

TRANSFER OF CATEGORIES AND TERMINOLOGY BETWEEN 'TEXT' AND 'TEXTS'. AN INTERDISCIPLINARY MODEL OF THE CONCEPT 'TEXT' AND IT'S HISTORY FROM TEXT CRITICISM TO CONTEMPORARY DISCOURSE IN ARTS AND SCIENCES

Fee-Alexandra HAASE
University of Nizwa
f.haase1@gmx.de

Abstract

This article is interested in the phenomenon 'text' both as a cognitive and linguistic concept and as a construct in the history of scholarship with a historical review of definitions and functions of the text as well as studies of concrete texts. In the tradition of art as '*mimesis*' (imitation), of textual criticism of Hellenism and Christian theology, of modern linguistic definitions and functions of the text, and in contemporary types of texts employed by scholars we trace the concept of 'text' until the contemporary state of research. Culminating in the question of the authority determining '*What is a text and what not?*' we face finally the need of an interdisciplinary text model for the text as a complex construct of textual sequences. This model presented here will take into account the historical, interdisciplinary, and structural aspects of the analysis of texts. We will demonstrate that a proper understanding of 'text' and its studies as a method is only possible, when texts are analyzed in a process of 'reading' with the background of various academic disciplines according to the here proposed model.

Keywords:

Text, texts, *mimesis*, textual criticism, modern linguistic.

I. The Current Impact and Relevance of the Non-Linguistic Origin of the 'Text' as a Concept

Which notion(s) do humans have regarding 'text'? In order to trace the meanings of 'text', we review here the etymological history of meanings of related word in other languages. Concrete associated meanings of nouns

are semantically stable and evolved around the abstract concept of a The Proto-Indo-European roots **tek-* and **tekVs-* have the meaning ‘weave’. In existing languages related is the Old Indian word *takmán-*, which means ‘a disease accompanied by skin-eruptions’. Armenian *thekhem* means ‘turn’, ‘weave’, and ‘uncoil’. Related are also the Slavic roots **tъkātī*, **tъkō*, **tъčb*, and **tъčjā*, the Baltic root **takiš-ia-*, the Germanic roots **θax-t-u-*, **θēx=*, and **θōx=*. The root was productive in the Lation language, from which many loanwords, among them the word ‘text’, entered into the vernacular European languages. Latin *texo* means ‘wave’, ‘weave’, and ‘build’, as well as ‘construct with wood’ and ‘build artfully’. *Textum* means translated as loanword ‘texture’; *textum* is also ‘texture’ and ‘context’. *Tela* means ‘tissue’; *subtilis* means ‘fine’, ‘fine feeling’, ‘fine sensing’, ‘exact’, ‘sharp thinking’, and ‘simple’; *subtemen* means ‘strike in the tissue’, ‘yarn’, and ‘thread’. The Proto-Germanic roots **θaxtu-z*, **θēx=*, and **θōx=* have the meanings ‘thread’ and ‘wire’. Old Norse *θāttr* means ‘wire’, ‘thread’, ‘segment’, and ‘part’. Related are Norwegian *tøtt*, Swedish *tøt* for ‘wire’ and *tøtte* for ‘cotton flake’. The Middle Low German words *dacht* and *decht* are used for ‘wick’. Old High German *tāht* means ‘wick’ and ‘thread’. In contemporary German the word *Docht* means ‘wick’. (Starostin 2015) The Latin noun *textus* has the meanings ‘texture’, ‘tissue’, and ‘structure’ in the context of poetry in post-Augustan prose. In Literary Latin in the expression “haec sunt tenuia textu” Lucretius (4,728) and in “capiuntur purpurae parvulis rarique textu”. Plinius (9,37,61) uses the term ‘textum’. As a trope for language ‘textum’ has the meanings ‘construction’, ‘combination’, ‘connection’, and ‘context’ as used by Quintilian (9,4,13; 8, 6, 57). Other uses as a trope are “rem brevi textu percurram” (Amm. 15, 7, 6), “ut ostendit textus superior” (15, 8, 1), “quod contra foederum textum juvarentur Armeniae” (id. 27, 12, 18) and “gestorum” (id. 27,12,11). (Lewis; Short 1879) The term ‘textura’ has the meanings ‘web’ and ‘texture’. In a literary context it appears with “aranearum” in Plautius (Stich. 2.2.24) and with “Minervae” (Prop. 4 (5), 5.23. Sen. Ep. 121.22). With a transferred meaning it is used as ‘construction’ and ‘structure’ in “quam tenui constet textura (animi natura)” by Lucretius (3.209). (Lewis; Short 1879) *Textilis* has the meanings ‘woven’, ‘wrought’, and ‘textile’. In a literary context it is used as adjective with ‘tegmen’ by Lucretius (5.1350), with ‘stragulum’ by Cicero (Tusc. 5,21,61) and together with ‘dona’ by Vergile (A. 3.485). As a compound expression with ‘aurum’. As noun

‘textile’ means ‘web’, ‘stuff’, ‘fabric’, ‘piece of cloth’, ‘canvas’ as used in the expression “nego ullam picturam in textili (fuisse), quin” by Cicero (Verr. 2.4.1.§1) and “textile” by Cicero (Leg. 2.18.45). Transferred the word *textilis* means ‘plaited’, ‘braided’, ‘interwoven’, ‘intertwined’, ‘constructed’ used e.g. with ‘serta’ for ‘garlands of roses’ (Mart. 6, 80, 8) and ‘pileus’ (App. M. 11. p. 261.2.). (Lewis; Short 1879) ‘Text’, as we can see from the Latin meanings, has always been a concept closely related to linguistics; first employed in the context of poetry, the art of making poems, it developed from a general meaning of ‘weaving’ as the produced fabric to the specific meaning of the faculty of writing. The non-linguistic meaning of the ‘text’ can be traced to the processes of a structuring production and the earliest human handcraft of weaving is associated with it semantically. As for the conceptual meaning of this process, at the end of the 20th century it was revived by the internet as a term for a means of communication, which is an overarching network for the exchange of information in various media. The digital media, basically the internet and other devices based on the digital codification of the contents, can be seen as a continuation of associated media terms for communicative means. In the following parts we will describe the position of the ‘text’ in the history of academia and the arts.

II. The Text as a Construct in the History of Scholarship

1. A Historical Review of Definitions and Functions of the Text in the Tradition of Textual Criticism

The Phenomenon ‘Text’ in the History of Sciences

The Greeks employed for the principle of resemblance the term *mimesis* and referred to the question how art can imitate nature. The aspect of the mimetic qualities of pieces of art or writing was theoretically inquired by rhetoricians and philosophers who also extended this aspect to poetry. The question how to deal with texts arose in the later Hellenistic age with the aim to preserve ancient writings especially in the Egyptian city of Alexandria. With the beginning of Christianity until the 19th century texts as valuable sacred or religious documents were approached in textual studies, which meant basically studies of Christian texts called scripture.

Also in the following centuries the interest in texts of contemporary and vernacular languages continued and extended to a broader spectrum of

texts deemed worthy to be studied. While the historical place of textual criticism can be localized as the Hellenistic Alexandria, we have since that time a tradition of the textual criticism, which continued across the Biblical criticism of the *Old Testament* and *New Testament* into the millennia after the fall of the classical Greek and Roman cultures as tasks of preservation and copying especially during the Middle Ages. The classical rhetorical heritage was turned into a means of hermeneutics and interpretation. The invention of the printing press during the Renaissance allowed for the first time a text to be copied mechanically and to be distributed and stored for a wide audience. The transmission of text from a manuscript to a printed edition, but also the change from one place to another, the emergence of new media, and any copying process made a critical revision necessary during all centuries. Regarding the scriptures, the common interpretative pattern of Biblical texts was a interpretation of the text in the four-fold way of the scripture of the *Old Testament* developed by the Church Fathers as literal, as allegory and typus, as ethic and tropological, and as anagogic and eschatological as means for the interpretative aspects of the text. The distinction between 'lower criticism' and 'higher criticism' was developed in the course of the studies of the ancient texts. The Biblical textual criticism was the field of scholarly enterprises, which aimed at the preservation of the texts of the *Bible*. Also the question of the translation of the texts was raised here, since the original texts relevant for the *Bible* were written in various languages and these languages at the time they were written and later were only understood by trained educated persons. So also the need of the translation into contemporary vernacular languages arose and raised political and cultural changes. The *Bible* was edited using the concept of the '*textus receptus*' of the Greek New Testament based on Erasmus' Greek text. (Kip Wheeler 2015) Among the secular writings the classical writings of the ancient Greek and Roman culture deemed until the 18th century to be the most worthy writings to undergo the process of the critical revisions of philologists. The contemporary and vernacular writings were the last ones to be considered text worth to be examined. With the subdivisions of different disciplines studying languages and literatures of different cultures, the term 'text' was used by different scholars of languages and literatures. In textual criticism the aim is to have texts examined for the "collection, comparison, and collating of all textual variants in order to reconstruct or recreate a single authoritative text,

especially one that reflects authorial intention.” On the contrary, ‘text’ in literary criticism is used by formalist critics in order to refer to a single work of literary art considering this text as “an autonomous verbal object--i.e., it is self-enclosed and self-creating, and thus the critic need not necessarily explicate it using the biography of the author, or the historical background of its time-period, or other “extra-textual” details.” (Kip Wheeler 2015) In textual criticism the phenomenon of the ‘textual variant’ exist as “a version of a text that has differences in wording or structure compared with other texts, especially one with missing lines or extra lines added.” (Kip Wheeler 2015) ‘Textual criticism’ (*A Glossary of Literary Terms*: 317) “undertakes to establish the principles and procedures that will justify the text of a literary or other work that a scholarly editor prepares and makes available to the public. The theory and practice of textual criticism goes back many centuries. It was applied at first to biblical and classical texts, of which all the surviving manuscripts had been written (and often altered) by scribes long after the death of the original writers.” The opposition between the original text and the copy was and is each time challenged, when the possibility of a copy is given. Besides the fact that a copy is not an original, the alteration of the original in the copy challenged the uniqueness of the text.

The Contemporary Conceptualization of the ‘Text’: The Terms ‘Textuality’ and ‘Texture’

The contemporary conceptualization of the concept ‘text’ must be understood from the perspective of its components: the terminology, from which it developed, and the related perspective onto the text; as we have seen, the ‘text’ has its origin as a specific term of a jargon in the poetological use of poets and also in rhetoric; in the modern and postmodern time the term further developed and applied by various disciplines of the humanities. The term ‘textuality’ derived from the context of the French deconstructive term *écriture*. (Kip Wheeler 2015) De Beaugrand and Dressler (1981: 3) suggested 'seven standards of textuality':

Acceptability
Coherence
Cohesion
Informativity
Intentionality

Intertextuality
Situationality

The term ‘texture’ used by John Crowe Ransom and the New Critics involves “poetic details such as the modification of the metrical pattern, associations attached to words, and the aural values of spoken sounds.” (Kip Wheeler 2015) In the *The Routledge Dictionary of Literary Terms* (2006: 237-238) is written on ‘texture’: “Strictly, the word texture when applied to language, describes the tactile images employed to represent various physical surfaces, but by extension has come to mean the representation in words of all physical phenomena. The widespread use of the term is based on the assumption that words have an expressive or simulative aspect which helps to illustrate their meanings more immediately.” On text as *écriture* is written in the *A Glossary of Literary Terms* (1999 316-317): “Traditional critics have conceived the object of their critical concern to be a literary “work,” whose form is achieved by its author’s design and its meanings by the author’s intentional uses of the verbal medium. French *structuralist* critics, on the other hand, depersonalized a literary product by conceiving it to be not a “work,” but an impersonal text, a manifestation of the social institution called *écriture* (writing). The author is regarded as an intermediary in whom the action of writing precipitates the elements and codes of the pre-existing linguistic and literary system into a particular text.”

2. Modern and Postmodern Definitions and Functions of the Text

The ‘Text’ in the French Philosophy: Barthes – Foucault - Derrida

In the 20th century the text was as a scholarly concept of the modern disciplines established; so linguistic structuralism employed the text as a concept. But with the emergence of the postmodern concept, also disciplines like philosophy and re-emerged rhetoric were interested in the phenomenon ‘text’. De Saussure (1966: 6) writes in *Course In General Linguistics* in *Chapter II. Subject Matter And Scope Of Linguistics; Its Relations With Other Sciences*: “The subject matter of linguistics comprises all manifestations of human speech, whether that of savages or civilized nations, or of archaic, classical or decadent periods. In each period the linguist must consider not only correct speech and flowery language, but all other forms of expression as well. And that is not all: since he is often

unable to observe speech directly, he must consider written texts (...)."Within the humanities a broader range of terminology for the understanding written and spoken speech and language and fields of studies like semiotics used the concept 'text' as a central means of meta-discourse. Based on the achievements of the structural linguistic approach, French philosophers in the second half of the 20th century developed a theory of the text, which entailed concepts of the text exceeding the actual area of linguistics. Barthes (1975) in *The Pleasure of the Text* developed the following concepts:

| | |
|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Affirmation / Affirmation | Langue / Tongue |
| Babel / Babel | Lecture / Reading |
| BaNI/Prattle | Mandarinat / Mandarinate |
| Bords / Edges | Moderne / Modern |
| Brio / Brio | Nihilisme / Nihilism |
| Clavage / Split | Nomination / Nomination |
| Communaute / Community | Obscurantisme / Obscurantism |
| Corps / Body | Oedipe / Oedipus |
| Commentaire / Commentary | Peur / Fear |
| Derive / Drift | Phrase / Sentence |
| Dire / Expression | Plaisir / Pleasure |
| Droite / Right | Politique / Politics |
| Echange / Exchange | Quotidienne / Daily |
| Ecoute / Hearing | Recuperation / Recuperation |
| Emotion / Emotion | Representation / Representation |
| Ennui / Boredom | Resistances / Oppositions |
| Envers / Inside out | Rive / Dream |
| Exactitude / Exactitude | Science / Science |
| Fetiche / Fetish | Significance / Significance |
| Guerre / War | Sujet / Subject |
| Imaginaires / Image-reservoirs | Theorie / Theory |
| Inter-texte / Intertext | Valeur / Value |
| Isotrope / Isotrope | Voix / Voice |

Barthes' merit in the above mentioned book is the collection of relevant concepts from various disciplines for the conceptualization of 'text'. Foucault (1989: 19) in the *Order of Things* wrote in chapter 2 *The*

Prose Of The World on the ‘four similitudes’ that the main aspect of human use of media was until the Age of Enlightenment the imitation of nature. Among these media the language was the means calling out the need of the imitation of nature:

“Up to the end of the sixteenth century, resemblance played a constructive role in the knowledge of Western culture. It was resemblance that largely guided exegesis and the interpretation of texts; it was resemblance that organized the play of symbols, made possible knowledge of things visible and invisible, and controlled the art of representing them. The universe was folded in upon itself: the earth echoing the sky, faces seeing themselves reflected in the stars, and plants holding within their stems the secrets that were of use to man. Painting imitated space. And representation – whether in the service of pleasure or of knowledge – was posited as a form of repetition: the theatre of life or the mirror of nature, that was the claim made by all language, its manner of declaring its existence and of formulating its right of speech.”

Foucault (1989: 38) in the *Order of Things* wrote concerning the unity and diversity of the text as a single and diversified phenomenon; for Foucault the single word is the smallest entity, which is able to form a text:

“There is no difference between marks and words in the sense that there is between observation and accepted authority, or between verifiable fact and tradition. The process is everywhere the same: that of the sign and its likeness, and this is why nature and the word can intertwine with one another to infinity, forming, for those who can read it, one vast single text.”

Foucault (1989: 45) used the relation between the commentary and the original texts to show an infinite process of production:

“The task of commentary can never, by definition, be completed. And yet commentary is directed entirely towards the enigmatic, murmured element of the language being commented on: it calls into being, below the existing discourse, another discourse that is more fundamental and, as it were, ‘more primal’, which it sets itself the task of restoring. There can be no commentary unless, below the language one is reading and deciphering,

there runs the sovereignty of an original Text. And it is this text which, by providing a foundation for the commentary, offers its ultimate revelation as the promised reward of commentary.”

Foucault (1989: 46) defined the text semantically as formed by a ‘totality of signs’ of an ‘unequivocal message’:

“It will be seen that the experience of language belongs to the same archaeological network as the knowledge of things and nature. To know those things was to bring to light the system of resemblances that made them close to and dependent upon one another; but one could discover the similitudes between them only in so far as there existed, on their surface, a totality of signs forming the text of an unequivocal message.”

The reason why philosophers and sociologist became interested in the concept of the ‘text’, which had a its origin in the *trivium* of the liberal arts. What for philosophers was interesting in the text, is that it is a quality of the existence and challenges semiotic and existential questions. It is common sense agreement that speech can have the form of written or spoken speech. Derrida (1997: 149-150) called the ‘thought’ the ‘blank part’ of the text in *The Rebus and the Complicity of Origins*:

*“The constitution of a science or a philosophy of writing is a necessary and difficult task. But, a **thought** of the trace, of difference or of reserve, having arrived at these limits and repeating them ceaselessly, must also point beyond the field of the *épistémè*. Outside of the economic and strategic reference to the name that Heidegger justifies himself in giving to an analogous but not identical transgression of all philosophemes, **thought** is here for me a perfectly neutral name, the blank part of the text, the necessarily indeterminate index of a future epoch of difference. In a certain sense, “**thought**” means **nothing**. Like all openings, this index belongs within a past epoch by the face that is open to view. This thought has no weight. It is, in the play of the system, that very thing which never has weight. Think-ing is what we already know we have not yet begun; measured against the shape of writing, it is **broached** only in the *épistémè*.”*

Derrida (1997: 153) defines discourse and text in *The Violence of the Letter: From Lévi-Strauss to Rousseau*; the discourse is for Derrida the 'living, conscious representation of a text':

"And why bring this question into play within the affinity or filiation that binds Lévi-Strauss to Rousseau? Another difficulty is added to the problem of the justification of this historical contraction; what is a lineage in the order of discourse and text? If in a rather conventional way I call by the name of discourse the present, living, conscious representation of a text within the experience of the person who writes or reads it, and if the text constantly goes beyond this representation by the entire system of its resources and its own laws, then the question of genealogy exceeds by far the possibilities that are at present given for its elaboration."

Barthes here actually anticipates the concept of 'intertextuality', when he writes that a text gives itself a representation of its own roots:

"We know that the metaphor that would describe the genealogy of a text correctly is still forbidden. In its syntax and its lexicon, in its spacing, by its punctuation, its lacunae, its margins, the historical appurtenance of a text is never a straight line. It is neither causality by contagion, nor the simple accumulation of layers. Nor even the pure juxtaposition of borrowed pieces. And if a text always gives itself a certain representation of its own roots, those roots live only by that representation, by never touching the soil, so to speak. Which undoubtedly destroys their radical essence, but not the necessity of their racinating function."

The French scholars discovered the semiotic representational aspects of the text as a problem beyond the level of the scholarly disciplines, which are concerned with linguistic issues. At this time also the digitalization process of information and the variety of media allowing information to be stored in analogue and digital media challenged the inquiry of the actual state and tools of texts, which serve for the description of imitative forms of original products. The following generation of scholars did not concentrate on the aspects of uniqueness or originality of any format of human communication, but these researchers were exposed to the actual state of

reduplicativity of any given work of communication in multiple communication channels.

3. English Terms of Contemporary Types of Texts and their Functions The Research History of the ‘Text’ from the Spoken Speech to Digital Representations of the ‘Text’

The Contemporary Terminology of the ‘Text’ as Medial Representation

The 80s and 90s approached the text under the aspect of the typology of texts taking into account the rhetorical and poetical traditional way of the concept ‘text’, but also the path of text studies towards new media and means of communication for texts. In this decade researchers were interested in the idea that various types of texts exist; the results from this approach are still today the different types of texts, which are considered in the humanities as fundamental for an analysis of texts. The researchers dealt with the question how to unite and merge various traditional approaches to written and spoken speech and language with the concept of the ‘text’; also the new computer-based storage facilities of knowledge and the digitalization of this knowledge raise the new aspect of corpus studies, whereas a corpus is considered a more or less by its topic or theme or genre or alternatively its medium defined collection of texts. The aspect of the reduplicability, universal presence, and recording of text let the ‘text’ appear as an impersonal product. At that time also the availability of texts on the digital media and their virtually endless reduplicability and storage resulted in a concentration on text as a de-humanized concept. One of the aims of the researchers was to classify texts; this task belonged to the practical research, while on the other hand theoretical researchers were concerned with the theoretical description of ‘text’. The differentiation between studies in ‘text’ and studies in ‘texts’ marks this difference. For example Biber (1989: 4) wrote that “there have been a number of text typologies proposed within linguistics and related fields. Researchers have typically developed typologies on a functional basis: first identifying one or two particular functional dichotomies, and then describing the 'types' defined by the poles of those distinctions.” Biber (1989: 4) mentioned that “within rhetorical theory, four basic 'modes' of discourse are traditionally distinguished: narration, description, exposition, and argumentation.” For Biber (1989: 5) linguistic features of text typology fall into 16 major grammatical categories: (A) ‘tense and aspect markers’, (B) ‘place and time adverbials’, (C) ‘pronouns and pro-verbs’, (D) ‘questions’, (E) ‘nominal

forms', (F) 'passives', (G) 'stative forms', (H) 'subordination features', (I) 'prepositional phrases', 'adjectives' and 'adverbs', (J) 'lexical specificity', (K) 'lexical classes', (L) 'modals', (M) 'specialized verb classes', (N) 'reduced forms and dispreferred structures', (O) 'coordination', and (P) 'negation'. Biber (1989: 6) distinguishes written and spoken texts in his text typological approach: Written texts are for Biber press reportage, editorials, press reviews, religion, skills and hobbies, popular lore, biographies, official documents, academic prose, general fiction, mystery fiction, science fiction, adventure fiction, romantic fiction, humor, personal letters and professional letters. Spoken texts are for Biber face-to-face conversation, telephone conversation, public conversations, debates, and interviews, broadcast, spontaneous speeches, and planned speeches. Since the 90s the digital media had such an impact onto text typological studies that they even evoked the concept of the 'hypertext'. In the last decade the term 'text' was employed for corpus-based linguistic studies. Lee (2001: 37) stated that "most corpus-based studies rely implicitly or explicitly on the notion of genre or the related concepts register, text type, domain, style, sublanguage, message form, and so forth." Lee (2001: 39) distinguished 'genre' and 'text type' as follows: "One way of making a distinction between *genre* and *text type* is to say that the former is based on external, non-linguistic, "traditional" criteria while the latter is based on the internal, linguistic characteristics of texts themselves." This includes also the tradition of the genre as a poetic and rhetorical category. Another recently employed category is the register, which takes into account the socio-linguistic status of written and spoken speech. The digital text representation raised questions about the terminology for the description of digital texts. So Santini (2006: 68) wrote that "with the growth of the Web a massive quantity of documents, namely web pages, are freely available for (corpus) linguistic studies. Web pages can be considered as a new kind of document, much more unpredictable and individualized than paper documents."

The Text
The Paratext (French *peritext*) / The Epitext
The Intertext
The Context
The Subtext
The Metatext
The Hypertext

Contemporary Types of Texts

The Conceptual Extensions of the ‘Text’ in the Research of the 90s

The research of the 90s developed conceptual extensions of the ‘text’, which basically aimed at the implementation of any kind of textual structural segment culmination in the term ‘intertextuality’, which – drastically explained- means nothing else than that any text is a copy of another text rejecting originality and considering the text as a flowing process of connections. These kinds of text-derivations actually refer to the relation of an original or auctorial text and its imitative relations standing copies or derivations. The ‘text’ here can be defined as anything carrying meaning, which is woven. The ‘paratext’ is also called ‘epitext’ refers semantically to the main text. The ‘intertext’ is a literary text, which is related to one or more other texts. The ‘context’ is the text, in which a particular text is presented. The ‘subtext’ is contents underneath the actual text. The ‘hypertext’ is the text in a digital version. The ‘metatext’ is any text, which concerns another text. In traditional editorial methods of textual criticism the terms ‘context’ and ‘intertext’ were used in Latin. Aristotle’s *Technēs Rētorikēs Biblia Tria. Aristotelis De Rhetorica seu Arte Dicendi Libri Tres* edited by Theodore Goulston (1572-1562) was published with the Latin subtitle *contextu graeco, ad exemplaria selectiora emendato latino, paraphrasi, ubi opus, intertexto* in London by Griffin in 1916. In the *The Routledge Dictionary of Literary Terms* (2006: 121-123) is written on ‘intertextuality’: “With the identification in structuralism of language as a series of interconnections between signs came the recognition of the importance of the relationships between those signs and the ways they interact to produce different meaning-formations. Thinking in poststructuralism subsequently tended to emphasize the ways in which signs, and their more complex relations – texts – depend upon each other for their meaning within the structures and frameworks of genre and discourse.” In *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms* (2001: 128) is written about the phenomenon ‘intertextuality’: “Intertextuality, a term coined by Julia Kristeva to designate the various relationships that a given text may have with other texts. These intertextual relationships include anagram, allusion, adaptation, translation, parody, pastiche, imitation, and other kinds of transformation. In the literary theories of structuralism and poststructuralism, texts are seen to refer to other texts (or to themselves as texts) rather than to an external reality.” In the *The Routledge Dictionary of Literary Terms* (2006: 34-35) is written on ‘intertextuality’: “A central

notion of modern philosophical linguistics, and by extension, of modern literary criticism too. Contextual theories of meaning assert that concepts precede percepts; that association can only take place between universals, not discrete impressions; and that all discourse is over-determined, having a multiplicity of meaning. In literary criticism the effect of these doctrines has been to extend the use of the word 'meaning' to cover all aspects of interpretation and to promote the false dictum 'The meaning of a word is its use in the language. What should be substituted for this is the sentence 'The interpretation of an utterance is dependent upon a knowledge of the contexts within which it occurs.'" Since an implicit meaning was not automatically part of the postmodern understanding of the 'text', the concept of the 'text' was extended with the 'subtext', which was considered anything implicitly included within the text, but without a textual representation. In *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms* (2001: 249) is written of 'subtext': "subtext, any meaning or set of meanings which is implied rather than explicitly stated in a literary work, especially in a play. Modern plays such as those of Harold Pinter, in which the meaning of the action is sometimes suggested more by silences and pauses than by dialogue alone, are often discussed in terms of their hidden subtexts." On the subtext (*A Glossary of Literary Terms*: 242) is written: "The widespread poststructural view that the surface or overt meanings of a literary or other text serve as a "disguise" or "mask" of its real meanings, or subtext, has been called, in a phrase taken from the French philosopher of language Paul Ricoeur, a hermeneutics of suspicion." The last conceptual extension of the 'text' is the use of the term 'hypertext', which takes into account the availability of digital formats and copies of a text. In *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms* (2001: 119) is written about 'hypertext': "Hypertext, a term used in the discussion of computerized text, referring to the realm of electronically interlinked texts and multimedia resources now commonly found on the World Wide Web (from 1990) and on CD-ROM reference sources. Hypertext is sometimes distinguished from 'linear' printed text in terms of the reader's changed experience of moving around and among texts. In a different sense, the term is also applied, in discussions of intertextuality, to a text that in some way derives from an earlier text (the 'hypotext') as a parody of it, a sequel to it, etc." To summarize, the history of academic approaches of text studies has brought forward several fields of studies of the text. Among them are the reconstruction of (ancient) texts, the theory of the text, the a

analysis of text, the media history of the text, and application of the text in academic and professional contexts.

Theory of the Text:

The Theory of the Text

History of the Text:

The Medial History of the Text

Application of the Text:

The Reconstruction of (existing) Text(s)

The Analysis of Text(s)

The Application of Text(s) in Academic and Professional Contexts

The Production of Text(s)

The ‘Text’ and ‘Texts’: Aspects of Contemporary Studies of the ‘Text’

The above mentioned list of areas, in which the concept of the ‘text’ is developed, makes it obvious that the concept offers wide areas of academic fields to be part of the studies. At the end of even our little history of the concept of the ‘text’ in academia and arts we must ironically face the question ‘What does not qualify to be called a text?’ and must conclude that the concept of the ‘text’ falls within a wide range of studies about communication, media, and representations. It is the merit of the French philosophers to have pointed out the representational aspect of speech. In term of the conceptualization of the concept, we here in the final part draw attention to the mental aspects associated with the concept ‘text’ like with any other concept, which as a propositional mental configuration opens up the semiotic areas of the representation (the ‘*signified*’) and the represented (the ‘*signifier*’) by the representational faculty of the mind. Whereas the concept of ‘text’ is a mental proposition and as such extended with its abstract terminologies, the application of the textual studies like in textual criticism and the active production of texts is the other side of the contemporary studies of the ‘text’. In the following part we present an interdisciplinary model of the ‘text’, in which the three large parts of the studies of the ‘text’.

III. An Interdisciplinary Model for the Theory and Application of Text: The ‘Text’ and ‘Texts’ as Textual Sequences

Inquiring the Authority of the ‘Text’: Limits and Liabilities of the Concept „Text”

Under the aspect of the extension of the meanings of the text as an infinite connection, the question ‘What is actually not a text?’ is challenged. It seems that we must approach the phenomenon ‘text’ from the perspective of its human condition for the termination of its limits in order to reach a suitable definition of the ‘text’. The last decades of structural approaches for the understanding of ‘text’ have drawn less attention on the mental conditions for the establishment of this extensive concept. The quality of ‘textuality’ e.g. defines a mode of connectivity, but it lacks any definition of the material of the connection and the materiality of what is connects. This feature actually allows the concept of the ‘text’ to be used in many ways and to be used as an interdisciplinary concept. But the equality of the contemporary term and concept ‘text’ is here challenged. When virtually everything can be considered to be ‘text’ and to have features of the concept ‘text’, which we described with the terms above, the perspective of the person who determines the text (as author or as perceiver) has become the authority of the ‘text’. To the concept of the ‘author’ researcher have in recent decades given less attention with the exception of individualists approaches to literary documents. The auctorial authority of the author was not considered to be of a strong impact in research approaches, which see texts as a collection of interwoven material. The ‘text’ as a conceptualization must be separated from the texts as the actually existing representations of interwoven meaning-carrying things. Applying the rhetorical scheme, texts are altered via the four basic categories of change ‘addition’ (*‘adjectio’*), ‘omission’; ‘subtraction’ (*‘detractio’*), ‘transposition’ (*‘transmutatio’*), and ‘permutation’ (*‘immutatio’*):

| | |
|-----------------------|---------------------|
| Addition | <i>Adjectio</i> |
| Omission, Subtraction | <i>Detractio</i> |
| Transposition | <i>Transmutatio</i> |
| Permutation | <i>Immutatio</i> |

The Rhetorical ‘Method of the Four Parts’ and its Categories of Change of the ‘Text’

The operations of the ‘addition’ (*‘adjectio’*), ‘omission’ (*‘detractio’*), ‘permutation’ (*‘immutatio’*), and ‘transposition’ (*‘transmutatio’*) were in Latin called the ‘method of the four parts’ (*‘quadripartita ratio’*) and can be traced back to Greek terms in the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*. Quintilian

describes the *quadripartita ratio* in his *Institutio Oratoria* (1.5.38-41). We can consider these operations the first model of the production of a 'text' in the Western culture. Since this passage is so important for the understanding of the channels of texts as well as text production, the function the rhetorician Quintilian uses here, we quote this passage of Quintilian's book 1 and the translation of Edgeworth Butler (1920/2015) writing of the addition ('*adiection*') and omission ('*detractio*'):

XXVIII. Atque ut omnem effugiam cavillationem, sit aliquando in uno verbo, numquam in solo verbo. Per quot autem et quas accidat species, non satis convenit. Qui plenissime, quadripartitam volunt esse rationem nec aliam quam barbarismi, ut fiat adiectione "nam enim", "de susum", "in Alexandriam", detractione "ambulo viam",

[38] To avoid all suspicion of quibbling, I will say that a *solecism* may occur in one word, but never in a word in isolation. There is, however, some controversy as to the number and nature of the different kinds of *solecism*. Those who have dealt with the subject most fully make a fourfold division, identical with that which is made in the case of *barbarisms*: *solecisms* are brought about by addition, for instance in phrases such as *nam enim*, *de susum*, *in Alexandriam*;

On transposition ('*transmutatio*') Quintilian wrote here:

XXXIX. "Aegypto venio", "ne hoc fecit", transmutatione, qua ordo turbatur, "quoque ego", "enim hoc voluit", "autem non habuit": ex quo genere an sit "igitur" initio sermonis positum dubitari potest, quia maximos auctores in diversa fuisse opinione video, cum apud alios sit etiam frequens, apud alios numquam reperiatur.

[39] by omission, in phrases such as *ambulo viam*, *Aegypto venio*, or *ne hoc fecit*: and by transposition as in *quoque ego*, *enim hoc voluit*, *autem non habuit*. Under this last head comes the question whether *igitur* can be placed first in a sentence: for I note that authors of the first rank disagree on this point, some of them frequently placing it in that position, others never.

XL. Haec tria genera quidam diducunt a soloecismo, et adiectionis vitium pleonasmon, detractionis elleipsin, inversionis anastrophes vocant: quae si in speciem

[40] Some distinguish these three classes of error from the *solecism*, styling addition a *pleonasm*, omission an *ellipse*, and transposition *anastrophe*: and they

soloecismi cadat, hyperbaton quoque eodem appellari modo posse.

On permutation (“*immutatio*”)
Quintilian writes:

XLI. Inmutatio sine controversia est, cum aliud pro alio ponitur. Id per omnis orationis partis deprendimus, frequentissime in verbo, quia plurima huic accidunt, ideoque in eo fiunt soloecismi per genera tempora personas modos (sive cui "status" eos dici seu "qualitates" placet) vel sex vel ut alii volunt octo (nam totidem vitiorum erunt formae in quot species eorum quidque de quibus supra dictum est divisoris): praeterea numeros,

assert that if *anastrophe* is a solecism, *hyperbaton* might also be so called.

[41] About substitution, that is when one word is used instead of another, there is no dispute. It is an error which we may detect in connexion with all the parts of speech, but most frequently in the verb, because it has greater variety than any other: consequently in connexion with the verb we get *solecisms* of gender, tense, person and mood (or “states” or “qualities” if you prefer either of these terms), be these types of error six in number, as some assert, or eight as is insisted by others (for the number of the forms of solecism will depend on the number of subdivisions which you assign to the parts of speech of which we have just spoken). Further there are solecisms of number;

We can assume that the text due to its quality of the interwoveness is a construct of sequences, which built part of the text. These sequences can be considered the theoretical core aspect of the text, they can be produced (like in the rhetorical use for the production of a speech), analysed (like in a study of text criticism), and be used as a methodological means. With reference to the ‘*quadripartita ratio*’, these sequences originate from the following operations:

Sequencing of a text by the ‘addition’ of text

Operation of the
‘*adjectio*’

Sequencing of a text by the ‘omission’ and ‘subtraction’ of text

Operation of the
‘*detractio*’

Sequencing of a text by the ‘transposition’ of text

Operation of the
‘*transmutatio*’

Sequencing of a text by the ‘permutation’ of text

Operation of the
‘*immutatio*’

Adaption of the Rhetorical ‘Method of the Four Parts’ as Categories of Change of the ‘Text’

While we are able to describe and explain the origin of text with the above mentioned extension of the four-parted method as a model of sequences of text in a theoretical way, we now look at the aspects of the representation of the text in the real world in concrete representations like a copy of a book, a video game, or a handwritten notice on a piece of paper.

The ‘Text’ and the Transformation Processes of Texts in Media

The abundance of texts available by digital means and the awareness of the media reduplication contributed to this perspective.

| | |
|---|--------------------|
| Analogue reduplication | “Copy” |
| Partly digital reduplication | “Variation” |
| Reduplication in another medium | “Medial Variation” |
| Reduplication without auctorial reference | “Plagiarism” |

The transformation process from one to another medium is possible; the contents of an image can appear as the text of a poem; a movie can be based upon the narrative of a story. A speech can be performed and broadcasted a week later on TV. The auctorial power and the uniqueness of the assemble of the text of the specific medium at the time of the transformation gets lost; the novel *The Name of the Rose* is not identical with the movie. The uniqueness of the original in contrast to the copies is also a feature of the text, which is auctorial; this unique and auctorial text is the representation of the act of originality; the following intertextual plays, the forms of textual derivations are products of lower quality: the copy is the imitation, while the version is the adapted copy. As Foucault mentioned, the smallest unit of the text is the word and developed the difference between original text and commentary. Foucault must have had something like the ‘plain text’ of reference in his mind, when he came to the conclusion that only the proper name would guarantee an understanding: Foucault in the *Order of Things* (1966: 10) wrote that only proper names guarantee the uniqueness of the language used and calls it in vain to employ rhetorical devices for the understanding:

“These proper names would form useful landmarks and avoid ambiguous designations; they would tell us in any case what the painter is looking at, and the majority of the characters in the picture along with him. But the relation of language to painting is an infinite relation. It is not that words are imperfect, or that, when confronted by the visible, they prove

insuperably inadequate. Neither can be reduced to the other's terms: it is in vain that we say what we see; what we see never resides in what we say. And it is in vain that we attempt to show, by the use of images, metaphors, or similes, what we are saying; the space where they achieve their splendour is not that deployed by our eyes but that defined by the sequential elements of syntax. And the proper name, in this particular context, is merely an artifice: it gives us a finger to point with, in other words, to pass surreptitiously from the space where one speaks to the space where one looks;

In the tradition of Foucault the semiotic situation of the text, which is original, requires that this text is unique and its referential function is determined. Such a 'plain text' is the text, which allows us to have no representational *double entendre*, no meanings attached.

| | |
|-------------|-------------------------------|
| “Original” | Unique and auctorial text |
| “Copy” | Text as imitation |
| “Version” | Text as adapted imitation |
| “Segment” | Text taken out of the context |
| “Discourse” | Living text; text in progress |

Derivations of the Text

The above mentioned derivations of the text are concrete representations of texts. They can occur as oral, written, or medial textual forms and are representations as concrete 'texts', whereas on the contrary the concept of the 'text' is a mental representation. The terminologies here described since antiquity are semiotically the signifying means.

The Sequencing of the ‘Text’: The Case for the ‘Parts of Speech’ as Categories of Text Sequences

The ‘parts of speech’ are sequencing elements of the text. The ‘parts of speech’ in rhetoric are the parts of a speech according to the classical rhetorical theory. The traditional eight divisions or categories for words as described by the Latin grammarian Aelius Donatus around 350 C. In English, these parts of speech are slightly modified:

| | |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| English ‘Parts of Speech’: | Donatus’ Latin ‘Parts of Speech’: |
| (1) Nouns | (1) Nouns |
| (2) Pronouns | (2) Pronouns |
| (3) Verbs | (3) Verbs |
| (4) Adjectives | (4) Adjectives |

| | |
|--|-------------------|
| (5) Adverbs | (5) Adverbs |
| (6) Articles | (6) Interjections |
| (7) Prepositions | (7) Prepositions |
| (8) Conjunctions | (8) Conjunctions |
| Interjections are usually treated separately | |

Grammatical ‘Parts of Speech’ as Feature of the ‘Text’

In our model the ‘parts of speech’ are the sequences, which distinguish parts of the text. These ‘parts of speech’ can be from different scholarly backgrounds. With the description of the grammatical ‘parts of speech’ of a poem we have the sum of the grammatical textuality of the poem. We can analyze also other aspect of e.g. a poem:

| | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| Textual Aspects of Grammar | Sequencing of the text by rhetorical devices and means |
| Textual Aspects of Rhetoric | Sequencing of the text by rhetorical devices and means |
| Textual Aspects of Linguistics | Sequencing of the text by linguistic devices |
| Textual Aspects of Semiotics | Sequencing of the text by semiotic devices |

Textual Aspects of Various Academic Disciplines

Both for the theory and the applications of the concept of ‘text’ the above mentioned process of sequencing is useful. A representational concrete unit (e.g. a poem) is not a text or an equivalent of a text; it actually entails aspects of textuality like we described above; The text is as a concept an abstract mental construct and texts are in concrete representations only the structural frames of the representational unit. Determination the grammatical textual aspects of the sentence “The cat eats the fish” in grammatical categories like the classical parts of speech as ‘article – noun – verb – article – noun’ or any other system of parsing means to analyze the textual structure of the sentence in terms of its grammar. But “The cat eats the fish” is not the text, it stays a sentence.

The Creation of the ‘Text’ of ‘Things’; An Interpretative Scholarly Act of the Examination of Words

While the previously described approaches to the phenomenon ‘text’ especially in the last decades saw it as a given quality that texts exist and are

structural qualities of communication, we approach the ‘text’ as a conceptual metal phenomenon. Actually, when speaking about a text x, we usually mean specific aspects, which for a thing or specific segment of information (e.g. a poem, a movie, a prescription etc.) demonstrate its coherence and consistence and other aspects of textuality. But we are unable to express the actual thing or segment of information in its wholeness. The ‘text’ is as the interwoven quality always a specific aspect of the thing, but not the thing itself. ‘Text’ is not equal to a poem, a movie, or a prescription. And ‘text’ is not ‘text’ *per se*. ‘Text’ is a specific meta-form of appearance and only a means of linkage; we must speak about the ‘rhetorical text’, the ‘semiotic text’, the ‘grammatical text’, the discursive text’ of a thing. This thing can be a poem, a movie, or a prescription. This way now the ‘rhetorical text’ tells us all aspects of rhetoricity within the ‘thing’ (e.g. its rhetorical devices, its argumentation, or the relation between author and audience), the ‘semiotic text’ tells us all aspects of semiotic relations of the ‘thing’ (e.g. semiotic relations of a ‘*significans*’ in the ‘thing’ or its representational function), the ‘grammatical text’ tells us anything about the ‘discursive text’ like e.g. the formation of the discourse. This way we get a description of the specific rhetorical, semiotic, grammatical, or discursive features of the ‘thing’. The concept of ‘text’ as a proposition refers to the fact that we must be always aware of the connectivity and the way things can be connected. The things we are interested in are words; the communication of words relies of certain structures; the text is one of them; the authority of the text is the mental faculty, which decides where the quality of textuality begins and which kind of textuality actually exists. But as a concept, the text stays as abstract and unreachable like a Platonic idea in distance from the representations of the concept. The terminology developed by researchers in the past can be seen as the linking representational *significans*. We distinguished so far the concrete representation of texts, analyzed their textual qualities employing the model of the sequencing of the text based of the rhetorical method of the text-production of the ‘*quadrupartita ratio*’, and distinguished these concrete manifestations from the concept of the ‘text’. The non-identity of the text and the representational thing we clearly mentioned demonstrating that the ‘text’ as the structuring linkage is a multi-layered phenomenon, which must be accessed via various ways of scholarly examinations; among those, we mentioned the grammatical, the semiotic, and rhetorical, and the linguistic textual structures, which consist of sequences. So we come to the method of reading the ‘text’. The ‘text’, to make a definition of the conceptual text, thus is the sum of all the textual qualities of the representing thing. To be able to read the ‘text’ means to be able to discover its specific layers of information.

Works Cited

ABRAHAMS, M. H., ed., "Text and Writing (Écriture)." *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. Seventh Edition. Boston, Massachusetts: Heinle & Heinle, 1999: 316-317.

ABRAHAMS, M. H., ed., "Textual Criticism". *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. Seventh Edition. Boston, Massachusetts: Heinle & Heinle, 1999: 317-320.

ABRAHAMS, M. H., ed., 1999, "Poststructuralism." *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. Seventh Edition. Boston, Massachusetts: Heinle & Heinle: 238-342.

BALDICK, Chris, ed., 2001, *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

BARTHES, Roland, 1975, *The Pleasure of the Text*. Tr. Richard Miller. With a Note on the Text by Richard Howard. New York: Hill and Wang.

BEAUGRANDE, Robert-Alain de; DRESSLER, Wolfgang Ulrich, 1981, *Einführung in die Textlinguistik*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

BIBER, Douglas, 1989, "A Typology of English Texts." *Linguistics* 27: 3-43.

CHILDS, Peter; FOWLER, Roger, eds., 2006, *The Routledge Dictionary of Literary Terms*. Oxon and New York: Routledge.

DERRIDA, Jaques, 1997, *Of Grammatology*. Tr. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, (1967).

FOUCAULT, Michel, 1989, *The Order of Things. An Archeology of Human Sciences*. London and New York: Routhledge.

LEE, David, "Genres, Registers, Text Types, Domains, and Styles: Clarifying the Concepts and Navigating a Path Through the BNC Jungle." *Language Learning & Technology* 5-3.3. (2001): 37-72. Michigan State University. Web. June 23, 2015. <<http://llt.msu.edu/vol5num3/lee/>>.

LEWIS, Charlton T.; SHORT, Charles, eds., *A Latin Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1879. Perseus Project. Tufts University. Web. June 23, 2015. <<http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.04.0059%3Aentry%3Dtextus2&highlight=text>>.

QUINTILIAN, Marcus Fabius, *Institutio Oratoria*. The Latin Library. Web. June 23, 2015. <<http://www.thelatinlibrary.com/quintilian/quintilian.institutio1.shtml#5>>.

QUINTILIAN, Marcus Fabius, *Institutio Oratoria*. Tr. Harold Edgeworth Butler. Cambridge, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: William Heinemann, 1920. Perseus Project. Tuft University. Web. June 23, 2015. <<http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A2007.01.0060%3Abook%3D1%3Achapter%3D5%3Asection%3D43>>.

SANTINI, Marina, “Web Pages, Text Types, and Linguistic Features: Some Issues.” *ICAME Journal* 30 (2006): 67-86. Norwegian Computing Centre for the Humanities. Web. June 23, 2015. <<http://clu.uni.no/icame/ij30/ij30-page67-86.pdf>>.

SAUSSURE, Ferdinand de, 1966, *Course in General Linguistics*. Ed. Charles Bally and Albert Sechehaye in collaboration with Albert Riedlinger. Tr. with an introduction and notes by Wade Baskin. New York, Toronto, London: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

SLOCUM, Jonathan, ed., *Pokorny's List*. In: *Indo-European Lexicon*. PIE Etyma and IE Reflexes. Linguistics Research Center. University of Texas. Web. June 23, 2015. <<http://www.utexas.edu/cola/centers/lrc/ielex/PokornyMaster-X.html>>.

STAROSTIN, Sergey, ed., *Starling Etymological Databases. The Tower of Babel Project*.. Starling. Web. June 23, 2015. <<http://starling.rinet.ru/>>.

WHEELER, L. Kip, ed., “Textual Criticism.” *Literary Terms and Definitions*. Carson-Newman University. Web. June 23, 2015. <https://web.cn.edu/kwheeler/lit_terms_T.html>.

WHEELER, L. Kip, ed., “Textual Variant.” *Literary Terms and Definitions*. Carson-Newman University. Web. June 23, 2015. <https://web.cn.edu/kwheeler/lit_terms_T.html>.

WHEELER, L. Kip, ed., “Textuality.” *Literary Terms and Definitions*. Carson-Newman University. Web. June 23, 2015. <https://web.cn.edu/kwheeler/lit_terms_T.html>.

WHEELER, L. Kip, ed., “Texture.” *Literary Terms and Definitions*. Carson-Newman University. Web. June 23, 2015. <https://web.cn.edu/kwheeler/lit_terms_T.html>.

WHEELER, L. Kip, ed., “Texus Receptus.” *Literary Terms and Definitions*.. Carson-Newman University. Web. June 23, 2015. <https://web.cn.edu/kwheeler/lit_terms_T.html>.