

## The nature of the text from the perspective of the western critical approach

**Hakim DEHIMI**

Department of Arabic Language

Faculty of Letters and Languages university of M'sila

[hakim.dehimi@univ-msila.dz](mailto:hakim.dehimi@univ-msila.dz)

### **Abstract:**

*Structuralism holds a central place in modern literary analysis, having helped establish a more dynamic textual theory than that of tradition. Despite criticisms declaring it obsolete, it remains a foundational pillar for contemporary approaches such as semiotics and deconstruction, which focus on the internal mechanisms of the text. Its method, predicated on the notion of close reading, thus continues to be pertinent. In the Arab world structuralism has often been conventionally adopted etc., often conveying a more ambiguous stance toward western modernity. Moreover, modern linguistics has also contributed to the scientific status of the analysis of literature to further legitimize the epistemological status of structuralism as a method within the human sciences.*

**Keyword:** Structuralism – Literary analysis – Modern linguistics – Textual theory – Western modernity

## La nature du texte du point de vue de l'approche critique occidentale

### **Resumé:**

*Le structuralisme occupe une place centrale dans l'analyse littéraire moderne, ayant permis de fonder une théorie textuelle plus dynamique que celle de la tradition. Malgré les critiques affirmant son obsolescence, il demeure un socle important pour des approches contemporaines comme la sémiotique et la déconstruction, centrées sur les mécanismes internes du texte. Sa méthode, reposant sur une lecture attentive, conserve ainsi sa pertinence. Dans le monde arabe, la réception du structuralisme a été marquée par une adoption souvent superficielle.*

*cielle, révélant une attitude ambivalente envers la modernité occidentale. Par ailleurs, la contribution de la linguistique moderne a renforcé la scientificité de l'analyse littéraire, consolidant l'épistémologie du structuralisme en tant que méthode rigoureuse dans les sciences humaines.*

**Mots-clés :** *Structuralisme – Analyse littéraire – Linguistique moderne – Théorie textuelle – Modernité occidentale.*

## Introduction

The issue of producing scientific knowledge about the text – which is the ultimate aim of modern critical approaches open to a set of rules and principles governing the functioning of the linguistic model – is in fact a natural outcome of what structuralism, in its various branches, and especially structuralist linguistics, have established in terms of frameworks that grant scientific legitimacy to the study of literary phenomena. This renders structuralism a scientific approach to literary analysis, one that seeks to comprehend the mechanisms of how the literary text operates and to lay the foundation for a modern textual theory that fundamentally differs from the boundaries set by traditional text theory. The latter has, in a way, wronged the literary text by restricting it to the act of writing and the conditions of its birth, without extending beyond these aspects to the various manifestations the text may take in its remarkable journey – from the point of formation to the receiving reader.

### 1. Structuralism on Trial

As for the extreme descriptions that diminish the importance of structuralism – such as claims of its decline in its place of origin, its failure to provide a comprehensive reading of all levels of the text, or the idea that it is a method outdated by events – these preconceived notions and judgments that attempt to overlook the role of structuralism in laying the foundational theoretical principles for the scientific study of literary texts may in fact signal a flaw in the way we connect the developments in structuralist thought with the logic of scientific evolution. On one hand, this reflects a breakdown in the mechanism of linking these devel-

opments with a coherent scientific framework. On the other, it may point to a lack of clarity among the critics regarding the depth of epistemological transformation that has characterized Western theories, which are fundamentally based on cumulative knowledge and the principle of positional exchange.

There is no theory that stands isolated or completely disconnected from its predecessor, for the intellectual foundation of most of these theories lies in how they reformulate the question in a new way—one that aligns with the demands of modernity and contemporary challenges. The ultimate goal envisioned by these theories is to continue building the edifice of knowledge in order to fulfill humanity's hopes of finding answers to its pressing questions. Therefore, there is no real contradiction in purpose between modernity (*modernité*) and postmodernity (*post-modernité*), nor between structuralism (*structuralisme*) and post-structuralism (*post-structuralisme*). The difference lies rather in the method of implementation, the pace of epistemological movement, and the way the question is reintroduced and reformulated. Ultimately, it is a matter of exchanging positions among the founding concepts of modern and post-modern thought, as well as a reordering of priorities.

## **2. The Arab Reader's Stance on the Achievements of Western Thought**

Modern critical studies have witnessed a shift in how concepts are approached, particularly regarding the precedence of exchange. For a long time, the notion of *content* dominated the field of literary studies. However, it was eventually replaced by the notion of the *text*, which has become—up to the present day—the central and dominant

concept in critical studies that aim to analyze texts based on logical principles.

While the concept of the text was previously regarded, within the structuralist perspective, as a *closed structure*—a fixed and unquestioned assumption in literary analysis and the guiding principle for most related approaches—it eventually gave way to the notions of *anti-structure* and *non-text*. These became the defining features of the deconstruction project (*Déconstruction*) and its foundational principle in shaping a new method of reading and interpreting the text—one that centers on the openness of the text to infinite meanings and multiple readings as its main path in the pursuit of meaning.

## 2.1. Modernity in Practice, from This Perspective

Modernity, in this perspective, practically means a continuous re-evaluation of our knowledge of nature in order to control it, deepen that knowledge, and improve it progressively. Revolutionarily, modernity signifies the emergence of new movements, institutions, and systems that lead to the disappearance of traditional social structures and the rise of new ones. Artistically, modernity involves a fundamental questioning that explores and investigates poetic language, opens new experimental horizons in writing practices, and invents modes of expression that are on par with this questioning. All of this must stem from a unique personal vision of the human being and the universe. (Mohamed, 2002, pp. 31-33)

Thus, human knowledge continues to grow and evolve along a coherent path, in which each subsequent contribution builds upon the one that came before—far removed from any epistemological rupture or gap that could disrupt

the course of Western intellectual development or obscure its clarity of vision.

## **2.2. As for the Arab Reception of This Western Import of Modern Methodologies, Procedural Tools, and New Philosophical Ideas that Establish a New Form of Knowledge:**

It is, in many cases, marked by a tendency toward direct adoption and partial understanding of many of its issues. Perhaps this is what led Mahmoud Amin Al-Alam to state:

"The various trends in our modern and contemporary criticism are generally echoes of European literary critical movements, and therefore also echoes of the epistemological and ideological concepts underlying these movements.".(Mahmoud, pp. 75-100)

This is the same context in which Abdel Aziz Hammouda highlighted the flaw that characterized the Arab consciousness's encounter with Western culture, affirming that: "We adopted the final outcomes of Western modernity without having experienced its foundations (Abdel, 2001, p. 27)." This position aligns with the stance of Adonis regarding the reception of the Western import. In the same context, he asserts:

"Modernity in Arab society is still something imported from outside. It is a modernity that adopts the modern product but does not adopt the mind and method that produced it. Modernity is a stance and a vision before it is a product."(Adonis, p. 84)

It is clear from these two positions that the borrowing of the Western import was not a comprehensive attempt that enabled the Arab intellectual to fully grasp the modern Western methodologies. Rather, it was a limited effort focused on direct appropriation, without extending to an understanding of the intellectual and methodological frame-

works within which these fundamental concepts of modernity had developed. According to Adonis, the Arab modernity project failed to comprehend the mechanisms of Western rationality, which renders it an inadequate endeavor—incapable of formulating a genuine modernist project that follows the model of Western modernity, draws from its core principles, and benefits from its structural foundations.

While there is indeed a fundamental difference in how the Arab approach to Western modernity is viewed in the two previous positions—those of Mahmoud Amin Al-Alam and Adonis—it lies in the fact that Mahmoud Amin Al-Alam appears convinced that the importation of Western modernity into the Arab cultural sphere necessarily entails the importation and adoption of the cultural frameworks that drive this modernity. This, in his view, poses a threat to identity due to the risk of assimilation into the culture of the other and detachment from the Arab-Islamic value system. In contrast, Adonis explicitly denies that the Arab mind has grasped the cultural and epistemological background from which this modernity emerged. This reveals a clear divergence in the understanding of the *mechanism* (*mécanisme*) of Arab reception of Western modernity—at least between these two thinkers—particularly in its various dimensions.

Many of the prevalent ideas in modern Arab discourse are marked by a poor understanding of the Western cultural context and by a hasty uprooting of that context from its original environment to transplant it into the Arab cultural sphere. This is often done with the aim of keeping pace with the West's progress and establishing (*mise en place*) new mechanisms for understanding the complex crises in the Arab reality. However, such attempts to adapt the Western import—whether cultural or intellectual—to the demands of

Arab cultural reality, along with the insistence on finding solutions to overcome various forms of disorientation, remain ineffective. This is because the act of benefiting from the West, if not grounded in a comprehensive understanding of its intellectual output—one that takes into account its partial components within the natural environment in which they were formed, and that embraces all the dimensions they might imply—will always fall short of achieving the intended goal.

Therefore, the extraction of achievements from the West—even at its best—remains a damaged extraction (*extraction endommagée*). This may be what has led to the Arab stance toward structuralism being one marked by ambiguity and misunderstanding, which can be attributed to many factors. However, it is also a reflection of a fundamental misapprehension of how the Western intellectual system operates, including the procedural tools it employs—tools that have found only unclear resonance in the Arab cultural environment. The absence of a comprehensive analytical view of Western accomplishments, along with the lack of intelligent application of these achievements and an understanding of the nature of conflict in all its forms and levels within our Arab reality, reduces the potential to benefit from the immense progress that contemporary approaches (*approche*) and understandings (*compréhension*) have achieved in today's world. It also hinders the possibility of proposing a modern Arab project—one that remains faithful to tradition as a genuine reference, while also being open to the Western contribution as a new opportunity for exchange and appropriation.

In the absence of the objective conditions necessary to achieve such a civilizational goal, the Arab researcher's perspective remains flawed, as is the case with the stereotyped

(*stéréotypée*) attitude toward structuralism in Arab criticism. Structuralism is considered by many as an outdated commodity whose validity period has expired, whereas, in a sense, it remains a primary material – an original source for ready-made products that appear novel and contemporary (*d'actualité*) on the surface, but in reality, they are nothing more than a reworking and reconfiguration of the original material, that is, the primary reference.

There is no doubt that a conscious understanding of the backgrounds of Western modernity and postmodernity, and the comprehension of the most important fundamental categories (*catégories fondamentales*) introduced by structuralism and its subsequent methodologies – ranging from literary semiotics to deconstruction and its methods of reading and aesthetics – along with all the accompanying attempts to codify the linguistic phenomenon, and through it the literary phenomenon as one that uses language as its tool, is what led one of the Arab critics and professor-researchers to acknowledge structuralism's contribution in establishing a foundation of scientific rigor in the field of human sciences. He says: "Structuralism was specifically established to recover the perspective called the 'emergent vision,' which is based on studying things in themselves before addressing their events and history (...) The concept of structure, ultimately, is nothing but a mental device or intellectual activity aimed at placing things within comprehensible, rational, clearly structured systems – clear in their functions, and precise in their relationships and connections." (Salah, 1985, p. 23)

### **3. The Role of Linguistics in the Field of Human Sciences**

So as not to stray from the context of our research, which primarily revolves around the impact of structuralist thought in shaping the concept of the text and its extensions in modern critical and methodological studies, as well as its contributions to establishing modern critical currents such as literary semiotics and deconstruction, we must emphasize the prominent and functional role that modern linguistics has played in the field of human sciences in order to establish a comprehensive scientific perspective for studying the literary subject. "It is well known that linguistics has become an indisputable focal point in the field of human sciences. All these sciences now resort, in their research methodologies and in evaluating their scientific outcomes, to linguistics and the scientific assessments and methods of inference it produces. The reason behind all these phenomena is that the human sciences today strive earnestly to understand the objective position under the pressure of the scientific approach toward modern man." (Abdel, 1977, p. 10)

Linguistics forms the fundamental basis for attempting to build a theory concerned with the scientific study of language and the scientific study of the text. This strengthens the theses of the structuralist approach in this context, which calls for focusing on the internal system of the text and emphasizing the network of relationships existing between its elements. It directs research toward the issue of the units and functions that organize and arrange these relationships, taking into account the dual operation of the linguistic sign at every step taken in this direction; that is, benefiting from the limits of the relationship between the signifier and the signified. This means that the association of structuralism with the scientific approach in contemporary research, in its attempt to elevate the literary phenomenon to the status of

other scientific phenomena that accept scientific hypotheses and respond to universal laws, is a logic that imposes itself in current linguistic studies and takes its place within literary studies that tend toward scientific rigor and methodological precision.

We can summarize this structuralist influence on the development of the scientific perspective toward understanding the literary text with a concise statement by Abdullah Ibrahim, which clearly acknowledges the merit of structuralism in the subject of critical study, expressing that "structuralism is a response to a purely scientific desire." (Abdullah, 1985, p. 62)

#### **4. The Literary Text from the Structuralist Approach Perspective:**

The literary text represents the culmination of all theoretical and practical efforts, intellectual and philosophical. Yet, it remains elusive and difficult to define. Perhaps this is because it is a goal contested by various intellectual doctrines and critical approaches that differ in their premises and objectives. This has made the concept of the text multiple and flexible to the extent that we cannot precisely and definitively define its meaning. The multiplicity of concepts and terms related to the text, depending on the diversity of intellectual and cultural references contributing to the construction of these terms, applies both to the status of the text in Western culture and to the reality of the text in the Arab environment. The conceptual shifts (*Développement des notions*) affecting the text in the Arab critical space are akin to an infection transmitted under specific conditions to the Arab cultural conceptual system, causing the text to acquire multiple concepts derived from a cultural environment foreign

to it. This is a state of "fait accompli" (established fact), as Arab thought has not yet managed to enrich the space of Arab culture with new concepts capable of nourishing its social and cultural reality and adding to its knowledge hierarchy. Thus, the field of civilizational contribution and addition to the heritage of humanity is determined, and with it – for example – the concept of the text gains its Arab reference framework.

As long as this demand remains a kind of dream that finds its origin in the Arab unconscious without transcending into the realm of true consciousness, the concept of the text within the conceptual system it operates remains distinctly Western. What confirms this fact is that we fail to find a self-contained, independent concept with its own intellectual and literary characteristics linked to the Arab cultural and literary linguistic history. This is despite the fact that the Arab heritage has remained in constant contact with the "text" particularly in its foundational (usuliyyah) notions (referring to the science of principles). The Arab mind has relied heavily on the authority of the Qur'anic text and the authority of the Hadith text in all aspects of its thought. It should be noted, however, that the text within this foundational (canonical) cultural horizon differs entirely from the concept of the literary text that we seek in this research context, which is primarily associated with literature and criticism understood as a conscious and specialized reading of literature.

#### **4.1. We have chosen to highlight some concepts related to the text within this context because of our conviction in two things:**

**First:** That the issue of the concept in itself represents the ultimate goal of scientific knowledge pursued by modern

methodologies and currents, based on the premise that "today's knowledge is more about concepts than about things. Concepts appear organized in chains that sometimes connect and sometimes separate, and they seem to produce one another as if completely unaware of their surroundings, as if they exist in total independence from any authority except their own." (Omar, 1992, p. 16)

**Second:** The concept of the literary text is one of the fundamental issues that has undergone a qualitative transformation through three prominent stages in Arab critical practice, as it represents one of the channels through which Western critical culture has manifested itself in Arab criticism, considering that this Western culture serves as a reference for this critical practice. These prominent stages in the history of literary criticism are as follows:

**First:** The stage of referential criticism (*Critique référentielle*), which refers to criticism that links the text to its historical, social, ideological, or psychological reference.

Second: The stage of artistic criticism, which treats the text as a given of artistic experience (textual criticism – *Critique textuelle*, as it is commonly used in some Arab critical books, a term literally translated from the French language).

**Third:** Analytical criticism, or what is called deconstructive criticism (*Critique dé-constructive*), which is associated with the philosophy of Jacques Derrida and the related concepts concerning writing, meaning in the text, and reading – since every reading cancels out the previous readings, leading to the transformation of the text into a non-text (*la non-texte*), where the existing structure of the text is subverted and deconstructed.

What concerns us most in this context of the transformations of the concept of the text is the second stage, which

served as an intellectual and temporal framework for the emergence of structuralism as a textual approach aiming to reveal the determining relationships that build the text — which is nothing but a system of relationships characterized by a set of features, perhaps the most important being self-regulation. This makes the text take on the concept of a linguistic structure closed upon itself and operating by itself; that is, it is viewed as a set of organized procedures within a linguistic-textual composition that opens onto a network of internal relationships exchanged among its elements, while cutting off any connection with external elements that do not belong to its internal system. Thus, in this perspective, the text is “fixed and closed. It has a central structure or an underlying hidden system. The text’s literariness or its system is formed solely from textual/self/internal signs. Humans are governed by a set of fixed hidden systems; humans are synchronous/timeless beings, and the world has a structure or system — that is, it has a center (Europe). The world moves or is moved by a fixed system consisting of a set of relationships, and therefore the human (with a kasra on the *yā’*) is absent because relationships (in the text and the world) precede being/existence. The being of the text and the world comes later, as a mere embodiment or effect of these relationships.” (Shukri, 1997, pp. 17-18)

To delineate more precise features of the concept of the text within the structuralist perspective, we must gather as many concepts and conceptual approaches as possible regarding the nature of the literary text through various stages of the development of structuralist thought — starting with Ferdinand de Saussure’s early lectures in general linguistics given to his students, passing through the Russian Formalists movement and the Prague Circle, and finally reaching modern structuralism in its various branches, all in pursuit

of a comprehensive concept of the true nature of the literary text.

Saussure understood the text as a linguistic structure, which he defined through his statement: "Nothing is distinguished before the linguistic structure." (Mejan & Saad, 1995, p. 29) From this statement, we can infer that the linguistic structure is the only present and controllable reality. Therefore, from the Saussurean perspective, the text is language itself, along with its elements that are consistent with each other thanks to the reciprocal relationships between them, characterized by transformation within a closed system isolated from external changes.

A concept of the literary text can be inferred by examining some key points from the Russian Formalists in their definitions of the purpose of literary art. For Victor Shklovsky, "The purpose of art is to give us the sensation of the thing as it is seen... The act of perception in art is an end in itself... In art, our experience lies in the process of construction, not in the finished product." (Robert, 1984, p. 100)

This position points us to the most important feature in the concept of the text according to the Russian Formalist movement: that the text is an experience of formal construction and formulation. In this description, it reflects the skill of construction and the uniqueness of the tool employed in building the literary text. In this sense, it derives its truth from the nature of its construction; it does not reflect any image other than the image of the text itself. The text is the text itself.

This idea is defined with a certain focus on the reality of the events within the text, which, from the Formalist perspective, represent nothing but the functioning of the internal elements that constitute the linguistic structure—the

body and spirit of the text. As Boris Eikhenbaum states: "...The synergy of a set of new events within the framework of their specific interrelation strikes us as the discovery of those events, since their existence outside the system is, scientifically speaking, equivalent to their non-existence." (Robert, 1984, p. 96)

What can be understood from this statement is that the text is a system in which the meaning of things is determined through their positioning within mutual relationships imposed by the logic of the text's own system. This grants them existence within this system, which represents the true manifestation of the structure. The existence and being of these elements remain threatened with collapse if they assume a position outside this system. But what is the nature of this relationship that preserves the existence of these elements within the structural system of the literary work?

"The unity of the literary work is not a closed entity, but a dynamic integration. Its elements are not connected by relations of equality or addition, but by relations of dynamic coexistence and complementarity. Therefore, one must perceive the form of the literary work as a dynamic form." (Fakhr al-Din, 1984, p. 193)

As a result, the literary text is a continuous "dynamic" movement among the totality of its constituent elements within the structure, according to the requirements of the system that reflects their embodiment. This concept does not differ from the previous one as long as it moves within the circle of element, relation, and integration within the system.

As for Jakobson (one of the key figures of the Russian Formalists and the Prague Linguistic Circle), he crystallizes the previous concepts and draws from the Swiss linguist Saussure's understanding of the linguistic system and its associated functions, revealing the literary reality of the lit-

erary text when he says: "The subject of the literary work is not literature itself but literariness, that is, what makes the work a literary work." (Yaqtin, 1989, p. 164)

Although Jakobson's discussion focuses on the "literary work" (Oeuvre littéraire), we understand from the context that the concept applies to the text, based on the idea that a literary work can encompass a collection of texts. It is worth noting that there is an overlap in usage among the terms "literary text," "literary work," "corpus", and "literary discourse" in Arab critical usage, each with its own particularities.

Despite some ambiguity in dealing with these terms in Arabic criticism, it seems that "corpus" is linked to the physical dimension of the text, regardless of its type, and relates to the accumulation of texts and works by a certain author in a given era. Meanwhile, "text" and "discourse" are connected to the conceptual structure that distinguishes them, differing in length and scope; discourse is broader than text. Discourse is defined as "a set of intellectual products intended to be conveyed to a receiver through written, spoken, or visual texts, which presents a comprehensive or partial stance on an existing or hypothetical issue or problem – in other words, the presentation of thought from a particular viewpoint on a certain subject." (Mohamed, 1983, p. 5)

According to Jakobson's concept of literariness, the literary text is the manner in which the structure is realized, embodying the specific mechanisms that govern the functioning of elements within the literary system. This underscores Jakobson's emphasis on the form of the structure and the impact of the network of relationships underlying its elements in shaping his concept of the text.

It is worth recalling here the applied model Jakobson presented through his analysis of the poem "*The Cats*" by the French poet Baudelaire, in collaboration with Claude Lévi-Strauss. This analysis led to several conclusions, the most important of which is that poetic imagery, as rhetorical forms, results from the nature of the composition and its components. This allows us to understand that the method of construction or "technique" (Téchnique) employed in formulating the text is essentially the true generator of imagery and the text's metaphorical dimension. It also affirms that literariness is essentially the product of the engineering of the structure, which places each element in its natural position within the linguistic system—a system inherently characterized by transformation.

Lévi-Strauss believed in the results reached by Jakobson and benefited from his perspective on the literary work, which led him to acknowledge that the social fact does not differ from the linguistic fact, affirming that "meaning is given only by the combination: only by the structure." (Baraka, 1986, p. 73)

The connection of the concept of the literary text to the specificity of its structure is the very idea that led Jacques Derrida (one of the second generation structuralists) to present his understanding of the text, revealing its truth by saying: "There is nothing outside the text." (Christopher, 1981, p. 48) This implies that the text is the linguistic structure itself, which the text embodies along with its possibilities of reference. Delving into the text, according to Derrida's expression, means nothing but creating a hole in the text's structure to uncover the hidden and latent elements behind the physical existence of the text. This is likely what he meant by deconstruction, which targets the syntactic relationships in the text through the practice of fragmentation in

order to reconstruct the elements, achieving the discovery of the structure that previously existed in the work. It is as if the matter concerns the necessity of destruction in order to discover how the text is constructed.

As for Roland Barthes, he does not differ from the previous approach regarding the set of concepts that investigate the essence of the literary text. In his view, literature "is nothing but language, that is, a system of signs not located in its content but rather in this system." (Mundhir, 1987, p. 13)

It can be inferred from this concept, compared to the previous ones, that Roland Barthes introduced the element of the sign (the signifier). This is justified if we consider his effort to incorporate some principles of the linguistic sign in his attempt to establish a semiological literary criticism (Critique sémiologique). However, what should be emphasized—based on the previous concept—is that the literary text still retains the reality of being a system and a network of interrelated relations in some way. Moreover, Barthes' text is a text of signs in the structuralist sense, as these signs relate to a system rather than to content.

The concept of the text in Gérard Genette's perspective is defined through his focus on rhetorical forms as a means of access to the world of the literary text. His study of Proust's novel *In Search of Lost Time* (*À la recherche du temps perdu*), among other analytical studies of several narrative texts, points to the importance of investigating rhetorical forms in order to arrive at a concept of the text. For Genette, realism begins at the moment when one can search for and compare a word or sentence with another word or sentence that was used in its place or was not used, according to his expression. Undoubtedly, this concept, derived from rhetoric, im-

explicitly refers to the issue of the text's realization rhetorically or according to rhetorical realism. This is achieved through the ability to grasp the movement of a word or sentence within its use in the linguistic system. Consequently, the text takes on the characteristic of a "mechanism" within which the word is positioned in the linguistic discourse. Ultimately, this is a conception that aligns with the system within which linguistic elements interact according to the structuralist concept, reaffirming once again the continuity of the text's meaning according to the same concept, as we have seen with the aforementioned figures despite differences in perspective.

From another perspective, Halliday (M. Halliday) and Ruqayya Hassan see that the reality of the text is based on cohesion, which is the aspect reflected by the regularity of elements within the linguistic system. They consider that: "The text is a semantic unit, and sentences are only the means through which the text is realized... For any text to have textuality, it must rely on a set of linguistic means that create textuality, such that these means contribute to its overall unity." (Mohamed, p. 13)

From the previous statement, we can infer that the unity of the text is a fundamental aspect in achieving textuality. This unity reflects the operation of linguistic elements according to a strict systemic coherence, which reminds us of how the network of realized relations in the text forms a self-contained system, as discussed in previous concepts. This leads us to conclude that the position of Halliday and Ruqayya Hassan aligns with the developmental trajectory of the concept of the text amid the transformations witnessed in scientific criticism regarding the precision of concepts, especially those related to the essence of the literary text.

In the context of structural stylistics, the text is a stylistic phenomenon, and style is "the central function organizing discourse." Within this framework, the text derives its meaning through phonetic, morphological, and lexical phenomena that integrate to produce the style of the text or the linguistic structure of the text.(Abdel Salam, p. 119)

From the perspective of structural psychoanalysis, the text is linked to the author, who in their creation emanates from two main poles according to Freud's psychoanalysis: the unconscious and the conscious (conscience). The study of the unconscious as an implicit language allows the discovery of the set of laws governing the operation of the text as a reflection of unconscious data on the symbolic level of the text. The power of psychoanalysis lies in expanding the unconscious as a language with its founding laws, its system, and its distinctive network of relations governing the operation of the elements of the unconscious. All this is justified by the fact that, ultimately, the literary text is an image of the human psyche.

It appears that the awareness of the importance of the unconscious and its involvement in the production of the text, from the perspective of psychoanalysis, is what encouraged Jacques Lacan to develop a structuralist perspective aided by psychoanalytic data. His starting point is fundamentally that the unconscious is a language governed by a system. Understanding the mechanism of its operation and the reciprocal relationships between its elements is a crucial step in interrogating the unconscious and discovering its role in the formation of the creative text.

Jacques Lacan defined two basic rules to achieve this goal: the rule of metaphor and the rule of metonymy. These formed the basis of his analysis of the language of the un-

conscious, without neglecting the two poles of meaning introduced by Saussure (the signifier and the signified), which remained the referential framework for the operation of these two rules (metaphor and metonymy). He concluded that "metaphor" corresponds to "condensation" in Freud's theory, while "metonymy" corresponds to displacement or transfer.

In this same context, Julia Kristeva emphasizes the importance of the language of dreams, describing it as "a structure with its own syntax and logic." Based on this definition, the structuralist approach that draws on psychoanalysis does not differ from other structuralist attempts, as it considers the dream a language with specific rules governing its system. Understanding the reality of these elements and how they are positioned within the system to which they belong opens awareness to the true relationship between the two poles of the poet's psychic universe (consciousness and unconsciousness). This is a fundamental step in the path toward understanding the structure of the literary text within the framework of the psychoanalytically-informed approach.

It is worth recalling in this context that the attempt to integrate the various propositions brought by structuralism with the findings of Freud's research in psychoanalysis and his exploration of the unconscious was not limited only to what Jacques Lacan and Julia Kristeva pursued, as we have seen earlier. Rather, it also extended to the Gestalt school in psychoanalytic criticism through its contributions to enriching psychoanalysis by incorporating fundamental structural concepts that define the nature of the text's functioning.

## Conclusion

It can be concluded from the above that the concept of the text, within the framework of the multi-faceted structuralist approach, is fundamentally linked to the linguistic structure in its phonetic, syntactic, morphological, lexical, and semantic dimensions. This structure is the result of the integration of various elements that constitute the material of the text into the text's own system according to a certain logic (a mental structure) and internal relationships that ensure the consistency of these elements with each other, enabling them to fulfill their roles within the text's structure as a self-sufficient entity that expresses itself through itself. It is also connected to an awareness of the nature of the unconscious structure and the determination of its relationship system with the system of consciousness within the psychoanalytic perspective.

## References:

- Abdel, A. H. (2001). *Concave Mirrors (Towards an Arabic Critical Theory)*.
- Abdel, S. A.-M. (1977). *Foundational Studies in Linguistics*. Bin Abdullah Publishing and Distribution.
- Abdel Salam, A.-M. *Style and Stylistics*.
- Abdullah, I. (1985). (*An Introduction to Modern Critical Approaches*) (1st edition ed.). Arab Cultural Center.
- Adonis. *Arab Poetics*. Dar Al-Adab.
- Baraka, B. (1986). Language and Social Structure, . *Journal of Contemporary Arab Thought*(40), 73.

- Christopher, N. (1981). , *Deconstruction - Theory and Application*, translated by Raad Abdel Jalil Murad. Dar Al-Hiwar for Publishing and Distribution Latakia.
- Fakhr al-Din, J. (1984). *The Form of the Arabic Poem in Arabic Criticism until the Eighth Hijri Century* (1st edition ed.). Dar Al-Adab.
- Mahmoud, A. A.-A. *The Cognitive and Philosophical Roots of Modern and Contemporary Arabic Literary Criticism*.
- Mejan, A.-R., & Saad, A.-B. (1995). *The Literary Critic's Guide*. Kingdom.
- Mohamed, K. *Text Linguistics: An Introduction to Discourse Coherence* (1st edition ed.). Arab Cultural Center.
- Mohamed, L. A.-Y. (2002). *Data* (1st edition 1993 ed.). Dar Saras Publishing.
- Mohamed, M. (1983). *Analysis of Poetic Discourse (Intertextuality Strategy)* (1st edition ed.). Arab Cultural Center.
- Mundhir, A. (1987). *Literary Discourse and Text Linguistics*, . *Al-Ma'rifa Al-Suriyya*(300-301), 13.
- Omar, A.-S. (1992). *The Concept in Its Place or the Relationship Between Philosophy and Sciences*. Dar Al-Janoub.
- Robert, S. (1984). *Structuralism in Literature*, translated by Hanna Abboud. Arab Writers Union, Damascus.
- Salah, F. (1985). *The Theory of Structuralism in Literary Criticism* (3 edition ed.). New Horizons Publishing House.
- Shukri, A. A.-M. (1997). *Problems of Modern Arabic Criticism* (First Arabic Edition ed.). Dar Faris for Publishing and Distribution.
- Yaqtin, S. (1989). *Analysis of Narrative Discourse* (1st edition ed.). Arab Cultural Center Casablanca.