Academic Journal of Modern Philology

ISSN 2299–7164
Vol. 22 (2024)
s. 389–404

Martin Testa
University of Warsaw, Faculty of Modern Languages
m.testa@uw.edu.pl
ORCID: 0000-0001-6086-2073

Beyond the Literal: Refining Text Typology through the Lens of Denotation and Connotation

Abstract

Text typology, a focal area of text linguistics since the 1970s, still faces a fragmented landscape with diverse typologies each analysing distinct parameters. Although some approaches (particularly those by Werlich and Sabatini) have yielded significant insights, they often fall short in identifying specific text types like irony, humour and metaphors – these texts, while superficially resembling other texts, possess inherent semantic characteristics. This article introduces a novel approach by positioning a *denotative/connotative* semantic parameter at the top of the typological hierarchy. Beginning with a critical overview of current text typologies, the article justifies the inclusion of such a parameter with references to speech act theory, poetic language and the general theory of verbal humour based on script opposition. Integrated with other surface-level parameters, this model may help effectively classify a broad spectrum of text genres, in the light of contemporary linguistic theories.

Keywords*:* text linguistics, text types, text typology, textual sign, denotation and connotation, irony and humour

Introduction

The significance of recognising and understanding text types and genres in our everyday lives cannot be overstated, for textual competence is essential for both creating and comprehending texts within our social contexts (*cf.* Conte 1977; Schmidt 1978; Mortara Garavelli 1991; Koch 2009; Sabatini & Camodeca 2016). This becomes especially relevant in modern assessments like the OECD's PISA test, which emphasises the necessity of these skills for personal and academic achievement (*cf.* Fiorentino 2020).

However, despite extensive discussions on text typologies, certain texts – such as those that are humorous or ironic – defy easy classification within existing frameworks. Moreover, current typologies often overlook critical concepts like denotation and connotation, which are essential for distinguishing

doi: 10.34616/ajmp.2024.22.26

these types of texts; instead they tend to focus primarily on surface text phenomena (*cf.* Palermo 2013: 236). Additionally, the field of linguistics offers a fragmented view of text types. Most analyses reveal a disarray of definitions, criteria and terminologies with only partial overlaps, leading to significant conceptual ambiguity (*cf.* Adamzik 2016; Aumüller 2014; Heinemann 2000). This inconsistency poses a substantial challenge in harmonising theoretical perspectives with practical applications, particularly in comprehending how sentence properties contribute to a text's overall characteristics.

This article aims to introduce a new approach to text typology. It proposes a fundamental semantic criterion (*i.e.*, denotation vs. connotation) at the top of the typological hierarchy, striving to provide a universally applicable framework for text classification. This effort seeks to promote a more systematic and comprehensive understanding that connects modern linguistic theory with practical applications in textual analysis.

Understanding Text Types and Genres

A crucial clarification must be made regarding the terminology. Although *text types* and *text genres* are sometimes used interchangeably, especially in everyday language, Adamzik (2016: 327) stresses the importance of distinguishing between these terms.[1] Broadly speaking, *text types* are theoretical constructs defined by linguistic features – such as lexical choices, syntactic structures and logical relationships – whereas *text genres* represent an open-ended list that refers to the sociocommunicative characteristics of concrete textual forms encountered in daily life. These characteristics are shaped by their content, functional properties, style and structure (Marcuschi 2003: 22–23). Furthermore, a single text type can manifest across multiple genres. For instance, the *narrative* type is prevalent in genres like short stories, fairy tales, novels, biographies and historical surveys; similarly, the *argumentative* type is commonly found in genres such as academic articles, dissertations, reviews, editorials and political speeches (Renkema & Schubert 2018: 69–70).

Another crucial differentiation to consider is that *genres* evolve over time, whereas *types* are regarded as timeless constructs (*cf.* Weinrich 1972: 161; Bernárdez 1982: 212). For instance, scientific texts are frequently analysed from a contemporary viewpoint, neglecting the fact that earlier forms of scientific discourse, like the works of Galileo (*cf.* Altieri Biagi 2010) or Chaucer's *Treatise on the Astrolabe* (*cf.* Halliday 1993), were presented in a dialogical format, a practice not prevalent in today's scientific writings. An interesting case is Francesco Redi's *Osservazioni intorno alle vipere* from the 17th century, which uniquely blends scientific narrative with poetic verses (Marazzini 1993: 252–253; in Palermo 2013: 254–255) – a combination that would be unimaginable by today's standards.

1 Adamzik (1995) reports about 4000 colloquial terms for "text types" in German. She also highlights the complexity of German text classification terminology, emphasising the use of terms like *Textsorte* ("text genre", also: Textmuster ["text pattern"], Textklasse ["text class"] and Text-Typ ["text type"]) to denote varying levels of text groupings (Adamzik 2016: 331–332). Despite criticisms of the broad use of *Textsorte*, Adamzik (2016) supports its flexibility for communicative needs. Heinemann & Heinemann (2002: 143) introduce a structured approach with *Textsorte* for intuitive grouping (*e.g.* weather report), *Textklasse* for general descriptors (*e.g.*, written text; newspaper text) and *Text-Typ* for abstract categorisation (*e.g.* informative text), plus an intermediate level, *Textsortenklasse*, for added granularity. This approach aims to serve as flexible tools for researchers to adapt to their specific needs.

Moreover, as Aumüller (2014) points out, genre classification operates on a binary system – a text either belongs to a genre or it does not – whereas text types are defined on a comparative basis, emphasising a text's *dominant* semantic properties. This means that although a complex text may display a variety of semantic traits, it is the presence of certain primary properties that prevails over others (*cf.* Beaugrande & Dressler 1981: § IX.6); consequently, the classification of a text into a specific type depends on the prominence of these characteristic properties.

The distinction between text types and genres is significant as it underscores the focus on *structural* analysis for genres versus the *semantic* analysis for text types (*cf.* Bieber & Conrad 2009: 15–19). Genres are characterised by their conventional structures and purposes, aligning with Bakhtin's definition ([1979] 1986) of genres as *relatively stable sequences of utterances*, highlighting their social recognisability (*cf.* Adam 2008; Koch 2009; Swales 1990; Renkema & Schubert 2018; Sousa 2012). This social recognition, often referred to as *genre knowledge* (Renkema & Schubert 2018) or *competência metagenérica* (*cf.* Koch 2009), is crucial for discursive proficiency – understanding how different genres operate within specific contexts. For example, it is important for first-year students to learn how to effectively produce academic genres, such as term papers and oral presentations, to navigate academic contexts successfully (Renkema & Schubert 2018: 75).

Systemic Functional Linguistics (*cf.* Martin & Rose 2007, 2008) views genre as a dynamic interplay among *field*, *tenor* and *mode*, aligning with Halliday's (1978) metafunctions of language: ideational, interpersonal and textual, respectively. This approach is illustrated in Halliday & Martin's (1993: 33–36) analysis of the "Popular science" genre. This genre melds a specific scientific *field* (*e.g.*, Paleontology), with a *tenor* that balances technical language with accessibility, incorporating expressive elements (e.g., *wonderful*). It also adopts an abstract *mode*, characterised by a nominal style and the use of grammatical metaphor. In contrast, strictly scientific writing primarily differs in tenor, tending towards more technical language, providing fewer explanations and omitting expressive language.

The study of text types requires precise classification criteria, particularly since genres are regarded as open-ended and evolving, shaped by social and cultural contexts, in contrast to text types, which are viewed from a perspective of higher theoretical abstraction, aiming for universal applicability akin to that of speech acts or language functions. In this context, the introduction of Isenberg's (1978) criteria for textual typology represented a notable development, addressing the demand for clarity and precision.

Isenberg's criteria, recognised for significantly contributing to a coherent classification system, encompass *homogeneity*, *monotypy*, *rigor* and *exhaustiveness*. These principles ensure that texts within a typology are uniformly categorised (homogeneity), a text cannot belong to multiple types at the same hierarchical level (monotypy), classifications must be precise to eliminate ambiguity (rigor), and every conceivable text within its scope must be classifiable into at least one specified type (exhaustiveness) (*cf.* Isenberg 1987: 106–119). These criteria have sparked debates and undergone refinement within academic discussions (*cf.* Sousa 2012: 360; Adamzik 2016: 327), reflecting on the balance between formal and functional definitions of text and the evolving approach to text analysis that favors a broader understanding of texts as dynamic entities shaped by their contexts. Despite these discussions, Isenberg's criteria remain foundational to developing a coherent text typology.

A Brief Overview of Textual Typologies

Aumüller (2014: §3) traces the history of text type evolution back to ancient philosophy, notably Plato's Republic's concepts of *diegesis* (narration) and *mimesis* (description), and his distinction between 'author-driven' and 'character-driven' narratives, prefiguring modern narratological concepts of *extradiegetic* and *intradiegetic* levels (Genette [1972] 1980: 161*ff.*). As Aümuller further notes, this early classification system was advanced by Goethe in the early 19th century, who identified three core forms of poetry – Epic, Lyric and Drama – based on intrinsic textual qualities, all of them more or less preminently manifesting across various 'surface' genres like novels and parodies.[2]

In the early stages of text linguistics, the focus on "text grammar" largely revolved around analysing texts through linguistic features such as the frequency of nouns and verbs and sentence length (*cf.* Sousa 2012: 347, and references therein). This period in the 1970s saw researchers predominantly engaging with these descriptive statistical differences; however, this methodology was limited by its failure to consider the semantic aspects of texts crucial for grasping their communicative intents and purposes (*cf.* Beaugrande & Dressler 1981: §IX.3). Sandig's (1975) model, for example, differentiated texts based on *twenty* binary characteristics, including spontaneity, modality (spoken or written), and the use of non-linguistic elements like gestures. Despite its ambition, the model has been critiqued for its complexity, making it challenging to apply to everyday texts such as letters or family conversations (*cf.* Bernárdez 1982: 223–228). Additionally, Isenberg (1978: 570) highlighted its lack of homogeneity due to the model's criteria spanning from pragmatic to syntactic features. Despite such criticisms, it is important to acknowledge that Sandig's contribution recognised the multidimensional nature of texts.

As the field of text linguistics has evolved, so too have the approaches to text typologies. The focus has broadened from an exclusive emphasis on linguistic features to encompassing the intentions behind text creation and the interpretive liberties granted to readers. Texts have been categorised based on various criteria[3], including the medium through which the text is conveyed, its primary pragmatic function, the interpretative role assigned to the addressee and the distinction between reality and fiction[4] (*cf.* Lala 2011; Palermo 2013; Ferrari 2014). I shall now focus on the most discussed typologies, offering a brief overview before delving into the specific proposal of this contribution.

The distinction between oral and written forms of communication – known as diamesic typology – has always been deemed crucial, emphasising significant differences in syntax, lexicon and structure (*cf.* Lala 2011; Palermo 2013: 238; Renkema & Schubert 2018: 65–67). While any written text can be read aloud, it remains distinct from spoken language due to these distinct features. For instance, oral language tends to be more paratactic and structurally complex, whereas the complexity of written

2 It is noteworthy that Goethe refers to Homer's epics as examples of "pure" Epic (*cf.* Aumüller 2014: §3).

3 Lala (2011) also discusses Manzotti's (1990) text typology for educational settings. This typology differentiates between *autonomous texts*, which facilitate free intellectual creation without rigid structures, and texts that *re-process* existing content, such as summaries and paraphrases. This distinction is expected to become increasingly relevant with the advancement of artificial intelligence-generated texts.

4 This distinction aims to differentiate, for example, between scientific/didactic texts and literary texts (see: Beaugrande & Dressler 1981: §IX; also Lala 2011: §2). However, the notion of truth in text creation proves elusive. Recent studies on memory (*e.g.*, Phelps & Hofmann 2019) have shown that our recollections are substantially "edited" or fictionalised, which complicates the clear demarcation between factual and fabricated narratives. In psychology, this phenomenon is referred to as 'flashbulb memories' (see: Hirst *et al.* 2015).

language often lies in lexical density and the use of heavier constituents (Halliday 1989). De Mauro (1993) further delineates *oral* texts on characteristics such as directionality, spontaneity and the presence of interlocutors, ranging from intimate face-to-face conversations to formal conference presentations. Regarding contemporary *written* language, the emergence of digital communication has introduced unique features such as hypertext and non-linear discourse, underscoring the significance of hyperlinks in fostering interconnected text structures (*hypercohesion*, Schubert 2017) across different nodes[5] of a hypertext. This aspect is central to the structure of *digital* discourse (Eisenlauer 2013; Renkema & Schubert 2018: 87–88).

Among the most widely acknowledged text typologies, Werlich's (1975, [1976] 1982) classification organises texts into five main types: descriptive, narrative, expository, argumentative and instructional, each with its unique speech act purpose. *Descriptive* texts aim to portray scenes or objects (*cf.* Roggia 2011a), *narrative* texts tell stories (*cf.* Roggia 2011b), *expository* texts provide information (*cf.* De Cesare 2011), *argumentative* texts seek to persuade (*cf.* Cignetti 2011a) and *instructional* texts give directions or commands (*cf.* Cignetti 2011b).[6] Werlich ([1976] 1982: 39, 93) highlights that descriptive texts often focus on static, timeless elements, whereas narratives prioritise the progression of time and events. This impacts the use of connectives and modal verbs, as well as the balance between nouns and verbs, underscoring stylistic distinctions among text types.[7] Additionally, Werlic's typology accommodates genres within each text type, suggesting that fairy tales, epics and scientific reports align with the foundational narrative and argumentative types but follow genre-specific conventions (*cf.* Lala 2011). The typology also aligns with the oral and written distinction, suggesting that each text type can manifest distinctly in spoken or written form (*e.g.*, oral/written narratives, oral/written argumentatives, *etc.*; *cf.* Lavinio 2004: 148).

While Werlich's typology is broadly recognised for its comprehensive approach to classifying text types by their specific contextual foci – *e.g.*, descriptive texts focus on "factual phenomena in space" (*cf.* Werlich [1976] 1982: 39) – it has not been without its critiques and suggestions for refinement. Isenberg (1987: 113) praises the typology for its exhaustiveness and its method of defining text types based on distinct contextual foci. However, Mortara Garavelli (1991: §3) posits that certain hypothetical text types – like an "optative" type, envisioned for expressing wishes, curses and prayers – do not seamlessly fit into Werlich's predefined categories. Moreover, Bernárdez (1982: 221) raises concerns about the typology's adherence to monotypy, since a single text may contain more than one type. However, this critique might be more aptly applied to the notion of *genres*, which, while capable of incorporating multiple text types, often demonstrate a *predominant* one (*cf.* Sabatini & Camodeca 2016). Despite these considerations,

5 Hyperlinks can be intranodal (*e.g.* within one article in Wikipedia), internodal (*e.g.* between different articles in Wikipedia) and extranodal (*e.g.* between Wikipedia and other websites) (*cf.* Renkema & Schubert 2018: 89).

6 A similar approach by Koch & Fávero (1987) categorises texts using three interconnected dimensions: *pragmatic* (macro-speech acts), *global schematic* (akin to van Dijk's 1980 "macrostructures") and *linguistic* (surface features), thus considering both internal and external factors in text production. They identify *six* textual types: narrative, descriptive, expository, argumentative, directive and predictive (*cf.* Sousa 2012: 356–360).

7 Halliday & Martin (1993: 36) show that temporal sequences (or "temporal scaffolding") can extend beyond the mere use of verbs. This can be achieved through the utilisation of time adverbs, prepositions and time-centric expressions (e.g. *in the 100-million-year wink of a geological eye…*). In their analysis of a 139-word passage from popular science literature, which contains only three verbs, they illustrate how the passage maintains the attributes of a narrative type despite its minimal verb usage.

Werlich's framework continues to serve as a foundational structure in the exploration and understanding of text types.

Adam's (1991, [1992] 2017, [2005] 2020) exploration into text composition (Fr. *typologie séquentielle*) builds on Bakhtin's genre theories, proposing that basic genres support more complex ones. Adam posits that texts should not be rigidly classified as 'narrative' or 'argumentative' (as suggested by Werlich): "[t]ales and fables can be considered narrative genres if we focus on their sequential storytelling structure; however, they can also be viewed as argumentative genres when we consider the moral lesson they convey" (2020: 259).[8] In fact, *genres* are complex and often consist of identifiable sequences that can be recognised as narrative, argumentative, descriptive and so forth. This *sequential* level of analysis focuses on the organisation of utterances within the text, how ideas (or micropropositions) are structured into broader concepts (macropropositions), and the arrangement of these concepts in a sequence throughout the text.[9] For example, texts typically categorised as 'argumentative' often feature a sequence of macropropositions including a thesis statement, supporting evidence, limitations and a conclusion, which may be arranged in a non-linear order to allow for different structural configurations (*cf.* Sousa 2012: 359). According to Adam, *genre* analysis should primarily determine whether a specific type of sequence *predominates* within a genre, rather than defining texts by strict *types* ([2005] 2020: 259–260).

Sabatini's (1990, 1999) typology stands as a pioneering and invaluable framework within the realm of Italian linguistics, shedding light on the interplay between an author's intent and the interpretive freedom granted to addressees. Sabatini's classification outlines three main approaches authors might take: (1) aim to convey extremely precise concepts about a topic, expecting the reader's interpretation to closely align with their own; (2) target readers who are unfamiliar with the topic, aiming for their interpretation to be relatively close to the author's; or (3) share personal expressions, allowing readers a broad interpretive leeway, enabling them to blend their experiences with the text (Sabatini 1990: 634).

This categorisation hinges on the balance between two parameters, namely *rigidity* and *elasticity* – terms that describe various aspects of a text, like its structure, cohesive devices, lexical choices and sentence length.[10] Rigidity in a text is characterised by features such as uniform and brief paragraphs, repetitive use of technical terms and a lack of exclamatory or interrogative sentences. On the other hand, elasticity is marked by the use of synonyms, exclamations, questions, figurative language and forms that suggest the presence of the author or the reader, making the text more "interactional" (*cf.* Hyland 2005). Texts can thus be grouped into three types based on the level of interpretive freedom allowed: (1) *rigid texts*, which include scientific, legal and technical documents, require strict adherence to the author's intended meaning; (2) *semi-rigid texts*, such as expository and informative works, maintain a balance

8 Unless otherwise indicated translations are those of the author. Orig.: "Les genres du conte et de la fable sont des genres narratifs si l'on considère le type séquentiel narratif comme enchâssant. Il peuvent être considerés comme des genres argumentatifs si l'on prend en compte l'enchâssement argumentatif dans la maxime de morale."

9 Adam's discussion of the enunciative dimension parallels Halliday's concepts of mode and tenor, while his treatment of the semantic dimension mirrors Halliday's notion of field. Furthermore, the introduction of micro and macropropositions echoes Martin's (1993) categorisation into macro-theme/rheme, hyper-theme/rheme and theme/rheme, as well as Ferrari's (2014) delineation of *unità informativa* and *unità comunicativa*. In a similar vein, Adam's concept of *séquences textuelles* echoes Swales' (1990, 2004) framework of rhetorical moves and steps, alongside Ferrari's notion of *movimento testuale*.

10 For a table aiding in text identification through the lens of rigidity versus elasticity, see: Sabatini *et al.* (2014: 224–225).

between constraints and expressive freedom; and (3) *elastic texts*, including prose and poetry[11], offer the greatest freedom in terms of language, sound and rhythm – they encourage active participation in interpretation, contrasting sharply with texts that confine readers to rigid interpretations (*cf.* Lala 2011; Sabatini & Camodeca 2016).

In conclusion, the field of text typology, explored through these various classification systems, remains complex and continually evolving. The term *text* itself carries multiple meanings – traditionally associated with sequences of sentences (as discussed in the context of "transphrastic grammar"), it can also refer to elements not immediately visible on the surface text, such as the invisible "sense" of a given text (Coseriu [1980] 1998). This complexity is further amplified by the advent of the internet, which introduces new dimensions to text classification, including hyperlinking and digital non-linearity (see Renkema & Schubert 2018). Moreover, the classification of texts can be complicated by factors such as humour and double entendres, which, as we shall see, illustrate that texts can defy straightforward categorisation within the current typologies.

Denotation and Connotation: A Contribution to Text Typology

Coseriu ([1980] 1998) was among the first to articulate a vision for text linguistics grounded in the concept of *sense* rather than *meaning*. He posited sense as a property of the *textual sign* – namely, the Saussurean linguistic sign contextualised – contrasting with meaning, which pertains to the Saussurean dyad of signifier and signified.[12] For instance, the linguistic sign *snake* denotes its literal representation as a serpent; however, as a textual sign, it can also carry connotations of "evil". This distinction becomes particularly pronounced in high-context cultures (*cf.* Hall & Hall 1990), which rely on implicit communication, in contrast to the more explicit communication preferred in low-context cultures (*cf.* Wurtz 2005).[13] For instance, Everett (2017: 274) provides a compelling illustration of the importance of culture in language through the following interaction between two linguists:

> A: Colourless green ideas sleep furiously.
> B: They sure do.

As Everett notes, while the general population of English speakers may have no idea what A's utterance means, if A and B are linguists, they may both understand the reference to Chomsky's famous

11 Nevertheless, Lala (2011) highlights that despite its "linguistic freedom", traditional poetry is structured around specific norms and traditions, especially rhythm and sound effects, to guide interpretation. However, she notes a trend in modern Italian poetry towards more flexible composition, deviating from traditional strictures to embrace looser cohesion and variable use of punctuation, capitalisation and rhyme.

12 For a related discussion on *sense* and *reference*, see Crystal (2010: 106–111). For an in-depth exploration of the distinction between denotation and reference, see: Lyons (1995: 78–82). Although this distinction is meaningful, it is not upheld in this article; instead, both concepts are encompassed under the notion of "denotative texts".

13 Several intriguing hypotheses may emerge from these considerations. For instance, it could be hypothesised that communication difficulties, such as those encountered in foreigner talk (*cf.* Yule 2010: 192), lead to the creation of more denotative texts for easier interpretation by the interlocutor. Additionally, it might be posited that the closer the relationship between the interlocutors, the more connotative texts are produced in conversations.

example. Thus, this short dialogue could serve a phatic function (*i.e.* its sense), essentially conveying, "Hey, we are both linguists".

This phenomenon of meaning displacement, where a linguistic sign is interpreted in a context-specific manner diverging from its standard denotation, extends beyond the realm of poetic language to permeate everyday language (Coseriu ([1980] 1998: §2). This indicates that the denotation/connotation difference is a crucial aspect of text typology, relevant to texts encountered in everyday life. Moreover, this parameter aligns with Isenberg's criterion of exhaustiveness, as it applies to texts at both the micro and macro levels (*cf.* Bieber & Douglas 2009: 5): short texts can be concisely identified as either denotative or connotative, with more complex texts tending towards one of these classifications (*cf.* Adam, above).

Furthermore, the concepts of rigidity and elasticity, as discussed by Sabatini, can be recontextualised in terms of semantics and form. Texts may exhibit semantic rigidity (*i.e.*, denotation) or elasticity (*i.e.*, connotation), which then interacts with their formal characteristics. For instance, the semantic content of a Spenserian sonnet can be elastic, allowing for a breadth of interpretations, while its structure remains highly rigid. This perspective diverges from Sabatini *et al.* (2014: 117), who consider all poetic texts as inherently "elastic", and highlights the critical need for accurate interpretation, especially on platforms like social media where the intended meaning of humorous memes can often be misconstrued as denotative.

To justify this proposal, let us examine several key arguments, such as speech act theory, the theory of verbal humour, poetic language, specific language registers and the concept of text allusion. These points collectively support the inclusion of a denotation/connotation parameter in text typology.

Beginning with *speech act theory* (Austin 1962), this theory categorises the communicative functions of utterances into actions like requesting, commanding, questioning or informing (*cf.* Yule 2010: 133–135). *Direct* speech acts align sentence type with function straightforwardly, such as using the interrogative *Can you ride a bicycle?* to genuinely ask a question. Conversely, *indirect* speech acts employ a structure typically associated with one function to fulfill another, as in *Can you pass the salt?*, where an interrogative sentence form is used to request an action, rather than to ask a question (*cf.* Crystal 2010: 125). Significantly, this also encompasses *illocutive* (or performative) *verbs*, that is, verbs that 'enact the action they denote' (Ferrari 2014: 301): in such instances, the text produced is denotative, as illustrated by expressions like *I would like to ask you how much it is* – for asking a question – or *I'm afraid I need to reject your proposal* – for indicating rejection.[14]

Humorous texts (*cf.* Crystal 2010: 64–67) – particularly through the General Theory of Verbal Humor (Attardo & Raskin 1991; Attardo 2001) and script-based Semantic Theory of Humor (Raskin 1985) – provide a strong case for the distinction between denotative and connotative texts. According to these theories, humour often emerges from *script opposition*, such as the clash between reality and fantasy, or from ambiguity. For example, consider a joke in which a customer, aiming to take advantage of a "Buy 1 Coffee, Get 1 Free" offer, is told by the barista, "Yes, the second coffee is indeed free *after* you buy the first one for $3." To which the customer replies, "In that case, *I'll start with the second coffee*", thereby exploiting the ambiguity of the offer's wording. Similarly, Jonathan Swift's *A Modest Proposal* might

14 Indirect speech acts have traditionally been regarded as more "polite" (*cf.* Everett 2017: 258–259), a perspective that Wierzbicka (1985) challenges as Anglo-centric. Wierzbicka emphasises that perceptions of politeness and the preference for indirectness vary across cultures.

seem like a straightforward economic proposal initially[15] but reveals its satirical nature only through connotative interpretation. While humorous texts might be classified as elastic according to Sabatini's typology, they are not completely so; some demand a specific interpretation to be fully appreciated, as shown in Swift's work or humour arising from script opposition.[16] An illustrative case cited by Mortara Garavelli (1988: 161) involves identity cards – typically an example of highly rigid, descriptive text; when used humorously, however, they can transition into connotative texts.[17]

Something similar occurs with irony, particularly when analysed from a polyphonic perspective. Ducrot (1984) argues that utterances can contain multiple voices, allowing speakers to distance themselves from certain perspectives within the same utterance. Ferrari (2014: 244) emphasises this in the context of irony. In such cases, the speaker simultaneously adopts and distances themselves from a statement that becomes ironic due to contextual contradictions. For instance, a person might declare it a sunny day while standing in pouring rain, thereby mocking their own previous weather prediction (*e.g.*, *È davvero una giornata in cui splende il sole!* 'It really is a day when the sun is shining'). In this case, the speaker essentially splits into two: one who previously held an absurd viewpoint and one who comments on it at the moment of utterance. The result is a communicative paradox that irony resolves by highlighting the contextual evidence; through intonational choices, the speaker triggers the intended ironic effects.

Poetic language is renowned for its rich use of metaphors and connotative expressions. This is vividly illustrated in the intricate use of kennings within Old Norse and Old English poetry, where complex metaphors describe objects or concepts without naming them directly, thus creating richly connotative texts. For instance, "hostile monster of the mast" (O. N. *jǫtunn vandar*) metaphorically describes the stormy wind, while "the prow beast" (O. N. *stafnkvígs*) and "Gestil's [a sea-king] swan" (O. N. *Gestils ǫlpt*) symbolise the ship (*cf.* Bernárdez 1982: 255). Similarly, Old English kennings – like "whale-road" (O. E. *hronrād*) for the sea and "bone-house" (O. E. *bānhūs*) for the body (Crystal 2003: 23) – demonstrate the depth of connotative language by imposing on readers a multi-layered understanding that goes beyond the literal (*cf.* Crystal 2010: 65). Francesco Petrarca's Sonnet 148 from his *Canzoniere* (14th century) offers another compelling illustration of the distinction between denotative and connotative language. This sonnet transforms a simple list of rivers (*Non Tesin, Po, Varo, Arno, Adige et Tebro,/ Eufrate, Tigre, Nilo, Hermo, Indo et Gange*) into a text imbued with emotional and symbolic resonance, reflecting the intense passion of love and the comforting, yet ultimately insufficient, solace of nature (*…poria 'l foco allentar che 'l cor tristo ange* '[Not even those rivers] could quench the fire that the sad heart torments'). The opening lines could ostensibly belong to a denotative text merely cataloguing rivers (*e.g.*, "Examples of rivers in Italy include *the Ticino, Po, Arno, Adige and Tiber*"). However, a comparison between the original and the hypothetical denotative example reveals differences not so much on the surface of the text but in

15 Swift's satirical essay masterfully employs argumentative style to propose a shocking solution to Irish poverty: selling children as food. Starting with a rational analysis of economic woes, it abruptly presents this outrageous solution.

16 This complexity becomes especially pertinent when considering individuals with Asperger Syndrome (AS), who may have intact language abilities but struggle with nonliteral language, such as irony, due to their difficulty with pragmatic language use in social contexts (*cf.* Martin & McDonald 2004).

17 For instance, consider the following fictitious Italian ID card for the actor Chuck Norris, humorously filled with whimsical entries fitting the genre's categories, such as *Cittadinanza: Tutte. Ad Honorem* ("Citizenship: All. Honorary") and *Capelli: Tantissimi e bellissimi* ("Hair: Very abundant and beautiful") (https://x.com/chucckk_norris/status/437680596077125632?lang=eng) [date of access: 28.03.2024]).

their ideational functions: the constructed example is denotative, focusing on direct information, while Petrarca's sonnet is distinctly connotative.[18]

Certain *language registers*, including specialised forms like Cockney rhyming slang and secretive linguistic codes used in criminal circles, demonstrate vividly how denotative and connotative meanings can differ significantly within various contexts. For example, Cockney rhyming slang ingeniously transforms everyday objects into complex, indirect expressions – *e.g. Cain and Abel* becomes a synonym for "table" and *Hampstead Heath* creatively denotes "teeth" (Crystal 2010: 55). In a similar vein, criminal codes introduce a level of secrecy by attributing unconventional meanings to conventional words, making them comprehensible solely within their own community (Crystal 2010: 60–61). These instances underscore the adaptive nature of language, demonstrating how the denotative (literal) meanings of words can be cloaked in connotative (implied) interpretations, thereby erecting a linguistic divide that distinguishes insiders from outsiders.

Lastly, *text allusion* – a form of intertextuality – provides a further argument for classifying texts into denotative versus connotative categories. Beaugrande & Dressler (1981: §IX.12) shed light on this by exploring how texts evolve and reference each other over time. They discuss how Christopher Marlowe's 1599 poem *The Passionate Shepherd to His Love* inspired Sir Walter Raleigh's response, which both emulated and critiqued Marlowe's original work. John Donne later adapted the theme to a fisherman's perspective, while Cecil Day Lewis's 1935 version reflected the 1930s economic challenges, contrasting sharply with Marlowe's idealism. This sequence of adaptations highlights how texts can both rely on and deviate from their predecessors, consistently "echoing" the original reference. Coseriu ([1980] 1998: §2.2.2) further illustrates how the sense of a text can change dramatically based on cultural and linguistic contexts. He contrasts how an Italian phrase – merely suggesting an unnamed location in a southwestern German region – is very likely to be understood denotatively (1a), against its Spanish counterpart (1b), instantly recognisable to Spanish speakers as an allusion to the opening of *Don Quixote*. Moreover, Coseriu argues that even a simple relative clause phrase like *X, de cuyo nombre no quiero acordarme*, can, in Spanish, evoke this literary reference. Similarly, an Italian professor's remark about being "in the middle of our course" (2a), meant to indicate the halfway point of the semester, could be perceived by Italian students as an allusion to the opening line of the *Divine Comedy* (*Nel mezzo del cammin di nostra vita...*); however, the English translation of this observation (2b) might not evoke the same literary connection.[19]

(1)
(a) *In un luogo della Svevia, il cui nome non voglio ricordare…*
(b) *En un lugar de la Suebia, de cuyo nombre no quiero acordarme…*
"In a place in Swabia, the name of which I have no desire to call to mind…"

(2)
(a) *Siamo nel mezzo del cammin del nostro corso…*
(b) *We are in the middle of the journey of our course…*

18 For other literary examples, *cf.* Coseriu ([1980] 1998: §2.6).

19 Coseriu points out that these are not just *potential* references but are actively and commonly recognised by those familiar with the cited texts. This is particularly evident in humorous texts, where allusions do not merely suggest interpretations – they *compel* them, ensuring the text's coherence.

One could argue that all texts inherently possess connotative meanings due to the principle of intertextuality. Indeed, Coseriu ([1980] 1998: §2) highlights that texts often reference other texts, as illustrated by traditional openings such as *Once upon a time…* in fairy tales. However, speech act theory distinguishes clearly between direct and indirect acts of speech: illocutionary verbs – as well the overlap between sentence type and speech act – represent direct speech acts. Similarly, the theory of verbal humor, which draws on script opposition, requires the simultaneous understanding of two distinct, contrasting scripts for a humorous interpretation, thus serving as a clear example of connotative texts. While analysing longer, complex texts might present challenges, it is important to remember that the denotative or connotative nature of a text is determined by its *dominant* function, a key aspect of text typology rather than genre classification. Consequently, all poetic language is *predominantly* connotative, while all scientific texts are *predominantly* denotative.

While denotative texts may be viewed as "rigid" discourse and connotative texts as "elastic" discourse, such categorisation risks oversimplifying the intricate dynamics between reader and text. Literary and poetic works, offering a wider margin for interpretation, in fact depend on the reader's ability to deduce the author's intended meaning in order to ensure textual coherence – a fundamental aspect of textuality (Conte [1989] 1999). This also extends to prescriptive "rigid" texts like recipes, which, despite their intent to reproduce an original purpose, may serve as adaptable guides for personal interpretation.

Furthermore, defining a text solely by its structure would be an oversimplification. The argumentative sequences (see: Adam, above) of prescriptive or scientific texts can be the subject of satire (as exemplified by Swift), challenging their categorisation as strictly denotative (argumentative) texts. Instead, although their form may resemble that of argumentative texts, they are distinguished by their connotative semantics. Additionally, while poetic language is predominantly connotative as a text type, the sonnet as a genre is characterised not only by its connotative semantics but also by its specific form. Therefore, it is the complex interplay of these features, rather than isolated characteristics, that enables accurate classification of both types and genres.

Consequently, the differentiation between denotation and connotation serves as a crucial parameter in the typology of texts, fundamentally grounded in linguistic principles. Moreover, this distinction can be further enriched through a meticulous analysis of surface structures (for instance, by applying Sabatini's rigidity/elasticity parameters), thereby facilitating the classification of a diverse range of text genres, as illustrated in Table 1 below:

Table 1. The denotation/connotation parameter applied to genres

Semantics	Form	Examples
Denotative	*rigid*	prescriptive; legal; scientific genres
	semi-rigid	popular science; school textbooks
	elastic	everyday spontaneous information exchanges (excluding highly routinised expressions)
Connotative	*rigid*	sonnets; ironic use of rigid denotative texts
	semi-rigid	less structured expressions of poetic and artistic texts
	elastic	stream-of-consciousness; postmodern poetry

Finally, at a more granular level, texts can be evaluated based on their sequential structures (*cf.* Adam [2005] 2020) to empirically determine which type of sequence – narrative, descriptive, argumentative, *etc.* – predominates in specific texts under examination. This approach would allow for a more in-depth understanding of textual composition and function, while simultaneously paying attention to the deeper semantic elements of texts.

Conclusion

This paper proposes a hierarchical model of text analysis that incorporates existing typologies while foregrounding the critical distinction between denotative and connotative meanings, positioning this semantic criterion at the apex of the hierarchy. By reintegrating Coseriu's concept of the *textual sign*, the model presented in this paper offers a re-evaluation of text analysis – it not only aligns with Sabatini's typology but also advances it and integrates Adam's refinements to Werlich's classic contributions.

The proposed hierarchy is structured to facilitate a layered analysis of texts. Following the primary semantic typological differentiation at the top level, the model classifies text genres based on their structural rigidity, thus allowing for a sequential examination from the abstract to the specific. Adam's criterion for dominant sequential types is considered at subsequent levels, thereby providing a comprehensive framework for text analysis.

In sum, this proposal advocates for an integrated approach to text analysis, presenting a robust analytical tool that is adaptable to the complexity of human texts. Employing this framework promises deeper insights into textual dynamics, enhancing our understanding of human expression and interaction. In the digital era, where effective communication hinges on the ability to discern and interpret layered meanings, recognising text types has never been more essential.

References

Adam, Jean-Michel (1991) "Cadre théorique d'une typologie séquentielle." [In:] *Études de Linguistique Appliquée*. Vol. 83; 6–18.

Adam, Jean-Michel ([1992] 2017) *Les textes: types et prototypes*. Paris: Armand Colin.

Adam, Jean-Michel ([2005] 2020) *La linguistique textuelle. Introduction à l'analyse textuelle des discours*. Paris: Armand Colin.

Adamzik, Kirsten (1995) *Textsorten – Texttypologie. Eine kommentierte Bibliographie*. Münster: Nodus.

Adamzik, Kirsten (2016) *Textlinguistik. Grundlagen, Kontroversen, Perspektiven*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Altieri Biagi, Maria Luisa (2010) "Galileo Galilei." [In:] Raffaele Simone (ed.) *Enciclopedia dell'Italiano*. Roma: Istituto dell'Enciclopedia Italiana, Treccani; 548–551. Retrieved from https://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/galileo-galilei_%28Enciclopedia-dell%27Italiano%29/ on 12 Mar. 2024.

Attardo, Salvatore (2001) *Humorous Texts: A Semantic and Pragmatic Analysis*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Attardo, Salvatore, Victor Raskin (1991) "Script Theory Revis(it)ed: Joke Similarity and Joke Representation Model." [In:] *Humor*. Vol. 4/3–4; 293–347.

Aumüller, Matthias (2014) "Text Types." [In:] Peter Hühn, Jan Christoph Meister, John Pier, Wolf Schmid (eds.) *Handbook of Narratology* (2nd ed.). Berlin: De Gruyter; 854–867.

Austin, John Langshaw (1962) *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bakhtin, Mikhail ([1979] 1986) ["Проблема речевых жанров." [In:] Sergey Bocharov (ed.) Эстетика словесного творчества. Moscow; 237–280]. Translated into English by Vern W. McGee. "The Problem of Speech Genres." [In:] Mikhail Bakhtin *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*. Austin: University of Texas Press; 60–102.

Beaugrande, Robert-Alain de, Wolfgang Ulrich Dressler (1981) *Introduction to Text Linguistics.* London: Longman.

Bernárdez, Enrique (1982) *Introducción a la Lingüística del Texto*. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe.

Bieber, Douglas, Susan Conrad (2009) *Register, Genre, and Style*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brinker, Klaus (2010) *Linguistische Textanalyse. Eine Einführung in Grundbegriffe und Methoden* (7th ed.). Berlin: Erich Schmidt.

Cignetti, Luca (2011a) "Testi argomentativi." [In:] Raffaele Simone (ed.) *Enciclopedia dell'Italiano*. Roma: Istituto dell'Enciclopedia Italiana Treccani. Vol. 2; 1468–1471. Retrieved from https://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/testi-argomentativi_(Enciclopedia-dell'Italiano)/ on 12 Mar. 2024.

Cignetti, Luca (2011b) "Testi prescrittivi." [In:] Raffaele Simone (ed.) *Enciclopedia dell'Italiano*. Roma: Istituto dell'Enciclopedia Italiana Treccani. Vol. 2; 1482–1485. Retrieved from https://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/testi-prescrittivi_(Enciclopedia-dell'Italiano)/ on 12 March 2024.

Conte, Maria-Elisabeth (ed.) (1977) *La linguistica testuale*. Milano: Feltrinelli.

Conte, Maria-Elisabeth ([1989] 1999) *Condizioni di coerenza: Ricerche di linguistica testuale* (2nd ed.). Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso.

Coseriu, Eugenio ([1980] 1998) [*Textlinguistik: eine Einführung*. Tübingen] Translated into Italian by Donatella Di Cesare. *Linguistica del testo*. Roma: Carocci.

Crystal, David (2003) *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Crystal, David (2010) *The Cambridge Encyclopedia Language* (3rd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

De Cesare, Anna Maria (2011). "Testi espositivi." [In:] Raffaele Simone (ed.) *Enciclopedia dell'Italiano*. Roma: Istituto dell'Enciclopedia Italiana Treccani. Vol. 2; 1474–1478. Retrieved from https://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/testi-espositivi_(Enciclopedia-dell'Italiano)/ on 12 Mar. 2024.

De Mauro, Tullio, Federico Mancini, Massimo Vedovelli, Miriam Voghera (eds.) (1993) *Lessico di frequenza dell'italiano parlato*. Milano: ETAS libri.

Dijk, van Teun (1980) *Macrostructures. An Interdisciplinary Study of Global Structures in Discourse, Interaction, and Cognition*. London: Routledge.

Ducrot, Oswald (1984) *Le dire et le dit*. Paris: Minuit.

Eisenlauer, Volker (2013) *A Critical Hypertext Analysis of Social Media*. London: Boomsbury Publishing.

Everett, Daniel (2017) *How Language Began. The Story of Humanity's Greatest Invention*. London: Profile.

Ferrari, Angela (2014) *Linguistica del testo. Principi, fenomeni, strutture*. Roma: Carocci.

Fiorentino, Giuliana (2020) "Scrivere come pratica sociale: riassumere per capire e per studiare." [In:] *Italiano LinguaDue.* Vol. 12/1; 1–24. [At:] https://doi.org/10.13130/2037-3597/13980 [date of access: 12 March 2024].

Genette, Gérard ([1972] 1980) ["Discours du récit." [In:] Gérard Genette *Figures III*. Paris] Translated into English by Jane Lewin. *Narrative Discourse. An Essay in Method*. Ithaca (NY): Cornell University Press.

Hall, Edward, Mildred Hall (1990) *Understanding Cultural Differences: Germans, French, and Americans*. Boston: Intercultural Press.

Halliday, Michael Alexander Kirkwood (1978) *Language as Social Semiotic. The Social Interpretation of Language and Meaning*. London: Arnold.

Halliday, Michael Alexander Kirkwood (1989) *Spoken and Written Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Halliday Michael Alexander Kirkwood (1993) "On the Language of Physical Science." [In:] Michael Alexander Kirkwood Halliday, James Robert Martin (eds.) *Writing Science: Literacy and Discursive Power*. The Falmer Press: London; 54–68.

Halliday, Michael Alexander Kirkwood, James Robert Martin (1993) *Writing Science: Literacy and Discursive Power*. London: The Falmer Press.

Heinemann, Wolfgang (2000) "Aspekte der Textsortendifferenzierung." [In:] Klaus Brinker, Gerd Antos, Wolfgang Heinemann, Sven Sager (eds.) *Text- und Gesprächslinguistik (Band 1)*. Berlin: de Gruyter; 523–546.

Heinemann, Margot, Wolfgang Heinemann (2002) *Grundlagen der Textlinguistik. Interaktion – Text – Diskurs*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Hirst, William, Elizabeth Phelps, Robert Meksin, Chandan Vaidya, Marcia Johnson, Karen Mitchell, Randy Buckner, Andrew Budson, John Gabrieli, Cindy Lustig, Mara Mather, Kevin Ochsner, Daniel Schacter, Jon Simons, Keith Lyle, Alexandru Cuc, Andreas Olsson (2015) "A Ten-Year Follow-up of a Study of Memory for the Attack of September 11, 2001: Flashbulb Memories and Memories for Flashbulb Events." [In:] *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*. Vol 144/3; 604–623. [At:] https://doi.org/10.1037/xge0000055 [date of access: 12 March 2024].

Hyland, Ken (2005) *Metadiscourse: Exploring Interaction in Writing*. London: Continuum.

Isenberg, Horst (1978) "Probleme der Texttypologie. Variation und Determination von Texttypen." [In:] *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Karl-Marx-Universität Leipzig. Gesellschafts- und sprachwissenschaftliche Reihe*. Vol 27/5; 565–579.

Isenberg, Horst (1983) "Grundfragen der Texttypologie." [In:] František Daneš, Dieter Viehweger (eds.) *Ebenen der Textstruktur*. Berlin: Akademie der Wissenschaften der DDR; 303–342.

Isenberg, Horst (1987) "Cuestiones fundamentales de tipología textual." [In:] Enrique Bernárdez (ed.) *Lingüística del texto*. Madrid: Arco; 95–129.

Kartika-Ningsih, Harni, David Rose (2018) "Language shift: analysing language use in multilingual classroom interactions." [In:] *Functional Linguistics*. Vol. 5/9; 1–22. [At:] https://doi.org/10.1186/s40554-018-0061-0 [date of access: 12 March 2024].

Koch, Ingedore Grunfeld Villaça (2009) *Introducão à lingüística textual. Trajetória e grandes temas* (2nd ed.). São Paulo: WMF Martins Fontes.

Koch, Ingedore Grunfeld Villaça, Leonor Lopes Fávero (1987) "Contribuição a uma tipologia textual." [In:] *Letras & Letras*. Vol. 3/1; 3–10.

Lala, Letizia (2011) "Tipi di testo." [In:] Raffaele Simone (ed.) *Enciclopedia dell'Italiano*. Roma: Istituto dell'Enciclopedia Italiana Treccani. Vol. 2; 1488–1494. [At:] https://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/tipi-di-testo_(Enciclopedia-dell'Italiano)/ on 12 Mar. 2024.

Lavinio, Cristina (2004) *Comunicazione e linguaggi disciplinari. Per un'educazione linguistica trasversale*. Roma: Carocci.

Lyons, John (1995) *Linguistic Semantics: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Manzotti, Emilio (1990) "Forme della scrittura nella scuola: una tipologia ragionata." [In:] *Nuova secondaria*. Vol. 7; 25–42.

Marazzini, Claudio (1993) *Il secondo Cinquecento e il Seicento*. Bologna: il Mulino.

Marcuschi, Luiz Antônio (2003) "Gêneros textuais: definição e funcionalidade." [In:] Ângela Paiva Dionísio, Anna Rachel Machado, Maria Auxiliadora Bezerra (eds.) *Gêneros textuais e ensino* (2nd ed.). São Paulo: Parábola Editorial; 19–36.

Martin, Ingerith, Skye McDonald (2004) "An Exploration of Causes of Non-Literal Language Problems in Individuals with Asperger Syndrome." [In:] *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*. Vol. 34/3; 311–328.

Martin, James Robert (1993) "Life as a Noun: Arresting the Universe in Science and Humanities." [In:] Michael Alexander Kirkwood Halliday, James Robert Martin (eds.) *Writing Science: Literacy and Discursive Power.* London: The Falmer Press; 221–267.

Martin, James Robert, David Rose (2007) *Working With Discourse: Meaning Beyond the Clause*. London: Continuum.

Martin, James Robert, David Rose (2008) *Genre Relations: Mapping Culture*. London: Equinox.

Mortara Garavelli, Bice (1988) "Textsorten / Tipologia dei testi." [In:] Günter Holtus, Michael Metzeltin, Christian Schmitt (eds.) *Lexikon der Romanistischen Linguistik*. Vol. IV. Tübingen: Niemeyer; 157–168.

Mortara Garavelli, Bice (1991) "Tipologie dei testi: categorie descrittive e generi testuali." [In:] Maria G. Lo Duca (ed.) *Scrivere nella scuola media superiore*. Firenze: La Nuova Italia; 9–23.

Palermo, Massimo (2013) *Linguistica testuale dell'italiano*. Bologna: il Mulino.

Phelps, Elizabeth, Stefan Hofmann (2019) "Memory Editing From Science Fiction to Clinical Practice." [In:] *Nature*. Vol. 572/(7767); 43–50. doi: 10.1038/s41586-019-1433-7 [date of access: 12 March 2024].

Raskin, Victor (1985) *Semantic Mechanisms of Humor*. Dordrecht: Reidel.

Renkema, Jan, Christoph Schubert (2018) *Introduction to Discourse Studies. New Edition*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Roggia, Carlo Enrico (2011a) "Testi descrittivi." [In:] Raffaele Simone (ed.) *Enciclopedia dell'Italiano*. Roma: Istituto dell'Enciclopedia Italiana Treccani. Vol. 2; 1471–1474. [At:] https://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/testi-descrittivi_(Enciclopedia-dell'Italiano)/ [date of access: 12 Mar. 2024].

Roggia, Carlo Enrico (2011b) "Testi narrativi." [In:] Raffaele Simone (ed.) *Enciclopedia dell'Italiano*. Roma: Istituto dell'Enciclopedia Italiana Treccani. Vol. 2; 1478–1482. [At:] https://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/testi-narrativi_(Enciclopedia-dell'Italiano)/ [date of access: 12 Mar. 2024].

Sabatini, Francesco ([1984] 1990) *La comunicazione e gli usi della lingua. Pratica dei testi, analisi logica, storia della lingua. Scuole secondarie superiori.* Torino: Loescher.

Sabatini, Francesco (1999) "'Rigidità-esplicitezza' vs 'elasticità-implicitezza': possibili parametri massimi per una tipologia dei testi." [In:] Gunver Skytte, Francesco Sabatini (eds.) *Linguistica testuale comparativa. In memoriam Maria-Elisabeth Conte. Atti del Congresso interannuale della Società di Linguistica Italiana (Copenhagen, 5–7 febbraio 1998)*. København: Museum Tusculanum Press; 141–172.

Sabatini, Francesco, Carmela Camodeca, Cristiana De Santis (2014) *Conosco la mia lingua*. Torino: Loescher.

Sabatini, Francesco, Carmela Camodeca (2016) "Modelli grammaticali, superficie del testo e tipi di testo." [In:] Paolo D'Achille (ed.) *Grammatica e testualità. Metodologie ed esperienze didattiche a confronto*. Firenze: Franco Cesati; 55–69.

Sandig, Barbara (1975) "Zur Differenzierung gebrauchsprachlicher Textsorten im Deutschen." [In:] Elisabeth Gülich, Wolfgang Raible (eds.) *Textsorten. Differenzierungskriterien aus linguistischer Sicht* (2nd ed.). Frankfurt am Main: Athenaion; 113–124.

Schmidt, Siegfried (1978) "Some Problems of Communicative Text Theories." [In:] Wolfgang Dressler (ed.) *Current Trends in Textlinguistics*. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter; 47–60.

Schubert, Christoph (2017) "Discourse and Cohesion." [In:] Christian R. Hoffmann, Wolfram Bublitz (eds.) *Pragmatics of Social Media.* Berlin: De Gruyter/Mouton; 317–344.

Sousa, Socorro Cláudia Tavares de (2012) "As abordagens tipológicas dos textos." [In:] *Linguagem em (Dis) curso*. Vol. 12/1; 347–364.

Swales, John Malcolm (1990) *Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Swales, John Malcolm (2004) *Research Genres: Explorations and Applications*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Weinrich, Harald (1972) Thesen zur Textsorten-Linguistiki. [In:] Elisabeth Gülich, Wolfgang Raible (eds.) *Textsorten. Differenzierungskriterien aus linguistischer Sicht*. Frankfurt am Main: Athenäum; 161–169.

Werlich, Egon (1975) *Typologie der Texte: Entwurf eines textlinguistischen Modells zur Grundlegung einer Textgrammatik*. Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer.

Werlich, Egon ([1976] 1982) *A Text Grammar of English* (2nd ed.). Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer.

Wierzbicka, Anna (1985) "Different Cultures, Different Languages, Different Speech Acts: Polish vs. English." [In:] *Journal of Pragmatics*. Vol. 9; 145–178.

Wildfeuer, Janina (2014) *Film Discourse Interpretation. Towards a New Paradigm for Multimodal Film Analysis*. New York/London: Routledge.

Würtz, Elizabeth (2005) "Intercultural Communication on Web Sites: a Cross-Cultural Analysis of Web Sites from High-Context Cultures and Low-Context Cultures." [In:] *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication.* Vol. 11/1; 274–299.

Yule, George (2010) *The Study of Language* (4th ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Received:
07.10.2024
Reviewed:
03.11.2024
Accepted:
27.11.2024