were differentiated between those who insisted on stopping at the level of the sentence and those who advocated moving beyond it.”

In 1952, Harris brought up the topic of discourse as the first linguist to attempt to expand the boundaries of linguistic research. He challenged the sentence and shifted the focus to discourse in his work “Discourse Analysis.” He aimed to analyze discourse using the same conceptual tools used for sentence analysis. Harris focused on two main issues: expanding the limits of linguistic description beyond the sentence and exploring the relationships between language, culture, and society, which were considered non-linguistic matters that were not previously addressed. He defined discourse as a sequence of connected sentences forming a closed set, allowing for the examination of the structure and sequence of elements through distributive methodology, thereby remaining within the realm of pure linguistics¹⁵.

In 1966, Benveniste observed that the sentence is subject to certain limitations, being the smallest unit in discourse. With the sentence, we move beyond the domain of linguistics as a system of signs, as it includes multiple signs and not just one, and we enter another domain where language serves as a tool for communication expressed through discourse.¹⁶

In 1970, Lyons addressed the issue of the utterance as a unit that extends beyond the word, text, or discourse. He considered it as the unit that can be subjected to linguistic analysis. Lyons presented Harris’s notion that the utterance is any part of speech made by a speaker, preceded and followed by silence on the speaker’s part¹⁷.

During the early 1970s, these two concepts (discourse and text coherence) received significant attention and were approached differently, drawing on various disciplines such as sociology, psycholinguistics, logic, cognitive psychology, artificial intelligence, and computational linguistics. However, there was a strong focus on investigating the mental mechanisms governing text generation, text structure, and text resolution, shifting the attention from the text to the mental processes. Western studies during that period primarily concentrated on the analysis of discursive texts, particularly focusing on two main types: the interactive type and the traditional narrative type that follows a typical storytelling structure¹⁸.

During these early stages, various attempts were made to discuss the definitions related to discourse in light of different approaches. Francois Rastier’s book “Towards Discourse Analysis” in 1972 contributes to defining the subject of discourse analysis in relation to linguistics and presents Bloomfield’s definition of the sentence, emphasizing the necessity to go beyond it during analysis. This leads to three strategic points:

¹⁵ Ibid, p. 17.

¹⁶ Ibid, p. 18.

¹⁷ Ibid, p. 17.

¹⁸ Mohamed Khatabi, Text Linguistics, page 6.

- a. Reducing discourse to a linguistic topic and defining it as a simple linear intersection of sentences, as Harris and Cartes did.
- b. Distancing discourse from being a subject of linguistics and considering it related not to language but to speech.
- c. Establishing discourse as a parallel field to linguistics, with one actual topic but a different cognitive subject¹⁹.

Harris and all distributionalists, stopped at the level of the observable (linguistic) unit. However, Benveniste, along with many Western linguists, introduced the concept of enunciation, which refers to the self-act of using language. It is a vital action in the production of discourse, as opposed to the observable, which is considered the accomplished, closed, and independent linguistic subject produced by the self. Enunciation allows the study of speech within the framework of the theory of communication and the functions of language. According to Benveniste, the subject of study is enunciation, not the observable. Therefore, in Benveniste's view, discourse is the observable looked at from the perspective of mechanisms and processes involved in communication. It involves every enunciation that assumes a speaker and a listener, with the former aiming to influence the latter in some way²⁰.

The mechanisms and processes of discourse in communication indicate that we have various types of discourses, such as television, storytelling, journalism, and discourses of different social groups. In short, these are all the forms where the relationship between the addresser and the addressee takes place. "Language in society is usually more complex than literary figures imagine. The society creates many languages, in addition to the language of literature and literary research. Mastery of a specific language is one of the ways of coping. Language is not merely a reflection of social conditions; it also shapes these conditions to some extent and prepares the way for dealing with them. The practices of discourse will open a new chapter in understanding words."²¹

In the mid-seventies, the problem of discourse will not only revolve around defining its subject and analytical procedures, or whether it will fall under the old citadel of traditional linguistics or not. The problem will be that discourse and its analysis will become relevant to all fields and specializations. From here, Mancino presents the issue from several points, namely:

Is there a place for discourse and its analysis within the humanities, and does it have a distinct position within linguistic theory?

He did not specify within his opinion that the analysis of discourse is well-defined within linguistic theory due to its unclear methodology and subject matter.

¹⁹ Saed Yaqteen, *Analysis of the Novelistic Discourse*, page 20

²⁰ *Ibid*, p.19.

²¹ Mustafa Naseef, *Language, Interpretation and Communication*, p.353.

Discourse borrows its tools from the fields of semantics and phonetics, both of which experience considerable fluctuations and instability in contemporary linguistic thought.

The occurrence of discourse and its procedures in the relationship between linguistics and the humanities has subjected the matter to a theoretical demand from those sciences, in contrast to the insufficient attention from the linguistic side “who seek that discourse analysis provides them with the scientific technique that allows them formal results suitable for their interpretations beyond linguistics.”²²

Several trends have emerged due to the development of linguistic and human sciences. Consequently, the perception of discourse analysis has evolved, leading to issues in defining and delineating its scope. These issues extend to various fields within the humanities and literature, revealing its distinctive position among them. Moreover, its subjects will diversify as different directions and domains continue to engage with it”²³

Discourse attracts various works and perspectives from different linguistic fields, ranging from rhetoric, philosophy of language, to psycho-linguistics. These fields have diverse natures, starting from lexicographic statistics to theories of textual semiotics (Jean Cazeneuve, 1983). From the psycho-linguistic perspective, discourse is a coherent sequence of utterances, characterized by three important observations:

1. Discourse assumes a connection established through verbal interactiveness between utterances.
2. Discourse is a continuous process, flowing in time with a directed pattern.
3. In its operation, discourse takes on an ascending character towards a particular objective”²⁴. As for (Möschler) in 1985, he sought to establish a pragmatic analysis of discourse and its delimited domains, which he confined to:
 1. Depending on the lexicological or semantic approach, or around the social and political interpretation of discourse.
 2. In the generative tradition, where “discourse analysis and sentence analysis conflict, and thus generativists working on discourse aim to establish a discourse model similar to the principles of generation applied to sentence constituents.”
 3. In the Anglo-Saxon tradition, especially in the Birmingham School, “discourse analysis is linked to a specific pattern of conversation analysis, starting from the interactions within the section between the teacher and the students.”²⁵

²² Saeed Yaqteen, *Analysis of the Novelistic Discourse*, p.22.

²³ *Ibid*, p. 23.

²⁴ *Ibid*, p.24.

²⁵ *Ibid*, p.25.

Micheler explains through quotations and dialogic units that discourse is dialogue. In the early 1980s, discourse analysis began to take a different form from what was found in French literature and European literature in general, particularly in Anglo-American writings. This can be attributed to the linguistic revolution that occurred there. The most significant observation in this context is the exclusion of the European literary heritage in defining discourse.

From the above, it is evident that the divergent approaches in attempting to define discourse are based on the different intellectual orientations of its proponents. The procedures applied to the text during analysis have contributed to the ambiguity surrounding the term. Despite this, there is a quasi-consensus in following the modern linguistic revolution that attributed notable importance to the individual word, sometimes incorporating smaller units within morphemes. In contrast, traditional linguistics focused on the sentence, considering it the largest describable syntactic unit. Linguists often recognize two other units between the word and the sentence, which are the compound and the clause. The distinction between them lies in considering the compound as a set of balanced words syntactically governed by one word, lacking its own agent and having its own content that enters into a larger sentence - this is the clause. Thus, the relationship between the five linguistic describable units, according to Lyons exclusively, is "word, clause, compound, sentence = the relation of structure."²⁶ Linguists are convinced, through intuition, as Dr. Koenig noted in 1976, that the concept of the sentence is necessary, thus overcoming methodological difficulties. As for transformational grammar, language is defined in principle as a collection of sentences, and anything not present in a sentence (such as a noun, for example) must be estimated through transformation or inference. Sometimes, the sentence has been treated not only as a pattern governed by grammatical rules but also as a logical proposition whenever circumstances allow for it.²⁷ "All studies of linguistic structures, since their inception in ancient times, have relied entirely on the concept of the sentence, and it is troubling that this fundamental structure has been surrounded by ambiguity and diverse definitions even in our present time. There are still beautiful variations in defining the sentence without explicitly acknowledging them as definitive definitions. Some define it as a syntactic pattern with specific formal components (Harris 1951, Fries 1952, Chomsky 1957), while others view it as a sequence of utterance elements that end with a pause (Gardner 1962), or as a complete idea (Ivens 1965)."²⁸ The multiplicity of sentence definitions reflects the diversity of definitions of text/discourse, which is considered a "comprehensive unit that is not encompassed by a larger unit." This larger unit is formed from different parts, which are arranged horizontally at the syntactic level and vertically at the semantic level. The first level consists of smaller textual units connected by syntactic relationships, while the second level consists of holistic conceptions linked by logical semantic

²⁶ Ibid, p.25, look at these trends in the Second Chapter in the research.

²⁷ Robert Bouchard, *Text, Discourse, and Procedure*, p.88.

²⁸ Ibid, p.88.

coherence".²⁹ Another concept related to the linguistic consensus in the modern linguistic revolution, alongside the sentence/word, is the concept of coherence. Coherence refers to the strong cohesion between the constituent parts of a text/discourse, and it focuses on the linguistic means that connect the elements forming a part of the discourse or the entire discourse. To describe the coherence of the discourse/text, the descriptive analyst follows a linear and gradual method from the beginning of the discourse (often the second sentence) to its end, observing pronouns, local references, anaphora, and cataphora, as well as various linking devices such as conjunctions, replacements, deletions, comparisons, supplements, and so on. All of this is done to provide evidence that the discourse/text (as a linguistic entity in general) forms a coherent and interconnected whole".³⁰ The coherence and the steps of its application have been subject to variation among discourse analysts through their respective theories to define and analyze it. These definitions will be addressed in a later chapter after discussing the essential sciences from which discourse analysis draws some of its elements and differentiations and works to overcome them.

At the end of the 19th century, the pioneers attempted to discern the beginnings of establishing the science of text linguistics through specific linguistic perspectives:

Firstly, the research trends in this field have taken several forms, depending on the foundations upon which linguists rely in text linguistics. For example, there is an approach that builds on the descriptive linguistics but adds new concepts and perspectives to address the higher level characterized by this science, namely the level of discourse. Another approach relies on the functional linguistics, and a third approach is based on the structural or generative linguistics, and a fourth approach builds on the transformational generative linguistics"³¹.

Secondly, the narrow and traditional boundaries of linguistics fade away in the face of a strong interaction between linguistics and related sciences such as psychology, sociology, philosophy, computer science, semiotics, hermeneutics, education, and literary studies. If linguistics does not vanish due to its isolation as a field of research, it should become a central science for discourse and communication, as many prominent researchers have predicted, such as Levi-Strauss, Derrida, Piaget, Hartmann, and Jakobson. In this context, text linguistics becomes a linguistic field within the realm of semiotics, encompassing everything from single-word texts to texts as lengthy as the Divine Comedy"³².

Thirdly, what Bachelard proposed in his book about the new scientific spirit: "Scientific thought will continue - sooner or later - to be the main subject of philosophical debate (meaning that philosophical and cognitive knowledge of the external world occupied the first place in ancient Greece and permeated other knowledge branches related to logic, mathematics,

²⁹ Sa'id Hassan Bahiri, *the Science of Text Linguistics*, p.19.

³⁰ Mohammed Khatabi, *Discourse Linguistics*, p.5.

³¹ Sa'id Hassan Bahiri, *the Science of Text Linguistic*, p.2.

³² Robert Bouchard, *Text, Discourse, and Procedure*, p.71-72.

nature, medicine, and more). This will lead us to replace metaphysical doctrines, based on intuition and direct experience, with doctrinal theories based on objective reasoning.”³³ The modern framework of the eloquence of discourse emerged from a scientific approach similar to Bachelard’s. However, the set of characteristics that govern literary discourse does not all belong to the realm of language alone. Arabic rules, conditions for interpreting meaning and semiotic reference, as well as concepts used to understand the world, work, and utilitarian functions, have smoothly integrated into the task of analyzing literary discourse”³⁴

Based on this distinction, we can identify some of the most important studies that are shared among these sciences, which were in contact with discourse and its analysis, as follows:

4. Psychological and Sociolinguistic Studies

Where it is necessary to analyze the differences between societies in their methods of connecting discourse and dialogue, the rules of cohesion, and the distribution of data and information within their structures and patterns. Researchers have noticed the emergence of studies beyond the scope of language, such as anthropology and sociology, which have focused on in-depth analysis of everyday dialogues and sequential sentence structures. Additionally, psychology has directly contributed to the development of linguistic and rhetorical research. Its steps became apparent as it analyzed mechanisms of reception, memory, the formation of attitudes based on sensory data, language acquisition methods, and cognitive representation for the use of precise information about levels of consciousness and the nature of linguistic structures present in the unconscious. Psychology has also explored the discovery of laws of association, encoding tools, transmission, intensification, implications of errors, and factors of repression at different levels”³⁵ Thus, it becomes necessary for scientific research in text discourse to benefit from the results of research in the following branches:

- The psychology of creativity and its experimental procedures.
- The cognitive and discriminative psycholinguistics.
- Physiological psychology, memory laws, reception, artificial intelligence, and automated text processing”³⁶.

Regarding this matter, analytical psychology focused on the rhetorical problems, as emphasized by its most prominent scholars, Freud, Jung, and Richards.

5. Aesthetics

³³ Salah Fadel, *Eloquence of Discourse and the Science of Text*, p.9.

³⁴ *Ibid*, p.10.

³⁵ *Ibid*, p.29-30.

³⁶ *Ibid*, p.30, Adapted.

Its actual leap occurred in the hands of Croce in 1902 when he called for "harmony between art, expression, intuitions, and insights, so that linguistics could absorb the results and become a part of aesthetics."³⁷ And among these developments was the central position that language occupied among the Romantics in terms of the focus of literary aesthetic theories, displacing some literary expressions in favor of comprehensive contemplations that attempted to grasp the uniqueness and secrets of artistic creativity and its factors. One of the most significant aspects concerning the eloquence of literary discourse is the recent evolution in the theory of aesthetics, known as the aesthetics of reception and interpretation. Researchers considered it a fundamental element of the philosophy of text analysis. They realized that "rhetoric cannot rely on the discourse justifying itself, while the height of beauty arises only when recognizing its purpose, which is the beautiful itself, existing independently and considered unshrinkable in concepts that surpass ideas like truth, goodness, and utility"³⁸.

One of the questions that arises regarding the aesthetics of the philosophy of reception and interpretation is the position of the receiver in those texts. If the text/discourse is what we are analyzing its procedures, it seems illogical to limit the research to questions such as: What is the text? What is its integrated unit? What linguistic processes govern it? Without paying attention to the receiver who may often struggle to answer the simplest questions posed by a certain text, such as: Why did the death of Cleopatra affect you and the death of King Oedipus did not? Rhetoric of discourse has been supported by advanced studies in the science of interpretation, proceeding through three stages in the field of interpretation: precise understanding, explanation, and application. Interpretive philosophers believe that the connection between rhetoric and textual interpretation can be studied through various aspects, and the linguistic character of human beings is strongly related to their social context. Therefore, they find it necessary to link textual interpretation with the logic of social sciences and their interwoven patterns."³⁹ From this perspective, rhetoric is not just a theory of discourse; it is a function in itself, independent of the act of examining and thinking about the means used in it.

6. Poetics or Zero-degree Rhetoric:⁴⁰

The poetics in the West has been engaged with the issue of literary genres since ancient times until now, and this preoccupation primarily arises from the Western conception of the literary text, throughout ages, schools, and textual structures. "Isn't the text the subject of poetics, but rather the collector of the text, i.e., the collection of general or distinctive characteristics to which each text individually belongs? We mention among these types: genres of discourse, forms of expression, and literary

³⁷ Ibid, p.30, adapted.

³⁸ Ibid, p.53.

³⁹ Salah Fadl, "Rhetoric of Discourse and the Science of the Text," page 52. Also, refer to Jerome Stolnitz, "Art Criticism, p.4,5,6.

⁴⁰ Salah Fadl, "Rhetoric of Discourse and the Science of the Text," p. 82,83,84.

genres.”⁴¹ It can be represented by that hidden and manifest moment when the creator grasps the moment of creativity, immersing until its very end in the contradiction between opposites, to offer us a free pause in existence. So, where does discourse stand amidst these contradictions?

What distinguishes the eloquence of poetic discourse is its reliance on two main axes: the axis of choice and the axis of composition/substitution, where they intersect in relations of adjacency and compositional processes. The type of relations with a similitude basis and the poetic function is to disrupt those relations and prioritize one axis over the other. In this context, Yaxbexon’s attempt to read lyrical and epic poetry and study the poet (W. Basrnak) is noteworthy, where he observed the extension of metaphor and metonymy beyond sentence units. The metaphor belongs to poetry, while metonymy belongs to prose. The term “deviation” with its various formulations in the Arabic language played a role in the eloquence of poetic discourse and was applied to the rule by which poetic deviation is measured at the degree of zero eloquence, a concept of considerable difficulty to determine. However, new rhetoric in modern poetry offered three attempts to solve the problematic of rhetoric situated between truth and metaphor. One attempt was by (Gérard Genette), who suggested that the encounter between established metaphor and others is a confrontation between language and realism and the possible, and one of them refers to the other, depending on the reader or the recipient’s conscience. Thus, interpretation links the possibility of language with the degree of zero eloquence as a mental state. The second attempt was made by (Jean Cohen) when he focused on the relative degree of zero eloquence, or what he called the relative zero degree, using language with the least labeled proportion from the rhetorical perspective, that is, with the least degree of metaphor. The third attempt looked at the degree of zero eloquence as a dead linguistic composition, neither possible (Genette) nor realistic (Cohen), but rather existing, where we call things by their actual names. Given the extensive efforts made by scholars to examine and redefine words, the degree of zero is considered a hypothetical element in language, and its absolute existence is not realized, except in limited types of discourse/practice, for example.

7. Discourse Analysis Approaches

In his book titled “Rhetoric of Discourse and the Science of Text,” Dr. Salah Fadl presents an introduction to three approaches that have had a presence in the analysis of rhetorical discourse. Here, I will present these approaches with the understanding that the previous attempts I mentioned had some merit. The approaches are as follows:

7.1 First Approach: The Perelman’s New Rhetoric

The term “New Rhetoric” was coined in 1958 by the Polish-born Belgian philosopher Chaim Perelman in an article titled “An Essay on Argumentation: The New Rhetoric.” Perelman considered the discourse of argumentation as a concern for rhetorical figures as stylistic tools and means of persuasion and argumentation. One of its essential principles is

⁴¹ Gérard Genette, Introduction to the Collection of Texts, p.5.

related to the renewal of speech concepts. The theory aims to study the discourse techniques that allow eliciting support for propositions presented to the audience or enhancing the diversity of this support. Perelman believes that this theory surpasses the older rhetoric, whose primary goal was primarily the art of persuasive public speaking. However, he also acknowledges the importance of retaining the idea of the audience from that traditional rhetoric, which directly stems from understanding the nature of discourse. It assumes that the physical absence of readers makes the writer think he is alone in this world, despite the fact that his text is always dependent on those to whom it is directed, consciously or unconsciously. The importance of rhetorical argumentation, according to Perelman, lies in the significance of analyzing philosophical arguments because they are essentially intellectual, addressing readers who are not subject to suggestions, pressures, interests, or biases. Thus, the importance of arguments becomes evident in all levels of discourse, whether it is a family discussion, a debate among specialized professionals, or an ideological debate.

7.2 Second Approach: General Structural Rhetoric

Originating in the mid-1960s and extending through the following two decades, the General Structural Rhetoric has no significant connection to Perelman's logical rhetoric. Its proponents can trace their steps in formal structuralism, represented by Gerard Genette, Jean Cohen, Todorov, and the M. Aulija group. Although they differ in approach and purpose between the two cultures, they draw their epistemic jurisprudence from modernist trends that coincide with other renewal movements, such as new criticism, the new novel, and cinema. Some of the most notable features of this approach include:

a. Actual discontinuity with old rhetorical traditions. b. A close connection to formal experimentation and a predominance of its scientific nature.

The proponents of this structural approach, accordingly, focused on analyzing the five recognized components of rhetoric: purpose, arrangement, diction, memory, and delivery, in their counterparts in modern linguistic systems. This was done by distinguishing between processes of pronunciation and pronunciation itself. Thus, they classified memory and delivery as processes of pronunciation, while the remaining three elements were considered pronunciation itself. Some of them linked the concept of rhetorical purpose from the semantic level to the syntactic level and made the concept of arrangement in the rhetorical sense correspond to the syntactic level. They also identified rigid phrases on both the phonetic and morphological levels. Additionally, they introduced a logical level of transition between meanings, which is the domain of semantic change, meaning that the poet turns the meanings of words upside down, replacing them to create the illusion that the man is not a man but a wolf/rabbit. The poet wants us to think what he thinks, and thus, we see what he sees. However, the poet does not use rhetorical form solely to obscure the linguistic relationships and alter their meaning: "The man is not a man; he is a wolf." Instead, the poet deliberately addresses the objective reality itself, so as to clearly separate from it and represent something else

and to achieve the results of this separation. One of their principles concerns the nature of the aesthetic response to the text and its rhetorical function. They argue that the complexity of the literary phenomenon leads to a primary reason, which lies in the concept of effect or value. The value attributed to the text is not necessarily inherent in it but is mostly a response by the reader or listener. Thus, the idea of influence has a psychological nature when discussing literary works, and the idea of value shifts to the second rank from a cognitive point of view.

7.3 Third Approach: Discourse Pragmatics Analysis

Pragmatics is one of the latest branches of linguistic sciences, concerned with the analysis of speech and writing processes, describing the functions of linguistic utterances and their characteristics during communication procedures in general. The integration of the new rhetorical discourse into the science of the text allows for the formation of a system of applicable methodological procedures at the pragmatic level. This results in a simplified cognitive and rhetorical apparatus that can be used to test and measure the studied texts, subject to constant modification and development.

The primary task of defining the relationship between rhetoric and pragmatics is to delineate the scope of each field. The German researcher (Losberg) defines rhetoric as a system with a structure of visual and linguistic forms suitable for creating the desired impact on a specific occasion. (Leitch) sees rhetoric as inherently pragmatic since it is the practice of communication between the speaker and the hearer, employing specific means to influence each other. As the linguistic text always finds itself within a particular context, rhetoric and pragmatic semiotics agree that language serves as a tool to act upon the recipient. Viewing everything as having utilitarian goals and every message having a purpose and a position and being subject to specific conditions upon reception, discourse analysts believe it is appropriate to narrow the scope of rhetorical significance by considering it as instrumental etiquette. Therefore, they understand pragmatic linguistic significance as an unaligned organization of semantics and syntax, except at the contextual level, where they converge into a third level concerned with direct context. Thus, pragmatics becomes the common denominator between the structures of linguistic, semantic, and rhetorical communication.

The discourse, according to their viewpoint, is divided into two categories:

- a. Direct discourse, which involves presenting the speaker's words directly and maintains a high degree of objectivity, often adhering to verbatim reporting.
- b. Indirect discourse, the more extensive form, arises when a discourse is absorbed and then performed in a non-literal way, necessitating adjustments to its actual verb tenses, pronouns, and references to align with the other party. This makes it distinct from direct discourse. Discourse analysts refer to the use of changes in linguistic code in the presentation and characterization of individuals. They achieve this by introducing a contrasting voice for the speaker who maintains a consistent and unique

language, and this change necessarily involves adjusting to the opposite side. Thus, the rephrasing of the utterance from the perspective of indirect discourse is not limited to summarizing and condensing its content but may also involve including specific phrases or paragraphs. The result is the merging of two discourses – the speaker's and the actor's – arising from the plurality of agents. Additionally, they explore distancing forms when a speaker adopts a position that does not imply complete adoption of what is said, leading to clear contradiction. This can be achieved by using quotation marks or other means.

Discourse analysts draw from the principles of semiotics, and two directions can be traced back: one linguistic, exploring the relationship of the text at the supra-sentence level, following the aspects of syntactic reference and the overall semantic structure of the discourse. The other direction, akin to the analyses of the folkloric structuralist school that inherited "Propp's" principles in the morphology of folk tales, seeks the underlying overall structure beneath the text and its external aspects. In the 1970s, the results of discourse analysis according to these two perspectives resulted in a consistent system of methodological procedures, benefiting the pragmatic perspective in language as it invests the semiotic analysis of functional units in texts under the comprehensive title of discourse analysis. Another outcome is the attempt to answer the question of how the text produces its meaning and which aspects contribute to its analysis.

There is an attempt that deserves attention, represented by Yule and Brown's effort in discourse analysis in 1983, where they tried to answer the following questions:

- How does a person use language for communication, and specifically, how does the sender construct linguistic messages for the recipient, and how does the receiver engage with linguistic messages with the intention of interpreting them?

In this perspective, they presented the functions of discourse analysis and the issues it addresses, which are as follows:

1. Reducing the language function to the transmission function: In this case, it is assumed that the primary concern of the speaker/writer is the efficient transmission of information, and everything they say/write is clear without any ambiguity.
2. Reducing the language function to the interactive function: Here, the aim is not only to convey information but also to establish and strengthen social relations, both private and public.
3. Placing the writer/speaker or the listener/reader at the heart of the communication process in terms of time, place, participants, and role. Hence, they made a clear distinction between a linguist who deals with language as a product and an analyst who makes it a process. The linguist won't seek to explain the mental processes involved in the language user's production of these sentences; they will limit themselves to data, attempting to produce a set of comprehensive and economical rules that will explain all the acceptable sentences in

those data⁴². While the discourse analyst aims to “track a specific discursive appearance to determine its frequency in order to formulate its regularities,” meaning that their goal is to reach recurrent patterns rather than standardized rules, considering that their data is subject to physical and social contexts, speakers’ purposes, and listeners’ responses. Therefore, the discourse analyst adopts the traditional methodology of descriptive linguistics, attempting to describe the linguistic forms found in their data without neglecting the surrounding context in which they occur.”⁴³ The recurrent patterns that the discourse analyst reaches are related to discourse as a process, not to language production. By production, it refers to “dealing with a linguistic unit as a product, studying the sentence or the text as it appears on the page, isolated from the sender, the receiver, and the context.” On the other hand, dealing with language as a process means taking all the elements of communication into consideration: the sender, the recipient, the message and its type, and the context”⁴⁴

Mohammed Miftah believes that attempting to list the theories and methodologies that sought to analyze discourse, let alone benefit from them, represents a form of misunderstanding and extremism. According to his view, the proper approach lies in the interaction between the text and the reader. In this regard, he has provided essential strategies for analyzing the structure of discourse or combining structural and functional analysis. These approaches have been applied in various languages, including French, English, Anglo-Saxon, and German.

He emphasizes that there are two fallacies that need to be avoided: the distinction between the gender of discourse, whether descriptive, presentational, scientific, or literary and artistic. They argue that five characteristics are crucial for literary discourse:

1. Arrangement, symmetry, proportion, and integration.
2. Absolute coherence.
3. Everything has meaning.
4. Artworks can be interpreted in various ways.
5. Artistic works transcend their era.

Among the discourse’s characteristics, he highlights intertextuality, suggesting the following definition: the presence of external relations between texts and internal relations between language levels. The degree of the relationship can vary from one to many, and it can be positive or negative.

Additionally, there are characteristics that apply universally to discourse, such as pattern, implication, and dynamics. According to his opinion, the

⁴² Mohammad Khattabi, *Discourse Linguistics*...p.49.

⁴³ *Ibid*, p.49.

⁴⁴ *Ibid*, p.50.

dominant features in literary discourse include phonetic symbolism, rhythm, parallelism, space utilization, and the temporal spectrum in textual interaction. He believes that the most important characteristic is the presence of multiple values in literary discourse, occurring as participants engage in aesthetic communication. They believe they are qualified to arrive at acceptable results that may differ at all levels and times, and they never expect other participants to arrive at the same conclusions as they do. It is evident that the multiplicity of discourse values undermines ontological fallacies, while the aesthetic engagement refutes extreme constructional fallacies with their principles and rules.

8. Two Approaches to the Concept of Text and its Qualitative Characteristics

We will review the most significant approaches that help us understand the concept of text, and among these approaches are context and the term "sentence syntax." In this context, we should not forget the strong indications provided by the critics Bloomfield and Chomsky. We will focus the analysis on two critical attempts that sought to present a vision of the concept of the text. The first attempt was made by Van Dijk, and the second by Hazem Al-Qartajanni. These attempts explore the Arab efforts in analyzing linguistic discourse.

8.1 Firstly, the context

"In language, the term 'context' has various meanings. In contemporary linguistic research, it often refers to the framework within which understanding takes place between two or more individuals. This includes the time during which the conversation occurred, shared concepts, and prior discourse of the conversation."⁴⁵ The mentioned context refers to the essential framework within which any linguistic unit is meaningfully constructed, and it confirms that textual units, whether written or spoken, complement each other. The context determines the meaning of the linguistic unit at three distinct levels in text analysis. Firstly, it determines any sentence and its pronunciation if uttered. Secondly, it usually informs us about the issue expressed if an issue is expressed. Thirdly, it helps us state that the issue under consideration has been expressed using a particular type of linguistic force, disregarding other contexts.

In these three cases, there is a direct relationship in determining what is being said based on the multiple meanings carried by the verb "say." Additionally, the context goes beyond what is explicitly said as it also implies what is intended implicitly. The context has a close connection to this aspect of the meaning of linguistic units"⁴⁶. From this, we understand that a single word's meaning is only realized within a specific context that imposes a particular interpretation on it. Among the researchers who emphasized the theory of context, the Polish anthropologist "Malinowski" stands out. In his view, texts have no meaning unless one understands the speaker's situation and the circumstances surrounding the linguistic event. Linguist "Firth" was also influenced by this theory, as he highlighted the importance of context in signification. According to him, semantic meaning encompasses the

⁴⁵ Ibrahim Khalil, *Context and Its Impact on Linguistic Studies*, p.37.

⁴⁶ Jones Leons, *Language, Meaning, and Context*, p.222.

entire linguistic functions along with the situational context, or what is known as the immediate context or contextual clues. It includes the phonological/morphological function, the syntactic/structural or systemic function, as well as the lexical function. It also incorporates the situational context and numerous contextual clues that surround the speech event and are related to the speaker, the addressee, the environment, and the prevailing circumstances.⁴⁷ Firth's study of meaning relies on three fundamental pillars:

1. The necessity of basing every linguistic analysis on what is known as "context" or "context of situation."
 2. The requirement to analyze the speech environment and its structure.
 3. The need to consider language in its various branches and stages.
- According to Firth, arriving at linguistic meaning entails the following steps:
- Analyzing the text at the aforementioned linguistic levels.
 - Clarifying the context of situation and the involved individuals, along with the surrounding circumstances of the speech.
 - Identifying the communicative purpose of the speech, whether it involves questioning, surprise, request, refusal, etc.

* Firth's theory emphasizes the impact left by speech (the psychological state of the speaker) and the importance of considering the word within its context (the context of situation).

However, (Ulmann) expressed some reservations regarding Firth's theory, as he criticized those who do not take into account the fundamental difference between speech and language. This difference lies in the fact that contexts exist in the actual situations of speech, and the meanings of words stored in the minds of speakers and listeners are not precise and specific until they are integrated into real spoken structures. Nonetheless, this does not imply that isolated words have no meaning at all. Otherwise, how would dictionaries be categorized if these words had no meanings?⁴⁸ Our heritage sources present expressions like:

- "For every situation, there is an appropriate saying."
- "Rhetoric in speech lies in its conformity with the context."
- "Every word has its appropriate context."

These expressions indicate the awareness of the Arabic linguistic heritage regarding the concept of context and contextual relevance. This became evident in the works of interpretive scholars such as Abu Hayyan Muhammad Al-Gharnati (d. 745 AH) and Badr al-Din Muhammad al-Zarkashi (d. 794 AH), as well as rhetorical experts like Abdul Qahir al-Jurjani (d. 1078 AH), who distinguished between "al-Maqam" (contextual

⁴⁷ Suwayss Al-Batman, *Semantic Relations in Light of Context*, p.94.

⁴⁸ Swiss Al-Batman, himself, page 53. Also, refer to: Helmi Khalil, *Arabic and Mystery*.

situation) and “al-Maqal al-Khatabi” (the rhetorical statement), and al-Rummani (d. 384 AH)⁴⁹. And linguists like Ibn Jinni (d. 392 AH) used the term “شاهد الحال” (shahid al-hal) instead of “سياقه” (siyaqah) as mentioned by Ahmed Mokhtar Omar in his book “علم دلالة” (The Science of Semantics).

In the Arabic linguistic heritage, the term “الاعتبار” (al-i’tibar) became common as a substitute for the term “السياق” (al-siyāq). They would say, “The eloquence and acceptance of speech depend on its alignment with the appropriate consideration (الاعتبار المناسب), and its decline results from not conforming to it. Hence, the context (مقتضى الحال) is the appropriate consideration.”⁵⁰ At times, the context refers to “the association of words and sentences, which, in another aspect, is what connects the structure of a written work or a composed piece. The connecting elements may vary, and it is the relationship that organizes the parts of the written work and makes them coherent in a sequential discourse”⁵¹.

The semantic, linguistic, and stylistic critics have shown interest in the context from different perspectives. Austin studied the extraction of context through the various structures of linguistic discourse. Semantic scholars focused on contextual meaning, referring to the meaning that the addressee deduces from the speech based on the context, as seen in the research of John Lyons and Firth. Stylisticians, on the other hand, emphasized the relationship between style and the contextual requirements, particularly the psychological framework of the discourse, as evident in the research of Hymes. Context has been regarded as a fundamental pillar in the analysis of literary texts, as acknowledged in the works of Bakhtin, Northrop Frye, and others⁵². Both Brown and Yule in 1983 agreed that the discourse analyst must consider the context in which the discourse appears. The context, in their view, is formed by the speaker/writer, the listener/reader, as well as the time and place, as it plays an active role in interpreting the discourse. In this regard, Haymes in 1963 sees the context having a dual role as it narrows down the possible interpretations and supports the intended interpretation⁵³. Therefore, the most important characteristics of context, according to their order in the following classification, are: sender and receiver, presence, subject, occasion, channel, message format, organization, key, and purpose. From Haiman’s attempt to Lief’s attempt in 1972, his purpose was to determine the characteristics for identifying truth or falsehood in a statement, and these characteristics include: possible world, time and place, speaker, presence, referent, previous discourse, and specification.

⁴⁹ See: Mohammed Barakat Abu Ali, *Studies in the Eloquence of the Quran*.

⁵⁰ Al-Qazwini, “Al-Izah fi ‘Ulum al-Balagha,” Part One, p.80.

⁵¹ Ibrahim Khalil, “The Context and Its Impact on Linguistic Studies,” page 39.

⁵² Khulood Al-Amoush, *The Quranic Discourse*, p.13.

⁵³ Mohammed Khatabi, *Text Linguistics*, Page 52

The Western scholars refer to various meanings of context, which can be summarized as follows⁵⁴:

A. Phonological Context: Refers to the influence of the linguistic sounds' positions on their pronunciation, articulation, and characteristics, such as intensity, looseness, loudness, and whispering.

B. Literary Context: Refers to the collected sayings, folk and literary traditions, the memories of writers and readers crystallized in specific cultural customs, narrative patterns, and common stylistic elements. This context is characterized by coherence and homogeneity at the same time and is known as the cultural context.

C. Linguistic Context: Refers to the occurrence of a word in different linguistic contexts, and it can be exemplified by the word "حسن" (good), which can describe people, quantities, and temporary things⁵⁵.

D. The emotional context determines the degree of intensity in words like "hate" or "detest."

E. The situational context expands the meaning of phrases like "may God have mercy on you," expressing sympathy for the deceased and seeking mercy in life.

In conclusion, the theory of context has influenced semantic research by going beyond its traditional focus on word sequencing and sounds to encompass the environmental and psychological factors surrounding the linguistic text. It also assesses the communicative function between words and the cohesive relationships among them.

8.2 Secondly/from sentence-level to discourse-level analysis⁵⁶

The efforts of linguists who gave great attention to the concept of syntax can be traced, and here we represent the efforts of "Bloomfield and Chomsky," who represent two contrasting linguistic approaches, a materialistic mechanical approach, and another mental and cognitive approach⁵⁷

Several essential differences arise between syntax and discourse as follows:

⁵⁴ Ibrahim Khalil, "The Context and Its Impact on Linguistic Studies," p.44, Adapted.

⁵⁵ Please note: Suwis Al-Batman, *Semantic Relations in the Light of Context*, pages 54 and 55, Adapted.

⁵⁶ The title of the book by the author Saad Maslouh, I found it more relevant to this part of the research, and I referred to the material from Robert de Grand.

⁵⁷ I chose not to address them again due to what has been previously presented about them, Hence, it must be noted

1. Discourse is an active system, while sentences are elements of a virtual system.
2. Sentences are purely structural entities determined at the syntactic level, whereas discourse needs to be defined according to complete textuality criteria.
3. Constraints imposed by the rules on the abstract structure of a sentence within discourse can be overcome through situational context stimuli.
4. Distinguishing what complies with syntactic rules from what does not is binary and comparative. However, distinguishing what qualifies as discourse and what does not is not made through such an automatic comparison.
5. Discourse must connect to a situation involving various foundations, expectations, and knowledge, including situational and internal structural contexts.
6. The text should not be seen as a mere arrangement of grammatical units and symbols. It is a human endeavor intended to create a text and direct the audience to establish various relationships with it, making texts more influential than sentences.
7. Texts are characterized by various states, such as informational, emotional, and social, and their production and comprehension occur as a series of events under prevailing, adhered-to, and dynamic guidelines. In contrast, sentences are considered static and synchronous elements of a system.
8. Social norms apply more to texts than to sentences, and psychological factors have a stronger association with texts than with sentences.
9. Texts refer to other texts differently than sentences referring to each other. Language learners rely on knowledge of the rules as a general virtual system when using sentences.

However, using texts requires contextual awareness of the ongoing events.

9. Two Textual Approaches

What is a text? What constitutes its integrated unity? What makes a certain entity a text? What defines completeness and deficiency in a text? These are the questions that this chapter will attempt to explore and present different approaches in answering. The answer depends on two aspects. Firstly, we will provide a general overview of defining a text and its various forms and models. Secondly, we will delve into the discourse of van Dijk and the efforts of Arabic linguistic scholars in this regard⁵⁸.

9.1 The first aspect: Text and its Forms and Models

The fundamental material upon which research, analysis, interpretation, and understanding are built is texts. The text is the space where we enter, engaging in a spiritual and human interaction with the author's ideas and

⁵⁸ Mohammed Khatabi, *Textual Linguistics*, adapted.

emotions⁵⁹. The first part of the text discusses the concept of the text and its various forms and models. It emphasizes that texts are the fundamental units for research, analysis, interpretation, and understanding. The text is seen as a complete entity in which readers engage in a spiritual and human interaction with the author's ideas and emotions. Different scholars have approached the definition of the text from various perspectives. Some view it as a continuous connection of substitutions with grammatical coherence, while others consider it in terms of its reception and interpretation. The text is subject to cultural levels and abstract concepts.

Textual analysis involves examining different textual forms and dealing with various text types in diverse social contexts. The study of psychological and social contexts plays a significant role in understanding the text. Moreover, text linguistics is a subfield of modern linguistics. Some researchers define the text based on linguistic structures and grammatical rules. Others classify it by distinguishing between dialogue and narrative or by focusing on microstructures as a fundamental basis for classifying texts.

Textual reception theory raises questions related to the reader and the hypothetical types of texts, such as open and closed texts. Readers play an essential role in constructing meaning within the text. The text contains permanent gaps that the reader fills, prompting the question of the presumed reader capable of filling these recurring voids. The goals of textual studies are better understood in later research, where scholars explore not just traditional rhetorical forms but also structures and methods that serve rhetorical functions. Textual attention is directed towards finding phonological and morphological constants and units, as well as the grammatical structure that allows for considerable freedom in transforming from typical to atypical structures. The meanings derived from the text are divided into direct and indirect, indicative and referential, suggestive and evocative.

This text discusses the concept of the text and its integrated forms and models. The text is seen as a complete entity that allows for complete semantic freedom or a comprehensive and cohesive structure. The meaning produced by the text is a result of continuous interaction and dialectical movement between its parts, focusing on the internal coherence of partial meanings rather than the conventional transition from part to whole.

Researchers emphasize the importance of considering the criteria that texts must fulfill to understand the comprehensive structure of text theory. Different linguists have varied definitions of the text; for example, Benveniste defines it based on generative rules and referential information that can have communicative functions for its parts. Meanwhile, Fondueur identifies the presence of possible textual forms with strong interrelated partial rules under the theory of the text.

⁵⁹ See: Sa'id Al-Ghanimi, *Contemporary Literary Theory*, p. 82.

Various scholars, such as Petofi, emphasize the importance of describing holistic aspects of texts within the context of linguistic study. After that, they set boundaries for multiple or separate partial textual theories, linking them to communicative events. Significant models that have influenced the growth of textual theory include those proposed by De Saussure, Bloomfield, the American school, Harris's early transformational model, and Chomsky's limited syntactic approach. Additionally, Feinhals suggests a model for text disintegration that relies on organized procedures to study the relationships between adjacent sentences to uncover coherence relations that form a strong interconnected textual composition.

Al-Azhar Al-Zanad views the text as a fabric of speech, with its meaning available in the equivalent term in Semantics, opposite to the term "text." The definition of the text is challenging due to the diversity of its criteria, approaches, and starting points. It can be understood in terms of its physical existence and components, as an event or accomplishment in time and space, as a structure governed by relations, or as a social and cultural institution that plays the role of a significant linguistic sign. The text is a fabric of words interconnected with each other, carrying individual and collective linguistic activity characteristics, and functioning as a significant communicative symbol"⁶⁰.

9.2 Elements of the Text

Due to the problematic nature of the term in modern linguistic discourse and its overlap with the concepts of discourse and horizon, as well as the diverse openness of texts in various types of writings and the interconnection of the concept of intertextuality, it becomes necessary to identify the distinguishing elements of the text that must be highlighted through reading, regardless of the type of context surrounding the effectiveness and communicative relationship between the addressing parties. These distinguishing elements have been revealed in the research:⁶¹

- Paul Ricoeur refers to discourse as what has been fixed through writing.
- Al-Azhar Al-Zanad refers to meaning. Hence, a text can be a single sentence or multiple sentences, or a sequential series of sentences that can be shortened or lengthened depending on their context, as mentioned by Khalid Al-Omouh in her book "Al-Khitab Al-Qur'ani."
- Van Dijk and John Lyons refer to cohesion, coherence, and consistency.
- Robert de Beaugrande refers to communication.
- Gerard Genette, in his book "Palimpsests," discusses the relationship of overlap, linking the text to various discourse patterns that the text

⁶⁰ Al-Azhar Al-Zanad, "The Fabric of the Text: An Inquiry into What Constitutes Uttered Discourse," pages 11 and 12.

⁶¹ Please refer to the article "ن (N) - ص (S) - ص (S)" in the book "Lisan al-Arab" for more information.

belongs to. Through this, one can understand the multiple colors of texts.

From these components, researchers have focused on the recipient in contrast to the deceased author to establish an analytical methodology with the goal of linguistic communication. According to Roman Jakobson, the elements of this linguistic message are the sender, receiver, content, and channel.

9.3 The second part: Van Dijk's Textual Approach, or the Macrostructures of the Text

Van Dijk presented models for various texts and attempted to modify the model to accommodate a larger number of texts. He emphasized that his models and analyses are modest attempts that require further efforts and continuous work to complete, in order to be applicable to several languages worldwide. He began by highlighting the inadequacy of sentence-level analysis to describe phenomena that go beyond its boundaries. He rejected the claims of sentence-level analysis and argued that introducing semantic and discursive elements into the description and analysis is essential. He considered the entire text as a fundamental unit that does not require a quantitative shift in criteria. Here, he introduced the term "textual grammar" or "macrogrammar," relying on the correlation between the concepts of lower-level structure and upper-level structure to describe the form of the text. He also used the correlation between the concepts of microstructure and macrostructure to describe the meaning of the text. He made use of transformational-generative grammar in particular. He saw in it the actual beginnings of moving research from within the sentence to outside it and believed that it was necessary to study the relationships between sentences. He criticized transformational-generative linguists for not being able to describe textual structures relatively simply. Therefore, he called for a textual grammar that could address all sentence structures in a language and considered the primary task of textual grammar to formulate rules that can clearly identify all grammatical texts of a language and provide us with a description of their structures. As a result, transformational-generative grammatical rules were not exempt from criticism.

"Van Dijk" emphasized the existence of abstract semantic structures primarily, and these structures are not realized in the actual text. Instead, they are hypothetical structures that text analysts must discover and extract from the text. This requires an attentive reader who can identify the internal coherence between the parts of the text, which he referred to as textual cohesion. However, this attentive reader could be considered a special type of recipient as well. In this coherence, sentences are sequenced within certain constraints, not just in terms of syntax but also in terms of acceptability. Van Dijk recognized the importance of replacing the notion of the sentence with the notion of the text, as the latter goes beyond the segmentation of units and focuses on tracing the relationships between elements of the larger unit. He advocated the expansion of grammar to

include not only the syntactic and semantic levels but also the discursive level or the level of speech events, with its specific constraints and criteria. According to his view, this expanded grammar would not only determine appropriate conditions for sentences but also determine suitable conditions for different types of discourse.

However, he argued that grammar remains incomplete in terms of meaning unless complemented with pragmatics. He provided an example to illustrate this point: "Hans and Peter lost their books today." The sentence has two meanings: each of them lost their book or both of them lost their shared books. In the first case, the linkage is a complex nominal structure, and in the second case, the linkage is a sentence as the basic structure. Despite his efforts, he could only use the sentence as the basic unit and ventured outside its framework only in beautiful sequences. However, those sequences may not form a coherent text unless understood narrowly.

Furthermore, Van Dijk explored the existence of abstract holistic structures that allow for the summarization of a vast amount of information presented in the sentence sequences. As mentioned earlier, the holistic structure is a hypothetical structure representing meaning that requires precise selection from several possibilities to determine the information revealed through the macrostructures.

9.4 Summary of "Van Dijk's" Perspective on Discourse Linguistics Can Be Followed in the Following Steps

1. In the introduction to his book "Text and Context" in 1977, Van Dijk presented his aspirations to build a sufficient linguistic theory of discourse capable of analyzing various discourse phenomena that traditional linguistics struggles to interpret. Some of these discourse phenomena include the discourse topic, coherence, macrostructure, and, more precisely, the levels of meaning and discourse processes. The main objective is to establish a clearer and more organized approach to linguistic discourse analysis.
2. The notion of meaning includes elements such as coherence, cohesion, and macrostructures. The notion of discourse processes encompasses contexts, speech acts, as well as discourse strategies and global speech acts. In this way, coherence becomes just one aspect of discourse among others in the semantic level.
3. Van Dijk's linguistic theory deals with the structures of natural language, their actual and potential configurations, their historical development, cultural variations, social functions, and cognitive foundations. These linguistic structures are characterized by their modesty, being shared among members of a linguistic community. Hence, the aim of the theory is to theoretically reconstruct these underlying structural rules, necessitating the formulation of levels, propositions, units, types of rules, and necessary constraints to describe the abstract structure of language users' utterances. The objective is to determine the types of utterances that are acceptable within this modesty and, consequently, the grammar focuses on

formulating the abstract structures of utterances in terms of phonetics, composition, and morphology.

4. As traditional linguistics considers the sentence as the highest linguistic unit that can be described, this description applies to complex sentences and sentence sequences as well. Van Dijk, however, perceives that the differences between sentences, complex sentences, and sentence sequences are primarily at the level of discourse, particularly in the context of communicative description. The meanings of sentences depend on each other, which is different from the dependence of sub-sentences on each other in complex or compound sentences. Consequently, he calls for a reconfiguration of utterances, not in the form of sentences but in the form of a larger unit, namely the text. For him, the text is the underlying abstract structure, commonly referred to as discourse.
5. In his view, the text is the higher unit of the sentence, and we wonder: does this mean that the set of levels, propositions, rules, and necessary restrictions for an adequate interpretation of the discourse structure differ from those used in interpreting the sentence structure through coherence features? Van Dijk attempted to provide an answer, and among those features are:

A. **Coherence:** It is used to refer to a specific relationship between sentences. Since the sentence is a syntactic structure and coherence is a semantic relationship, Van Dijk preferred to talk about the relationship between two or more sentence propositions. To illustrate this, he provided three examples:

1. The tiger is alive, so it is not dead.
2. The tiger is alive, so it must have wanted to catch the devil in Rome.
3. The tiger is alive, and thus, Muscat is the capital of the Emirates.

“Van Dijk” raises the question of what specific constraints are involved in the concept of semantic acceptability or unacceptability of sentences and discourses, as well as the conditions governing coherence.

The first condition: The relationship between the meanings of the words used in the sentences, such as “alive” or “dead”. However, this condition alone is not sufficient to discuss two interconnected sentences.

He added **the second condition:** Referential identity, meaning that the same person is referred to in both parts of the sentence. However, the mere fact of the tiger being alive and its desire to catch the devil in Rome doesn’t seem to establish a meaningful connection. Thus, he introduced a broader condition called “referential coherence,” which refers to the connection between propositions. To meet this condition, the following sub-conditions must be met:

- a. **Temporal order:** The sequence of events must follow a chronological order. For example, “Yesterday, the weather was beautiful, so we went to the Dead Sea” is coherent, whereas “Yesterday, the weather was beautiful,

so we went to the Dead Sea last week” lacks coherence due to the inconsistency in temporal order.

b. Coherence of possible worlds: In some cases, there might be a coherence in one world (e.g., a dream world) but not in the real world. For instance, “I dreamt that the weather was extremely hot, so I went to the Dead Sea” lacks coherence because the weather in a dream does not justify the action in the real world.

c. Contextual coherence: The relationship between sentences is determined by relative interpretations, and analyzing coherence requires identifying the type of meaning that allows for this. Van Dijk considers it relative meaning.

d. Discourse structure: The regular arrangement of events in a discourse, such as narrative sequences, affects coherence. Changing the sequence can lead to different interpretations.

e. Complete and incomplete discourses: Van Dijk suggests that a discourse does not need to be complete to be coherent; it can still convey its intended meaning even with missing elements.

In the process of building the discourse, Van Dijk discusses the importance of thematic coherence or the overall structure. He considers discourse as a vague term, illustrated by the lengthy example of the city of Iraq. The question he raises is about the specific rules or procedures that enable the construction of the thematic coherence. Some essential processes include deletion, removing information related to a specific frame or concept, and simple generalization.

10. In Arabic Linguistic Efforts or Descriptive Approaches to Text Cohesion

Professor Ahmed Al-Mutawakil, in his book “Studies in Functional Arabic Grammar” published in 1986, assumes that ancient Arabic linguistic activity can be divided into two categories: sentence linguistics and discourse linguistics. The latter is represented by rhetoric, interpretation, and the fundamentals of jurisprudence. The three mentioned disciplines adopt a larger linguistic unit than the sentence and vary in their contribution to effective communication in the face of discourse. Rhetoric deals with speeches, poetry, and the Quran, indicating their non-identical nature on one hand, while sharing rhetorical discourse features to elevate the discourse to an expressive level on the other.

Literary criticism has focused on poetic discourse, with particular attention to literary theft, structure, typography, and craftsmanship. Remarkably, this investigation involves ambiguous texts using a tightly linked lexicon with the concept of coherence, such as coherence and consistency, connecting some verses with others, unity of parts, and integration. This topic has prompted profound insights and advanced contemplations on how poems cohere part by part. Regarding interpretation, one can highlight the following truth: the

Quran was revealed at different times, in different places, and on various occasions, over a period of twenty-two years. Despite this, it is considered as a unified speech. How do the interpreters justify this? In examining the most significant indications and presenting the views of ancient rhetoricians, the factors contributing to discourse consistency and coherence can be deduced:

1. Rhetoric is concerned with differentiation and division. Both Al-Jurjani (d. 1078 AH) and Al-Sakkaki (d. 626) considered this aspect one of the most challenging issues in rhetoric. Al-Jurjani's efforts in this regard revolve around what should be done in a sentence, whether to connect its parts or leave it disconnected and bring them separately, with each part being resumed after the other.
2. Representation, where Al-Jurjani concluded that representation, which is more concerned with the distant rather than explicit simile, is only achieved through a series of words, two or more sentences, especially when the simile is more abstract and conceptual, requiring more than one sentence.

He referenced Surah Yunus (Verse 24), where he examined the organization of the speech in terms of representation. The previous verse is composed of intertwined sentences, closely related to one another, making it impossible to remove any of them without compromising the entire meaning. The verse indicates three stages:

- The stage of water descending from the sky and its resulting mingling with the earth's vegetation.
 - The stage of embellishment and people's admiration for it, believing in its permanence.
 - The stage of divine intervention, making it like a barren field.
3. Lexical consistency and its manifestations: To some extent, the linguistic heritage references to the function of eloquent enhancements have been evident, but they were not commented upon, nor did they highlight their function in combining two or more things, as seen in Al-Askari (d. 260 AH) and those who followed him. Some manifestations of lexical consistency include conformity, reversing word order, construction, appropriateness, repetition, and rephrasing using numbers or types.

Overall, Van Dijk's analysis focuses on the interrelations between sentences and how they contribute to the overall coherence of discourses, while also considering various factors that can affect this coherence.

11. Conclusion

If coherence and consistency are essential conditions for a text, then it is necessary for the approach presented by Van Dijk to investigate the possibility of providing specific specifications in the receiver, whom the critic Mikhail Rifatir described as the "intentional reader." I find an agreement between this type of reader and Chomsky's theory regarding the

presumed device in textual construction and the overall structure of the text according to Van Dijk. They both agree on the abstraction that can only be achieved under conditions that go beyond reality in some texts. Any process of analysis attempting to decipher the intricacies of a text, woven with interconnected cultural, psychological, and social threads like a spider's web, may lead to a weakening of the text's vitality. An ordinary or simple reader may not possess the means to decode such intricate patterns. This is where the demand for the concept of the artistic critic emerges. In their endeavor to recreate the text, they should avoid turning it into sterile mathematical equations and perplexing symbols.

In conclusion, this has been a modest overview of the concept of discourse analysis and its branching in the linguistic realm.

We discussed its cultural criticism according to Michel Foucault and Edward Said, exploring its connection with human knowledge, which contributed to its interpretation. We then delved into its various dimensions and followed its aspirations through the notions of underlying structures, represented in the text. We highlighted the most significant aspects of Van Dijk's contributions concerning the concept of the overall structure of the text and the endeavors of Arabic heritage regarding the terms cohesion and consistency in the text. While we are convinced that this research is only the first step in exploring the facets of linguistic discourse and its analysis, we hope that the outcome will facilitate the possession of the necessary critical tool to read texts and decipher them, all in a coherent structure aimed at benefitting the ordinary reader everywhere, thus avoiding any delicate gaps in the whirlwind of things.

Bibliography

- Ibrahim Khalil, "Fil-Lisaniyat wa Nahw al-Nas," Dar al-Maseera, Amman, 2009.
- Ibrahim Khalil, "Al-Siyaaq wa Atharuhu fi al-Daras al-Lughawi," University of Jordan.
- Ibn Manzoor, "Lisan al-Arab," Dar Sader, Beirut, 1979.
- Al-Azhar al-Zanad, "Nasij al-Nass, Bahth fi Ma Yakoon bihi al-Malfuz Nassan," Al-Markaz al-Thaqafi al-Arabi.
- Hossam al-Din, Kareem Zaki, "Usul Turathiya fi Ilm al-Lughah," Maktabat al-Anglo al-Misriya, 2nd edition, 1985.
- Halimi Khalil, "Al-Arabiya wa al-Ghumood: Dirasah Lughawiya fi Dalalat al-Mabni ala al-Ma'na," Dar al-Maaref al-Jameya, Egypt, 2013.
- Gerard Genette, "Mudakhkhal ila al-Nass al-Jamee," Translated by Abdel Rahman Ayoub, Dar al-Sho'un al-Thaqafiya, Baghdad, 1985.
- Khuloud al-Amoush, "Al-Khitab al-Qur'ani: Dirasah fi al-Alaqah Bain al-Nass wa al-Siyaaq," Alam al-Kutub al-Hadeeth, Irbid, Jordan, 2008.
- Robert de Beaugrande, "Al-Nass wa al-Khitab wa al-Ijra," Translated by Dr. Tamam Hassan, Alam al-Kutub, Egypt, 1998.
- Saad Maslouh, "Min Nahw al-Jumla ila Nahw al-Nas," Dar al-Radwan, Cairo, 2019.

- Saeed Hussein al-Bihairi, "Ilm Lughat al-Nass: al-Mafahim wa al-Ittijahat," Maktaba Noor, Lebanon.
- Saeed al-Ghanmi, "Al-Lughah Ilman," Dar al-Sho'un al-Thaqafiya, Baghdad.
- Saeed Yaqutin, "Tahleel al-Khitab al-Riwayi: Al-Zaman wa al-Sard wa al-Tabieer," Al-Markaz al-Thaqafi al-Arabi.
- Suweis al-Batmani, "Al-Alaqat al-Dalaliya fi Dhaw' al-Siyaaq," University of Jordan, 1989.
- Salah Fadl, "Balaghah al-Khitab wa Ilm al-Nass," Majlis al-Watani li al-Thaqafa, Kuwait, Alam al-Maaref, August 1999.
- Salimah Mudlaf, "Tahleel al-Khitab al-Qasasi fi al-Qur'an al-Kareem Surat al-Qasas Usmudajlan," University of Jordan, 1993.
- Ferdinand de Saussure, "Fusul fi Ilm al-Lughah al-Aam," Dar al-Maaref al-Jameya, Alexandria.
- Van Dijk, "Ilm al-Nass, Mudakhkhal Multidisciplinary," Translated by Dr. Saeed al-Bihairi, Dar al-Qahira, Egypt, 2001.
- Friedrich Wilhelm Nietzsche, "Ma Wara al-Khayr wa al-Sharr," Dar al-Kanz al-Adabiya, 1999.
- Al-Qazwini, "Al-I'jaz fi al-Balaghah," Tahqeeq by Muhammad Abdul Mun'im Khafaji, Dar al-Kitab al-Lubnani, Beirut, 1975.
- Muhammad Barkat Abu Ali, "Dirasat fi al-I'jaz al-Bayani," Dar Wael for Publishing, Amman, 2000.
- Muhammad al-Khitabi, "Lisaniyat al-Nass, Mudakhkhal ila Insijam al-Khitab," Al-Markaz al-Thaqafi al-Arabi, Beirut, Dar al-Bayda, 1st edition.
- Muhammad Anani, "Al-Mustalahat al-Adabiya al-Haditha," Al-Sharika al-Misriya li al-Nashr.
- Mustafa Nasef, "Al-Lughah wa al-Tafsir wa al-Tawasul," Al-Majlis al-Watani li al-Thaqafa, Kuwait, Alam al-Maaref.
- Megan al-Ruwaili and Saeed al-Bazaie, "Dalil al-Naqid al-Adabi: Ida'at li Akthar min Sab'een Tiran wa Mustalahan Naqdiyan Mu'asiran," Al-Markaz al-Thaqafi al-Arabi