



The Procedures Of Analyzing Texts Between Textual Linguistics And Cognitive Linguistics

Fatima Brahimi, PhD student Arabic Teaching Science Laboratory, Higher School of Teachers, Bouzareah (ENSB) – Algeria, Fatima.brahima@ensb.dz

Pr. Ahmed Belhout, Arabic Teaching Science Laboratory, Higher School of Teachers, Bouzareah (ENSB) – Algeria, belhout.ahmed@ensb.dz

Received: 05/10/2024

Accepted :28 /10/ 2024

Published:22/11/2024

Abstract:

Linguistics has undergone a qualitative shift in the process of analyzing natural language texts for some time. Most linguistic theses in the recent past have surpassed the limits of the linguistic sentence due to the shortcomings of its concept and its related aspects, in achieving a description of the data both before and after the syntactic structure of the language, as well as the structural system with its conceptual framework in European linguistics, in particular.

Linguistics in the Germanic region, in particular, has come to view language as a natural phenomenon from the perspective of the concept of the linguistic text. This concept serves as the most appropriate model for applying practical procedures in the analysis processes of texts, while observing the systems of interaction between the components of the language during the practice of its speakers in endless situations that align with the nature of linguistic performance within the speaking community.

This study reviews the aspects of analyzing linguistic texts through two linguistic trends that overlap in their level of analysis but differ in the theoretical foundations of the two approaches: textual linguistics and cognitive linguistics.

The textual approach emphasizes the social, psychological, and informational aspects of human language, while the cognitive approach focuses on the neurocognitive processes involved in language activity in the brain.

The aim of this study is to clarify the boundaries of the analysis processes for each approach and to showcase the procedural tools utilized by each separately, as well as the sources from which each approach derives these procedures.

Keywords: text analysis, textual linguistics, text, cognitive linguistics.

Introduction:

The subject of study in Western linguistics is natural human language, which encompasses various levels, including phonetic, morphological, syntactic, lexical,

semantic, conversational, communicative, and informational. The theories concerning the rules of speech structure have traditionally been limited to the concept of the sentence as a reference point for analyzing the relationships and syntactic components identified in the research conducted by European and American structural linguistic schools.

However, the various approaches within this field have struggled to move beyond the constraints of structural linguistics regarding the concepts of structure and grammatical relationships. There has been a growing call among linguists for the necessity of constructing a new framework that aligns with the linguistics of language, particularly the linguistics of speech, which emphasizes the importance of actual speech achievements.

This perspective is grounded in the concept of the linguistic text, which posits that all texts are individual formations arising from the natural production of speech. Consequently, a shift has occurred in the areas of interest within linguistics, emerging from the remnants of European structuralism, due to the challenges associated with the compatibility of meaning, perception, and grammar in language. These linguistic challenges have served as a fundamental impetus for the development of a science of general linguistics that studies actual speech production, rather than virtual production, as seen in the outputs of artificial intelligence (AI language), which may mimic manifestations of natural human language. This field has emerged as a distinct branch within general linguistics known as textual linguistics (*linguistique textuelle*).

Textual linguistics initially focused on delineating the boundaries that differentiate text from non-text through the concept of textuality, positing that non-text comprises language that fails to achieve textuality, which is defined by the interactions of communicative components within the parameters of texts.

Textual linguists employ procedural tools and methodologies in the text analysis processes that are grounded in the conceptual frameworks of textual standards and the various factors that have emerged through technological advancements in linguistic research across diverse fields of exact and technological sciences.

This research paper aims to identify these tools and discuss the procedures for their application within textual linguistics. It adopts a theoretical approach that explores these procedures in two directions: the textual direction and the cognitive direction (*linguistic cognition*).

This study seeks to address the following problem: **What are the elements of the procedures that textual linguistics utilizes in analyzing texts, and how do these elements relate to cognitive linguistics and its scientific and methodological cognitive effects?**

To achieve this, the research paper employs a comparative approach to determine the similarities and differences between the two theories by examining their foundational sources. The research plan for this study consisted of the following:

- 1- Brief Presentation of the Concepts of Textual Linguistics and Cognitive Linguistics: The study begins by outlining the key concepts behind textual linguistics and cognitive linguistics, providing a foundational understanding of both fields and their significance in the analysis of linguistic texts.
- 2- Presentation of the Theory of Text Analysis: The next step involves presenting the theory of text analysis from two different perspectives: the textual orientation and the cognitive orientation. This section outlines the methodologies and approaches each orientation uses for analyzing texts.
- 3- Comparison Between the Two Theories**: A comparative analysis is conducted between the textual and cognitive orientations, highlighting their differences and similarities in the context of text analysis. This step is key to understanding the strengths and limitations of each approach.
- 4- Extracting the Most Important Results**: The study concludes by summarizing the key findings from the comparison, shedding light on the scientific and methodological processes involved in analyzing linguistic texts. These results form the basis of the study's conclusion and recommendations.

This research aims to arbitrate and evaluate the scientific methods used in the analysis of linguistic texts, focusing on two models of text analysis to contribute to the ongoing discourse in linguistic methodologies.

Textual Linguistics: it refers to the branch of linguistics that studies how language operates in its communicative form, focusing on the organization and function of texts rather than isolated sentences. The term is a modern one, and in Arabic, it corresponds to the French "linguistique textuelle." Different researchers and linguists have provided varying definitions of textual linguistics, often shaped by their academic orientations. One notable scholar,

Robert-Alain de Beaugrande, defines textual linguistics as the science concerned with the processes by which human language is used in a communicative context¹. According to Beaugrande, this field emphasizes the role of the text as the primary unit of communication, reflecting a shift from the traditional focus on isolated, illustrative sentences to a more comprehensive understanding of how language functions in real communicative situations. In this context, **linguistic events** are analyzed not merely as individual words or sentences but as part of larger communicative acts, or texts, which have a specific structure and meaning intended for communication. This involves both the **superficial structure** (phonology) of individual words and sentences, and the deeper organization and meaning within the context of texts. The text, therefore, is not only a linguistic form but also a vehicle for meaning, shaped by its communicative purpose. This approach highlights the transition in linguistic thought from sentence-level analysis to a broader focus on texts as the primary medium through which language is manifested and understood. Textual studies in the field of linguistics have prompted a shift in focus from identifying the smallest units of language to understanding the largest, as they apply research methodologies that examine how language is used in real-world communication.

This transition moves away from purely abstract, cognitive formulations to a broader perspective that embraces the interactive nature of language. Textual linguistics thus becomes a **verbal semiotic field**, studying the vast range of textual forms—from single-word texts, which can convey a complete message, to expansive works like Dante’s *Divine Comedy*. These texts are viewed in the context of **interactive communication**, produced by speakers or writers within specific temporal and communicative boundaries².

Teun A. van Dijk, in his book *Textual Linguistics* (translated by Hassan Al-Bahri), frames text science as an **interdisciplinary field**. According to Van Dijk, this area of study is relatively new but intersects with older concepts like **text analysis** and **text interpretation**. While traditional approaches focused on the **material description of literary texts**, text science takes a more **general and comprehensive** approach, addressing all possible forms of text and their associated contexts. This includes theoretical, descriptive, and applied perspectives. Van Dijk emphasizes that text science is concerned not only with the text itself but also with how these texts are received and understood by individuals and groups. This process involves specific **stylistic choices**, **rhetorical techniques**, and **textual genres**. Moreover, textual structures influence how readers form **desires**, make **decisions**, and take **actions**, as texts contribute to shaping perceptions and behaviors in a wide array of social and communicative settings³.

Wolfgang Heinemann and Dieter Viehweger present a more confined view of textual linguistics, differing from Van Dijk's comprehensive approach. In their book *Introduction to Textual Linguistics*, they argue that textual linguistics should not be understood as an all-encompassing science of texts as Van Dijk proposed. Instead, they emphasize that the field should focus primarily on the **structure and formulation of texts**, analyzing them in relation to **general communicative, social, and psychological contexts**. According to Heinemann and Viehweger, textual linguistics should limit its scope to studying the internal mechanisms of texts rather than extending into broader interdisciplinary areas⁴.

On the other hand, **Jean-Michel Adam** offers a different perspective, recognizing the significance of textual linguistics within contemporary linguistic studies. Despite the rise of **post-textual trends** in literary analysis in the 21st century, Adam still regards textual linguistics as crucial. He aligns himself with other scholars like **Michel Charolles**, **Bernard Combettes**, and **Lita Lundquist**, emphasizing that textual linguistics remains relevant, especially within the analysis of **discourse**, which was highlighted as a branch of textual linguistics at the **World Congress of French Linguistics in 2008**. Adam traces the origins of textual linguistics to the mid-20th century, noting that **Eugeniu Coseriu** introduced the term in 1955. It gained further momentum with **Harald Weinrich**, who was instrumental in presenting the first courses on textual linguistics in France in 1969. In addition to these foundational figures, Adam credits **French linguistic theories**, particularly the **semiotics of Roland Barthes**, along with the contributions of **Robert Lafont** and **Françoise Gardes-Madray**, as having played key roles in advancing textual linguistics as a discipline. In essence, while Van Dijk envisions textual linguistics as a broad, interdisciplinary field, Heinemann and Viehweger advocate for a more narrowly

focused approach, and Adam positions the field within the historical and ongoing development of discourse analysis and semiotic theories. Françoise Gardès-Madray, Michael Riffaterre, and Leta Lindquist made significant contributions to textual linguistics, stylistics, and discourse analysis in the latter half of the 20th century. The works of Gardès-Madray in textual analysis, combined with the stylistic insights of Riffaterre in the 1970s, laid the foundation for the structural and semantic exploration of texts. Lindquist's contributions in the 1980s further advanced these studies, complementing the structural and semantic dimensions of textual linguistics. Contextual analysis came into prominence with the achievements of Teun A. van Dijk, whose work, particularly in the analysis of discourse, was translated into French and brought attention to **textual linguistics** in the 1990s. Van Dijk's approach emphasized the integration of text with its social and communicative contexts, marking a shift from the purely structural analysis to a broader understanding of discourse. From the various definitions and perspectives, it is evident that several terms often overlap, each focusing on different aspects of text as a subject of study⁵(nesrine bou amrani2018). These fields include **textual linguistics**, **text linguistics**, **discourse analysis**, and **literary analysis**. A brief distinction among them is as follows:

- 1) **Textual Linguistics:** (la linguistique textuelle) refers to the scientific study of the internal mechanisms and coherence of a text, such as its structure, plot, and style. It focuses on understanding how texts function as coherent wholes beyond the sentence level.
- 2) **Text Linguistics:** (linguistique de texte) is a broader field than textual linguistics. It encompasses different orientations and approaches to analyzing texts, but shares the idea of moving beyond sentence-level analysis to focus on the entire text.
- 3) **Discourse Analysis:** is concerned with studying texts in their social and communicative contexts, examining verbal productions within the circumstances of their production. This approach considers texts as discourses, with an emphasis on how meaning is constructed and communicated in specific contexts.
- 4) **Literary Analysis:** focuses on analyzing literary texts, emphasizing the stylistic, thematic, and interpretive dimensions of literary works. It intersects with textual and discourse analysis but is primarily concerned with literary forms and genres. In summary, while **text linguistics** and **textual linguistics** study the internal structure and coherence of texts, **discourse analysis** expands to include the social context of text production, and **literary analysis** deals more with interpretive and stylistic aspects of literary works. **Literary Analysis** is the research into what makes a literary text artistic. It explores the aesthetic, stylistic, thematic, and interpretive dimensions that give a literary work its artistic value.⁶

When it comes to the concept of **text linguistics** in the Arab world, the definitions and approaches are not unified due to the various translations and perspectives held by different scholars. An additional challenge is the variety of terms used in Arabic for text linguistics, including *text grammar*, *science of the text*, and others. This multiplicity of terms reflects the evolving and

interdisciplinary nature of the field, making it difficult to settle on one consistent definition. One of the leading Arab specialists in the field, **Saeed Al-Buhairi**, adopts the term "text linguistics" in his book *Text Linguistics, Concepts and Trends*. He emphasizes that text linguistics is a term used for different views and practical branches across various fields of study.⁷ According to Al-Buhairi, the interdisciplinary exchange of concepts between text linguistics and other sciences such as rhetoric and general linguistics complicates the process of defining its subject. Al-Buhairi also highlights that **text linguistics** draws heavily on the foundational work of linguists such as **Ferdinand de Saussure** and **Noam Chomsky**. Their students, along with other scholars, have contributed significantly to the development of textual analysis. Al-Buhairi suggests that what distinguishes text linguistics from other fields is its restoration of **meaning** as a central element of study. He argues that meaning is the starting and convergence point in text linguistics, and this field seeks to uncover not only surface meanings but also deeper internal structures within texts. These internal structures represent the fundamental framework of the text, which helps in understanding its overall significance⁸. In conclusion, **text linguistics** in the Arab world is seen as an interdisciplinary science that is deeply connected to meaning and structure. It goes beyond surface-level analysis to explore the deeper layers of texts, making it a critical tool for understanding both literary and non-literary texts in various contexts⁹.

Muhammad al-Khattabi, in his book *Text Linguistics: An Introduction to Discourse Coherence*, adopts the term "text linguistics" and explores various Western perspectives. These perspectives range from **descriptive linguistics** to **discourse analysis** and even the viewpoint of **artificial intelligence**. His work offers an extensive overview of both Western and Arab contributions in the field, but he does not provide a clear-cut definition of text linguistics. Instead, he focuses on the concepts of **consistency** and **coherence** of texts, which are central themes in research on discourse analysis, text grammar, and related fields.¹⁰

Similarly, **Bashir Ibrir** touches on the distinction between **text grammar** and **text linguistics** in an article published in 2005. He equates the Arabic term for text grammar (*grammaire de texte*) with **text linguistics** (*linguistique textuelle*), explaining that grammarians have used the former to describe the linguistic structure of texts, especially in contrast to sentence grammar. On the other hand, linguists used **text linguistics** to differentiate from sentence linguistics. According to Ibrir, these two terms are essentially synonymous, as both focus on moving beyond the sentence to examine the entire text. However, Ibrir draws a distinction when it comes to the term **textology**. While **text linguistics** typically concerns itself with specific types of texts, **textology** has a broader scope of analysis. It includes various types of texts—novels, advertisements, journalistic and scientific articles, cinematic films, and other forms of contemporary cultural texts. Textology, therefore, expands the study of texts beyond the limitations of specific genres and explores their role in broader cultural and communicative contexts¹¹.

After presenting the key definitions of textual linguistics, we can conclude that this field is vast and multifaceted. As Saeed Al-Buhairi noted, it is difficult to

provide a precise definition of textual linguistics because its origins and development were not confined to a single country, school, or direction. Instead, it has drawn from three major intellectual currents: **German**, **French**, and **American**. These countries, through the contributions of notable scholars, have shaped the discipline, even though their views on the purpose and subject of textual linguistics differ.

Cognitive Linguistics: Cognitive linguistics is defined as a branch of linguistics that adopts a novel approach to analyzing natural language. It emerged in the late 1970s and early 1980s through the works of scholars like **George Lakoff**, **Ron Langacker**, and **Leonard Talmy**. This field views language not just as a tool for communication but as an instrument for **organizing**, **processing**, and **transmitting information**. The analysis in cognitive linguistics begins from a **conceptual** and **experiential** basis, seeing linguistic elements as reflections of broader conceptual structures influenced by **experience** and **environment**. Unlike traditional views that treat linguistic elements as autonomous, cognitive linguistics connects language, thought, and the world, representing an **experiential approach** in understanding these relationships. It challenges the **Cartesian dualism** of separating mind and body by unifying them in an embodied perspective of language and cognition. In this approach, the body and its interaction with the world play a crucial role in shaping thought and language. This embodiment is functionally realized through **metaphorical structures**, where traditional and novel metaphors allow us to comprehend abstract concepts. These cognitive models help us understand how we perceive and interact with the world, making language a key means by which we organize and convey complex ideas. Even abstract concepts are understood through **metaphor**, which serves as a cognitive tool for grasping and framing new knowledge¹².

Thus, cognitive linguistics emphasizes the **experiential**, **conceptual**, and **embodied** nature of language. Although the term **cognitive linguistics** is closely associated with the movement that emerged in the United States in the 1970s, its roots trace back to much older intellectual traditions. If we consider cognitive linguistics as an approach that views grammatical structures and processes as having **neurobiological** underpinnings, it can encompass theories that analyze linguistic forms based on **meaning** and **general cognitive mechanisms** (universals).

This approach also defines meaning and forms through **mental states**, linking it to historical theories of knowledge found in philosophy, psychology, and sociology. These traditions include the **theories of ideas**, **faculties**, and **pictorial or rhetorical representation**, all of which have explored the relationship between **thought and language**. In fact, the works of **Gustave Guillaume**, **Bernard Pottier**, and **Antoine Culioli** offer significant insights into how cognitive linguistics has evolved, especially when compared to the American version of cognitive linguistics. The distinctive features of the American approach include its **experiential focus**, **opposition to formalism**, and its emphasis on cognitive faculties. At the same time, it has relatively **neglected pronunciation** and other phonological aspects. These characteristics highlight a fundamental divergence between the **American**

cognitive linguistics** movement and earlier European or philosophical traditions¹³

While some may argue that exploring the historical precursors of cognitive linguistics is unnecessary, comparing past and present approaches is a **valuable endeavor**. It allows us to trace how modern cognitive linguistics has built upon, diverged from, or even echoed earlier philosophical and linguistic traditions, thus enriching our understanding of the field. Such comparisons provide important context for the theoretical developments and methodologies used in cognitive linguistics today. Cognitive linguistics stands out as a distinctive field due to its foundational assumptions and commitments, particularly the **generalization commitment** and **cognitive commitment**. These two commitments frame the orientation of cognitive linguistics, particularly within its two main branches: **cognitive semantics** and **cognitive grammar**. Both branches examine the intricate relationship between language, reasoning, and experience, grounded in the thesis of **embodied cognition**. This concept posits that our cognitive structures are fundamentally shaped by the ways our bodies engage with the environment¹⁴

One of the key tenets of cognitive linguistics is the view that language is not separate from our overall cognitive abilities. Consequently, the field explores various topics, including: - **Structural characteristics of natural language**: This includes classifications such as **prototypes**, **systematic polysemy**, **cognitive models**, **mental imagery**, and **metaphor**. - **Functional principles of linguistic organization**: Cognitive linguists examine how language is organized, considering principles such as **iconicity** and **naturalness**. - **The conceptual interface between syntax and semantics**: This involves exploring cognitive and construction rules that govern how we understand the relationship between sentence structure and meaning. - **The experimental and practical contexts of language use**: Cognitive linguistics emphasizes the importance of real-world language applications and the empirical foundations of linguistic theories. - **The relationship between language and thought**: This area investigates how language influences cognitive processes, touching on concepts like **linguistic relativity** and **conceptual assumptions**.

Importantly, cognitive linguistics does not adhere to a single unifying principle that governs all research topics within the field. Instead, it functions as a **flexible framework** rather than a singular theory of language. This flexibility allows cognitive linguistics to encompass a **family of related approaches**, each with its own focus, while sharing common themes and methodologies.

As such, cognitive linguistics serves as an **interdisciplinary discipline**, intersecting with fields such as psychology, philosophy, neuroscience, and semiotics, enriching our understanding of the complex interplay between language and cognition. Cognitive linguistics, while not yet settled in a single unified theory, provides a framework for exploring shared features and common views across its various research forms. This exploration is crucial to understanding the broader implications of cognitive linguistics and how it intersects with text analysis¹⁵.

Text Analysis: Text analysis is fundamentally rooted in the analyst's conceptualization of the "text" itself. When approached from a **descriptive structural perspective**, the text is seen as a sequential arrangement of sentences, representing the highest unity above the individual sentence. In contrast, the **generative view** considers the text a tightly organized sequence of well-formed sentences¹⁶. Critics often refer to such structural analyses as "home-language homework," implying a disconnect from the practical realities of linguistic use. Historically, the evolution of text analysis reflects a shift from a strict focus on phonology and morphology, where the smallest units of language could be isolated and analyzed, to a recognition that grammatical structures present more complex challenges. The relationship between theoretical units (like sentence structures) and actual language use became increasingly complicated, leading to difficulties in defining analytical boundaries and concluding analyses effectively¹⁷.

Historical Context of Text Analysis Initially, text analysis began as a formal exploration of linguistic constraints, tied closely to descriptive and generative linguistics. However, scholars, particularly in the German context, began to approach texts as both theoretical and actual units from semiotic, philosophical, and phenomenological perspectives. This shift allowed textual linguistics to free itself from the formal constraints that previously dominated semantic and pragmatic analyses, enabling a more holistic view of language. Text analysis extends beyond linguistics into realms traditionally occupied by critics, writers, and rhetoricians. The term "text analysis" often evokes a literary critical orientation, focusing on rhetorical and stylistic elements. Rhetoricians and stylists analyze texts to discern literary and poetic qualities, emphasizing strategies of speech such as persuasion and symbolism. In contrast, textual linguistics encompasses a broader range of texts, including technical, sacred, journalistic, and everyday communication.¹⁸(van dijk,2001)

Divergence in Approaches While the analysis of texts in textual linguistics is broader and more inclusive than traditional literary analysis, it does not diminish the value of rhetorical and stylistic critiques. Instead, textual linguistics incorporates insights from these fields to establish criteria for distinguishing texts from non-texts, grounding its analysis in a comprehensive understanding of textuality. The evolution of textual linguistics has led to the emergence of various orientations that analyze texts from different perspectives¹⁹.

Wolfgang Heinemann and Dieter Vieweger categorize these orientations into five major currents:

1. **Structural Orientation:** This approach views texts as systems containing phrases and structures.
2. **Semantic Orientation:** This perspective emphasizes semantic features that contribute to textual coherence and interdependence.
3. **Social Orientation:** This approach considers texts as communicative events, focusing on their social context and interaction.
4. **Cognitive Orientation:** This current regards texts as products of mental processes, linking language use to cognitive functions.

5. **Conversation Analysis:** This trend employs a pragmatic approach, analyzing conversational structures and dynamics²⁰.

The landscape of text analysis is multifaceted, reflecting the diverse methodologies and theoretical underpinnings of various disciplines. As textual linguistics continues to evolve, the interplay between these currents allows for a richer understanding of how texts function within linguistic, social, and cognitive frameworks. The integration of different analytical perspectives enhances the field's ability to address complex issues related to language use, meaning, and communication. The study of text analysis, particularly from a linguistic perspective, is enriched by various theoretical currents that provide distinct yet complementary models for understanding how texts function. While the first three currents—structural, semantic, and social—focus on the operational aspects of texts within specific contexts, the latter two currents—cognitive and conversational—emphasize the mental processes and contextual factors that shape the creation and interpretation of texts. This differentiation allows for a nuanced examination of texts as both linguistic constructs and communicative events, reflecting the complexity of human interaction with language²¹.

The distinction between (textual trends) and (cognitive trends): is essential for understanding the various approaches to text analysis. Textual trends concentrate on the structural properties and semantic relationships within texts, viewing them primarily as linguistic events governed by grammatical, semantic, and pragmatic rules. Cognitive trends, on the other hand, explore how mental processes, psychological phenomena, and anthropological contexts influence the production and interpretation of texts.

Analysis Procedures According to the Textual Orientation Within the textual orientation, the analysis of texts is predicated on the idea that a text is not merely a sequence of sentences but rather a cohesive unit. Although this orientation has roots in sentence-based linguistics, it diverges significantly in its approach. Below are some key models and contributions within this framework²²:

1. **Semantic Textual Description:** Linguists in this area argue that the superficial structure of a text only partially reflects its meaning. To fully understand a text's unity, one must consider semantic rules and linking mechanisms, which serve as facilitators for comprehension. This perspective aligns with the work of several notable scholars:
 - Algirdas Julien Greimas (1966)**: Greimas introduced the concept of **isotopy**, which posits that textual coherence arises from shared semantic attributes among lexical units. In his view, texts consist of networks of isotopes, each representing a series of semantic analogies. These isotopes collectively contribute to the overall coherence of the text. For example, consider how repetition, synonyms, generalized codes, and alternative descriptions contribute to the text's semantic unity²³:
 - Simple Replay: Driver – Driver
 - Synonyms: Driver - Vehicle Commander
 - Generalized Codes: Driver - Traffic Subscriber

- Counter Codes: Driver – Mash
- Alternative Descriptions: Driver - Agricultural Road Champion.
 - Janos S. Petofi (1971)**: Petofi's model integrates ideas from generative semantics, focusing on the roles of semantic components and their interpretation. He emphasizes the need to consider both the competencies of speakers and listeners in the communicative process. Petofi argues for a balance between the ****structure of the world**** (real-world referents) and the ****structure of the text**** (creative expressions). His approach advocates for an analysis that extends beyond internal relationships within the text to encompass external meanings and implications, which can be indicative, metaphorical, or deliberative²⁴.
 - T. Van Dijk (1972, 1977, 1980): Initially drawing from transformational generative grammar, Van Dijk's work evolved toward cognitive orientations. He posited that understanding texts involves recognizing deep and surface structures, highlighting the cognitive processes that govern how individuals comprehend and generate meaning in language.

Synthesis of Textual and Cognitive Approaches The interplay between textual and cognitive analyses illustrates the complexity of language as both a formal system and a dynamic communicative process. While textual approaches provide models for structural and semantic coherence, cognitive approaches offer insights into the mental frameworks that shape our understanding of texts. By comparing these two orientations, we can identify both similarities and differences. Textual trends focus on the linguistic features and structures that underpin text coherence, while cognitive trends emphasize the mental processes, contextual influences, and the ways in which language reflects and shapes human thought²⁵.

In conclusion, the evolving landscape of text analysis, enriched by diverse theoretical frameworks, allows for a more comprehensive understanding of language as a multifaceted phenomenon. The integration of both textual and cognitive approaches contributes to the development of a holistic view of texts that acknowledges their linguistic properties as well as the cognitive and contextual dimensions that influence their interpretation. In examining the theories of text analysis, particularly through the lens of scholars like Teun A. van Dijk and De beaugrand and Dresler, we find a rich exploration of how texts function as coherent units of meaning shaped by both linguistic structures and contextual factors. This analysis highlights how different models of text understanding can offer insights into the intricate relationships between language, cognition, and communication.

Van Dijk's Model of Text Structure Teun A. van Dijk conceptualizes texts as judicial compounds, where the significance lies not in individual propositions but in how they interconnect to form larger semantic units. He posits that understanding a text requires engaging with its ****case model****, which allows for the interpretation of how various issues relate to one another beyond mere adjacency²⁶.

Key Components of Van Dijk's Model:

1. Overlapping Relationships^{**}: Textual coherence is achieved through overlapping relationships among not only adjacent propositions but also broader semantic units. This means that understanding a text involves recognizing connections between various parts, which may not be immediately next to one another.

2. Major Rules for Text Formation^{**}: Van Dijk introduces **major rules** that facilitate the reconstruction of a text's grand structure:

- Deletion Rule: Excludes irrelevant cases that do not contribute to the overall interpretation of the text.
- Generalization Rule: Replaces specific sequences with more generalized perceptions, allowing for a broader understanding of the text's themes.
- Base of Composition: Integrates sequences characterized by shared properties into a cohesive issue that represents a more comprehensive understanding of the text.

3. Contextual Flexibility: Van Dijk acknowledges that these rules can vary based on context, the recipient's cognitive position, and situational factors. This flexibility suggests that a single text can be interpreted in multiple ways depending on the reader's background and situational context.

4. Abstraction of Subject: He argues that the central subject of a text exists at a level of abstraction and may not be explicitly stated. If it is mentioned, it indicates a "subject pronouncement," reflecting a more straightforward presentation of the text's main idea²⁷.

Contributions of De Beaugrand and Dresler:

De Beaugrand and Dresler's work emphasizes the evolution of linguistic analysis from a narrow focus on isolated sentences to a broader understanding of language as it manifests in real communication. They advocate for establishing a science of texts that encompasses various interrelated disciplines, recognizing the complexity of language use in social contexts.

Criteria for Textuality: De beaugrand proposes seven key criteria to define and distinguish texts:

- 1- Cohesion: This involves grammatical elements that create structural bonds within the text, such as repetition, reference, deletion, and linking devices.
- 2- Coherence: This criterion emphasizes the logical and conceptual connections among elements of knowledge, including causality, organization of events, and overall thematic unity. Coherence is often enhanced by the reader's prior knowledge of the world.
- 3- Intentionality: Referring to the author's purpose, intentionality reflects a plan or goal behind the text's creation. It is not always necessary for a text to be highly planned to be coherent or cohesive.

- 4- Acceptability: This addresses the reader's receptiveness to the text, emphasizing the importance of mutual understanding between the author and the audience.
- 5- Situationality: This relates to how well the text connects to the situational context. It can vary significantly depending on whether the text is being communicated directly or is historical, such as literary works.
- 6- Intertextuality: It is pertained to relations that combine a text with other texts that took place within the limits of a previous experience, whether mediated or without mediation.
- 7- Informativity: It is the influential factor for not being certain in judging textual facts, or facts in a textual world as opposed to possible alternatives, where media is high-grade when there are many alternatives, and each media text has at least a small time²⁸.

De Beaugrand details more in the relationship of the seven criteria to the text, where he makes the first and second criteria, namely foundation and harmony, closely related to the text, while the care of attitude and synance are calculated by psychological criteria, while the media criterion is according to discretion, and all of them (the seven criteria) are not understood without thinking about language, reason, society, and procedure, which confirms, according to De beaugrand, the need for synergy and integration of science to research the characteristics of texts²⁹.

Synthesis of Theoretical Insights The integration of these perspectives from Van Dijk, De Beaugrand, and Dresler reveals a complex interplay between structure and meaning in text analysis. Both models emphasize the importance of understanding texts as dynamic entities shaped by cognitive processes and situational contexts rather than static collections of sentences. Van Dijk's focus on overlapping relationships and the major rules for text construction provides a systematic approach to dissecting texts, while De beaugrand and Dresler's criteria highlight the multifaceted nature of textuality and its dependence on both linguistic and extralinguistic factors. Overall, these frameworks underscore that text analysis transcends mere linguistic examination; it involves a comprehensive understanding of how language operates within communicative contexts, shaped by both cognitive processes and social dynamics. As text analysis continues to evolve, it remains essential to consider the diverse influences that contribute to the interpretation and production of meaning within texts.

We are content with these models that start from the text as a raw material to determine its grammatic, semantic, and circular characteristics and the criteria that distinguish it from the text, but with the development of scientific and technological research, the linguistics of the text have adopted other trends in the analysis of texts that take their ideas and procedures from other sciences.

Procedures for analyzing texts according to the cognitive orientation:

The consideration of cognitive (perceptual) linguistics was not limited to texts, but customary ideas included the fields of language at all levels, as this trend generally seeks to obtain more psychological explanation in linguistic issues, which is called the cognitive transformation in linguistics.

The owners of this trend proceed from the premises that every work or activity related to practical things is accompanied by cognitive processes, and highlighting perception more clearly makes the texts appear to be the basis of psychological phenomena and the result of mental processes, where representatives of cognitive psychology confirm that there are many important psychological procedures to produce and understand texts, so the speaker's awareness before starting to make practical things or enter into a communication process is not It is from a vacuum and even before that collecting experiences to accomplish a certain practice by activating these experiences for the success of the linguistic event, which also requires the actual conversion of the internal program into linguistic symbols, especially also when understanding the text³⁰.

From these points of views, those who have a cognitive orientation believe that the task of linguistics is to develop models of studying the procedural text that take into account a large proportion the psychological processes when the text is created and processed to prove the ways in which the event maker organizes communication linguistic practices according to certain foundations that can be summarized from the point of view of procedural contribution as follows:

- The mental organization of knowledge formats: It means that communication partners introduce certain elements of their knowledge in communication processes, such as encyclopedic science, linguistic science, interaction science, knowledge about the holistic text sample, and all of these cognitive forms are important for linguistic research, as cognitive psychology tries to show how these forms build each other, they are stored with certain important information in consciousness, and then the process of identifying concepts is carried out through the identity of attributes and distributing them on specific things, as the concept is not stored in isolated in memory, but there are close or lukewarm relationships between it and other concepts called the semantic network that differ from person to person to another in terms of the amount of inventory And how it is characterized by relative stability. According to Klix/ Kukla/Kuhn (1989), the patterns of relationships between these concepts fall under two basic types: relationships with internal concepts such as the relationship between sugar-sweet, windstorm, high-low and interconcept relationships such as the relationship of the event maker between a climbing monkey, spatial relationship: fish-pond, mechanical relationship: axe-hernia, objective relationship: learn-dent and others. From these hypotheses, other hypotheses have been developed about introducing the contents of consciousness to the network, especially in American cognitive psychology to work on artificial intelligence research and primarily about the subordination of structural units in consciousness³¹.
- The exploration of cognitive actions in the context of text analysis sheds light on how individuals activate their mental frameworks to interpret and understand language. This discussion emphasizes the interaction between cognitive processes and linguistic structures, particularly within the framework of cognitive linguistics.

Cognitive Actions in Text Processing: Cognitive actions refer to the mental operations that individuals engage in when interacting with texts. These actions involve activating different structures of knowledge, which can be categorized into two primary processes as suggested by Teun A. van Dijk:

- **Updating Knowledge Structures:** This process involves refreshing or activating existing knowledge stored in memory. This can be triggered by the text's content, leading to a re-evaluation or adjustment of prior knowledge based on new information. For instance, when a reader encounters new facts or concepts in a text, they may update their mental representations to include these new elements.
- **Memory-Based Updating:** This involves procedures that compare the content of the text with previously stored knowledge. Readers draw connections between the text and their existing understanding, which may involve making inferences, drawing conclusions, or recognizing relationships between different concepts. This can lead to a more nuanced comprehension of the text, as readers integrate new information with what they already know. These processes are interrelated and often overlap, reflecting a dynamic interaction between comprehension and memory retrieval. The cognitive actions engaged in during text processing help to create a coherent understanding of the text and its implications, forming a personalized mental model that goes beyond the text itself³².

Implications of Cognitive Linguistics, particularly as it pertains to customary or cognitive approaches, focuses on the relationship between language and the mind. Scholars in this field aim to address several fundamental questions regarding the neural and cognitive underpinnings of language: - **Neural Network Complexity**: The human brain consists of complex neural networks that are responsible for producing perceptions, including those expressed through language. Researchers explore how specific neural structures correspond to particular types of perceptions, seeking to understand the intricacies of language processing and perception formation. - **Learning and Language**: Cognitive linguists investigate how these neural assemblies learn to represent and articulate various perceptions. This involves examining the mechanisms through which individuals acquire language and how their experiences shape their understanding of abstract concepts³³.

Metaphors and Conceptual Understanding A significant contribution to cognitive linguistics is the work of George Lakoff and Mark Johnson in their book *Metaphors We Live By*. Their research redefines the nature of metaphor, positing that metaphors are not merely linguistic decorations but fundamental to human thought. Key points from their work include: - **Metaphors as Conceptual Tools**: Metaphors facilitate understanding by framing one experience in terms of another. For instance, the concept of time is often metaphorically understood in terms of money, illustrating how abstract ideas are grounded in more concrete experiences. - **Empirical Basis of Metaphors**: The authors argue that metaphors emerge from our interactions with the environment, highlighting the importance of experiential dimensions in shaping our understanding of complex concepts. - **Systemic Correlations**: Cognitive research emphasizes that abstract perceptions often require a tangible foundation. The correlations between different experiences form a system that supports the development of abstract thought.³⁴

Literary and Critical Orientation Cognitive research has also influenced literary criticism, giving rise to new branches such as **cognitive poetics** and

****cognitive stylistics****. These fields explore how cognitive processes inform the interpretation of literary texts, focusing on how readers' mental frameworks shape their understanding and engagement with literature.

Characteristics of Cognitive Poetics and Cognitive Stylistics:

- **Interdisciplinary Approach:** These fields draw from cognitive science, psychology, linguistics, and literary theory, creating a rich, interdisciplinary framework for analyzing texts.
- **Focus on Reader Response:** Emphasis is placed on the reader's cognitive engagement with the text, examining how mental processes influence interpretation and emotional response.
- **Exploration of Cognitive Patterns:** These disciplines investigate recurring cognitive patterns in literature, such as metaphorical reasoning and narrative structures, contributing to our understanding of how texts resonate with readers.

The integration of cognitive actions in text analysis highlights the dynamic interplay between language, thought, and context. By examining how knowledge structures are activated and updated during reading, scholars can gain insights into the cognitive processes that underpin text comprehension. The advancements in cognitive linguistics, particularly regarding metaphor and cognitive poetics, further enrich our understanding of how language shapes human experience, offering valuable perspectives for literary and critical analysis. This evolving field continues to offer fertile ground for research, inviting further exploration into the cognitive dimensions of language and its implications for understanding texts in diverse contexts³⁵.

Al-Azhar Zenad's comparative analysis of cognitive linguistics and customary linguistics provides insight into how these two trends approach the study of language, text, and discourse. Below is a structured comparison based on Zenad's observations:

- 1- **Focus of Study - **Cognitive Linguistics**:** - Cognitive linguistics primarily investigates the mental processes underlying language use. It examines how cognitive mechanisms, such as metaphor, shape understanding. For instance, Lakoff's (1987) work on conceptual metaphor emphasizes metaphor as a cognitive mechanism, yet it remains largely confined to sentence-level analysis without delving into larger texts or discourse. - This trend tends to focus on spontaneous language use across various contexts but does not treat the text or discourse as a separate subject of study. - ****Customary Linguistics**:** - Customary linguistics encompasses a broader range of linguistic phenomena, focusing on grammatical structures at and beyond the sentence level. Langacker's (1987) customary grammar adopts an integrated approach, yet it often lacks an explicit framework for examining texts and discourse, despite indications that its principles could apply to these levels. - This approach is more holistic, integrating various aspects of language use, including dialogue and deliberative interactions, yet still often overlooks a systematic examination of text³⁶.
- 2- **Conceptualization of Meaning - **Cognitive Approach**:** - The theory of mental spaces (Fauconnier, 1985) provides some exploration into how concepts

- interact within discourse. However, cognitive linguistics typically emphasizes lexical units and metaphor formation without adequately addressing how these concepts function in longer texts or narratives. - **Customary Approach**: - Customary linguistics has explored the formation and regularity of concepts, particularly through Talmy's contributions. However, it has often centered its analyses on lexical units rather than examining their role within larger discursive structures³⁷.
- 3- Discourse and Textual Analysis - **Cognitive Perspective**: - Cognitive linguistics lacks a dedicated discourse analysis framework, limiting its exploration of how language functions in texts. The predominant focus remains on cognitive mechanisms rather than on the interaction of language within social contexts. - **Customary Perspective**: - Researchers like T. Van Dijk advocate for a multidisciplinary approach to text science, suggesting that integrating social customs into linguistic analysis can enrich our understanding of texts and discourse. This approach seeks to meld cognitive insights with traditional linguistic analysis, although it remains a developing field³⁸.
- 4- Interdisciplinary Connections - **Cross-Pollination of Ideas**: - The overlap between cognitive linguistics and customary linguistics is notable, especially in critical discourse analysis. Works by scholars like Fairclough illustrate how insights from both trends can inform the study of language in social contexts, yet no comprehensive framework currently exists that unifies these approaches into a coherent study of text. - **Focus on Literary Texts**: - Much of the customary approach has been directed towards literary texts, exploring structural and stylistic elements in poetry and prose (as seen in the works of Peter Stockwell). This focus can limit the application of customary principles to a broader range of texts and discourses³⁹.
- 5- Gaps and Future Directions - **Need for Comprehensive Frameworks**: - Zenad notes a lack of a unified linguistic framework that clearly defines how customary linguistics should address texts and discourse. Most frameworks focus on linguistic events at various levels but do not effectively bridge the gap between cognitive and customary linguistics. - **Potential for Integration**: - The intersection of cognitive and customary linguistics holds promise for developing new analytical models that can address both cognitive processes and linguistic structures. This integration could enhance our understanding of language's multifaceted nature, particularly in diverse communicative contexts⁴⁰.

Conclusion:

This research has explored the evolving landscape of text studies, leading to several key conclusions:

1- Emergence of Text Studies: Texts began to be regarded as independent subjects of study only in the early 1970s, marking a significant shift in linguistic research.

2- Fluidity of the Text Concept: The definition of "text" has not been stable or unified, with various perspectives on the elements that differentiate texts from other forms of discourse.

3- Initial Studies and Critique: Early research approached the text as a sequence of sentences, a view later challenged by textual linguists who established text linguistics. This newer perspective considers texts as cohesive units analyzed through diverse theories.

4- Diverse Orientations in Text Characteristics: Different orientations—semantic, social, cognitive, and ethnographic—have influenced the characteristics that define what constitutes a text.

5- Varied Analytical Approaches: Major trends in text analysis adopted different methodologies based on their foundational influences. The semantic orientation drew from generative grammar, while the social orientation was informed by communication theory and customary linguistics, influenced by embodied philosophy.

6- Procedural Differences: There are fundamental differences in the analytical procedures employed by textual linguistics and cognitive linguistics, reflecting their distinct theoretical frameworks.

7- Interconnectedness of Theories: Theories often overlap, with researchers benefiting from previous ideas, either expanding, critiquing, or clarifying them.

8- Contextual Focus of Textual Linguistics: Textual linguistics emphasizes external contexts in its analysis, drawing from surrounding disciplines without fully integrating them. Conversely, cognitive linguistics engages more broadly across various fields, giving rise to subfields like customary phonetics and customary poetics.

9- Development of Theories: Customary linguistics has yet to establish concrete theories for text and discourse analysis; existing ideas are largely proposals from specialists in the field.

10- Cognitive Linguistics Influence: Customary linguistics often adopts cognitive linguistics' insights for text interpretation and analysis, contrasting with textual linguistics, which does not integrate these suggestions.

11- Cognitive Ideas in Text Linguistics: Many researchers in text linguistics have embraced cognitive concepts, especially in artificial intelligence, which heavily relies on cognitive linguistics outcomes.

12- Lack of Clarity in the Arab Context: There is a lack of clear understanding of both textual and cognitive linguistics in the Arab academic arena, coupled with terminological confusion that obscures the subtle differences among the relevant sciences.

13- Overlap with Literary Studies: A thin line exists between literary studies—focused on literary text analysis—and textual linguistics, which approaches texts from a broader perspective. Despite their intersection in many concepts, their foundational premises differ.

14- Terminological Exploration: This research did not delve into the terminological distinctions between text and discourse or the specific domains of each field. This remains a complex area deserving further investigation.

Referrals and Margins:

¹De Beaugrand, *Text, Discourse and Procedure*, trans. Tamam Hassan, Alam Al-Kutub, Egypt, 1st ed./1998, p. 67

-
- ² See: Ibid, pp. 71-72
- ³ Teun van Dijk, *Textual Science: An Interdisciplinary Approach*, trans. Saeed Al-Buhairi, Cairo Book House, Egypt, 1st ed./2001, p. 14
- ⁴ The Ibid, pp. 26-27.
- ⁵ Halina Grzmil-Tylutki, *Initiation à la linguistique textuelle*, Université Jagellonne, Cracovia, p. 16
- ⁶ Nasreen Bouamrani, Ahmed Belhout, *The Textual Linguistic Term Among Moroccans Between Status and Use*, *Al-Hiwar Al-Fikri Magazine*, 13/15, Algeria, 2018, p. 402
- ⁷ Ibid, p. 403
- ⁸ Saeed Al-Bahri, *Text Linguistics, Concepts and Trends*, Lebanon Publishers Library, Beirut, Lebanon, 1st ed./1997, p. 15
- ⁹ Ibid, p. 58
- ¹⁰ Muhammad Khattabi, *Text Linguistics: An Introduction to Discourse Coherence*, Arab Cultural Center, 1st ed./1991, p. 5
- ¹¹ Bashir Ibrir, *From Sentence Linguistics to Text Linguistics*, *Al-Tawasul Magazine*, Annaba University, No. 14/2005, p. 94
- ¹² Peter Stockwell, *Toward a critical cognitive linguistics*. In: Combrink A, Biermann I (eds) *Discourses of War and Conflict*. Potchefsroom University Press, 2000, p 510 .
- ¹³ Jean-Michel Fortis, *the cognitive linguist: history and epistemology*, Introduction. In: *History and history*, topic 34, page 1, 2012. *The cognitive language: history and history*. pp. 5-6.
- ¹⁴ Fian Evans, Melanie Green, *The Nature of Cognitive Linguistics*, trans. Abdo Al-Azizi, *Fusul Magazine*, Egyptian General Book Authority, Volume (25/4), Issue 100/2017, p. 38.
- ¹⁵ Dirk Geeraerts, Hubert Cuyckens, *introducing cognitive linguistics*, chapter 1, p4 https://www.researchgate.net/publication/286721291_Introducing_Cognitive_Linguistics.
- ¹⁶ De Beaugrand, *Text Linguistics: Towards New Horizons?*, trans. Hassan Al-Bahiri, Zahraa Al-Sharq Library, Cairo, 1st ed./2007, p. 16.
- ¹⁷ Ibid., p. 16.
- ¹⁸ Ibid., pp. 18-21.
- ¹⁹ Teun van Dijk, *Text Linguistics: An Interdisciplinary Approach*, pp. 18-19.
- ²⁰ Wolfgang Heine and Dieter Vieweger, *Introduction to Linguistics Textual*, p. 55.
- ²¹ Ibid., p. 37.
- ²² See: Ibid., pp. 39-40.
- ²³ See: Ibid., pp. 39-40.
- ²⁴ Hassan Al-Buhairi, *Text Linguistics, Concepts and Trends*, p. 256.
- ²⁵ Wolfgang Heine and Dieter Vieweger, *Introduction to Text Linguistics*, p. 45.
- ²⁶ Ibid., p. 48.
- ²⁷ Klaus Brinker, *Linguistic Analysis of the Text*, translated by: Saeed Hassan Al-Buhairi, Al-Mukhtar Foundation for Publishing and Distribution, Egypt, 1st ed./2005, pp. 68-69.
- ²⁸ See: De Beaugrand, *Text, Discourse and Procedure*, pp. 70-71
- ²⁹ Ibid., from pp. 103 to 105.
- ³⁰ Wolfgang Heine and Dieter Vieweger, *Introduction to Linguistics Text*, p. 80.
- ³¹ Ibid., p. 84.
- ³² See: Ibid., p. 90.

³³George Lakoff, Mark Johnson, *Philosophy in the Flesh - The Embodied Mind and Its Challenge to Western Thought* -, trans. Abdul Majeed Jahfa, United New Book House, 1st ed./2016, p. 739.

³⁴*Ibid.*, p. 11.

³⁵*Ibid.*, p. 12.

³⁶See: Al-Azhar Al-Zanad, *Text and Discourse: Cognitive Linguistic Studies*, Niebuhr House, Iraq, 2nd ed./2014, p. 5.

³⁷ See: *Ibid.* p. 5.

³⁸See: *Ibid.* p. 5.

³⁹ See: *Ibid.* p. 6.

⁴⁰See: *Ibid.* p. 6.