

DISCOURSE & ANALYSIS

HUMAN
AND SOCIAL
SCIENCES

SIMONE BONNAFOUS &
MALIKA TEMMAR (eds)

**DISCOURSE
ANALYSIS &
HUMAN
AND SOCIAL
SCIENCES**

What is the relationship between discourse analysis and its more recent companion disciplines such as sociology, political science and information and communication sciences, at their point of convergence between the symbolic and the social? How are relationships evolving between discourse analysis and disciplines like the literary studies, psychoanalysis and philosophy, which have been the constant companions of linguistics as these emerged and developed? What is the place and role of discourse analysis in Europe? These are some of the themes dealt with in this book. A team effort on the part of *Centre d'Etude des Discours, Images, Texte, Ecrits, Communication* (Céditec EA 3119), it aims not to present another view of the history and concepts of discourse analysis, but to encourage thinking and debate on interdisciplinary practices.

Simone Bonnafous is Professor of Media and Communications at the University of Paris-Est Créteil. In 1999, she created the research cluster Céditec, which she directed until 2008. After her doctoral dissertation on the 1979 convention of the Socialist Party in Metz, she worked extensively on the discourse about immigration and immigrants. Located at the cross-roads of linguistics and political science, her best known book is *Immigration surrounded by words* (1991). More recent publications have focused on gender studies (such as the International Women's Day). Since 2006, she has held leading positions in higher education administration in France.

Malika Temmar is lecturer of linguistics and discourse analysis at the University of Picardie Jules Verne, Amiens. She has been member of Ceditec since its foundation in 1999. She works on philosophical discourses (such as Descartes, Condillac, Merleau-Ponty) and media discourses (such as blogs of literary critics). Her research focuses on concepts and methods of discourse analysis. She has recently co-edited a book on Discourses of the Economy, to appear in 2013. She has co-edited a special issue with *Le discours et la langue* on "les sujets de l'énonciation". Her work *Le recours à la fiction dans le discours philosophique* will come out in April 2013.

DISCOURSE ANALYSIS AND HUMAN AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

SIMONE BONNAFOUS &
MALIKA TEMMAR (eds)

DISCOURSE ANALYSIS & HUMAN AND SOCIAL SCIENCES



PETER LANG

Bern • Berlin • Bruxelles • Frankfurt am Main • New York • Oxford • Wien

Bibliographic information published by die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data is available on the Internet at <<http://dnb.d-nb.de>>.

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data: A catalogue record for this book is available from The British Library, Great Britain

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Discourse Analysis & Human and Social Sciences / SIMONE BONNAFOUS & MALIKA TEMMAR (eds).

pages cm.

ISBN 978-3-0343-1241-7

1. Discourse analysis–Social aspects. 2. Discourse analysis–Psychological aspects. 3. Interdisciplinary approach to knowledge. I. Bonnafous, Simone, editor of compilation. II. Temmar, Malika, editor of compilation. III. Title: Discourse Analysis and Human and Social Sciences.

P305.18.I57D57 2013

401'.41–dc23

2012047670

Céditec et Institut Universitaire de France

Original title : Bonnafous Simone et Temmar Malika (eds), *Analyse du discours et sciences humaines et sociales*, Editions Ophrys, Paris, collection “les chemins du discours”, 2007.

ISBN 978-3-0343-1241-7 pb.

ISBN 978-3-0352-0165-9 eBook

© Peter Lang AG, International Academic Publishers, Bern 2013
Hochfeldstrasse 32, CH-3012 Bern, Switzerland
info@peterlang.com, www.peterlang.com

All rights reserved.

All parts of this publication are protected by copyright.

Any utilisation outside the strict limits of the copyright law, without the permission of the publisher, is forbidden and liable to prosecution.

This applies in particular to reproductions, translations, microfilming, and storage and processing in electronic retrieval systems.

Printed in Switzerland

Contents

Introduction	
Simone BONNAFOUS and Malika TEMMAR	1
I. Discourse analysis in Europe	
Johannes ANGERMÜLLER	9
II. Discourse analysis and information and communication sciences: beyond corpora and methods	
Claire OGER	25
III. Discourse analysis and comprehensive sociology. A critical look back at an interdisciplinary research practice	
Claire OGER and Caroline OLLIVIER-YANIV	43
IV. Multidisciplinary work on discourse. Examples of a “way of doing” discourse analysis	
Alice KRIEG-PLANQUE	59
V. Political discourse analysis: content analysis, lexical statistics, a semantic-enunciative approach	
Pierre FIALA	75
VI. Analysing a debate. The contributions of argumentation study to political science	
Juliette RENNES	93
VII. Discourse analysis and the study of literature	
Dominique MAINGUENEAU	113
VIII. Discourse analysis and history. Meeting and forgetting	
Marie-Anne PAVEAU	127

IX.	The role of psychoanalysis Dominique DUCARD	141
X.	Discourse analysis and philosophy: intersecting perspectives Malika TEMMAR	159
	The authors	173

Introduction¹

Simone BONNAFOUS and Malika TEMMAR

Discourse analysis became current in France in the late 1960s, thanks to researchers working in a variety of disciplines such as linguistics, sociology, history and philosophy. They all shared an interest in linguistic phenomena considered in their social and historical contexts. Although the concepts and methods of the language sciences have long been a feature of this field of research, relationships with the other human and social sciences have always played a part too. Exchanges between these disciplines, far from signalling a fragmentation of discourse analysis, have gone hand in hand with its development as it came to be recognised and established through research centres, conferences, journals and, more recently, textbooks and dictionaries². The

1 Thanks to Alice Krieg-Planque and Claire Oger for reading this text and giving their advice. We would also like to thank Dominique Ducard for his support during the later stages of publication.

2 Without claiming to be exhaustive, a list might include: Dominique Maingueneau, *L'Analyse du discours. Introduction aux lectures de l'archive*, Paris, Hachette Supérieur, collection Linguistique, 1991. Georges-Elia Sarfati, *Eléments d'analyse du discours*, Paris, Nathan Université, collection 128, 2001. Francine Mazière, *L'Analyse du discours. Histoire et pratiques*, Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, Collection Que sais-je?, 2005. Patrick Charaudeau and Dominique Maingueneau editors, *Dictionnaire d'analyse du discours*, Paris, Seuil, 2002. Catherine Détrie, Paul Siblot and Bertrand Verine editors, *Termes et concepts pour l'analyse du discours. Une approche praxématique*, Paris, Honoré Champion, 2001. "Les analyses du discours en France" (coordinated by Dominique Maingueneau), Paris, Larousse, *Langages*, n° 117, 1995. "Le discours: enjeux et perspectives" (coordinated by Sophie Moirand), Paris, Hachette/Edicef, *Le Français dans le monde*, special edition, 1996. "Analyse du discours. Etat de l'art et perspectives" (coordinated by Dominique Maingueneau), *Marges linguistiques. Langages. Représentations. Communication*, half-yearly electronic journal of language sciences, publisher M.L.M.S., <<http://www.marges-linguistiques.com>>, n° 9, 2005.

increasing number of works on discourse analysis testifies to the vitality of this domain which has been able to interact with the growth of new disciplines such as information and communication sciences. After the “golden age” of the pioneers who featured in the great intellectual debates of the time (on the notions of ideology and subject for example), since the mid-1980s there has been a certain specialisation, in terms of topics of study and sectors, such as media, political and institutional discourse.

The Céditec (Centre d’Etude des Discours, Images, Textes, Ecrits et Communications, EA 31 19) was created in 1999 by a small group of teachers in the language sciences, information and communication sciences and sociology. Since its inception it has always placed “discourse” – which has its focus beyond diversity of meaning and conceptual frameworks – at the centre of its questioning, and been particularly interested in the relationship of discourse to the political arena and to knowledge.

This interest is the legacy of the Ecole Normale Supérieure at St Cloud, with its laboratory of lexicometry and political texts. It was founded in the 1970s by Maurice Tournier, who was a major figure in lexicology and political lexicometry in France. From these origins and from the institutional and epistemological links maintained by several of its members with the centres responsible for founding discourse analysis in France, Céditec has remained deeply grounded in the language sciences and in the political sphere. These centres were the departments of language sciences at the University of Nanterre and the groups of philosophers, linguists and psychologists gathered around Michel Pêcheux. Because of these influences, Céditec has maintained a keen interest in computer processing of texts, which is one of its major methodological contributions. It has also continued to invest substantially in the journal *Mots, les langages du politique*³.

3 An interdisciplinary journal which brings together researchers in language sciences with those in information and communication sciences and political science around a common objective.

Céditec has in addition benefited from a wide variety of different inputs. Among these is the work carried out since the 1970s by Dominique Maingueneau and Frédéric Cossutta on “constituent” discourses (literary and philosophical discourses) as well as the research by enunciation linguists like Dominique Ducard, and more recently the contributions of young researchers who are interested in discourse from political science, sociology, information and communication sciences and so on.

Céditec is therefore both the fruit of this particular academic collaboration and also the place where these epistemological and scientific developments are to be seen. Even though a good number of its members do not teach at the *Université Paris-Est Créteil*, Céditec was effectively founded within a multidisciplinary university, where language sciences are not a separate department, but where questions of enunciation, argument, enunciative polyphony, language acts, etc. are dealt with as much in arts subjects and humanities as by communication and social sciences. In other words, “discourse”, as a socially embedded language activity, is the raw material for much of our teaching; and this has enabled an interdisciplinary team to be founded at the *Université Paris-Est Créteil* – a team which is both close to and different from other discourse analysis teams.

This diversity of disciplinary origins, and also of their scope (from literature to politics via media, philosophy and institutions), finds its rationale in a certain definition of “discourse” and the relationship between the social and linguistic. The development of a declared epistemological guideline, which has been driven, among others, by Dominique Maingueneau, has meant that reflection on the history and evolution of discourse analysis, including its encounters with other disciplines, is one of our shared preoccupations.

It was in the context of this thinking that Malika Temmar, a senior lecturer in language science and author of a thesis on fiction in philosophical discourse, agreed to organise a Céditec seminar in March 2005. This would enable several members of the team to take stock of the place of French discourse analysis in Europe and to examine our interdisciplinary practices of discourse analysis, each from its

specific boundaries. It would also permit an overview of the way in which the relationship between discourse analysis and its founding disciplines has evolved over time.

This book provides an account of this process and of the shared reflections resulting from it. It is not a new introduction to the history and concepts of discourse analysis; this can be found in the books and journals already mentioned. It is more of a team effort whose purpose is to recreate what goes to make up the intellectual life of Céditec and to give an account of what discourse analysis is today in its cross-boundary practices.

We have therefore followed the order of our seminar by asking the sociologist Johannes Angermüller, who is also the author of a Franco-German thesis on the state of the social sciences and the intellectual landscape in France between 1960 and 1980, to start off this volume with a chapter on discourse analysis in Europe.

We then gathered together five contributions providing a notion of how discourse analysis fits together with its newfound companions, information and communication sciences and political science, at the meeting point between the symbolic and the social. Three texts have been written by colleagues (Claire Oger, Caroline Ollivier-Yaniv and Alice Krieg-Planque) working and teaching in political, media and institutional communication, where discourse analysis now occupies an entirely new place in training. Their formation and their various disciplinary roots – from linguistics to sociology – have often led them to work together on research and writing, as will be seen in these papers which can be read as casting three different lights on very closely-related questions. In 2005 Juliette Rennes completed a political science thesis on the polemics surrounding the rise of women in public careers under the Third Republic. Her contribution to this book completes the previous approaches by showing what discourse analysis contributes to the understanding of political debates and strategies, with the notion of “controversy” being a good example of how several disciplines can be linked. Finally, Pierre Fiala examines the way in which corpus linguistics, assisted by the development of automatic language processing tools and the extension of text databases,

have helped re-direct language sciences back towards empirical data and experimental methods, by reformulating the question of meaning and verbal interaction on the basis of data analysis.

The four contributions which follow have an objective that is both historical and epistemological, since they are concerned with examining the relationships between discourse analysis and the disciplines which have continued to be partners of the language sciences as they emerged and evolved. Dominique Maingueneau, for example, analyses the relationship between discourse analysis and literary studies, often seen as rather contentious even though the former derived partly from the latter through the practice of textual commentary. Marie-Anne Paveau, Dominique Ducard and Malika Temmar, on the other hand, return to the subjects of history, psychoanalysis and philosophy which, during the 1960s and 1970s, provided the spaces in which discourse analysis was able to grow. It is evident from this that “meeting” is sometimes followed by “forgetting”, to quote Marie-Anne Paveau’s title, and that, on the institutional and scientific front, discourse analysis is less at home today with some of the disciplines that are its historical companions than it is with more recent acquaintances within the social sciences (mainly sociology, politics and information and communication sciences).

This book was conceived and written by teachers/researchers – colleagues who do not divorce their research activity from their teaching. Indeed, each of these feeds into the other. The texts gathered together here were first presented as lectures to an audience of researchers and young doctoral students, but our aim in publishing them is to make them accessible and useful to a wider public, not least those students engaged in research for Master’s degrees and doctorates.

Without claiming to put ourselves in the place of readers – for the way in which they understand these texts will depend first and foremost on the questions they themselves are asking – and without wishing to reduce the texts to a single dimension, we have nevertheless tried to organise them according to three priorities:

- A component which explores avenues that have been relatively neglected until now. This, for example, allows the history of European traditions of discourse analysis to be examined, and enables us to see with Johannes Angermüller how its major trends (“French formalism”, “German hermeneutics”, “Anglo-Saxon pragmatism”) interconnect today in the networks which gather together researchers from different countries. The long multilingual bibliography at the end of this book also has an informative purpose. In the same way, Malika Temmar’s contribution is not so much a reflection on the relationships between philosophy and discourse analysis as a demonstration of the way in which philosophical discourse, as a scientific discourse and like any scientific discourse, may be an object of discourse analysis. Then, in the article by Dominique Ducard, we have a timely reminder of the links between psychoanalysis and discourse analysis: by means of various examples, he shows how certain enunciative processes reflect the order of Law in discourse and not merely subjectivity or inter-subjectivity. Listing references to Freud and to the linguist Culioli together with the work of Pierre Legendre and Vincent Descombes, this contribution is a plea for the anthropological significance of psychoanalysis.
- A historical and epistemological component. This naturally plays a part in all the articles, but has a dominant role in those contributions which retrace the complex history of the relationships between discourse analysis and information and communication sciences (Claire Oger); discourse analysis and the study of literature (Dominique Maingueneau); and discourse analysis and history (Marie-Anne Paveau). All three contributors enable us to grasp how these have evolved and to understand how these evolutions are indissociable from debates, within each discipline and between disciplines, about what constitutes a “corpus” or an “archive”, a “memory” or a “history” (Marie-Anne Paveau); “literature” and “literary discourse” (Maingueneau); or “subjects”, “actors” and “public problems” (Claire Oger).

- A methodological contribution. Although present in all the articles, this is nevertheless more explicit in four of them. The first takes the form of a critical look back at an interdisciplinary research practice between discourse analysis and comprehensive sociology (Claire Oger and Caroline Ollivier-Yaniv). The second is an illustration of a “way of doing” discourse analysis (Alice Krieg-Planque), while the third reflects on discourse analysis and its close relationship to lexicometric quantification and enunciative approaches (Pierre Fiala). The fourth presents a combination of an argumentative approach and a political science approach (Juliette Rennes). These contributions thus show that the meeting of various disciplines may be experienced differently depending on whether one is starting from a “linguistically describable” question whose social and political implications are understood (Alice Krieg-Planque), or from an ideological question (Juliette Rennes), or from a collaboration between two people in which a sociologist and a discourse analyst are led to frequent the same institutional corpora (Claire Oger and Caroline Ollivier-Yaniv).

However our readers choose to use these texts, we hope that this present volume will help show that, although clear theoretical positions are necessary as far as epistemology is concerned, it is the meetings and exchanges between disciplines which are productive in making research contribute to our knowledge of society. This, at any rate, is the path that Céditec wishes to follow, as a team which is open not only to the whole academic world, but also to the interested public.

Chapter I

Discourse analysis in Europe

Johannes ANGERMÜLLER

Introduction

Since the late 1960s, a variety of trends in discourse analysis have developed in Europe. Given this diversity, it is not easy to gain an overview, especially since discourse analysis does not have its own disciplinary locus [Ehlich, 1994]¹. Roughly speaking, the evolution of this heterogeneous and relatively vaguely-defined field has been characterised by an intersecting of the different strands, each of which has its own national significance. Until the 1970s, relatively homogeneous fields were developing in coexistence in certain countries, but by the 1980s these “schools” were beginning to produce more and more branches outside their countries of origin.

In order to clarify the rather ambiguous situation of discourse analysis in Europe, I propose to distinguish three major trends – French, Anglo-Saxon and German – which relate to ancient traditions of thought, and of which followers can now be found all over Europe. Although these trends are no longer attached to any particular country, they serve as a theoretical basis for the various “clusters” of researchers who have dominated the discourses on discourse in Europe since the 1970s: “the French school”, poststructuralist discourse theory, critical discourse analysis and interpretive discourse analysis.

1 I thank Jacques Guilhaumou, Reiner Keller and Dominique Maingueneau, as well as the two editors of this work, for their valuable comments.

Three major theoretical trends

The “French” trend

The “French” trend was inspired by the 1960s controversy over structuralism. It combines the Saussurian viewpoint (1962) with the psychoanalytical criticism of the “speaking subject” [Lacan, 1978] and a Marxist analysis of “ideology” [Althusser, 1965]. Discourse analysis “à la française” is distinguished by its vision of a rigorous and exhaustive description of the life of signs within a society. In view of the transpersonal organisation of language activity, this trend gives priority to the written text and to large groups of texts; their underlying rules of construction need then to be discovered and analytical models obtained. Towards the end of the 1970s, there was a change of direction in France with the decline of structuralism and a turning towards pragmatism. From then on, thinking no longer focused upon the Saussurian duo of *langue* and *parole* (*language and word*), but on the problem of enunciation, that is to say the rules which cause language acts to become facts of discourse. Although linguistics has a considerable hold over this disparate field, it also includes many specialists in information and communication as well as sociologists and historians, who are distinctive for the epistemological break they have made with their object of study and the fact that they have accorded priority to the materiality of discourse.

The “Anglo-Saxon” trend

The “Anglo-Saxon” notion of discourse draws its inspiration from American pragmatism and English analytical philosophy, particularly in the theory of language acts [Austin, 1962]. Unlike the French enunciative approaches, discourse refers to the level of the language act in a given communication situation [Levinson, 1983]. Thus American discourse analysis examines the rules which organise interac-

tions and conversations between actors [Brown and Yule, 1998]. While conversation analysts describe the way in which partners end up with a shared framework/understanding of the situation by each taking their turn in discursive interaction, ethno-methodologists reveal the implicit knowledge governing daily interactions [Cicourel, 1973]. In view of the insistence on deictic and polyphonic organisation of discourse, American conversation analysis and ethnomethodology have made a crucial contribution to the evolution of linguistic pragmatics. The objects of investigation may be encounters between actors in a situation where a conflict has to be negotiated. In the United Kingdom, on the other hand, it was M.A.K. Halliday's functionalist linguistics which enabled a great number of linguists to analyse the uses of text within society. As the "Anglo-Saxon" trend is characterised by a clear grounding in empirical material [cf. Grounded Theory, Glaser and Strauss, 1967], it has given rise to numerous pieces of research applied to communication problems arising in different institutional contexts (professional spheres, hospitals or prisons, for example).

The "German" trend

In Germany, emphasis has for a long time been put on a *theory* rather than a method of discourse. Thus Jürgen Habermas's theory of the "communication act", influenced by pragmatic Anglo-Saxon trends, aims at a model of the conditions for a critique of authority and inequality. According to Habermas and his followers, when we communicate, we cannot fail to recognise certain rules of discourse, such as the discursive partner's equality and the "criticability" of each argument. These rules are based on a consensus between partners which serves as a common measure for criticising arguments put forward in the discourse [Habermas, 1981]. There have been many attempts to implement Habermas's discursive ethics in empirical social research. In social sciences, for example, political discourses have been analysed in the light of the democratic claims of modern societies. How-