

AYDI EST.

Open Learning & Translation

2022-2023

Fourth Year

Second Term



I



# Discourse Analysis

19.05.2023



مؤسسة العائدي للخدمات الطلابية  
(دار العائدي للدراسات والنشر والترجمة)

DA 4.1

AYDI© 2023

## HELLO EVERYONE!

I am Dr Amani Al-Eid; I will be teaching you discourse analysis.

\*\*\*

The materials I will be using this time are **totally different** from the ones I shared with students last year, so I have changed everything.

We will start with the lecture titled *Literature and Discourse Analysis*. It is a PDF file (17 pages).

We will not read everything; we are going to skip some lines.

\*

### Abstract

**Literary discourse analysis** – viewed legitimately as a branch of **discourse analysis** – is a new approach to literature. In this article we begin by studying its emergence, taking into account the evolution of the relationship between literature and linguistics throughout the 20th century. That allows us to bring to the fore its main characteristics. We then discuss two concepts of interest to literary discourse analysis: **self-constituting discourse** and **scenography**. We close by explaining that the introduction of discourse analysis to the field of literary studies, modifies its map, from an institutional and an epistemological viewpoint. This assumption implies a distinction between two paradigms: **"hermeneutic approaches"** and **"discourse approaches"**.

This is just an abstract to the research paper I have here, and it's just an integration of literature and discourse analysis; is it possible to interpret analyse literature using discourse analysis? Is it doable? This is the question this article will try to answer.

\*\*\*

### 1. Introduction

The label "literary discourse analysis" is still seldom used: we are always hearing of "discourse analysis" and "literary discourse" but very few scholars claim to practise "literary discourse analysis".

Among the people who claim to practise literary discourse

analysis, very few do it in reality: most of the time they only apply pragmatic concepts to literary texts, without changing the way they understand literature, as if a discourse analytical outlook were an "approach" like any other one.

So, even those who apply discourse analysis to the study and analysis of literature they don't even know how to do it.

**Discourse analysis aims to consider the reciprocal envelopment of text and context, which implies shifting the core of the analysis: from the creator and his or her work to the conditions that make literary discourse possible.**

At the core of discourse analysis, there is the reciprocal relationship between text and context and this implies once you take this relationship into consideration, it implies a shift/a transformation/a change from reading literature in connection to the writer, the producer, or the creator to the conditions that make literary discourse possible.

Applying literary discourse analysis is something looking beyond the creator, the producer, or the writer who produced the text. It is at the relationship between text and context.

\*\*\*

## **2. Literature, linguistics and discourse analysis**

The people who claim to tackle literature as discourse analysts must fight on two fronts: traditional literature studies, of course, but also discourse analysis. The development of a branch of discourse analysis dedicated to the study of literature is scowled at not only by the scholars who work in the area of traditional "humanities" but also by most discourse analysts, who consider that "true" discourse analysis must ignore literature, that the study of everyday conversations must be the hard core of their activity.

- Scowled: it's mocked/it's not taken seriously

It's like how can you apply discourse analysis to literature? It's viewed by both camps; the camp that I come from 'traditional humanities' those who immersed in the study of literature and literary criticism, and you guys who are immersed in the study of linguistics

and translation, so both teams don't take this approach seriously; 'how can we apply discourse analysis to the study of literature? Is it possible? It's so hard. So, the battle is not even settled down between the two teams.

Those who actually consider true discourse analysis they ignore literature. They study the relationship between discourse and media, discourse and politics, discourse and translation, discourse and linguistics, but not discourse and literature.

**The study of literature takes place in Humanities departments in which two kinds of scholars work on literary texts: most of them are specialists of literature, whereas a few come from the area of linguistics and comment on texts with a "stylistic" outlook.**

➔ What is a 'stylistic outlook'? Have you heard about stylistics before?

It is the study of the distinctive styles found in particular literary genres and in the works of individual writers. It is also a branch of applied linguistics concerned with the study of **style in texts**, especially but not exclusively, in literary works. So, stylistics focuses on figures, rhetorical devices, used to provide variety and distinctness to someone's writing etc. From the word 'style', they look at the style of writing, the kind of words used by the writer, the relationship between words and sentences, the division of paragraphs, figures of speech, the choice of words etc.

When you, students, study literature, you are mainly interested in the relationship between words and sentences, the division of paragraphs, the voice, body language and so on. However, we, literary people, who come from the traditional humanities, we take the literary text to another level. We might study the text not only by focusing on the style or the language, but also we look at the content, we look at the psychology, we look at the social and political conditions that made the work what it is, so it's two different visions and two different approaches.

It's just normal, I think, those who are immersed in linguistics and translation to be more interested in language than us.

**Now, if we practise "literary discourse analysis" the situation is**

**much less clear: in spite of its tight connection to linguistics, discourse analysis cannot be located in a specified area of the university but can develop as much as in Humanities as in Social and Human sciences.**

The field of discourse analysis is not limited to humanities, but go far beyond humanities to social and human sciences. As I said, those who study discourse they study discourse in relation to other fields such as translation, media, linguistics, politics etc.

\*\*\*

## **2.1. Until the sixties**

**Until the sixties, the relationships between literature and linguistics were fairly peaceful. The scholars who commented on old texts had recourse to philology to study lexicon or grammar. Others used linguistics for a "stylistic" outlook on texts. In fact, two main stylistic approaches can be distinguished:**

Do you think that people who come traditional humanities, like myself, look down on people who come from the linguistics and why?

You don't think so because each one has his own vision and view the world differently because his brain works differently. Those who are interested in poetry and drama (like myself) they tend to activate the creative hemisphere of the brain, while those who are interested in linguistics are logical, reasonable, and they are interested in the mathematics of language. Both camps complete each other and they need each other.

**- An approach in the continuity of classical rhetoric which aimed at analysing the way authors manage to provoke determined « effects » on their addressees.**

What do you understand by "rhetoric" or "rhetorical devices"?

Figures of speech and how they are used by politicians, by motivational speakers, or by those who create advertisements to convince you to buy a certain product or to follow a certain political agenda, so these are the rhetorical devices.

- Addressees: audience

**This approach was based on the assumption that one can**

**establish systematic connections between "procedures" and "effects": if you want to trigger this feeling, you can use one of these procedures.**

If you want to trigger a certain feeling in the audience, you need to know how to use rhetorical devices or what we call the **procedures** and by knowing how to use them, you produce a certain effect on the addressee.

The language of this article is pragmatic, technical, very academic, very formal, paced on facts, terminology based etc.

**- The other stylistic approach can be characterised as "organic". It is tightly connected to romantic aesthetics. Literary works are considered as the "expression" of the conscience of their author, who shows in his/her work his/her own "vision of the world".**

- Aesthetics: something related to style, to form, to the beautiful outlook of something etc.

**This organic stylistics, in fact, has a loose connection with (or to) linguistics. For it, literary style cannot be analysed only as a specific use of language.**

Linguists are not interested in aesthetics; us literary people who are immersed in traditional humanities we are interested in the beauty of things. For it, literary style cannot be analysed only as a specific use of language. If you want to analyse literature, you cannot analyse literature by merely focusing on language. This is not enough, it's insufficient, it's reducing the literature into one medium and literature is more than one medium.

What's the meaning of "organic stylistics"?

It means when you want to study literature or a text, you actually look at the relationship between all the linguistic elements in a text; words, utterances, speech, conversations, the way paragraphs work together to produce something, so all this how it works together as if it were a living organism, so there is some kind of unity between these linguistic elements in a text whether it's literary, political, or whatever it is. There is specific jargon we use when we produce a text for specific audience. How these jargon, words, and terminology work together they formulate a body and they formulate a language. This

body has certain divisions or sections that actually work together, fit together, and stand together to speak and deliver something; this is organic. So, the unity and the harmony of different elements that come together and work together to deliver something are the organic stylistics.

**The blood of poetic creation is the same everywhere: in language, in ideas, in plots, in composition (...) Because I happened to be a linguist, I took the viewpoint of linguistics to penetrate the unity of works. In such a stylistic approach, works are viewed as the projection of obsessive schemata inside the mind of their creators.**

\*\*\*

Let us talk about “**structuralism**” which is a literary approach that is interested in language.

- Structuralism: البنيوية

## **2.2. Structuralism and « Nouvelle critique »**

**Literary structuralism, like Russian formalists, claimed to take on modern linguistics to develop a true science of literary text.**

- Nouvelle critique (French) = new criticism

Have you heard of ‘**Russian formalism**’?

It is a literary approach. It is a critical approach. I want you to do some research about ‘**Russian formalism**’ and what it means.

They are explaining the meaning of Russian formalists. Russian formalists view literature as if a true science of literature, so they are very logical, very pragmatic when they approach literature.

**But if linguistics means “a discipline that studies the properties of Human language”, it can easily be observed that most of structuralist research did not work with categories such as “adjective”, “phrase”, “aspect”, “determination”, “focus”, etc., neither with categories such as dialect, variation, stress, etc. In reality, the notions that were mainly used were “paradigm”, “syntagm”, “connotation”, “pattern”, etc. many specialists of literature denounced linguistics as “imperialist” ; but it was an imperialism of semiotics, not one of linguistics. The fields most developed by literary structuralism were narratology, poetics (in the**

**narrow meaning of a science of verse) and lexicology.**

What do you understand? Why do literary people view linguists as imperialist when they approach literature?

Imperialist (إمبريالي) here means elitist (نخبوي). Those who come from the field of linguistics they view language as the top, however, from a literary perspective the situation is totally different.

Each one is elitist in their own way. The linguists look up to language because it's their field and it's what they are specialized at. For those who are immersed in humanities, the situation is totally different.

**However, in spite of the problems that it raised, structuralism changed our way of considering the relationship of text and context. This relationship was not enigmatic at all: having recourse to popular psychology or sociology, it was not difficult to state that a writer was "influenced" by such or such traumatic event in his or her life, that a novel "reflected" the preoccupations of the group the writer belonged to, and so on.**

- Enigmatic: mysterious/ambiguous

**But, from the sixties on, the relationship text/context became problematic; people looked desperately for a "theory" of the "articulation" of text and context.**

- To articulate: to speak/to express/to communicate

**But the very frontier text/context was not really questioned by structuralism, in the sixties and the seventies. On the contrary, it was preserved, and even strengthened. Of course, the study of context was marginalized by the new trends of literary criticism, which focused on the structural properties of texts.**

**From the late seventies on, structuralism was less and less influential: new approaches transformed our way of considering language activity, and consequently literature. Among them, one must bring to the fore "text linguistics", enunciation theories, pragmatics. They did not exert influence at the same level, but their effects converged, to question the very frontier of text/context. The last step was the emergence of the field of literary discourse**



analysis.

As we can see in the past two pages, we were looking at the history and development of literary criticism and how it evolved until we arrived at a new threshold: the field of literary discourse analysis.

\*\*\*

### **3. Discourse analysis, text and context**

By its nature, discourse analysis exceeds the boundaries of the usual distinction between text and context. Discourse analysts are threatened by two dangers, one that could be named "textualism" and the other, "sociologism". The former consists of reducing to the text the scope of the analysis; the latter consists of studying the setting of the speech independently of discourse activity. So, it is no wonder that in literary discourse analysis the notion of genre plays a key role.

When you use the approach of 'textualism', you are namely interested in the text itself, not in the writer, not in the outside text or context. You are not interested in the context at all. You are mainly focusing on the text.

What's the meaning of 'genre'?

It is a type of literature like a novel, short story, poetry, prose, drama, novella, diary etc.

**Here I am using "genre" as usually defined in discourse analysis. I know that "genre" can refer to groups of texts of any kind. But in discourse analysis, as a rule, "genre" refers to communication frames, to sets of norms associated with a certain category of speech situations.**

Here we are invited to explore new meanings of the word 'genre', which are 'communication frames' and 'sets of norms associated with a certain category of speech situations'.

**From this perspective, an interview on TV or a PhD, for example, are genres, but polemic or political texts do not constitute genres.**

We are taking the word 'genre' out of its literary context and viewing it within a discourse analysis context.

**Considered at a given moment of history and in a given society, literature can be considered as a network of genres, a certain configuration of legitimate speech activities. This network is not only constituted of literary genres – I mean the genres of literary works –, it includes also genres dealing with literature but belonging to other areas: conversations in salons or in academies, newspapers, journals, handbooks, TV programs, biographies of great writers, and so on.**

All these examples are examples of genres.

**That does not mean that a novel and its commentary in a newspaper, the autobiography of a poet and his/her poems belong to the same category, it means that one must consider the whole network to understand the functioning of literary discourse. Discourse analysts try to take into account at the same time how texts are produced and consumed and how they are commented on, transformed, ordered or stocked: these dimensions are inseparable.**

The focus or the core of discourse analysis is how texts are produced, how they are consumed (received by the audience), how they are commented on by the critics, how they are transformed, how they are ordered, how they are stocked.

- Stocked: saved/archived i.e. how to save these genres from getting lost and this is the work of historians.

In other words, as discourse analysts when we approach a literary text or whatever kind of text, we are interested in how the text gets produced, how the text gets received by the audience, how the critics interact with a certain text, how is it transformed to another genre, and how is it saved or preserved from getting lost.

**Spontaneously, nowadays when they analyse texts, most scholars oppose two forms of subjectivity: that of the "enunciator" (who can be a "narrator" for a tale or a novel), to whom the responsibility of the utterance is attributed, and that of the "real" person, the author outside text.**

What's the meaning of 'subjectivity' in this context? They differentiate between two types of 'subjectivity', what are they?

They are talking about two (I)s: the subjectivity (I speak, I think etc.), so the 'enunciator' is the narrator or he could be the speaker. The other (I) or the other subjectivity is the 'I' of the writer.

Do you remember sonnet 18 by William Shakespeare?

*Shall I compare thee to a summer's day?*

When we study poetry, we always ask ourselves the following question: is the 'I' the 'I' of the speaker or the 'I' of the writer?

Sometime the speaker of the poem is not the poet. In such cases, the poet is speaking on behalf of another person.

The two oppositions that the scholars face when they approach a literary text are the two kinds of 'subjectivity'; the 'I' of the narrator or the speaker vs. the 'I' of the writer. They are not necessarily the same.

- Oppose = collide

**This opposition is very useful and comfortable, but it does not correspond to the immense complexity of discourse.**

This is not merely what discourse is about; there is more than the opposition between the two 'I's.

**The writer determines certain options concerning his/her behaviour as a producer of works: he or she assumes a pen name or not, gives interviews or refuses to see journalists, publishes in certain genres and not in others, writes forewords, etc.**

- Pen name: anonymous name

It's like the name 'Shakespeare'. We don't know if the name 'Shakespeare' is the name of the actual writer. It might be a pen name.

**Besides, he or she behaves according to the representations of the writer status in his/her society. Let us take the case of a poet of the sixteenth century who writes love poetry in the manner of Petrarch: a tacit contract prescribes to the reader the thought that the person who says "I" in these poems is not really in love with the great lady to whom he is addressing his sonnets.**

- Petrarch: an Italian poet

**But in the nineteenth century when a romantic poet writes "I love you", by virtue of another tacit contract, the person, outside text, is supposed to be really in love.**

When you read a poem from the sixteenth century, it is totally different from when you read a romantic poem (from Romanticism).

When you read a poem written under the influence of the Italian poet Petrarch, you don't make a connection between the speaker and the writer. However, when you read a poem written under the umbrella of Romanticism, there is a connection.

**Obviously, this difference is not inside text, it is a consequence of the variation of the institutional status of the writer and of literature.**

There are many elements or conditions that play a role in determining the relationship or the connection between the subjectivity of both speakers; the speaker/the narrator and the writer.

**Another consequence of the development of a discourse analytical approach to literature is the integration of literary studies into larger spaces.**

**If we give up focusing only on texts considered in themselves, many phenomena that were previously outside the legitimate scope of literary studies become relevant: for example the way the writers produce their works or literary life: the places in which artists meet, the groups they constitute, the way they play their role in the media, etc. The way texts circulate, the way they are consumed, the way writers live, the way school deals with literature, etc. cannot be dissociated from what is unduly considered as being "inside" text.**

- Dissociated from: not related to/disconnected from/separated from

- Dissociated  $\neq$  associated

**For discourse analysts, there is no inside and outside text. What is "inside" must construct its own "interiority" through interdiscourse.**

So, there is no inside and outside text. What do you understand by 'outside text'?

It is the outside circumstances like environment, society, religion,

culture, conflicts, war, economy etc. All these are outside the text, but they influence the text.

**So, whereas classical approaches (psychological or sociological) agree to remain "outside" text, waiting for an "articulation" of text and context, discourse analysis questions the very idea of "outside text".**

From the perspective of discourse analysis, the inside and outside are inseparable.

**Pierre Bourdieu's attitude is interesting from this viewpoint. Undoubtedly, his research on literary field contributed to the promotion of literary discourse analysis, but he preserved a form of distinction between inside and outside text.**

- Pierre Bourdieu: a French thinker in sociology

**For example, in his study of Flaubert's work he claims that his outlook does not take into account the "contents" of the novels, except when a clear correspondence can be established between the life of Flaubert and the life of his characters.**

In other words, the French thinker Bourdieu separated the inside text from the outside text.

**Contrary to this attitude, to transform the conditions of research on literature, one needs to open a new space, that of discourse.**

Contrary to the viewpoint of Pierre Bourdieu, we cannot separate the inside from the outside, text from context.

**Discourse analysis can be used to comment on texts, like traditional stylistics did, but also to understand the functioning of literary discourse, as part of the discursive practices of a given society.**

Discourse analysis like stylistics they are interested in commenting on a text as a text, so they are interested in the text per se (by itself), but not only that; they move beyond stylistics to understand how a text has a social functioning and it is a byproduct of society.

**So, it is convenient to distinguish four modalities for linguistics to intervene in the field of literary studies.**

- The first one is that of traditional stylistics (atomistic or organic): studying linguistic phenomena is supposed to help the analyst to interpret texts. The linguistic analysis is only a tool.

This is from the perspective of the stylistics who they are only interested in language, in the form, in the relationship between words to deliver something etc.

- The second modality is that of the approaches that use concepts and methods from pragmatic, text linguistics or discourse analysis. We can distinguish two purposes: a) elaborating interpretations of a work or a group of works; b) working out a model of the linguistic properties of a corpus, which can be defined according to various criteria.

- Modality: a particular mode in which something exists, experienced, or expressed.

The second modality for linguistics to help them intervene in the field of literary studies is the use of concepts and methods. When they use concepts and methods, we can distinguish two purposes:

1. Elaborating interpretations of a work or a group of works
2. Working out a model of the linguistic properties of a corpus
3. Corpus: a body of literary work/a text

**For example, describing a genre or the properties of texts belonging to the same aesthetic position (naturalism, surrealism...) or written by the same author.**

The second modality is interested in making a connection between the text and outside factors such as these movements (naturalism, surrealism...) and how they influence the text and how they influence the ideas of the text and the style of writing.

**- In the third modality, the analysts claim to study works, but they attempt to question the frontier between text and context by taking into consideration not only works but also larger units such as literary field, discourse communities and so on.**

In the third modality, they questioned the relationship between the text and context, but they take into consideration larger units such as literary field, discourse communities and so on, so they are interested

in outside factors that influence the text.

- The fourth modality is the most radical: the works are no longer the focus of the analysis. The object is literary discourse, considered as a network of manifold genres (and not only the genres of the works). That means that anthologies of literature, literary chronicles in newspapers, commentary practices at the university or at school, interviews that the writers give on TV, and so on, are part of literary discourse.

They view literary discourse as a product of a network of manifold genres.

From this viewpoint, literary discourse analysis must not be viewed as a new trend of literary criticism, but as a new way of constructing the object "Literature".

In my view, the modality (1) does not pertain to discourse analysis; modality (2) pertains to literary discourse analysis in a « weak » sense; only modalities (3) and (4) pertain to discourse analysis in a "strong" sense.

The modality (1) focuses on stylistics. The modality (2) focuses on concepts and methods. In the modality (3), we view the text being influenced by movements like we ask ourselves who is influenced the writer. Is the writer influenced by outside factors? They could be movements. They could be social factors, political factors, psychological factors etc. In the modality (4), we focus on literary discourse as a network of other genres. That means that anthologies of literature, literary chronicles in newspapers, commentary practices at the university or at school, interviews that the writers give on TV, and so on, are part of literary discourse.

The rest of this article is not included in the exam. We will stop here and next time we will move to another article.

يعني ما تبقى من الملف محذوف بدءًا من الفقرة التي بعنوان:

4. Two notions: self-constituting discourse and scenography

وحتى نهاية الملف.

Thank You

جميع الحقوق محفوظة

AYDI© 2023

جميع الحقوق محفوظة. لا يسمح بإعادة إصدار هذا الكتيب أو أي جزء منه أو تخزينه في نطاق استعادة المعلومات أو نقله بأي شكل من الأشكال، دون إذن خطي من مؤسسة العائدي.

All rights reserved. No part of this booklet may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means without written permission of AYDI Est.

تحذير: إن كل ما يصدر عن دار العائدي للدراسات والترجمة والنشر، بما في ذلك المحاضرات الصادرة عن مؤسسة العائدي للخدمات الطلابية والتي تحمل لوغو العائدي، محمي بموجب ترخيص حماية حقوق النشر الصادر عن وزارة الثقافة - مديرية حماية حقوق المؤلف.



Al Kindi  
Languages & Training

دورات متابعة ومكتشفات

بإشراف نخبة من أفضل الأساتذة الجامعيين

في معهد الكندي

لطلاب الترجمة (التعليم المفتوح) ولجميع المواد



Page:

مؤسسة العائدي للخدمات الطلابية

Group:

مكتبة العائدي - التعليم المفتوح - قسم الترجمة



AYDI 7958



• مكتبة العائدي: المزة- نفق الآداب



• هاتف: 011 2119889



• موبايل + واتساب: 0941 322227

