

Text to Textuality: A Conceptual Evolution of Theory of the Text In Modern Linguistics

Dr. Sukhmanpreet Kaur

Assistant Professor, Faculty of humanities and languages, Guru Kashi University, Talwandi Sabo

Abstract

Textuality signifies the traits of a text that render it a cohesive entity. Contemporary linguistics reconceptualizes language not merely as a communicative instrument but also as a semiotic system. Saussure in Europe and Chomsky in America introduced modern ideas about language. These ideas have changed the way we think about language from sounds, words, sentences, and meanings to discourse and text. The idea of textuality as a broader form of language has also become a theory. Textuality is now acknowledged as a distinct discipline. The conceptual evolution of textuality has been examined in relation to various branches of linguistics, including semantics, text linguistics, and French linguistics. This paper will delineate the historical evolution of textuality within diverse branches of contemporary linguistics.

Keywords: French linguistics, modern linguistics, structuralism, semantics, textuality, text linguistics, etc.

Introduction

The reason for man's superiority in the entire animal world is his biologically naturally developed intellectual capacity. It is through this ability that he is able to create various creations. Among these creations, the most important and original creation is human language. According to Epstein, "The human linguistic capacity is what enables humans to develop linguistic knowledge. This linguistic knowledge is formed by a limited system and unlimited creative capacity" (50). The use and mastery of this linguistic knowledge determines the continuous development of language as a means of social communication. Thus, language plays a role as a fundamental tool in creating human communication. It is this basic system that connects the human being with the rest of the various social arrangements. As a result, the whole fabric of human life reality is built. Human language, being the foundation of knowledge and creative capacity, also plays the role of a bridge between the social and mental existence of man. It is for this reason that Kristeva considers language to be an alien layer between diverse systems. "which exists between these arrangements and is not separate from them. It is a place where inner energies are expressed through language, sexuality plays with ideas, and where bodies and cultures meet" (Macfee, 1).

To understand human life in its true sense, it is very important to understand the various creative arrangements created by human cognitive capacity. Language plays a fundamental role in understanding this overall creative structure of human life. Textual theory is created in the modern period to understand the entire arrangement of human life as a creative organization. Yuri Lotman writes about this in his essay "The Concept of Text", "Text is an internal arrangement that extends from a rigid level to a structural whole" (52). A text is thus a cohesive unit that communicates any form of communication. It is a communicative unit rather than a linguistic, literary, social, cultural, anthropological unit, regardless of whether its formal form is related to any of these diverse aspects. In this way, the unity and integrity of

the text retains a separate autonomous existence while encompassing all aspects of the human creative system. Text plays a role as a communication medium in the creation process and functioning of human creative organization. Therefore, the text forms a basic unit for understanding the communication system and communication process of this creative arrangement. In this regard, Sujan Urin, citing Burgade, says, "Reading is a communicative activity in which linguistic, cognitive and social activities develop. It is not just a string of words in spoken or written form. Burgade interprets text as a set of linguistic, cognitive and social processes. Therefore, the text can be considered as a model for understanding the world. In fact, text primarily exists as a linguistic communication unit. Therefore, it is made a subject of thought in the form of Structure, Composition and Discourse on the basis of its arrangement, process and functionality. Within linguistics structural linguistics studies the structure of text, semantics its composition and textual linguistics its discourse. In this research, an attempt has been made to understand the linguistic form of the text based on its nature.

The English word Text's origin lies in the Latin word *textus* (101, Borrer). Based on the derivation of this word, its meaning is cloth, spider web, knitting, etc. in many forms. Vitaclona believes that "In the early sixties, writers named Ivanov, Toprov, and Yelynik in the United Raster made an early attempt to discuss the text item on a technical level, and in 1962, another scholar, Pjatogroskij, made practical use of the text"(2). An attempt to interpret the text primarily from a linguistic point of view was made by Hemzlev and Harris. Treated these texts as a linguistic unit but did not discuss its theory in particular. Yet their ideas about the text and discourse matter play a primary role. After this, many linguists like Hartman, Weinrich and Biervsich etc. made the text as a language unit the basis of discussion.

A basic theoretical discussion of textual content begins with *Cohesion in English* (1976). In this, of course, textual thinking is defined in the sense of discourse, but it is only through this that the concept is properly established as a meaning unit rather than a language unit. Halliday defines the text and writes, "The text is a unit which is a unit, but not of form but of meaning. This unit is related to the sentence or phrase, but in terms of meaning and not in terms of form. It is the codification of one symbolic arrangement into another symbolic arrangement. A text is not constituted by sentences but is coded or expressed with the help of sentences" (2). The interesting point here is that Halleday does use text but in the sense of discourse. In fact, both the terms text and speech were so confused in the early days that linguists continued to use them interchangeably. Later, Roman Jacobsen, Nicole Trabjkay, and Louis Ylemslev of the Parag School of Linguistics took the linguistic approach to the field of literature, thereby moving textual theory away from linguistic texts. The myth expanded to the text. After Lewis Strauss joined the field, the model evolved into variety of fields, leading to the field of anthropology" (Does, 22).

Textual theory, however, has been defined in many ways within different disciplines. But in giving it a self-governing existence, the French thinker Rolla Barth has made an important contribution. Through his essays 'Death of the Author' and 'Work to Tax', he liberates textual theory from the confinement of labor, doer and regions and gives textual theory the existence of only 'text'. Rolla Barat weaves the meaning of the textual concept (weave of signifiers), as a tissue and a woven cloth" (10). It is basically a view that provides a model for scientifically analyzing the universe as a structural whole. Thus, Barat sees the text as a communication unit instead of defining it in different terms as literary text, linguistic text, cultural text, social text etc. and establishes the text item as an autonomous unit.

This problem has been facing the textual theory since the beginning that this unit as a structure should be considered complete as a whole of internal elements or else it should be studied keeping in mind its relations with external phenomena. He had to face this problem in the field of linguistics and literature.

Later, post-structuralism tried to resolve the battle between this form of structure and function. This thinking liberates labor from its intersubjective bonds and gives it an interrelated and dialogic form by relating it to objectivity. In this regard, a famous concept of Yak Derrida in the essay 'In Essay on Rousseau', "There is nothing outside-text is very important" (158, Derrida). It is worth mentioning that due to the error in the translation of this statement in the French to English translation by Gayatri Spivak, it is taken to mean nothing is outside the text, which is not correct. In fact, 'external texts are nothing' does not mean that there is nothing outside the text but it means that its objectivity is also present within it. In this way, the existence of textual theory is not only in the written form but it expands its scope by spreading beyond the linguistic existence and assuming a discourse form. Any sign-structure becomes a text only when it creates possibilities for the emergence of other sign-structures. A text is not a concrete entity but a living, active and productive entity which can take the form of both linguistic and non-linguistic forms but its identity is its discourse world. This is why Julia Kristeva considers text to be a "trans-linguistic device"(36). Text is a tool that can go beyond the surface of language. It is also worth noting here that the concept of text had to undergo various readings within the fields of linguistics and literature to become a post-structuralist translinguistic tool. Therefore, to understand its present nature, it is very important to understand its historical background in the linguistics.

Method

From the current point of view of text theory, if its previous development sequence is to be determined, it can be said that it begins with the concept of linguistic text within linguistics. Its multifaceted and multifaceted nature is due to the fact that it has been transformed over time under various disciplines. But since the origin of this concept is mainly related to linguistics, the discussion about its development can be started from here. This theory is primarily associated with the theory of 'structure' and its qualitative characteristic of totality and unity is to give textual theory a structuralist vision. Thus the theory of structure develops from language to literature and then from literature to other disciplines. In the same way, the text theory, taking existence from the theoretical framework of structural linguistics, taking an autonomous existence through textuality ahead of text linguistics, takes a multi-layered and multi-directional form by going to different disciplines.

While talking about the development of textual theory, Vitacolna has broadly identified three stages in it: textual linguistics, textual theory and symbolic textology. It is on these grounds that he gives shape to areas of textual theory, from textual linguistics to advanced multimedia semiotic textology. German linguist Mild Goncalves also talks about the three levels of textual analysis, textual grammar and textual theory within textual linguistics in his "Article Tuad's Theory of Tax" (16). Text theory has further developed into the current text world theory (world tax theory). In order to draw a historical outline of textual theory, it is very important to first understand its foundational relationship with linguistics. A long tradition of linguistic studies in the form of linguistics, historical linguistics, comparative linguistics etc. is obtained before arriving at the textual theory underlying linguistics. These are approaches that focus on the functional aspect of language. If we look at the history of linguistics, the basic trend has been limited to the level of historical interpretation of language. Later, when modern linguistics begins with the principles of Saussure, then this discussion comes out as structural linguistics focusing on linguistic structure as form. Structural linguistics seems to focus purely on the structure of language and historical linguistics focuses its attention

Focuses on the functional aspect of language. In this way, the structure of language is important for one and its social use for the other. "This duel of form and function comes forward in the form of text and context, text and discourse, syntax and practical linguistics (Pragmatics) etc. This relationship between form and meaning forms the basis for the creation of poststructuralist textual theory" (Williams, 33). While on the one hand the structuralist model established by Saussure was developed by linguistics, on the other hand American historical linguists began to create a dialogue with Saussure's theories as a response. As a result of this dialogue, the discussion of the form and function of 'linguistic text' within linguistics begins. "Related linguists attempted to establish a different structuralism vis-à-vis Saussure's structuralism, which refused to recognize the linguistic sign presented by Saussure as a two-dimensional mental entity. According to this, human physical reality is naturally divided into two parts. Linguistic existence is only a form of that natural model which is divided only externally into pairs. External reality is not created by linguistic signs, linguistic signs take existence from physical reality." (Burgade, 18) Such linguists tried to create psychological structuralism which sees reality not as a structure but as a system of systems. Bloomfield's Systematic Grammar is the product of such studies. Thus textual theory has changed during different regions and phases. Sometimes the internal structure of its text has been studied and sometimes its external structure has been given importance. Linguists see the text as a larger unit of language than the sentence, which later forms the basis of text linguistics.

The conceptual framework of textual theory exists in traditions related to Saussurean 'structural linguistics' and Bloomfieldian 'psychological structural linguistics'. One of these traditions underlies the text's structural structure while the other focuses on its creative structure. In the words of Gonçalves "Saussure's division of language into two forms which he represents as *Lange* and *Parole*, in a way prefigures the two developed fields. In which *lang* is related to system and *parole* is related to individual pronunciation. These distinctions further develop linguists' attention to theories of text and discourse" (15). In fact, both 'text' and 'discourse' are closely related terms. Therefore one cannot be understood without the other. This is the reason why linguists at the basic level have been using the terms text and discourse interchangeably. While these two theories are inter-related, they have their own unique existence. In fact, the text is related to the codified form of the language, which is created by the speaker to fulfill the communication and the discourse is the linguistic abstract form that the listener absorbs and adds to his linguistic knowledge. Thus language has one concrete form and the other abstract. It is impossible to understand the meaning of one without the other. Saussurean linguists make embodied form the basis of language communication and Bloomfieldians attempt to judge the meaning of a linguistic text on the basis of external linguistic features. Based on these two types of visions, two types of studies come out. One language-text deals with meaning structure and the other deals with pragmatics i.e. composition.

Textual theory has been divided into two major areas within linguistics. One of them is related to the grammatical structure of the text and the other is related to the social structure. Thus, "Saussure's deconstruction of structure influenced European linguistics on the one hand, and American linguists on the other hand fostered another tradition, indirectly contradicting his principles" (Does, 53). One side provides a model of surface structure while talking about scientific structure and the other emphasizes deep structure based on logic. One has a modern linguistic perspective and the other a philosophical linguistic perspective. But both these views are of equal importance in textual theory. In Europe, Saussure's theories influenced the leading schools associated with modern linguistics, the Geneva School of Albert Saeche, the Prague Linguistic Circle, the School of Andene Martine, etc. As a result of which structural linguistics and functional linguistics developed from these schools.

When literary works became the subject of study under the Parag School and the School of Andene Martine, linguists such as Yemslev under the School of Sache began the discussion of text and discourse. European linguists talk about the nature of language considering the text as a grammatical unit. Therefore, they try to model textual communication by considering the text as the largest unit of grammar rather than the sentence. They believe that just as the sentence has its own grammar, the text also has its own grammar. They see speech as infinite linguistic structures, rather than sequences of sounds, words, sentences. For example, Harris's statement about this is quite popular that "Language does not appear in absolute words or sentences; it can be a relational discourse ranging from a spoken word to a ten-part composition or from a monologue to a United States debate" (Harris, 28). It is noteworthy here that Harris text and lecture no takes it in the same sense and Yamslev also defines the text as a structure and the text as a process looking at the text on the basis of the form and function of the language. According to him, linguistic text is a constitution that is committed and a process that is active. It is this process that creates diverse linguistic texts. Thus, Yemslev and Harris's primary contribution to the theory of text is a major one. Although he did not define the form and meaning of the text, he was the first to use this term in the sense of linguistic text. Luisano Vitacolna believes that "Yamslev and Harris's concepts of text and discourse deserve attention because it is from the interpretation and critique of their definitions that the first works on textual linguistics began. Textuality basically originates within textual linguistics. Therefore, it is very important to know and understand the nature of textual theory underlying the textual linguistic theory" (2).

Thus, while one aspect of textual theory is related to European linguistics, the other aspect is also associated with American linguistics. Where Saussure considers language to be derived from the combination of meaning and concept. There Bloomfield bases psychological realism. According to him, the structure of the human brain is structural in nature, which perceives the phenomena in the form of binary pairs and all systems are built in binary pairs. Language is also one of those systems. Where Saussurean places the utterance at the center, they give importance to the speaker. They do not consider structure as an extended entity of language but see it as a separate form. It therefore "does not confuse text with semantics, but perceives it as an autonomous entity. Frege Bose, Edward Sapier, Leonard Bloomfield, Charles Fires, Yeling, Harris etc. are important linguists associated with American structuralism" (Sachmid,12). If we talk only about the linguistic text, then on one hand there is the Saussurean view which sees existence in concrete form in the form of symbolic arrangement of absolute structure and ignores the subtle existence of psychological reality while embracing only the apparent macroscopic nature of reality and on the other hand American structuralism gives importance to purely psychological existence by separating concrete reality. They see semantics as separate from text. In this way, both have a boundary due to which the story of searching for reality gets confused instead of resolved.

These two contrasting views develop two important areas of linguistics. Which eventually gave birth to European textual linguistics and American pragmatics. The basic issue between these two is language and foreign language. While text linguistics is based on the linguistic structure of the text, pragmatics is based on the cross-linguistic structure of the text. Drawing on insights from these two fields, Roman Jakobson and Trabjckay, thinkers associated with the Prague School of Linguistics, developed the scope of the linguistic text to include the literary text. But their basis was language itself. They considered poetic language as another layer of language itself. Therefore, their real purpose was to find a theoretical nomenclature of poetic language. Through which literary science can be created. In a way, these disciplines come into existence only through the use of semantic communication. Communication is related to the

internal existence of a structure on the one hand and its external behavior on the other. The issue that linguists try to deal with in the form of linguistic texts and literary scholars in the form of literary texts.

The textual theory underlying textual linguistics has been considered in three forms:

1. Text as a grammatical unit
2. Text as a semantic unit
3. Text as a textual unit

In fact, Goncalves, with reference to Ingender Koch, has talked about the three levels of the development of text theory (transference analysis, text grammar and text theory",16). Under them the text is seen as a grammatical unit, a semantic unit and a textual unit. Linguistic units have been the focus of linguistics at various times. The nature and function of 'sounds' within comparative linguistics; In the field of linguistics and descriptive linguistics, 'words' were placed at the center and the 'sentence' unit came to occupy a central place in modern linguistics. Saussure sees the sentence as parole and Noam Chomsky makes the 'sentence' the basis of cognitive transformational grammar. In the line of development of these traditions comes the advent of 'text theory' as an extended grammatical unit. The main reason for this is that linguists needed to broaden the scope of their content. Since the existence of communication was beyond the structure of the sentence, the need for another unit to deal with it was inevitable. Because of this, the text item began to be used for the first time as a larger linguistic unit beyond the sentence.

Thus, linguists initially saw the text as purely a grammatical unit like sound, word, phrase, sentence etc. He believed that there is a need to go beyond the sentence to encapsulate linguistic phenomena. In the words of Goncalves, "Linguists such as Harvarg and Isenberg, who did early studies on this subject, considered text as an evolved form of speech and saw speech as purely quantitative, not qualitative. That is, they only made the basis of the concrete structure of the sentence and neglected the external features. Text here The form was limited to the form of paragraphs, essays, books etc." (16). It was for this reason that the issues of semantic communication related to the text remained confused and the non-linguistic elements included in the language remained neglected which governed the linguistic communication.

When the field of semantics was included in the field of language studies, the theory of text got a new form. The text came to be seen as a semantic unit rather than a purely grammatical unit. So far, the questions that sentence grammar could not solve, they were handed over to text grammar. Halliday first establishes the text as a unit of meaning rather than as a unit of language. According to him, "a text is not a grammatical unit but a unit of language use. It cannot be defined on the basis of its size. Text is sometimes conceptualized as a 'supersentence', saying that a text is a grammatical unit that is related to a sentence in the same way that a sentence is related to a phrase and a phrase is related to other grammatical units. 'Text is a larger unit than sentence' is a misleading assumption. In fact, a text is not only bigger than a sentence but a separate entity. The totality of the text is different from the totality of the sentence" (11).

In this way, in the context of the text, the issue does not remain of quantitative meaning concrete structure but becomes of qualitative. This means that it is important to understand not only the structure of the sentence but also its factuality as well as its substance. Linguists related to this view like Weinrich, Wendige and Pitofe etc. started studies related to textual grammar. Whereas the traditional view analyzes from 'sentence' to 'text'. There textual grammar considers 'text' as the primary linguistic form and analyzes it. The first vision was from the micro to the macro level. Whereas text grammar penetrates the deeper plane of structure by looking for the macroscopic units. Sentence grammar is concerned with structure and text grammar is concerned with composition. But the issue of communication calls for a textual entity

beyond these two that can encompass this vested existence. Sujan Urin believes that, “All possible relationships of possible symbols in a text are determined by the textual grammar. Code-language provides textual cues and allows for the production of received message text” (20).

When the concept of 'text' is included in the field of semantic studies, its boundaries extend beyond language to language. The relation of speech is beyond the linguistic function is also social. One is its structure and the other is its use. 'Text grammar' succeeds in the subtle study of the text but fails to cover the contexts outside the structure of the text. The text is also related to a sumdaya and it also to various sub-sections like society, politics, economics, psychology etc. before the sumdaya. When the text moves out of the internal structure, it becomes a problem to deal with all these arrangements before it, and textuality solves this problem. Therefore, the text is not a grammatical or semantic unit but a part of the textual arrangement as a textual unit. In fact, this textual arrangement creates the text and the text itself plays the role of the basic unit for understanding the textual arrangement. In this way, textual study calls for an interdisciplinary perspective, and out of this demand, the textual linguistics perspective comes into existence. Text theory or text linguistics aims to understand the production, function and ability of text. It not only studies the internal part of the text but also the external factors which play an important role in its construction and interpretation.

The linking of text to context was first done by Weinrich in Tax Grammar of the German Language. He of course based text-grammar but also included contextual elements in its study. In addition to Weinrich, Schmid also conducted such studies and named it textual theory, but his particular emphasis remained on social context. After this Gulich (gulich) added to it such studies that came out in the form of procedures for reconstructing the text. Thus Wenreich, Sachmid and Glitch etc. did basic works on textuality. But the most important work in this regard is considered to be that of Burgade and Dressler. He made an early attempt to conceptualize textuality by specifying seven levels of textuality. These seven levels play an important role in the creation and interpretation of text. Two of them Cohesion and Coherence are related to language and five standards Informatively, Situationality, Intertextuality and Acceptability are related to the cross-linguistic field. Following Burgade and Dressler's theories of textuality, Wenrich also moves from the field of textual grammar to the field of textuality and presents theories such as micro-structure and macro-structure. The biggest change in the nature of the theory of text within linguistics comes from Eginu Cresseau's work Textlinguistik (textlinguistik, 1980). He sees linguistics as a central discipline and considers it the basis of cultural science. At the same time, he sees textual linguistics as an autonomous field rather than a branch of linguistic studies. He believes that text is of course not separate from linguistics but a level next to linguistics. So they see text linguistics as a separate discipline rather than as a sub-discipline of linguistics Sees as discipline.

In this context, Goncalves writes with reference to Cresseau, “Language is a universal human activity that is realized in individual form and contains historical conventions. This definition of Cresseau identified three areas within linguistics: first the linguistics of plain speech, second the linguistics of languages and third the linguistics of text. The first of these is related to individual utterances and the second is related to historical development and the third is related to both. It includes both individual words and their historical context” (18). Thus, according to Cresseau, the text is a macro-sign that arises from the dual symbolic relation of both naming and meaning to a larger and more unified object unit. This vision underlying textual linguistics not only took text out of the scope of linguistics but also adopted a vision beyond structuralism.

French linguists have made a special contribution to the theoretical study of text and to the development of text linguistics. Among them, the names of Jean-Michel Adam, Jean-Paul Broncotti and Francisco Restor are worth mentioning. Underlying Text Linguistics According to John Paul Adams, the main purpose of text linguistics is to theorize the sequence of utterances in a coherent unit of text and to interpret and analyze them in discourse. He also defines the boundaries between textual linguistics and discourse analysis as two distinct fields interrelated with each other. His most important contribution is to establish the interrelatedness of text and discourse, even when they are viewed separately. Its predecessor approaches have treated text and discourse either as synonymous or as completely different. While Adam takes an exclusive approach from them. In Coutinho's words he "rejects the pre-contextualist and separate view of text and discourse. In *Elements de linguistique textuelle* (1990), Allamatus writes that the most important theoretical change comes from the rejection of irrelevance and the dissociation of text and discourse. They are no longer two separate disciplines, but interconnected and hierarchical fields. They cannot be separated nor can they be understood as goods of each other. But they can be seen in relation to each other. According to Adam, text strikes a balance between repetition and production" (119). It also constructs social organization and constructs textual organization by connecting with various textual phenomena (micro, meso and macro etc.) and contextual aspects. Thus the interplay of text and discourse plays a dual role as social and textual.

After Michel Adam, Jean Paul Broncotti is the next distinguished name in textual theory. He theorized socio-contextual interactions, attempting to expand the field of text. The aim of this theory was to understand human phenomena with the help of language, psychology, sociology and philosophy. The specialty of Broncotti's theory was that it made language the focal point for understanding human phenomena. According to this, language plays a primary role in the mental development of man and the development of sociological aspects. In fact, it forms the basis of creating a relationship with the rest of the human environment. He believes that language comprehension is achieved through actual verbal production, which has many aspects because this verbal production depends on a communication system. Broncotti calls these literal productions texts which are experimental creations of language. Broncotti in 1997 began to see the textual text as an established literal production that is constructed through the use of language. It can be anything spoken or written. By established here is meant the context in which a text originates. "Socio-territorial temporal scales are interrelated with the text that affect the text. Broncotti writes, defining the text, the text is a unit of literal production that conveys a linguistically organized message that produces an impression of totality on the listener. Language arises in a particular social organization. Sentences are connected to each other according to various constraints that in a way also represent the rules that establish the various contextual objects in a textual organization" (Goncalves, 20). Thus a cross-linguistic component emerges which is social and psychological. When we include these two parts in a language unit, it does not remain a language unit but becomes a communication unit. But still it acts as a medium of communication for a speaker to create an overall act of establishing relationships that help in building sociality. Broncotti not only discussed the nature of the text but also provided a model for its study. He sees the text as a construction whose three layers can be understood through the interplay of its overall infrastructure, textualization techniques, and phonological responsiveness. Francisco Restor also has a special contribution regarding textual theory. In his book *Art as a Science of Taxation* (2002) he presents the notion that even if the various types of text linguistics are multiplied, they are nothing if they remain at the sentence level. Because they follow grammar linearly. The text forms a unified theoretical framework for solving this problem should be seen in It should be viewed as a larger length of internal

experimental units rather than as a subsection of a unit such as a sentence. Quoting Raster, Goncalves defines the text and writes:

“Text is not simply a sequence of letters, nor is it a sequence of signs, nor is it a sequence of mental faculties. Rather, it is an authentic experimental language sequence that emerges from specific social practice and is definitively associated with a particular medium. Three characteristics of text are presented in the above definition. First it is an authentic existence, secondly it arises out of a society or social order and thirdly it has a special medium. Based on this, it can be in spoken, written or digital form. It broadened its scope of study from the field of textual linguistics by defining the theory of text as an experimental object, a knowledge object rather than a linguistic object” (20).

From the above discussion, it is clear that textual linguists have done most of the work related to 'text' and 'text theory' within linguistics. He contributed to its theory construction by defining the text from various aspects and presented the text mainly in the form of gross symbol, high-level composite unit, established verbal production, communicative unit, experimental unit, authentic experimental language sequence etc. As such, they prove to be useful perspectives for understanding the form and nature of the text. Some linguists found the limits of textual studies within textual linguistics and included literary studies in its field. Bernadé and Dressler considered the fields of poetics, stylistics, linguistics etc. to be very important within textual linguistics. According to Bernadé, these disciplines have a direct influence on textual linguistics, while Dressler considers rhetoric, stylistics, and structural narrative analysis to be the predecessors of textual linguistics. In fact, Bernadé and Dressler develop textual linguistics into textuality and incorporate diverse fields into it. By this, textual theory relates to literature studies after language and has a theoretical development of its own. Considering textual thinking within linguistics, its roots can be traced in structural and historical linguistics, which can be called the dialogue between the two aspects of text, structure and composition. They publish the text item as a language unit and meaning unit from the perspective of grammar and text grammar. When textual thinking crosses these boundaries, it enters the realm of discourse and takes the form of a textual unit as a structural unit extending to multiple genres. As a textual unit, it remains confined to the field of linguistics and enters the field of 'textual science' at the next stage by the French linguists ahead of textual linguistics. Now textual thinking is not limited to the field of linguistics but it takes an interdisciplinary form from literature, anthropology. Therefore, taking it as a model, a text world theory comes into existence to understand the mental existence of the world existing in human intelligence, which is mentioned by Prof. Johanna Gavins does in her book *Text World Theory: An Introduction* (2007). Thus it can be said that linguistics is only one basis of textual thinking while its field is as vast as the world.

References

1. Barthes, Roland. "Textual analysis of Poe's Valdemar". *Uniting the text: A post-structuralist reader*. Ed. Robert Young. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1981. print.
2. *Elements of Semiology*, trans. Annette Lauers and Collin Smith. Will and Wang, 1985.
3. *S/Z*. Trans. Richard Miller. Blackwell, 1974.
4. *Image Music and Text*, trans. Stephen heath. Fontana Press, 1977.
5. *The Pleasure of the Text*. Trans. Richard Miller and Richard Howard. Hill and Wang, 1998.
6. Beaugrande, Robert de. "Text Linguistics and New Applications". *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*. Cambridge University Press.1991

7. Borror, Donald J." text". "Dictionary of word roots and combining forms". Mayfield publishing company, 1960, pp. 101. print
8. Coutinho, Antonia. "The place of semantics and pragmatics in a Linguistics Approach to texts". Catalan Journal of Linguistics.115-128.
9. Dosse, Francois. The rising sign. History of Structuralism. trans. Edborah Glassman. University of Minnesota Press. 1997.
10. Genette, Gerard. Figures of Literary Discourse, Alan Sheridan (trans). Columbia University Press.1982
11. The architext: an introduction. University of California Press, 1992.
12. Goncalves, Mailde. "Towards the theory of Text". Grammar and Text: Selected papers from the 10th & 11th forums of Linguistics Sharing. (Ed. Maria Antonia and contributors). UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing. 2018.
13. Halliday, M.A.K & Ruqaiya Hasan. "Introduction". Cohesion in English. Longman. 1976.
14. Hanks, W.H. "Text and Textuality." Annual Review of Anthropology.18.(1989): 95-127. Print
15. Eagleton, Terry. literary theory an introduction. Malden: Blackwell publishing, 2005. print.
16. Elmo Raj, P.prayer, Text/Texts: Interrogating, Julia Kristeva's concept of Intertextuality, ResearchGate, Vol.3, January 2015)
17. Epstein, S.D, "Is the Faculty of Language a perfect solution to interface systems?".The Cambridge Companion to Chomsky. Ed. James McGilvery. Cambridge University Press.2017.
18. Jakobson, Roman."Closing statement : Linguistics and Poetics". Ed. Thomas. A . Style in Language. London: John Wiley and Sons Ltd.,1958. 350. Print
19. Jurij. Lotman.The structure of Artistic text.trans by Ronald Vroon. ANN ARBOR.1977.
20. Kristeva, Jullia. "The bounded text"". Desire in Language. Ed. Loen S. Roudiez. New York: Columbia University Press,1977. Print
21. Kristeva, julia. "Word, Dailogue and Novel". The kristeva reader. Ed. Toril Moi. London: John Wiley and SonsLtd., 1986. Print.
22. Jurin, Suzana."Text and Genres". Texts and their usage through Text Linguistics and Conginitive Linguistics Analysis. Filozofski fakultet u Rijeci.2017
23. Macfee,Noelle. Julia Kristeva. Newyork: Routledge Tylor and francis group,2004.print.
24. Saussure, Ferdinand de. Course in General linguistics. Ed.Roys Harris.London: Bloomsbury Academic,2019 edition.print.
25. Schmid, Hans-jorg. "Linguistics Theories, Approaches and Methods". English American Studies Theory and Practice. Weimer:Metzler.2012.371-394.