

Semiotics and Textual Science A Socio-Critical Analysis

السيمياءات وعلم النص
-قراءة سوسيو نقدية-

1-Ahmed Metahri*

university of Ahmed ben bela Oran1, Algeria , a_metahri@yahoo.fr
Laboratory of Semantics at the Linguistic Levels in Algerian Literary Heritage

2-Nassira Krouchi*

university of Ahmed ben bela Oran1, Algeria krouchi.nacera@univ-oran1.dz
Laboratory of Semantics at the Linguistic Levels in Algerian Literary Heritage

Received 19/04/2026 Accepted 21/05/2026 Published 10/06/2026

Abstract:

At the beginning of the twentieth century, the Swiss linguist Ferdinand de Saussure introduced the concept of semiology as a new scientific discipline concerned with the study of signs within social life. As outlined in his posthumously published lectures, semiology seeks to analyze how meaning is produced and communicated through sign systems. Its primary objective was to provide linguists and researchers with analytical tools capable of interpreting complex human and socio-cultural phenomena that had long remained outside traditional frameworks of knowledge.

Almost contemporaneously, the American philosopher Charles Sanders Peirce developed a parallel theoretical framework under the term “semiotics.” Although geographically distant from Saussure, Peirce similarly emphasized the need for a systematic approach to understanding signs and meaning. However, unlike Saussure’s structural perspective, Peirce’s model introduced a more dynamic and triadic conception of the sign. Despite their terminological differences, both approaches contributed significantly to the development of modern sign theory.

Despite their differing epistemological foundations, semiology and semiotics have collectively fostered a new form of critical awareness with far-reaching implications. Their theoretical and methodological contributions have influenced a wide range of disciplines, including anthropology, sociology, psychoanalysis, and literary studies. As a result, semiotics has emerged as a central intellectual framework that has profoundly transformed contemporary critical practice by offering new tools for analyzing, interpreting, and classifying textual and cultural phenomena.

Semiotic concepts provided researchers with several starting points, crystallizing many ideas across multiple fields and opening new horizons for addressing human phenomena language, thought, writing, and emotion from new angles to allow greater opportunities for research and innovation. It can be said that Semiology contributed significantly to renewing critical awareness by reconsidering the approach to issues of word and meaning. In this field, it presented important proposals that shifted critical reading from a state of descriptive reading, formal impression, and transient incidental emotion without interaction and rhetorical speech that stops at the direct description of sentential and textual facts to institutional, cognitive, and

* Corresponding Author **Ahmed Metahri** :

aesthetic analysis. Texts, in their diversity and variety, are expressive materials that must be viewed as a semantic procedure rather than a mere collection of formal signs and codes. Semiology, along with Semiotics, was explicit in the field of cognitive linguistic studies because it simply studies linguistic phenomena according to semantic systems, regardless of their language or form of manifestation.

Following this linguistic revolution marked by the emergence of Semiology and what was called the era of Structuralism, the post-structuralist period arrived. Many linguistic schools adopted Saussurean ideas, and the linguistic phenomenon was treated as a human social phenomenon aimed at communication and transmission of meaning. Consequently, so-called descriptive, functional, formalist, contextual, and deconstructive studies emerged, and methods and propositions multiplied.

Keywords: Semiology; Structuralism; Sign; Text; Analysis; Criticism; Linguistics; Sentence; Reading; Social.

ملخص:

شهد مطلع القرن العشرين تحولاً إبستمولوجياً بارزاً في الدرس اللساني مع إعلان العالم السويسري فرديناند دي سوسير (Ferdinand de Saussure) عن تأسيس علم جديد أطلق عليه السيميولوجيا، وحدد موضوعه في دراسة حياة العلامات داخل المجتمع. وقد مثل هذا الإعلان نقلة نوعية في فهم الظواهر اللغوية، إذ أدرجها ضمن شبكة العلاقات الاجتماعية والثقافية، وفتح المجال أمام مقارنة تتجاوز التصنيفات المعرفية التقليدية.

وفي السياق نفسه تقريباً، بلور الفيلسوف الأمريكي (Charles Sanders Peirce) تصوراً موازياً تحت مسمى السيميوطيقا، سعى من خلاله إلى بناء نظرية عامة للعلامة تؤسس لفهم أوسع للعمليات الدلالية. وعلى الرغم من اختلاف المنطلقات الفلسفية بين المشروعين، فإنهما التقيا في جوهر الاهتمام بالعلامة بوصفها أداة لإنتاج المعنى داخل أنساق ثقافية واجتماعية معقدة.

وقد أسهمت السيميائيات، بمختلف توجهاتها، في إحداث وعي معرفي جديد امتدت تأثيراته إلى حقول متعددة، كالسوسيولوجيا والأنثروبولوجيا والتحليل النفسي والتاريخ والنقد الأدبي. كما نقلت القراءة النقدية من مستوى الانطباع والوصف السطحي إلى مستوى التحليل المنهجي الذي ينظر إلى النص بوصفه بنية دلالية متكاملة، لا مجرد تجميع شكلي من العلامات.

ومع صعود البنيوية، ترسخت الرؤية التي تتعامل مع اللغة باعتبارها نسقاً من العلاقات الداخلية، قبل أن تتوسع آفاق البحث مع ما بعد البنيوية، فتتعدد المناهج وتتقاطع المقاربات بين الوظيفي والسياقي والتفكيكي، في إطار سعي دائم إلى تعميق فهم النصوص والظواهر الإنسانية ضمن أفق دلالي مفتوح.

الكلمات المتاحية: السيميائيات - البنية - العلامة - اللسانيات - القراءة.

Introduction

Semiotics may be broadly defined as the science of signs, encompassing both natural and artificial systems of signification. Signs may either be conventionally established through human agreement—such as linguistic systems and traffic signals—or may arise independently of human intervention, as in natural phenomena including animal sounds and environmental signals. In this sense, semiology is closely associated with theoretical inquiry into symbols, sign systems, and their conceptual structures within a general philosophical framework.

Within Western intellectual traditions, semiological approaches have diversified into multiple orientations, including Peircean semiotics, the semiology of signification, the semiology of communication, and the semiology of culture. Methodologically, semiology operates through processes of decomposition and recombination, examining the internal structural organization of texts by analyzing their constituent elements and reconstructing their

relational configurations. The ultimate aim is to uncover meaning by identifying the generative structures that govern textual production at both logical and semantic levels.

I The Science of Signs or Semiotics

Konrad Bayer states: "Language is a system among semiotic systems, and the study of style is possible at all semiotic levels, both material and immaterial." The science of semiotics, as it appears in some critical texts, is a term derived from the Greek *Sémion*, meaning "sign."¹ In its scientific capacity, it is referred to as semiology, defined as the science that studies all types of symbols, including linguistic symbols, as tools of communication.

This is manifested in the following:²

- A. **Immanent Analysis**³: Searching for the internal conditions governing the formation of signification; meaning is thus a network of relations connecting various elements
- B. **Structural Analysis**⁴: To perceive the meaning of utterances and texts, the existence of a system based on a set of relations is presupposed. This leads to the conclusion that textual elements have no significance except through that network; therefore, attention should only be given to elements that crystallize the system of difference and the harmonious or divergent isotopies.
- C. **Discourse Analysis**⁵: While structural linguistics, in all its schools, studies the sentence through a set of methodological levels⁶—starting from the smallest unit (the phoneme) to the largest linguistic unit (the sentence), and vice versa—semiology transcends the sentence to analyze discourse.

It is perhaps useful to note that the precursors of this science were the results of the Saussurean linguistic vision. The first signs of interest in this field appeared in the early 1960s, half a century after the death of Saussure, as the discipline carved its path among other human sciences and branches of knowledge.

Salah Fadl, conveying Saussure's view on semiotics, explains: "We can scientifically conceive of a subject that studies the life of signs within social life. This science would become part of social psychology, and consequently, general psychology. We call it semiology or the science of signs. In it, we study how symbols are formed and the laws that govern them, so they may be applied to linguistics, occupying its specific place among the group of sciences that study various human phenomena."⁷

1. The Importance of Studying Signs

Semioticians have focused on studying the signs that govern the structure of letters composing a linguistic unit and the significations they contain. Furthermore, they devote extensive attention to studying the "life of signs" and all types of markers that govern the structure of societies.

The Dictionary of Modern Linguistics indicates that while Saussure made language a part of linguistics, some scholars interested in semiological study—such as the American anthropologist Pierre Guiraud (Bir Duristell) and the French critic Roland Barthes⁸—drew inspiration from the linguistic method in their various studies. They considered the science of signs to be subordinate to linguistics, or even a branch of it, because the sign systems known to society closely resemble the system of languages; indeed, they are languages themselves, even if their material substance differs.⁹

2. Semiotics and the Dialectic of the Signifier and the Signified

The primary discovery of this science remains credited to De Saussure, who was a pioneer in the history of human knowledge. Subsequently, Peirce developed it through his studies of symbols and their significations, as well as the relationships between their elements within the

boundaries of things during the second half of the twentieth century. Then came Roman Jakobson, who distinguished between three elements:¹⁰

- Signs
- Symbols
- Icons¹¹

This classification was constructed based on the depth between the object and what it symbolizes, in terms of realistic transcendence and its existential movement.

A sign is a relational entity linking the signifier to the signified through a sensory perception based on the act of transcendence; for instance, a finger pointing to a painting. According to De Saussure, the Icon is a Non-Arbitrary symbol, such that a causal relationship exists between it and what it symbolizes—namely, the similarity between meaning (Ma'na) and structure (Mabna), as seen in the word "car" and its actual or realistic existence.

As for Symbols, they indicate the elements of existents as conventionally agreed upon by a group, whether regarding the linguistic aspects of units or the movement of social actions, such as traffic light colors, etc. These signs constitute a semiotic language rather than a literary language as found in texts and structures. It is a system governed by differential values, whose poles are attracted by degrees of understanding or perception of these systems (the set of syntactical rules and their deviations) between the addresser and the addressee. For example, mathematical symbols such as arrows and curves may signify a specific value in reference to a particular concept within a given equation; yet, they do not fall within the same sphere as arrows signifying directions like right, left, up, or down.¹²

Based on this conceptualization, modern linguistics has defined language as a System of Signs:

- 1) **Auditory Systems:** Spoken language that addresses the ear.
- 2) **Visual Systems:** The alphabet of the deaf and mute addressing the sight, and lip-reading.¹³
- 3) **Tactile Systems:** The language of the blind addressing the hand, sign systems, the language of colors, rope language, fire language, flag language, mirror language, and others.

All these systems share with language the fundamental origin upon which they were established.¹⁴

3. The Duality of the Signifier and the Signified

The study of the signifier (al-dāll) and the signified (al-madlūl) encompasses diverse and distinct, yet interconnected, linguistic inquiries. Following a period where study was restricted to "utterance" and "meaning," the expansion of semantics led to investigating the signifier and signified within an organizational network. The signifier does not possess its significance inherently; rather, the source of meaning lies in those binary oppositions occurring at the level of the linguistic repertoire. This relationship can only be regulated by passing through the signified, or the mental concept, which refers us back to the object we indicate—the signifier.

This relationship is largely similar to a two-sided coin, which only functions as a coin when its two sides are united such that they cannot be separated, as separation would constitute a distortion. The signifier holds great importance in discourse construction, manifested in the performance of its semantic function. Furthermore, its distinction by a phonetic structure enables precise expression of meaning and allows for representation and mimesis. Thus, "a distinction must be made between the signifier and the signified in terms of form and content, while observing semantic aspects in the craft of speech; for the written and the spoken embody the mental idea until the intended meaning is reached."¹⁵

We can conceptualize the approach of classical linguists toward the signifier and the signified. Al-Jahiz, for instance, posits that "signaling" (al-ishārah) consists of those bodily gestures and signs accompanying speech, linking their significance to that of the linguistic utterance. He states: "The categories of indications of meanings—both verbal and non-verbal—are five things, neither more nor less: first, the utterance (al-lafz); then the gesture (al-ishārah); then counting by fingers (al-‘aqd); then writing (al-khaṭṭ); and finally, the latent state (al-hāl), which is termed al-niṣbah."¹⁶

Applying this text to the categories of indications according to modern theory, we find three means of communication within the essence of social life: Utterance, which for Al-Jahiz corresponds to the term "spoken language" in modern linguistics, as it distinguishes humans from other animals; Gesture, which corresponds to the sensory movement accompanying speech, such as raising an eyebrow; Writing, which corresponds to "written language" and serves as evidence for the absent needs of people; Counting, which is calculation and ranks below utterance and writing; and al-Niṣbah, the state that speaks without utterance and inspires without the hand, which is evident in the creation of the heavens and the earth.¹⁷

These bodily gestures and signs may disconnect from speech and become significant in themselves; here, the concept of "gesture" aligns with the concept of the "sign" (al-dalīl). Examples include the set of religious rituals performed in mosques and churches, as well as the facial expressions accompanying changes in human emotion, such as laughter and smiling, to indicate joy and pleasure.

Regarding language as a system of phonetic signs or symbols leads to another point that neither classical Arabic scholars nor moderns—Arabs and Europeans alike—overlooked: the relationship between the utterance and its signified, or between the symbol and what it symbolizes. Ibn Jinni was among those who expanded on this subject, believing in a strong correlation or connection between the utterance and its signified, a point he mentioned in several places in his book *Al-Khaṣā’iṣ*. He dedicated two chapters to this topic: "On the Proximity of Utterances due to the Proximity of Meanings" and "On Making Utterances Resemble Meanings." In the former, he addressed the proximity of triliteral, quadriliteral, and quintiliteral roots, as well as root permutation and composition.¹⁸ In the latter, he discussed the meanings of the weights of verbal nouns (maṣādir) and augmented verbs; for instance, verbal nouns following the pattern fa‘alān denote agitation and movement. Regarding verb meanings, he stated that verbs are indicative of meanings, such that their repetition or phonetic segmentation serves as evidence of the intensity of the meaning.¹⁹

Ibn Jinni views the duality of the signifier and the signified as tracing back to the primordials of language formation: divine revelation (al-tawqīf), convention (al-tawfīq), and mimesis (al-muḥākāh). His view on mimesis involves human imitation of natural sounds, as evidenced by his statement: "Some have maintained that the origin of all languages stems from audible sounds, such as the whistling of the wind, the rumble of thunder, the flow of water, the braying of the donkey, the cawing of the crow, the neighing of the horse, the cry of the deer, and the like. Languages were subsequently generated from these thereafter; and this, in my view, is a viable perspective and an acceptable doctrine."²⁰

According to Ibn Jinni, the linguistic utterance (signifier) possesses the capacity to provide us with alternative conceptions of objects in a manner unattainable by any other means. This is evidenced by his statement:

"This occurs when two or three wise men meet and find it necessary to clarify known entities; they assign a mark and an utterance to each, so that when mentioned, its referent is recognized. This distinguishes it from others and renders its mention sufficient, precluding the need to physically present the object to the eye. Such a method is more efficient, lighter, and easier than the burden of physical presentation to achieve the objective of clarifying its state."²¹

From this, it is inferred that Ibn Jinni acknowledges that every signifier has its specific signified. Once the signifier is articulated, its signified is determined, thereby defining the complex meanings of the text. Frequently, a single signifier may correspond to multiple signifieds, encompassing phenomena such as synonymy, antonymy, and polysemy—subjects to which Ibn Jinni dedicated specific chapters.

It can be argued that Ibn Jinni anticipated the duality later proposed by Saussure regarding the linguistic sign (*le signe*), which comprises the two components: the signifier (*signifiant*) and the signified (*signifié*). This is supported by Saussure's assertion: "The linguistic sign does not link a thing to a name, but a concept to an acoustic image."²² He views the linguistic sign as a mental link between the concept (the named object) and the acoustic image of the name (the phonological pattern). Saussure clarifies:

"The latter is not the material sound, which is a purely physical thing, but the psychological imprint of that sound, or the representation provided by the testimony of our senses. The acoustic image is sensory, and if we call it material, it is only in this sense and in contrast to the concept, which is the other, generally more abstract, term of the association."²³

Consequently, the linguistic sign does not unite a thing and a name, but rather a mental concept and an acoustic image. The acoustic image is not the physical sound but its psychological impression. Saussure further notes: "We can speak to ourselves or mentally recite a verse of poetry without moving the lips or tongue." This indicates that the psychological nature of the acoustic image becomes clear during internal monologue, where the process remains entirely sensory and devoid of physical effort.²⁴

In Saussure's view, the linguistic sign—consisting of the signifier and the signified—is the "unit of the system." It is a linguistic element composed of an acoustic image and a concept (the idea associated with that image). For instance, the word "man" is a linguistic sign consisting of an acoustic image—the psychological perception of the sequence of sounds (m-a-n)—and a concept, which is the sum of semantic features: living, speaking, rational, human, male, and adult.²⁵

An individual sound from the sequence (m-a-n) cannot be taken in isolation as an independent linguistic sign; it is merely an arrangement of abstract sounds. Similarly, the semantic features of the concept "man" do not constitute a linguistic sign on their own. This necessitates a complete union between the acoustic image and the concept to form the linguistic sign.²⁶

Following this vision, Saussure states: "The linguistic sign is thus a two-sided psychological entity that can be represented as (Concept-Acoustic Image). These two elements are intimately linked, each calling forth the other."²⁷ This idea is echoed by Greimas and Courtés in semiotics: speech, as utterance and meaning, represents the relationship between the signifier and the signified.

For example, in traffic light signals, our eyes perceive distinct colors (green, amber, red) in specific positions and sequences. These are the visible signifiers corresponding to fixed signifieds: green signifies "permitting passage," amber signifies "caution," and red signifies "prohibited passage." Likewise, if someone posits, "this is a delicious drink," there is, on one hand, the sound received by the ears—the signifier—and on the other hand, the comprehension associated with the signified or content, which might be understood differently by different individuals.

The spoken language of a specific social group relies on sounds; however, in common usage, it refers to a system and is not employed to discuss sound itself. The acoustic elements constitute the signifier, while its semantic interpretation is known as the signified and falls within the content schema.²⁸ This confirms that the utterance is a sign of meaning, as the latter functions to provide clarification and manifestation. This relationship can be represented as follows:²⁹

- Written Symbols: Signifier — Acoustic Image of Words: Signified
- Acoustic Image of Words: Signifier — Mental Image: Signified
- Mental Image: Signifier — Perceived Entities: Signified

In this manner, every signified is transformed into a signifier. These two components of the sign (Signifier/Signified) are interconnected through a relationship of mutual implication, or what Hjelmslev establishes as solidarity: one cannot exist without the other; that is, it has no meaning unless attributed to the other, and vice versa.

This conception does not diverge significantly from what Abu Hamid al-Ghazali mentioned, as he posits that a thing has four levels of existence: "its essence in itself; then the establishment of its representation in the mind, which is expressed by the pen; then the composition of a sound with letters that indicate it, which is the expression denoting the representation in the soul; and finally, the composition of lines perceived by the sense of sight, indicating the utterance, which is writing. Thus, writing follows the utterance as it indicates it."³⁰

As for Abd al-Qahir al-Jurjani, through his analytical method, he calls for a distinction between error and correctness. The words of language are nothing but signs and markers indicating meanings. A sign, qua sign, cannot be described as ugly; it is sufficient for it to perform its semantic function through its connection with its signified. Al-Jurjani attempts to refute the established notions of his contemporaries, who believed that words, as attributes, are deemed ugly or beautiful. He states: "Words do not yield benefit until they are composed in a specific manner of composition, directed toward one aspect of construction and arrangement rather than another."³¹ He also notes: "Beauty and ugliness in them [words] do not transcend the utterance and the resonance to that which communes with the intellect and the soul."³²

Al-Jurjani insists on linking words to their signification, stating: "The utterance follows the meaning in the Nazm (construction), and words are arranged in speech due to the arrangement of their meanings in the soul."³³ Thus, after the utterance settles in the mind through hearing, it interacts with the soul to be detailed thereafter; it is, therefore, prior to thought and the soul before detailing.

The same idea was expressed by Hazim al-Qartajanni, who said: "It has become clear that meanings have existing realities in entities, representations existing in minds, and—from the perspective of the words that indicate those representations—an existence in understandings. They also have an existence from the perspective of the script that indicates those words, which establishes the representations of words and the representations of what they indicate in understandings and minds."³⁴

In his aforementioned discourse, Al-Jurjani relied on three levels in his definition of the signifier and the signified. The first level is where a single word consists of several successive letters and sounds in pronunciation that cannot be uttered simultaneously. The second level is where individual words do not convey meaning in isolation except by joining them to one another. The third level is composition (Tarkib), such that speech does not consist of a single part, but must include a subject (Musnad ilayh) and a predicate (Musnad).³⁵

4. Semiology and Linguistics³⁶

Undoubtedly, linguistics maintains relations with other fields of knowledge; for instance, it is related to psychology on one hand, and to sociology on the other.

Similarly, semiology possesses links with various other domains of thought. Jean-Claude Gardin observes: "Semiology is considered one of the current sciences, as months do not pass without us encountering new references indicating the relations it establishes with various fields of thought that had seemed, until now, in no need of it: psychology, theatrical criticism, iconographic analysis, the study of myths, and even documentation techniques. Symbolism or sign theory—that is, semiotics—converges with a science specialized in explanation and interpretation, namely Hermeneutics, and this encounter is highly fertile."³⁷

Semiotics also has clear relations with logic, grammar, rhetoric, and other sciences. What concerns us is to pause carefully at the relationship between semiotics and linguistics. Scholars have alluded to and studied the nature of this relationship; some noted that semiotics was not distinct from the general theory of language but was subordinate to it. However, over time, semiology evolved and transformed into an independent science by unifying and commanding various sciences, producing epistemic tools to approach different cultural phenomena as communicative and signifying systems.

Ferdinand de Saussure maintained that linguistics is a part of a general science, which is semiology. He states: "Linguistic science is but a part of this general science, and the laws that semiology will discover will be applicable to linguistics."³⁸

Elsewhere, he says: "As for us, contrary to those who preceded us, we consider the linguistic question to be, above all, semiological."³⁹ Conversely, Roland Barthes posits that linguistics is the origin and semiology is the branch, stating: "Linguistics is not a part of the general theory of signs... semiology is a part of linguistics."⁴⁰ This implies that semiology, in its study of a set of non-linguistic systems—such as fashion, cuisine, advertising, and trends—relies on linguistic elements for their study, deconstruction, and synthesis. Among the most important of these linguistic elements according to Roland Barthes, we mention: signifier and signified, language (*langue*), speech (*parole*), denotation, connotation, the paradigmatic axis, and the syntagmatic axis.

It is worth noting that Mohammed Serghini, in his work *Lectures in Semiology*, clarified that there is a clear overlap when he said: "Saussure considered language the origin and semiology the branch, making one linked to the other as a general is to a specific."⁴¹ It is understood from this that Roland Barthes considered semiology a general science of which tongues (*langues*) are a part. It is evident here that Serghini attributed to Saussure what should be attributed to Barthes, and attributed to Roland Barthes what should be attributed to De Saussure. Jacques Derrida holds another opinion in this regard; while recognizing Barthes' efforts, he calls for transcending the aforementioned Barthesian proposition. In his famous book *Of Grammatology*, he argues that "Grammatology" is the origin that will replace semiology and linguistics because grammatology—as Derrida says—is "a science not yet realized, and no one can say what it is, but it has a right to exist... and tongues will be merely a part of that general science, and the laws discovered by grammatology will extend to linguistics."⁴²

5. The Distinction Between Language, Parole, and Langue

Linguists of various backgrounds and schools of thought employ the terms language, parole, and langue in their scholarship. At first glance, a reader may perceive no difference between these three terms; however, a meticulous examination reveals that these concepts differ semantically just as they differ structurally. We refer here to the scholar Ferdinand de Saussure, as he originated the distinction between these three terms. He established a fundamental differentiation between language, parole (speech), and langue (tongue/linguistic system).

To Saussure, language is the set of signs used for communication among members of a particular linguistic group. it is considered a social product of the faculty of langue, adopted by the social entity to enable individual speakers to exercise their linguistic activity within their societies.⁴³ Consequently, language is not a function of the individual speaker, but rather a product acquired passively by the individual.⁴⁴

Parole, on the other hand, is the actual execution or performance of language in reality, according to the patterns of langue and their manifestation in practice. Thus, language and parole constitute the foundation and pillar of human langue. Language is a social institution, whereas parole is an individual act; language belongs to society, while parole is specific to the individual speaker. Furthermore, language is a product accepted and internalized by the speaker without freedom of choice, whereas parole is an activity performed by the speaker to express

their will and intelligence—a creative act in which the speaker excels. Language is also a system, while parole is the application of that system.⁴⁵

Regardless of Saussure's efforts to prove that language and parole are distinct entities, he ultimately reconsidered his position. At times, he declares that language is essential for parole to be intelligible and to achieve its full results and effectiveness; at other times, he asserts that language and parole exist in a state of internal interdependence, rendering the latter both the means and the result of the former. It appears that this latter view is the correct one, as parole precedes language, and the learning of language occurs only through hearing and the use of parole.⁴⁶ Language, as a human phenomenon, is characterized by a multiplicity of elements and is, therefore, inherently heterogeneous. It is a subject for various human sciences (physical, physiological, and psychological studies), making its classification and subjection to description and analysis difficult, if not impossible. Consequently, it eludes the linguistic researcher who seeks to approach it from a single perspective, as it is a focal point for many disciplines.⁴⁷

To reconcile the apparent variance in Saussure's ideas, we can state that language is an abstract social system, similar to other social institutions. Parole is the actual realization of language in reality—the concrete use of language by one of its members for the purpose of communication and mutual understanding.⁴⁸ Thus, parole represents the actual tangibles in the speaker's reality. Accordingly, language and parole are two sides of a single entity: the capacity for expression and communication.

Langue, meanwhile, is the communicative system possessed by every ideal speaker-listener belonging to a linguistic community with specific cultural and civilizational characteristics.⁴⁹ Saussure states: "Langue, in our view, is language minus parole."⁵⁰ Therefore, it is most effective to search for a framework that is unified in its structure and characterized by complete homogeneity among its elements. This quality is realized only in langue. Saussure maintains that langue is not a function of the speaker; it is the result recorded passively by the individual, unlike parole, which is an individual act stemming from will and intelligence. He remarks: "In separating language from parole, we simultaneously separate the social from the individual, and the essential from the secondary and somewhat accidental."⁵¹

Saussure differentiated between language as a general natural phenomenon characterized by a multiplicity of elements, langue as a social phenomenon independent of the speaker's will, and parole as an individual act through which the speaker exercises their natural expressive capacity. In doing so, Saussure distinguished between the social (langue), the individual (parole), and the natural (language). Ultimately, language remains the most significant tool for expression, being the primary communicative system in which different langues diverge and are realized through the act of parole.

6. Semiotic Discourse Analysis

Semiotic analysis is itself a form of discourse analysis. It distinguishes between textual semiotics and structural "sentential" linguistics. While the latter focuses on the sentence in terms of syntax and production—referred to as sentential competence—semiotics is concerned with constructing a system for the production of utterances and texts, known as discursive competence. Consequently, it is now appropriate to establish the rules and laws governing the construction of these utterances and texts.⁵²

Semiotic discourse analysis proceeds from the conclusions reached by linguists regarding the general theory of language and the conceptual issues surrounding discourse. It requires consistency with fundamental dualities: (Language/Speech), (System/Process), and (Competence/Performance), while also accounting for its relationship with the category of enunciation. The Semiotic Dictionary by Greimas and Courtés, in discussing the term "competence" from Noam Chomsky's perspective, views it as a set of necessary conditions in the process of enunciation. It posits two independent forms of this competence:

The first is semiotic narrative competence according to the perspectives of Hjelmslev and Chomsky. This can be conceived as both taxonomic and synthetic articulations simultaneously, rather than a simple Saussurean substitution of language. Semiotic analysis views these narrative forms globally, independent of any linguistic or non-linguistic group, as they are linked to human genius. Here, credit must be given to the Russian Formalist school, particularly the author of *Morphology of the Folktale*, and his influence on the French structuralist school: Claude Bremond (*Logic of Narrative*), Greimas (*Structural Semantics*), and Claude Lévi-Strauss (*Structural Anthropology*). No researcher can deny that Propp's genius and scientific research paved the way for the emergence of narrative syntax and its rules.

The second is describable competence, which is established according to the process of enunciation, recording the formulation of enunciated forms expressible through speech. The authors of the *Semiotic Dictionary* argue that addressing the dual nature of competence is a necessity for achieving a new and precise conception of discourse.⁵³

In all cases, discourse raises the issue of its relationship with enunciation and communication. However, the semiotic field is interested in its frames of reference, such as social connotation and its attribution to a given cultural context, which remains independent within its structural or semantic analysis. The typology of discourses capable of formation within this perspective would be purely semiological. Regardless of how abstract the semiological definitions of discourse are, the problem of defining the essence of discourse remains, even when literary discourse is defined by its literariness (*littérarité*), as advocated by the Russian Formalists.

Literature, in their conception, is "a system of signs similar to other semantic systems, such as natural language, arts, mythology, etc. On the other hand—and this is what distinguishes it from other arts—it is constructed with the aid of the structure of any language. It is, therefore, a second-order semiotic system; in other words, it is a creative expressive system (connotative). At the same time, language serves as the material for forming the units of the literary system, which—according to Hjelmslevian terminology—belong to the plane of expression, without its own apparatus losing its content."⁵⁴

Russian Formalism identified the specific data by which a certain discourse can be called literary. Roman Jakobson gave this idea its final formulation when he stated: "The object of literary science is not literature, but literariness (*literariness*), that is, what makes a given work a literary work."⁵⁵

The semiotics of communication has achieved substantial progress in the field of message analysis by identifying its six functions. This occurred despite a conspicuous neglect of signification, an area which Roland Barthes was keen to emphasize within the orientations of the semiotics of signification. Describing language as a system of communication characterized by a high degree of harmony allowed linguistic study to focus on the model delineated by Jakobson: (Sender—Message—Receiver—Code—Reference). This model enabled linguistics to transcend applications confined to a limited set of properties inherent in the linguistic phenomenon, moving toward a linguistic reading of texts and other modes of expression. While Jakobson restricted discourse to the relationship between an addresser and an addressee, Lotman pointed to another model of reception that does not occur between a sender and a receiver. Instead, there is a discourse in which internal dialogue is manifested—as is the case with autobiography—occurring between the sender and the self, a phenomenon observed in the discourse of Taha Hussein in his memoirs, *Al-Ayyam*.

Semantics, in classifying types of meaning into natural, rational, and conventional, did not fail to reference fields of communication, whether vocal or semiotic. The Arab contribution is evident in this domain, particularly through their engagement with Greek philosophy, including the Peripatetic and Megarian-Stoic schools. Adel Fakhoury pursues a comparative

study between Arabic semantics and modern semiotics, providing a comparative example between the classifications of semantics and the American Peirce's classification of the sign.⁵⁶

The semiotic project, as a science approaching "nebulous" systems, extends toward liberating fields of human knowledge from the metaphysical constraints that fetter them and hinder their research from reaching results that grant them authority and a prestigious status within contemporary human knowledge. It enables a precise scientific reading of many posed problems and human phenomena that previously did not exceed the framework of passing contemplation or naive horizontal interpretation. For the semiotic project to acquire the legitimacy of a science capable of examining the deep structures of its subject matter—and to approach its depth and the laws governing its composition—it was necessary, like any science, to define its methodological premises and theoretical foundations, establish its categories, test its procedural tools, and explore the boundaries that separate it from or draw it closer to other sciences.

It appears that human communication is more complex than any other form, because the use of the sign in this field only occurs, as Saussure stated, within social life. Therefore, cooperation is a prerequisite for conveying the message to the receiver. This can only be achieved through mutual convention and consensus, allowing any dialogue between sender and receiver to present ideas in the form of agreed-upon codes. Consequently, some semanticists have concluded that the communication process does not clearly appear in the animal world except when there is cooperation or social activity; all communication is fundamentally linked to cooperation, and every social dialogue is tied to it.⁵⁷

The semiotic analysis of the social system aims to examine how signs operate within social contexts. Thus, we find that the systems prevailing in human society possess signs and cultural symbolic systems that enable the semiotician to identify a social segment, group, or class. In tribal organization, we observe rituals and customs manifested in a set of signs and symbols that distinguish it from other social systems in the methods of ceremonies, weddings, funerals, holidays, and other cultural manifestations.

While we previously noted the nature of communication in its multiple forms, there are codes for each of these communicative modes. Animal communication has its own signs—some explored by research and others remaining unknown. The same applies to natural codes that define the signs or signals of nature, enabling the reception of its message through either sensory or rational perception. If the weather is exceptionally cold in a region known for a moderate climate, one perceives that the source of the cold is snowfall. Conversely, an unusual intensity of heat exceeding the seasonal average leads to the perception that its source may be a fire. All of this results from the existence of relations—which may be complex—between natural codes, biological makeup, and human physiological sensitivity. Regardless, social codes remains more complex, requiring practical effort and keen intelligence to understand and interpret social signs deeply. The sign, as defined by Ullmann, is "a conscious social product consisting of a signifier and a signified which generally represent a thing or a concept other than the sign itself."⁵⁸

Semiological analysis extends to encompass all semiotic systems, whether represented in the natural, social, or cultural sciences. This science, as predicted by Saussure and envisioned by Charles Sanders Peirce, aspires to be the science of all sign systems, whether linguistic or non-linguistic. The semiotic project continues to seek landmarks to define its reference frames, subjects, procedural practices, and relationships with other sciences to delineate its method and clarify its categories precisely. This is what prompted Roland Barthes, in his writings (*Mythologies*, *Empire of Signs*, and *Elements of Semiology*), to raise issues regarding the maturity of this project. He states that "semiology still needs to be designed, and we believe that no manual for this method of analysis can yet exist, largely due to its extensive character

(since semiology will be the science of all sign systems). Semiology will not be handled directly until these systems are designed empirically."

Faced with this semiotic accumulation and the genuine revolution it has caused in the methods of the sciences in general, and the humanities in particular, the researcher finds a diversity in approach, a contrast in conception, and a multiplicity in applied practice. In some cases, semiotics becomes conflated with hermeneutic theory. However, the science of signs has only become modern by defining its features, building its categories, clarifying its literature, and testing its theories and procedural tools. Otherwise, we encounter many of its conceptions in the history of philosophical thought among ancient peoples who contributed to the building of human civilization, such as the Pharaohs, Babylonians, Greeks, Arabs, Muslims, and Romans. The birth of this science was coupled with the revolution of contemporary linguistic thought as a result of its close link to the achievements and discoveries realized by modern science.

II The Text and Structuralist Concepts

The term text is among the terminology of linguistics. We find its linguistic meaning in the Arabic root (N-S-S) revolving around the following matters:

1. **Text (Al-Nass):** To raise something. To "textualize" a discourse (nassa al-hadith) means to elevate or present it. Everything that is made manifest is said to be nass. A doe "textualizes" (nassat) its neck when she raises it. To be placed on the minassa means to be at the height of exposure, fame, and appearance. The minassa is the platform upon which a bride appears to be seen. One "textualizes" (nassasa) belongings when stacking them one upon another. The origin of nass refers to the extremity and goal of a thing; the nass of everything is its ultimate end. The nass of truth is the ultimate reach of reason.⁵⁹

Furthermore, text refers to the original form of speech as produced by the author. Here, the meaning revolves around the axes of elevation, manifestation, joining one thing to another, and the extremity or ultimate end of a thing.

It is observed that "elevation and manifestation mean that the speaker or writer must elevate and manifest their text so that the recipient (listener or reader) can perceive it and understand it. Thus, a text is the joining of sentence to sentence via numerous links. The fact that a text is the 'extremity and end' represents its status as the largest accessible linguistic unit, as we consider the text to represent the sixth level of the recognized levels of linguistics."⁶⁰

Accordingly, the conceptual definition of text does not deviate from the following criteria: its nature as spoken, written, or both; consideration of the semantic dimension; consideration of volumetric determination (text length or brevity); consideration of the pragmatic dimension; consideration of the context; consideration of cohesion; consideration of the functional dimension; and consideration of the communication between the addresser and addressee, linking it to transformational concepts such as competence and performance, while highlighting its status as a constrained entity.⁶¹ These criteria are considered features of a complete text; if any of these features are lacking, it may be termed a "deficient text." Therefore, they can be regarded as conditions that must be met to designate it as a complete text.

Among the definitions of text provided by linguists are the following:

M.A.K. Halliday⁶² and Ruqaiya Hasan argue that the word text "is used in linguistics to refer to any passage, spoken or written, regardless of its length or extension. A text is a unit of language in use and is not defined by its size. The relationship between a text and a sentence is similar to the relationship between a sentence and a clause. Undoubtedly, a text differs from a sentence in kind. The best view of a text is as a semantic unit. This unit is not form but meaning; therefore, any text relates to the clause or sentence through realization, not size." For them, a text is essentially a semantic unit, a production, and a process of exchanging meaning between

participants in discourse, such as dialogue.⁶³ Thus, the text is linked to context, as context plays a prominent role in interpreting the text. Furthermore, "a text need not necessarily be only written or spoken, but can be conveyed by any other means of expression. This poses a question: does sign language using any body part constitute a text? If it is a text, how can it be analyzed based on the foundations of text linguistics?"⁶⁴

A text can be a single word, a single sentence, or an extension of many sentences. The fact that a text can be a single word or sentence is confirmed by other scholars, such as David Crystal.⁶⁵ In his definition of text, he emphasizes extension and its status as spoken or written, then affirms the communicative function. He cites models of text such as news reports and poems, as well as road signs. He notes that, like long texts such as news reports and poems, single-word texts function with full significance, as seen in a warning sign.⁶⁶

Among the comprehensive definitions of text is that of Robert-Alain de Beaugrande and Wolfgang Dressler: it is a "communicative event that must satisfy seven combined criteria of textuality to be considered a text. This designation is lost if any of these criteria are absent: cohesion (grammatical linking), coherence (semantic connectivity), intentionality (the goal of the text), acceptability (concerning the recipient's attitude toward accepting the text), informativity (the degree of expectation regarding the information contained), situationality (concerning the relevance of the text to the situation), and intertextuality."⁶⁷ These criteria focus on the nature of both the text and its users (speaker and recipient), as well as the context surrounding the text and the interlocutors. This definition encapsulates most of the preceding concepts of the text.

2. Text Structure and Discourse Analysis

A text is considered a linguistic discourse directed toward human groups in accordance with the requirements of dialogue, as language is delimited by sounds and purposes. This was affirmed by Ibn Jinni, who stated: "As for its definition, it consists of sounds through which every people expresses their purposes."⁶⁸ In reality, there is no disagreement regarding this concept or the definitions of the term text. Definitions generally agree that it is "a branch of linguistics that studies spoken and written texts... and this study emphasizes the way in which the parts of a text are organized and interconnected to convey a meaningful whole; it is likewise the linguistic study of the structure of texts."

Although David Crystal notes that discourse analysis is associated with the analysis of spoken language while text analysis is linked to the analysis of written language, he subsequently affirmed that analysis—whether of text or discourse—encompasses all spoken and written linguistic units while identifying the communicative function. Nils mentions that text linguistics refers to the study of the linguistic tools of textual cohesion, both formal and semantic, while emphasizing the importance of context and the necessity of the recipient possessing a background during text analysis.⁶⁹ Thus, text linguistics is that "branch of linguistics concerned with the study of the text as the maximal linguistic unit, by examining numerous aspects, most notably cohesion or coherence—its means and types—reference and its types, the textual context, and the role of the participants in the text (addresser and addressee). This study includes both spoken and written text alike."⁷⁰

3. Syntactic Parsing of the Text

Harald Weinrich⁷¹ sought to present a new approach to text processing that is inseparable from his fundamental concept of the text, as it accounts for several syntactic connections (Syntaktische Verbindungen) within the text. "In reality, such connectivity arises first at the sentence level and subsequently transitions to the text level, where both levels may run parallel and jointly contribute to defining the cohesive macrostructure. Thus, the sentence is not viewed as an independent, informative part that can be isolated from the other constituent parts of the textual whole (Textganz); rather, it is a complementary part. The other parts participate in rendering its understanding more rational, as it only provides specific information that

contributes, along with other information, to forming a body of information strongly integrated into a single structure, which may be the theme of the text, the discourse, the global meaning, or the significance."⁷² It is noteworthy here that the text is an inevitable construct subject to interconnected grammatical rules. The theory of the grammatical governor (al-'āmil) confirms this orientation; the connection of the subject and object to the verb in the verbal sentence, and the connection of the predicate to the subject in the nominal sentence, is established and acknowledged by all grammarians of various backgrounds and schools—referring here to Arabic grammar.

In the Western tradition, Harald Weinrich attempted to transcend the boundaries of the sentence in both description and analysis by presenting a methodology based on elements or components that go beyond traditional categories and draw upon more comprehensive foundations. "Within the framework of this holistic conception adopted by text scientists, we find Harald Weinrich presenting a heuristic method (Heuristische Methode) in which he attempts to reconsider the sentence, the sequence of sentences, and the text as a whole by proposing a set of fundamental ideas that lead to a deeper investigation into the textuality of the text. Here, he does not reject the sentence level but emphasizes that it is the starting point of analysis. This is strong evidence that text scientists—whether they began with the macro-unit and ended with the micro-unit or vice versa—have taken into account the sentence, its categories, and its parts, despite the attempts of some to avoid stating this explicitly."⁷³ The structure of the text is primarily a spoken linguistic one; however, its continuity and the realization of its significance are linked to the pillars of communication, namely the producer or producers.

From this, it becomes clear that "the text score method (Textpartitur) can be considered an alternative to the well-known method continuously used in all stages of linguistic study for sentence analysis, as it analyzes according to parts of speech on one hand—which are termed grammatical genera—and according to sentence elements on the other. Analysis according to parts of speech is sometimes considered a quasi-logical analysis of the sentence. Regarding the text score, it can be described as a dual partitioning: the analysis of the sentence according to parts of speech, and its analysis according to sentence elements." It is difficult to consider parts of speech and sentence elements, when analyzing a sentence or another textual passage, as distinct grammatical categories, as it is difficult to differentiate between them purely; furthermore, there are specific parts of speech that show a significant inclination toward specific sentence elements.⁷⁴

"If all of this has occurred within the framework of the sentence, there is no doubt that we can reconsider the indications provided by the ancients in rhetoric, exegesis, jurisprudence, criticism, and other branches of heritage—those which transcend the framework of the sentence and pertain to sentential sequences or several parts of the text."⁷⁵ In truth, the study of any text must take into account several linguistic and cultural aspects, semantic dimensions, and contextual facets.

4. Structural Semiotic Analytical Application to a Text

Text: "The Algerian state is no longer a consuming state, but has become a producing state in many fields."

4.1 Parts of Speech in this Text:

4.1.1 First Section: The Algerian state is no longer a consuming state.

- **Analysis:** Particle of emphasis and accusative case (Inna) + singular noun in the accusative + qualifying adjective in the accusative + jussive particle of negation + verbal sentence in the nominative position as the predicate (Khabar).

Sentence Elements: Emphatic Linker + Subject + Predicate.

4.1.2 Second Section: But [it] has become a producing state in many fields.

- **Analysis:** Particle of emendation (Istidrak) + abrogating verb (Nasikh) + nominal sentence + prepositional phrase.

Sentence Elements: Emendative Linker + Subject + Predicate.

4.2 Textual Reading:

There are two sentences. The first: **"The Algerian state is no longer a consuming state,"** contains two parts:

- The first part, **"The Algerian state,"** is emphasized by the particle of emphasis and accusative case (Inna). The sentence is affirmative, indicating that the word "Algeria" signifies the personality of a fully sovereign state with constituents and constants represented by the homeland (the land), the people (various ethnic groups), the language (Arabic), and the religion (Islam).
- The second part, **"is no longer a consuming state,"** is negated by the jussive particle of negation (Lam). The sentence is negative, indicating that the fully sovereign Algerian state manufactures its own products and is no longer subject to dependency.

The second sentence: **"But [it] has become a producing state in many fields,"** contains two parts:

- The first part, **"But [it] has become a producing state,"** is an emendation using the particle (Bal). The sentence is affirmative, indicating that Algeria has entered a new status, having transitioned from a state of consumption to a state of production.
- The second part, **"in many fields,"** is an explanatory and detailed clarification in the form of a prepositional phrase, termed an "adjunct" (Fadla) in grammatical terminology, which confirms the positive state of transition.

Conclusion:

Through tracing the developmental stages of semiotics, the evolution of its structural concepts, and its methodological applications in the analysis of literary texts, it is evident that numerous foundational and organizational nuances must be addressed. This necessitates considering the elements of communication, from the sender (addresser) of the linguistic discourse to the receiver (addressee) utilizing the sense of hearing or the inner ear. This linguistic discourse integrates several key elements from which dialogues and expressions emerge, whether purely linguistic or sign-based, as observed through our examination of the science of signs, the issue of the signifier and the signified, and the distinction between language (langue), linguistics, and speech (parole).

The specificity of linguistics across its various branches—descriptive, functional, and applied—renders it capable of establishing systems, methodologies, and imperatives for the study of the word, the sentence, the text, and the discourse within the framework of modern linguistic theories. The text remains, as a linguistic unit, a focal point for researchers captivated by the sentential expressions that constitute these artistically, expressively, and methodologically diverse contexts.

Resources and References

1. Al-Jurjani. (2003). *Asrar al-Balagha [Secrets of Rhetoric]* (M. Al-Fadhli, Ed.). Al-Maktaba al-Asriyya.
2. Fadl, S. (1992). *Al-Balagha wa 'Ilm al-Nass [Rhetoric and Text Linguistics]* (1st ed.). 'Alam al-Ma'rifa.
3. Al-Jahiz. (1975). *Al-Bayan wa al-Tabyin [The Book of Eloquence and Exposition]* (A. S. Haroun, Ed. & Ann.; 1st ed.). Maktabat al-Khanji.

4. Eco, U. (2004). *Al-Ta'wil bayna al-Simiya'iyyat wa al-Tafkikiyya* [Interpretation between Semiotics and Deconstruction] (S. Bengrad, Trans.; 2nd ed.). Al-Markaz al-Thaqafi al-Arabi.
5. Groupe d'Entrevignes. (1986). *Al-Tahlil al-Simyutiqi lil-Nusus* [Semiotic Analysis of Texts] (M. Al-Sarghini, Trans.). *Journal of Literary and Linguistic Studies*, (2).
6. Cardin, C. (1987). *Al-Tahlil al-Simyutiqi wa al-Adab* [Semiotic Analysis and Literature] (A. Tankoul, Trans.). *Journal of Literary Semiotic Studies*.
7. Ibn Jinni. (2001). *Al-Khasa'is* [The Characteristics] (M. A. Al-Najjar, Ed.; 2nd ed.). Dar al-Huda.
8. Scholes, R. (1994). *Al-Simiya' wa al-Ta'wil* [Semiotics and Interpretation] (S. Al-Ghanimi, Trans.; 1st ed.). Arab Institute for Research and Publishing.
9. Schaeffer, J. M. (2004). *Al-'Alamatiyya wa 'Ilm al-Nass: Nusus Mutarjama* [Semiotics and Text Linguistics: Translated Texts] (M. Ayachi, Ed. & Trans.; 1st ed.). Al-Markaz al-Thaqafi al-Arabi.
10. Derrida, J. (2000). *Al-Kitaba wa al-Ikhtilaf* [Writing and Difference] (K. Jihad, Trans.; 2nd ed.). Dar Toubkal.
11. Al-Mahidi, A., Samoud, H., & Al-Mesdi, A. S. (1989). *Al-Nazariyya al-Lisaniyya wa al-Shi'riyya fi al-Turath min khilal al-Nusus* [Linguistic and Poetic Theory in Heritage through Texts]. Dar al-Thaqafa.
12. Al-Ghadhdhami, A. (2006). *Tashrih al-Nass* [The Anatomy of the Text] (2nd ed.). Al-Markaz al-Thaqafi al-Arabi.
13. Khalil, H. (2000). *Dirasat fi al-Lisaniyyat al-Tatbiqiyya* [Studies in Applied Linguistics]. Diwan al-Matbu'at al-Jami'iyya.
14. Al-Jurjani. (2004). *Dala'il al-I'jaz* [Proofs of Inimitability] (A. Khafaji, Ann.; 1st ed.). Dar al-Jeel.
15. Fakhoury, A. (1985). *'Ilm al-Dilala 'inda al-Arab: Dirasa Muqarana ma'a al-Simiya' al-Haditha* [Arabic Semantics: A Comparative Study with Modern Semiotics] (1st ed.). Dar al-Tali'a.
16. Abdul Jalil, A. Q. (1999). *'Ilm al-Lisaniyyat al-Haditha* [Modern Linguistics] (1st ed.). Dar Safa.
17. de Saussure, F. (1985). *'Ilm al-Lugha al-'Am* [General Linguistics] (Y. Y. Aziz & M. Y. Al-Mutallibi, Trans.). Dar Afaq Arabiyya.
18. Al-Fiqi, S. I. (2000). *'Ilm al-Lugha al-Nassi bayna al-Nazariyya wa al-Tatbiq* [Text Linguistics between Theory and Practice] (1st ed.). Dar Quba.
19. Al-Jayyar, M. (2005). *'Ilm al-Nass: Dirasa Naqdiyya Jamaliyya* [Text Science: A Critical Aesthetic Study] (1st ed.). Dar al-Fikr.
20. Bahri, S. H. (2007). *'Ilm Lughat al-Nass: Nahwa Afaq Jadida* [Text Linguistics: Towards New Horizons] (1st ed.). Maktabat Zahra' al-Sharq.
21. Barthes, R. (2003). *'Anasir al-Simiylujya* [Elements of Semiology] (M. Nazif, Trans.; 2nd ed.). Afrique Orient.
22. Todorov, T., et al. (2002). *Fi Usul al-Khitab al-Naqdi al-Jadid* [On the Origins of the New Critical Discourse] (A. Al-Madini, Trans.; 1st ed.). Dar al-Wafa.

23. Hassani, A. (1993). Mabahith fi al-Lisaniyyat [Studies in Linguistics]. Diwan al-Matbu'at al-Jami'iyya.
24. Loshen, N. H. (n.d.). Mabahith fi 'Ilm al-Lugha wa Manahij al-Bahth al-Lughawi [Studies in Linguistics and Linguistic Research Methods]. Al-Maktab al-Jami'i al-Hadith.
25. de Saussure, F. (1986). Muhadarat fi al-Alsuniyya al-'Ammah [Lectures in General Linguistics] (Y. Ghazi & M. Al-Nasr, Trans.). Algerian Foundation for Printing.
26. Al-Sarghini, M. (1987). Muhadarat fi al-Simyulujya [Lectures in Semiology] (1st ed.). Dar al-Thaqafa.
27. Darraqi, Z. (1992). Muhadarat fi al-Lisaniyyat al-Tarikhiyya wa al-'Ammah [Lectures in Historical and General Linguistics]. Diwan al-Matbu'at al-Jami'iyya.
28. Al-Qartajanni, H. (1981). Minhaj al-Bulagha' wa Siraj al-Adaba' [Method of the Eloquent and Lamp of the Literati] (M. H. Bin Khoja, Ed.; 2nd ed.). Dar al-Gharb al-Islami.
29. Eichenbaum, B., et al. (2006). Nazariyyat al-Manhaj al-Shakli [Theory of the Formal Method] (I. Al-Khatib, Trans.; 1st ed.). Dar Sana'a.

Foreign References:

1. Schaff, A. (1974). Introduction à la sémantique. Anthropos.
2. Greimas, A. J., & Courtés, J. (1979). Sémiotique: Dictionnaire raisonné de la théorie du langage. Hachette.
3. Ullmann, S. (1975). Précis de sémantique française. Francke.
4. Courtés, J. (1991). Analyze sémiotique du discours: De l'énoncé à l'énonciation. Hachette.
5. Humboldt, W., Valéry, P., & Beckett, S. (n.d.). Le langage de la pensée et l'écriture.

Footnotes:

-
- ¹ -Modern Linguistics, Abdul Qadir Abdul Jalil, p. 73.
 - ² -Semiotics and Text Linguistics: Translated Texts, Jean-Marie Schaeffer, edited and translated by Munther Ayash, pp. 13, 14, 15.
 - ³ -Text Linguistics: A Critical Aesthetic Study, Medhat Al-Jayyar, pp. 197, 203.
 - ⁴ -Ibid.
 - ⁵ -Rhetoric and Text Linguistics, Salah Fadl, p. 65.
 - ⁶ -Ibid.
 - ⁷ -Modern Linguistics, Abdul Qadir Abdul Jalil, p. 74.
 - ⁸ -Roland Barthes, a French philosopher, literary critic, semanticist, and social theorist, was born on November 12, 1915, and died on March 25, 1980. His work spanned numerous intellectual fields, influencing the development of several schools of thought, including structuralism, Marxism, post-structuralism, and existentialism, in addition to his impact on the development of semantics. Roland Barthes's works fall between structuralism and post-structuralism.
 - ⁹ -See General Linguistics, Ferdinand de Saussure, translated by Yousef Aziz and Malek Yousef Al-Mutalibi, p. 26.
 - ¹⁰ -Modern Linguistics, Abdul Qadir Abdul Jalil, p. 75.
 - ¹¹ -Icon: a statue or form, meaning a type of pictorial writing.
 - ¹² -See Modern Linguistics, Abdul Qadir Abdul Jalil, p. 76.

- ¹³ -Ibid., p. 76.
- ¹⁴ -Ibid., p. 77.
- ¹⁵ -The language of thought and writing, humboldt, valery, beckett, p48, 49
- ¹⁶ -Al-Bayan wa al-Tabyeen, Al-Jahiz, Vol. 1, p. 56.
- ¹⁷ -Studies in Applied Linguistics, Hilmi Khalil, p. 154.
- ¹⁸ -See Al-Khasa'is, Ibn Jinni, Vol. 2, pp. 145, 146, 147.
- ¹⁹ -Ibid, Vol. 2, pp. 152, 153, 154.
- ²⁰ -Ibid, Vol. 1, pp. 46, 47.
- ²¹ -Al-Khasa'is, Ibn Jinni, vol. 1, p. 44.
- ²² -Lectures on General Linguistics, de Saussure, p. 88.
- ²³ -Ibid., p. 88.
- ²⁴ -Ibid., p. 89.
- ²⁵ -Studies in Linguistics, Ahmad Hassani, p. 90.
- ²⁶ -Ibid., p. 40.
- ²⁷ -Lectures on General Linguistics, de Saussure, p. 89.
- ²⁸ -Semiotic analysis of discourse from statement to statement, Joseph Courtès, p12
- ²⁹ -Semiotic analysis of discourse from statement to statement, Goseph Courtès, p18
- ³⁰ -Linguistic and Poetic Theory in the Heritage Through Texts, Abdelkader El-Mahdi, Hammadi Samoud, Abdel Salam El-Mesdi, p. 88.
- ³¹ -Secrets of Eloquence, Al-Jurjani, p. 8.
- ³² -Ibid., p. 9.
- ³³ -Ibid., p. 45.
- ³⁴ -The Path of Eloquence and the Lamp of Literature, Hazem El-Qartajani, p. 19.
- ³⁵ -See The Signs of Inimitability, Al-Jurjani, pp. 351, 415.
- ³⁶ -Interpretation between Semiotics and Deconstruction, Umberto Eco, translated by Said Benkrad, p. 21; Semiotics and Interpretation, Robert Scholes, translated by Said Al-Ghanmi, p. 71.
- ³⁷ -Semiotic Analysis and Literature, Claude Cardin, translated by Abdul Rahman Tankoul, p. 30.
- ³⁸ -General Linguistics, Ferdinand de Saussure, translated by Youssef Ghazi and Malek Youssef Al-Mutalibi, p. 37.
- ³⁹ -Ibid., p. 84.
- ⁴⁰ -Elements of Semiology, Roland Barthes, translated by Muhammad Nazif, p. 132.
- ⁴¹ -Lectures in Semiology, Muhammad Al-Sarghini, p. 45.
- ⁴² -Writing and Difference, Jacques Derrida, translated by Kazem Jihad, p. 56.
- ⁴³ -See Lectures in General Linguistics, de Saussure, p. 21.
- ⁴⁴ -Ibid.,
- ⁴⁵ -See Studies in Linguistics and Methods of Linguistic Research, Nour El-Houda Louchen, p. 63.
- ⁴⁶ -See Lectures in Historical and General Linguistics, Zoubir Draqi, pp. 72-73.
- ⁴⁷ -See Studies in Linguistics, Ahmed Hassani, p. 39.
- ⁴⁸ -Ibid, p. 37.
- ⁴⁹ -Ibid, p. 37.
- ⁵⁰ -Lectures in General Linguistics, de Saussure, p. 33.
- ⁵¹ -Ibid, p. 25.
- ⁵² -Semiotic Analysis of Texts, Antrouvène Group, translated by Mohamed Serghini, p. 26.
- ⁵³ - semiotics-dictionary-reasoned of language theory, Greiruas and constes, Hachette Paris 1979, p103

-
- ⁵⁴ -In The Origins of the New Critical Discourse, Tzvetan Todorov et al., translated by Ahmed Al-Madini, p. 13.
- ⁵⁵ -The Theory of the Formal Method, Boris Eichenbaum et al., translated by Ibrahim Al-Khatib, p. 36.
- ⁵⁶ -Review Semantics Among the Arabs: A Comparative Study with Modern Semiotics, Adel Fakhoury, p. 29.
- ⁵⁷ -Semantics, Adam Senaf, ed. Hutropos, Paris, 1974, p. 194
- ⁵⁸ -Precis de semantics, UiSman, Fhamcaise Voti – S, ed Framcke 1975 -
- ⁵⁹ -See Text Analysis, Abdullah Al-Ghadhami, p. 5.
- ⁶⁰ -Textual Linguistics: Between Theory and Application, Sobhi Ibrahim El-Feki, Vol. 1, p. 28.
- ⁶¹ -Ibid, p. 29.
- ⁶² -Michael Halliday was born in 1925 in England to an academic family. He studied languages, graduating from Peking University in England in 1955.
- ⁶³ -Textual Linguistics: Between Theory and Application, Sobhi Ibrahim El-Feki, p. 29.
- ⁶⁴ -Textual Linguistics: Between Theory and Application, Sobhi Ibrahim El-Feki, p. 30.
- ⁶⁵ -David Crystal is a British linguist, academic, and writer, CBE. He was born in Lisbourne, Northern Ireland, in 1941, and grew up in Holyhead, North Wales, and in Liverpool, England, where he studied at St. Mary's College from 1951. Crystal studied English at University College London from 1959 to 1962.
- ⁶⁶ -Textual Linguistics: Between Theory and Application, Subhi Ibrahim al-Faqi, p. 31.
- ⁶⁷ -Ibid., p. 33.
- ⁶⁸ -Al-Khasa'is, Ibn Jinni, vol. 1, p. 33.
- ⁶⁹ -Text Linguistics: Between Theory and Application, Subhi Saleh, p. 35.
- ⁷⁰ -Ibid., p. 35.
- ⁷¹ -Harald Weinrich was born on September 24, 1927, in Wismar. He was a German writer, university professor, classical historian, Romantic scholar, and linguist.
- ⁷² -Text Linguistics: Towards New Horizons, Said Hassan Bahri, p. 43.
- ⁷³ -Ibid., p. 23.
- ⁷⁴ -Text Linguistics: Towards New Horizons, Saeed Hassan Bahri, p. 23.
- ⁷⁵ -Ibid., p. 25.