Linguistics – narratives – narratology

Linguistique – récits – narratologie

Jean-Michel Adam

Translator: Michael Parsons

This text was automatically generated on 3 September 2021.

Linguistics – narratives – narratology

Linguistique – récits – narratologie

Jean-Michel Adam

Translation : Michael Parsons

1   The parataxic title of this article raises a certain number of questions and problems. Do *narratives*, an object that Roland Barthes himself was careful to put in the plural, only concern *narratology* or can they be of interest for any of the domains of *linguistics*? If the object of linguistics is language and the sentence is its outer boundary of investigation, then narrative is not an object for linguistics (Adam, 2008a). But if linguistics does not end with the sentence, then the narrative may be the object of what Barthes called the "linguistics of discourse" in his famous "Introduction à l'analyse structurale des récits" ("An Introduction to the Structural Analysis of Narrative") (2002a, p. 831). Narratology limits its investigations to narrativity and to the different forms of narrative creation, whereas, for the linguistics of discourse, the narrative is just one of the possible forms of textuality and narration one of its forms of enunciation. This explains the increased interest in the different *narrative genres* specific to discursive practices as disparate as advertising, religious, political and literary discourses, ordinary conversation, historical discourse, etc.

Epistemological overview of contemporary debates around narratology

2   Following James Phelan (2005), Raphaël Baroni (2016) seems to reconnect with the claim that narratology could play the role of a the "pilot-science" in literary studies about which Gérard Genette wrote in *Nouveau discours du récit* (*Narrative Discourse Revisited*) (1983, p. 7). Proposing the institutionalisation of narratology in university literature departments challenges the profoundly interdisciplinary and cross-media nature of narrative studies.[1] It should not be forgotten that the success of Genette's

narratology is the result of a misunderstanding. And yet the first sentence of the section "Narrative discourse" in *Figures III* is clear: "The specific object of this study is the narrative in *À la recherche du temps perdu* (*Remembrance of Things Past/In Search of lost Time*)" (Genette, 1972, p. 67).

3   Those who are selling us the idea of "post-classical narratology" as the only horizon present the "new narratologies" as interdisciplinary, unlike "classical narratology". This is to forget rather too quickly the very active cooperation, in common publications, between researchers in domains as different as the disciplines represented by the authors who contributed to issue 8 of *Communications*: Barthes, Algirdas Julien Greimas, Claude Bremond, Umberto Eco, Jules Gritti, Violette Morin, Christian Metz, Tzvetan Todorov and Genette, or, to take just one other example, in *Sémiotique narrative et textuelle* ("*Narrative and Textual Semiotics*") (Rastier, 1973): Sorin Alexandrescu, Barthes, Bremond, Claude Chabrol, Greimas, Pierre Maranda, Siegfried Schmidt and Teun van Dijk. Grounded in the intellectual context of the École des hautes études and of the Centre d'étude des communications de masse, issue 8 of *Communications* placed narratology on an interdisciplinary foundation and, under the authority of Barthes at least, gave the linguistics of discourse a much more significant role than the structural perspective to which its theoretical contribution is generally reduced.

4   For a few years now, histories of narratology have been biased by the intention to promote a so-called "post-classical" American narratology and/or a "poetical theory of narration[2]" presented as a literary alternative to the discursive approach. Sylvie Patron goes so far as to consider the "recognition of the discursive nature of the literary fact [...] as an epistemological obstacle, making it impossible to pose the crucial problem of a more or less hypothetical specific character of literature" (Kuroda, 2018, p. 48). To counter this persistent stance[3] I would like to recall Todorov's research programme in "La notion de littérature[4]" ("The notion of literature"). This programme guided my own work[5] on texts and literary discourses:

> Here we have to introduce a generic notion in relation to that of literature: the notion of *discourse*. [...] Why is it necessary?[6] Because the rules of language, common to all users, are only a part of the rules which govern any actual verbal production. Language fixes, with varying degrees of rigidity, the rules governing grammatical combinations within a sentence, a phonology and a common meaning for words. Between this set of rules common to all utterances and the precise characterisation of a particular utterance, there is an abyss of indetermination. This abyss is bridged, on the one hand, by the specific rules of each discourse: an official letter is not written in the same way as a private letter; and on the other hand by the constraints imposed by the enunciative context: the identity of the two speakers, the time and place of the utterance. Discourse is defined as what is beyond language but at a level lower than enunciation. (Todorov, 1975, p. 362.)

5   In defining the framework of a theory of the relations between low level linguistic determinations and discursive determinations, Todorov made a certain number of proposals that are impossible to implement due to institutionalised disciplinary divisions:

> Each type of discourse usually labelled literary has non-literary "relatives" that are closer to it than are any other types of "literary" discourse. [...] Thus the opposition between literature and non-literature gives way to a typology of discourses. [...] In place of literature alone we now have numerous types of discourse that deserve our attention on an equivalent basis. If the choice of our object of study is not dictated by purely ideological motives (which would then have to be made explicit), it is no

longer legitimate to concern ourselves exclusively with the literary subspecies, even if our workplace is called a "department of literature" (French, English or Russian, and so on). [...] A coherent field of study, for the time being parcelled out among semanticists and literary critics, sociologists and ethnologists, philosophers of language and psychologists, thus demands imperiously to be recognised[7]. (ibid., p. 363-364.)

6 In 1978, T. Todorov concludes very firmly through the addition of a relative clause at the end of the last sentence: "in which poetics will give way to the theory of discourse and to the analysis of its genres." (1978, p. 26). This carries on from what Barthes (2002a, p. 832) said at the very beginning of "L'analyse structurale des récits" : "It would precisely be one of the tasks of the linguistics of discourse to found a typology of discourses". As Todorov (1978, p. 23) says again in a modified re-edition of his article: "There is no reason to limit this notion of genre to literature alone, for: "The literary genres [...] are nothing but [...] choices among discursive possibilities, choices that a given society has made conventional". He speaks less of genres than of "systems of genres": "[...] the choice a society makes among all the possible codifications of discourse determines what is called its *system of genres*. [...] The genres of discourse [...] depend quite as much on a society's linguistic raw material as on its historically circumscribed ideology"[8] (ibid., p. 23-24).

7 So the notion of genres of discourse acquires all its importance, as a system of norms which run across the rules of language. This has been shown in the work of William Labov. As part of a vast sociolinguistic survey of African American English Vernacular, Labov and Joshua Waletzky (1967, reproduced in Labov, 1972)[9] established a relationship between a language (the African American English Vernacular they were describing and studying) and a very specific narrative genre, as practised in a given socio-cultural context: narratives of violent personal events experienced and reported by members of gangs of young African Americans from the ghettos. This study and this survey technique enabled them to shed light on a linguistic competence which could not have been observed outside this socio-discursive context. I have elsewhere studied at some length the other generic context of spontaneous oral production described by W. Labov: the exchange of ritual insults of the form "Your mother ...", which raise interesting problems of fictionality and syntactic complexity, revolving around intensive consecutive constructions (Adam, 1999, p. 157-173; 2011b; 2013).

8 The heart of the criticism of classical narratology resides in an opposition constructed between a form of structuralism which it is claimed is founded on the vulgate of the *Cours de linguistique générale* and a "poetics of discourse" founded on "F. de Saussure's new texts".[10] With respect to narratology, this simplification of the history of ideas does not stand up to a re-reading of the epistemological framework of "Introduction à l'analyse structurale des récits".

9 I am conducting this re-reading in the light of my own intellectual history and that of the adventure of *Pratiques*,[11] encouraged by recent statements such as those of J. Baetens (2017, p. 241), who deplores the tendency of the humanities, and particularly of narratology, to repeatedly run over the same ground: "Since we cannot agree on what has been achieved, we incessantly reopen the same fronts, and fight for the same old ideas". He makes two observations which lie at the heart of my argument. First of all he regrets that what has already been done in research is forgotten:

And yet it can also happen that returning to an abandoned question can be more than useful. To make progress, it is sometimes the only way. In this respect, it

seems to me that a well-informed revisiting of the problems of narrative, driven by structuralist thought, would contribute to a serious reinforcement of the theoretical groundwork that narratology sorely needs. (ibid.)

10   Besides, as he says again, the limitations of narratology stem from the fact that, reduced to being simply a toolbox for literary studies, it "overlooks the anchoring of the narrative thread in a textual web, any simplification of which would be tantamount to a destruction" (ibid.). To conceptualise this "textual web" one needs a theory of the text and tools of analysis which narratology alone – even "postclassical" – is unable to provide.

Anchoring of narratology in É. Benveniste's linguistics of discourse

11   The "question abandoned" by narratologists is, for me, the fact that Barthes and Todorov based their work, in the 1970s, on the linguistics of discourse of which Benveniste (1974, p. 43-66) defined the programme in "The semiology of language". Published in the first issue of the journal *Semiotica* (1969), this article prolongs the proposals of "Form and meaning in language" (a paper given in Geneva in 1966). The preparatory notes for this article in *Semiotica*, the notes of the last lecture Benveniste gave at the Collège de France on December 1 (Benveniste, 2012)[12] and the working papers on the poetic language of Charles Baudelaire that Chloé Laplantine (Benveniste, 2011)[13] has made accessible confirm the importance of the programme that he had in mind. Barthes' narratology draws on Benveniste's "translinguistics of texts and works" (1974, p. 66) that T. Todorov's thinking connects with on the basis of the theory of enunciation (it was Todorov who commissioned Benveniste to write "L'appareil formel de l'énonciation" ("The Formal Apparatus of Enunciation"), for issue 17 of *Langages* (1970) of which he was editor). The last part of Genette's "Frontières du récit" ("Frontiers of narrative") (1966), with its very famous distinction between "Narrative and discourse", is a somewhat briefer testimony of a reading of Benveniste's article (1966, p. 237-250) on "Les relations de temps dans le verbe français " ("The correlations of tense in the French verb"), an article which sketched out, in 1959, the first outlines of his theory of enunciation[14].

12   The enunciative anchoring of Barthes' ideas on narrative and his interest in grammar were already apparent in "L'écriture du roman" (an article reproduced in *Le Degré zéro de l'écriture* (*Writing Degree Zero*), 1953)[15]. In it he makes the past simple tense the "keystone" of a certain form of narrative challenged by the "white writing" of Albert Camus' *L'Étranger*, dominated by the present perfect[16]. Consequently it is of little surprise to see Barthes, right from the introduction of "L'analyse structurale des récits", clearly declaring that "to describe and classify the infinite number of narratives, a 'theory' is needed. In the current state of research, it seems reasonable to propose linguistics itself as the founding model of the structural analysis of narrative" (Barthes, 2002a, p. 830). The linguistics to which he appealed is not structural or generative linguistics, but a linguistics of enunciation and of discourse that Benveniste defines as a "translinguistics of texts and of works".

13   Barthes (2002a, p. 830-831) notes that linguistics comes up against the boundary of the sentence and can therefore not analyse narrative texts:

As we know, linguistics stops at the sentence, which is the last unit it considers itself entitled to deal with [...]. Hence linguistics cannot take an object superior to the sentence, because, beyond the sentence, there is never anything but more sentences: having described the flower, the botanist cannot be concerned with describing the bouquet.[17]

14 There are therefore two possible solutions: either one accepts that beyond the sentence, there are only sentences, which means that it is not possible to describe the slightest transphrastic narrative sequence or that narrative is homologically assimilated to a big sentence:

[...] the most reasonable thing is to postulate a homologous relation between sentence and discourse, insofar as the same formal organisation apparently regulates all semiotic systems, whatever their substances and dimensions: discourse would be one huge "sentence" (whose units would not necessarily be sentences), just as the sentence, allowing for certain specifications, is a little "discourse". (ibid., p. 831-832.)

[...] Structurally, the narrative has some of the characteristics of sentences without ever being reduced to the sum of a number of sentences: the narrative is a big sentence just as every statement is in some sense the outline of a little narrative. (ibid., p. 832.)

15 In "The linguistics of discourse", in 1970, Barthes extends this homology to the discourse:

The system of discourse reproduces in a kind of homographic way the system of the sentence, with its two coordinates: on the one hand substitution, segmentation and distributional relationships between segments of the same level, and on the other hand integration of the units at each level into a higher-level unit, which gives it its meaning. (2002d, p. 616.)

16 Barthes (2002a, p. 831) argues that the linguistics of discourse – and therefore narrative theory – has its origins in rhetoric more than in poetics:

And yet, it is obvious that discourse itself (as a group of sentences) is organised and that by this organisation it appears as the message of another language, superior to the language of the linguists; discourse has its units, its rules, its "grammar": beyond the sentence and although composed solely of sentences, discourse must naturally be the object of a second linguistics. This linguistics of discourse has for a very long time possessed a celebrated name: Rhetoric.

17 He assigns to the linguistics of discourse the task of looking afresh at the questions raised by rhetoric[18], before it shifted towards Belles-Lettres and disappeared from teaching. In the 1970 article, he asserted the kinship of translinguistics with the old rhetoric, stressing the compositional levels that we are striving today to theorise and describe[19]: "This territory is huge. It has already been explored. First of all by Aristotle and his successors, who tried to subdivide (non-mimetic) discourse into units of increasing size, from the sentence to the major parts of the *dispositio*, with in between the period and the piece of text (*ekphrasis, descriptio*)" (Barthes, 2002d, p. 613).

18 Barthes bases his thinking on a celebrated article by Benveniste: "Les niveaux de l'analyse linguistique" ("The levels of linguistic analysis") (1966, p. 119-131), and takes the subject further in the light of the problems posed by the study of narrative texts:

If we try to comprehend the whole of a written narrative, we see that it starts from the most powerfully coded (the phonematic, or even merismatic level), gradually loosens until it reaches the sentence, extreme point of combinatory freedom, then begins once more to tighten, starting from the small groups of sentences (micro-sequences), still very free, up to the major actions, which form a strong and limited

code: the creativity of narrative would thus be located *between two codes*, the linguistic and the translinguistic. (Barthes, 2002a, p. 864.)

19   R. Barthes returns to this "translinguistics" in the 1970 article in which he puts forward the idea of a "second linguistics" which he once again calls, following on from Benveniste, "*the linguistics of discourse* or *translinguistics* (the preferable term *meta-linguistics*, having already been used, but with a different meaning)" (Barthes, 2002d, p. 611). He even brings together the works of Roman Jakobson, Nicolas Ruwet, Vladimir Propp, Greimas, Claude Lévi-Strauss and Zellig Harris under a name which is manifestly borrowed more from Benveniste than from Saussurian semiology:

> Placing ourselves uniquely at the point of view of a classification of semiotics, we propose to unify these attempts and those that will be inevitably prompted by the infinitely varied works of folklore, literature and a part of mass communications [...] under a single semiotics which we will, at least provisionally, call *the linguistics of discourse*, or *translinguistics* (the preferable term *meta-linguistics* having already been used, but with a different meaning) (ibid., p. 611.)

20   Placing the "territory of translinguistics" (ibid., p. 612) beyond the key level of the sentence, he defines an ambitious programme of theoretical work on the staged levels of integration of the sentence within "social praxis":

> [...] On the one hand, any information provided by the letter of the corpus must be able to be located at a systematised level of description; on the other hand, all these levels must form an integratory continuum, each unit of a level only taking on its meaning, according to Benveniste's formulation, when it is included among the units of the immediately higher level, as is the case successively of the distinctive features (merism), the phoneme and the word (we have seen that the sentence, linguistically speaking, integrates the word, but cannot integrate itself). So translinguistics cannot be constituted if it does not establish, for each of its objects, the levels of integration of the discourse, starting with the sentence, which is the last level of linguistic integration and the first level of translinguistic integration, until the discourse is articulated on social *praxis*. (ibid., p. 613-614, italics in the text.)

21   The study of narrative enables Barthes (ibid., p. 614) to assert that "the need for integrative description is not only epistemological, it is also operational, because on it depends the segmentation of the discourse into units". He also postulates an approach to what he calls "the limit of the system":

> The principle of integration has [...] a dual scope: firstly structural, of course, because it theoretically enables the description of meaning and operationally the segmentation of discourse; and secondly general, because it makes it possible to give a descriptive status to the *limit* of the system, by designating, *in semiological terms* (that is the important thing), the moment at which the system is articulated on the social and historical praxis: a semiology which respects the principle of integration has every chance of cooperating effectively with extra-semiological disciplines, such as history, psychology or æsthetics. (ibid., p. 616.)

22   In an unpublished lecture, given in February 1972 at the University of Geneva, where he was a visiting professor, Barthes considers that Benveniste is "the only textual linguist" and adds: "he performs a junction between linguistics and textuology". Barthes identifies the question which is raised in a very technical way: "The question of the integration of sentences within a discourse is the question of their meaning", adding "There lies the future of a science of the text". He goes on to say: "If one abandons the attempt to describe the integration of sentences within a text, one abandons any translinguistic science of the text".

For a linguistic, textual and discursive narratology

23   The widespread interest in the narrative in the 1960s can be explained by the fact that structural analysis of narratives and narrative grammars, which were at that time emerging in the fields of the analysis of tales, literary and biblical texts as well as oral narrative covered elements going beyond the limits of the sentence. Some linguists, sociolinguists and psycholinguists were driven to take a closer interest in narrative due to the manifest lack of thinking on the text,[20] common not only to discourse analysis and linguistics in general but to psycholinguistics and sociolinguistics as well.

24   By teasing out the deep narrativity of all semiological forms, the narrative semiology of Greimas and the École de Paris prefigured what can be seen today with the "all narrative" of a narratology which makes excessive claims. On the contrary, my work, and the work developed in *Pratiques*, takes an approach founded on the differences and specific features of forms of text and discourse creation. On the differentiating basis of sequential meso-textual organisations (Adam, 2017 & 2018a), narrative genres (Adam, 2011a) have been distinguished from other textual genres, such as the genres of description (*Pratiques* 55, 1987; Adam & Petitjean, 1989), the genres of argumentation (*Pratiques* 28, 1980; Adam, 2004), the genres of explanation (*Pratiques* 51, 1986; *Pratiques* 58, 1988; Adam, 2008b) and instructional-procedural genres (*Langages* 141, 2001; *Pratiques* 111-112, 2001). We have also examined both the relationship between "poetry and narrativity" (Adam, 2002; 2011a, p. 151-196) and narration in an argumentative co(n)text (Danblon, 2008; Adam, 2011a, p. 197-244) and argumentation in a dialogic co(n)text (*Langue française* 112, 1996). The discursive functioning of narrative genres such as news items, parables, fairy tales, fables, exempla, anecdotes and funny stories, are at the centre of current research on socio-historical variations and their realisations.

25   This interest in the direction of texts was developed by Harald Weinrich when, in *Tempus: Besprochene und erzählte Welt* (1964), he placed his enunciative theory of narrative within the framework of a textual linguistics of which he is, with Eugenio Coseriu, one of the founders. Teun van Dijk (1973) explored the limits of narrative grammars inspired by generative linguistics, and later took into account, with Walter Kintsch (Kintsch & Dijk, 1975 ; 1984 ; Kintsch, 1981-1982d; 1982), Jean Matter Mandler's psycho-cognitive approaches to narrative (1981-1982 & 1984). Psycho-cognitive research centred on textuality took the narrative as an object very early on. The experimental work on the memorisation and production of narrative is well represented, in France, by the publications of Michel Fayol (1985), Éric Espéret (1984) and Stéphane Ehrlich & Agnès Florin (1981) and by the translations published by Guy Denhière (1984) in *Il était une fois...*

26   In the theoretical framework of praxematics, Jacques Bres (1994) focused on tense and the narrativity of written and oral texts. Alain Rabatel (2009) (re)theorised the question of point of view and developed a very extensive linguistic approach to narrative enunciation. Françoise Revaz (1997; 2009) focused initially on the boundaries of narrative and the description of actions (see also Adam, 1994b; 1997), and then went on to work, with Baroni and Stéphanie Pahud (2006; 2010), on the serialisation of media events and storytelling in comic books (seriality). All this work has a scope wider than the generative framework, dominated by syntax, of the articles by Sige-Yuki Kuroda

(2018) on storytelling. In the 1970s, he focused essentially on translation into Japanese of certain enunciative features specific to novels written in (or translated into) English.

27   To construct a general theory of text and discourse, it was necessary first to break with the reduction of discourse to the sentence in the mode of homology and phrastic composition. The first powerful challenge, as early as 1976, was that of Michael Alexander Kirkwood Halliday and Ruqaiya Hasan (1976, p. 293), in the name of a principle of radical change of level, which corresponds to Benveniste's hypothesis:

> A text [...] is not just a string of sentences. In other words, it is not simply a large grammatical unit, something of the same kind as a sentence but differing from it in size – a sort of supersentence. A text is best thought of not as a grammatical unit at all, but rather as a unit of a different kind: a semantic unit. The unity that it has is a unity of meaning in context, a texture that expresses the fact that it relates as a whole to the environment in which it is placed.

28   It is widely accepted today that the dual process of segmentation and commutation can be used to identify all units of subphrastic level. But the decomposition of texts into sentences and even of complex periodic sentences into predicative units cannot be done with the same combinatory regularity as the decomposition of syntagms, morphemes and phonemes. This solution of continuity is well summarised by Olivier Soutet (2005, p. 325): "In the particular case of text, the relationship of the whole to the part does not present the same kind of predictability as that between each of the subphrastic units and their immediate components". In crossing the boundary of the nucleus of the simple sentence to focus on the natural products of linguistic interaction that are texts, one is not simply performing a transphrastic extension of the limits of linguistics. Antoine Culioli (1984, p. 10) was able to speak of a "theoretical breakthrough with inescapable consequences» and Benveniste of a "second linguistics or meta-linguistics".

29   The syntactic solidarities between units of the language only have a very limited reach. As soon as one crosses the threshold of the syntagm and the nucleus of the basic sentence to enter into the fields of the periodic sentence and of the transphrastic, other systems of connection appear, which do not rest on morpho-syntactic criteria, but on relational instructions and marks, with a more or less distant *scope*. And also, as Jean-Marie Schaeffer writes: it must be realised that " [...] any activity of textualisation is inscribed in the framework of a (pragmatically determined) specific discursive genre." (Ducrot & Schaeffer, 1995, p. 504)

In conclusion

30   In conclusion, I would refer the reader to what Béatrice Fleury and Jacques Walter (2017, p. 193) wrote about the work carried out within the Centre d'études linguistiques des textes et des discours (Celted) in Metz and in the journal *Pratiques*:

> To begin with, although the emphasis was placed on narrative semiology, it was from a textual and then enunciative linguistics point of view that narrative was mainly theorised [problematised]. Research focused not only on the generic features of a number of narratives (factual and fictional), but also on the phenomena of textual organisation (characters, description, dialogue), of textual and narrative cohesion (the written form and tenses, narrative and evolving referents, narrative and points of view, etc.).

31   As John Pier (2011) and Jacques-Philippe Saint-Gérand (2012) have rightly stressed, my work on narrative does not fall within intra-narratological debates, but within a broader linguistic and discursive perspective in which the concepts of *formal enunciative system*, of *sequence*, of *types of texts*, of *textual genres* and *genres of discours* occupy an important place[21]. What I have proposed calling *textual analysis of discourse* sheds light on narratological questions by offering an overall theory, and concepts and examples of analysis much broader than what is proposed by American "poetic narratology", which is centred on the literality of certain enunciative features of limited scope.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ADAM, J.-M. (1976a). « La *mise en relief* dans le discours narratif ». *Le Français moderne* 4-44, p. 312-330.

ADAM, J.-M. (1976b). « Langue et texte : imparfait/passé simple ». *Pratiques* 10, p. 49-68.

ADAM, J.-M. (1981). « Labov et le récit ». *Cahiers de linguistique sociale* 3, p. 4-129.

ADAM, J.-M. (1990). *Éléments de linguistique textuelle.* Bruxelles : Mardaga.

ADAM, J.-M. (1994a) [1985]. *Le Texte narratif.* Paris : Nathan.

ADAM, J.-M. (1994b). « Décrire des actions : raconter ou relater ? ». *Littérature* 95, p. 3-22.

ADAM, J.-M. (1997). « Une alternative au "tout narratif" : les gradients de narrativité ». *Recherches en communication* 7, p. 11-35.

ADAM, J.-M. (1999). *Linguistique textuelle. Des genres de discours aux textes.* Paris : Armand Colin.

ADAM, J.-M. (2002). « Conditions et degrés de narrativisation du poème ». *Degrés* 111, p. a1-a26.

ADAM, J.-M. (2004). « Une approche textuelle de l'argumentation : "schéma", séquence et phrase périodique ». In : Doury, M. & Moirand, S. (dirs), *L'Argumentation aujourd'hui.* Paris : Presses de la Sorbonne Nouvelle, p. 77-102.

ADAM, J.-M. (2008a). « Essai de définition linguistique du récit ». *Actes de savoirs* 4, p. 113-127.

ADAM, J.-M. (2008b). « La construction textuelle de l'explication : marqueurs et portées, périodes et séquences ». In : Hudelot, C. *et al.* (eds.), *L'explication. Enjeux cognitifs et interactionnels.* Louvain : Peeters, p. 23-40.

ADAM, J.-M. (2009). « Barthes et *L'Étranger.* Le blanchiment de l'écriture ». In : Rabaté, D. & Viart, D. (eds.), *Écritures blanches.* Saint-Étienne : Publications de l'université de Saint-Étienne, p. 57-69.

ADAM, J.-M. (2011a). *Genres de récits. Narrativité et généricité des textes.* Louvain-la Neuve : Academia-L'Harmattan.

ADAM, J.-M. (2011b). « Les consécutives intensives : un schéma syntaxique commun à plusieurs genres de discours ». *Linx* 64-65, p. 115-131.

ADAM, J.-M. (2011c). « Le programme de la "translinguistique des textes, des œuvres" et sa réception au seuil des années 1970 ». In : Brunet, É. & Mahrer, R. (eds.), *Relire Benveniste.* Louvain-la-Neuve : Academia, p. 123-147.

ADAM, J.-M. (2011d). *La Linguistique textuelle. Introduction à l'analyse textuelle des discours.* Paris : Armand Colin.

ADAM, J.-M. (2013). « Esquema sintático e géneros de discurso. Poderão as consecutivas intensivas ser marcadores de género ? ». *Estudos Linguísticos/Linguistic Studies* 8, p. 15-38.

ADAM, J.-M. (2016). « *Pratiques*, la linguistique textuelle et l'analyse des discours dans le contexte des années 70 ». *Pratiques* 169-170. Online: http://pratiques.revues.org/2931.

ADAM, J.-M. (2017). *Les Textes : types et prototypes.* Paris : Armand Colin.

ADAM, J.-M. (2018a). *Le Paragraphe, entre phrases et texte.* Paris : Armand Colin.

ADAM, J.-M. (2018b). *Souvent textes varient.* Paris : Classiques Garnier.

ADAM, J.-M. & GOLDENSTEIN, J.-P. (1976). *Linguistique et discours littéraire.* Paris : Larousse.

ADAM, J.-M. & HEIDMANN, U. (2009). *Le Texte littéraire.* Louvain-la-Neuve : Academia.

ADAM, J.-M. & LAPLANTINE, C. (coordinators) (2012). « Notes manuscrites de Benveniste sur la langue de Baudelaire ». *Semen* 33. Online: https://journals.openedition.org/semen/9442.

ADAM, J.-M. & PETITJEAN, A. (1989). *Le Texte descriptif.* Paris : Nathan.

ADAM, J.-M., LUGRIN, G. & REVAZ, F. (1998). « Pour en finir avec le couple récit/discours ». *Pratiques* 100, p. 81-98.

BADIOU-MONFERRAN, C. (ed.) (2010). *Il était une fois l'interdisciplinarité.* Louvain-la-Neuve : Academia Bruylant.

BAETENS, J. (2017). « Nouvelle narratologie, nouveau récit ». *Questions de communication* 31, p. 241.

BARONI, R. (2016). « L'empire de la narratologie, ses défis, ses faiblesses ». *Questions de communication* 30, p. 219-236.

BARTHES, R. (1953). *Le Degré zéro de l'écriture.* Paris : Gonthier.

BARTHES, R. (2002a) [1966]. « Introduction à l'analyse structurale des récits ». *Communications* 8, p. 1-27. Reprinted in *Œuvres complètes II.* Paris : Éditions du Seuil, p. 828-865.

BARTHES, R. (2002c) [1970a]. « L'ancienne rhétorique. Aide-mémoire ». *Communications* 16, p. 172-229. Reprinted in *Œuvres complètes III.* Paris : Éditions du Seuil, p. 527-601.

BARTHES, R. (2002d) [1970b]. « La linguistique du discours ». In Barthes, R. *et al., Signe, langage, culture,* La Haye : Mouton. Reprinted in *Œuvres complètes III.* Paris : Éditions du Seuil, p. 611-616.

BENVENISTE, É. (1966). *Problèmes de linguistique générale I.* Paris : Gallimard.

BENVENISTE, É. (1970). « L'appareil formel de l'énonciation ». *Langages* 17, p. 12-18. Online: https://www.persee.fr/doc/lgge_0458-726x_1970_num_5_17_2572.

BENVENISTE, É. (1974). *Problèmes de linguistique générale II.* Paris : Gallimard.

BENVENISTE, É. (2011). *Baudelaire.* Presentation and transcription by C. Laplantine. Limoges : Lambert-Lucas.

BENVENISTE, É. (2012). *Dernières leçons.* Paris : EHESS/Gallimard/ Éditions du Seuil.

BRES, J. (1994). *La Narrativité.* Louvain-la-Neuve : Duculot.

CHISS, J.-L. & DESSONS, G. (coordinators) (2005). « Linguistique et poétique du discours à partir de Saussure ». *Langages* 159.

CULIOLI, A. (1984). « En guise d'introduction ». In : Atlani, F., Danon-Boileau, L. & Grésillon, A. (éds), *La Langue au ras du texte.* Lille : Presses universitaires de Lille, p. 9-12.

DANBLON, E. (éd.) (2008). *Argumentation et narration.* Bruxelles : Éditions de l'université de Bruxelles.

DENHIÈRE, G. (éd.) (1984). *Il était une fois... Compréhension et souvenir de récits.* Villeneuve d'Ascq : Presses universitaires de Lille.

DIJK, T. A. van (1973). « Grammaires textuelles et structures narratives ». In : Rastier, F. (ed.), *Sémiotique narrative et textuelle.* Paris : Larousse, p. 177-207.

DUCROT, O. & SCHAEFFER, J.-M. (1995). *Nouveau dictionnaire encyclopédique des sciences du langage.* Paris : Éditions du Seuil.

EHRLICH, S. & FLORIN, A. (1981). *Niveaux de compréhension et de production d'un récit par des enfants de 3 à 11 ans.* Paris : Éditions du CNRS.

ESPÉRET, É. (1984). « Processus de production. Genèse et rôle du schéma narratif dans la conduite de récit ». In : Moscato, M. & Pieraut-Le Bonniec, G. (eds), *Le Langage. Construction et actualisation.* Rouen : Publications de l'université de Rouen, p. 179-196.

FAYOL, M. (1985). *Le Récit et sa construction. Une approche de psychologie cognitive.* Paris/Neuchâtel : Delachaux et Niestlé.

FENOGLIO, I. (2014). « Énonciation et genèse d'un texte : élaboration sémantique et textualisation ». In : Monte, M. & Philippe, G. (eds), *Genres et textes. Déterminations, évolutions, confrontations.* Lyon : Presses universitaires de Lyon, p. 211-213.

FLEURY, B. & WALTER, J. (2017). « La narratologie dans tous ses états ». *Questions de communication* 31, p. 183-197. Online: https://journals.openedition.org/questionsdecommunication/11109.

GENETTE, G. (1966). « Frontières du récit ». *Communications* 8, p. 152-163. Online: https://www.persee.fr/doc/comm_0588-8018_1966_num_8_1_1121.

GENETTE, G. (1972). « Discours du récit ». In : GENETTE, G., *Figures III.* Paris : Éditions du Seuil, p. 65-267.

GENETTE, G. (1983). *Nouveau discours du récit.* Paris : Éditions du Seuil.

HALLIDAY, M. A. K. & HASAN, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English.* London/New York : Longman.

HEIDMANN, U. & ADAM, J.-M. (2010). *Textualité et intertextualité des contes.* Paris : Classiques Garnier.

HERMAN, D. (1997). « Scripts, Sequences, and Stories: Elements of a Postclassical Narratology ». *PMLA* 112, p. 1046-1059.

HERMAN, D. (1999). *Narratologies: New Perspectives on Narrative Analysis.* Columbus : Ohio State University Press.

KINTSCH, W. (1981-1982). « Aspects de la compréhension de texte ». *Bulletin de psychologie* 35 (356), p. 777-783.

KINTSCH, W. (1982). "Text Representation". In : Otto, W. & White, S. (eds), *Reading Expository Material.* New York : Academic Press, p. 87-102.

KINTSCH, W. & DIJK, T. A. van (1975). « Comment on se rappelle et on résume des histoires ». *Langages* 40, p. 98-116. Online: https://www.persee.fr/doc/lgge_0458-726x_1975_num_9_40_2300.

KINTSCH, W. & DIJK, T. A. van (1984) [1978]. « Vers un modèle de la compréhension et de la production de textes ». Translated by G. Denhière. In: Denhière, G. (ed.), *Il était une fois... Compréhension et souvenir de récits.* Villeneuve d'Ascq : Presses universitaires de Lille, p. 85-142.

KURODA, S.-Y. (2018) [ca. 1970]. *Pour une théorie poétique de la narration.* Translated from the English (US) by C. Braconnier, T. Fauconnier and S. Patron. Paris : Armand Colin.

LABOV, W. (1972). *Language in the Inner City. Studies in the Black English Vernacular.* Philadelphia : University of Pennsylvania Press.

LABOV, W. & WALETZKY, J. (1967). "Narrative Analysis: Oral Versions of Personal Experience". In : Helm, J. (ed.), *Essays on the Verbal and Visual Arts.* Seattle : University of Washington Press, p. 12-44.

LANGAGES 141 (2001). « Les discours procéduraux ». Online: https://www.persee.fr/issue/lgge_0458-726x_2001_num_35_141.

LANGUE FRANÇAISE 112 (1996). « L'argumentation en dialogues ». Online: https://www.persee.fr/issue/lfr_0023-8368_1996_num_112_1.

MANDLER, J. M. (1981-1982). « Recherches récentes sur les grammaires de récit ». *Bulletin de psychologie* 35 (356), p. 705-715.

MANDLER, J. M. (1984). *Stories, Scripts, and Scenes: Aspects of Schema Theory.* Hillsdale/London : Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

PATRON, S. (2018). *Introduction à la narratologie postclassique.* Villeneuve d'Ascq : Presses universitaires du Septentrion.

PHELAN, J. (2005). "Who's Here? Thoughts on *Narrative Identity and Narrative Imperialism*". *Narrative* 13-3, p. 205-210.

PIER, J. (2011). "Is There a French Postclassical Narratology?". In : Olson, G. (ed.), *Current Trends in Narratology.* Berlin/New York : De Gruyter, p. 349-360.

PRATIQUES 111-112 (2001). « Les consignes dans et hors l'école ». Online: https://www.persee.fr/issue/prati_0338-2389_2001_num_111_1.

PRATIQUES 28 (1980). « Argumenter ». En ligne : https://www.persee.fr/issue/prati_0338-2389_1980_num_28_1.

PRATIQUES 51 (1986). « Les textes explicatifs ». Online: https://www.persee.fr/issue/prati_0338-2389_1986_num_51_1.

PRATIQUES 55 (1987). « Les textes descriptifs ». Online: https://www.persee.fr/issue/prati_0338-2389_1987_num_55_1.

PRATIQUES 58 (1988). « Les discours explicatifs ». Online: https://www.persee.fr/issue/prati_0338-2389_1988_num_58_1.

PRINCE, G. (2003) [1987]. *Dictionary of Narratology.* Lincoln/London : University of Nebraska Press.

PRINCE, G. (2006). « Narratologie classique et narratologie post-classique ». *Vox-Poetica.* Online: www.vox-poetica.org/t/articles/prince.html.

RABATEL, A. (2009). *Homo narrans I & II.* Limoges : Lambert-Lucas.

RASTIER, F. (éd.) (1973). *Sémiotique narrative et textuelle.* Paris : Larousse.

REVAZ, F. (1997). *Les Textes d'action.* Metz : Centre d'études linguistiques des textes et des discours.

REVAZ, F. (2009). *Introduction à la narratologie. Action et narration.* Louvain-la-Neuve : Duculot.

REVAZ, F., PAHUD, S. & BARONI, R. (2006). « De l'intrigue littéraire à l'intrigue médiatique : le feuilleton Swissmetal ». *A Contrario* 2 (4), p. 125-143. Online: https://www.cairn.info/revue-a-contrario-2006-2-page-125.htm.

REVAZ, F., PAHUD, S. & BARONI, R. (2010). « La temporalité du récit : fiction, médias et histoire ». *A Contrario* 1 (13), p. 3-8. Online: https://www.cairn.info/revue-a-contrario-2010-1-page-3.htm.

SAINT-GÉRAND, J.-P. (2012). « Jean-Michel Adam, *Genres de récits. Narrativité et généricité des textes* ». *Questions de communication* 22. Online: http://questionsdecommunication.revues.org/6988.

SAUSSURE, F. de (2002). *Écrits de linguistique générale.* Paris : Gallimard.

SOUTET, O. (2005) [1995]. *Linguistique.* Paris : Presses universitaires de France.

TISSET, C. (2000). *Analyse linguistique de la narration.* Paris : Sedes.

TODOROV, T. (1975). « La notion de littérature ». In: Kristeva, J., Milner, J.-C. & Ruwet, N. (eds), *Langue, discours, société.* Paris : Éditions du Seuil, p. 352-364.

TODOROV, T. (1978). *Les Genres du discours.* Paris : Éditions du Seuil.

TODOROV, T. (1987). *La Notion de littérature.* Paris : Éditions du Seuil.

TURPIN, B. (2003a). « Légendes – Mythes – Histoire. La circulation des signes ». In : Bouquet, S. (dir.), *Ferdinand de Saussure.* Paris : Éditions de L'Herne, p. 307-316.

TURPIN, B. (2003b). « La Légende de Sigfrid et l'histoire burgonde. Présentation et édition ». In : Bouquet, S. (ed.), *Ferdinand de Saussure.* Paris : Éditions de L'Herne, p. 351-429.

WAGNER, F. (2018). « Des mécanismes de l'intrigue à l'enseignement de la littérature. Entretien avec Raphaël Baroni ». *Cahiers de narratologie* 34. Online: http://journals.openedition.org/narratologie/9130.

WEINRICH, H. (1964). *Tempus: Besprochene und erzählte Welt.* Stuttgart : Kohlhammer.

NOTES

1. A transmediality also defended by R. Baroni, in a conversation with F. Wagner (2018).

2. S. Patron in her introduction to *Pour une théorie poétique de la narration* by S.-Y. Kuroda (2018).

3. With the support of C. Badiou-Monferran (2010, p. 46-50), in her presentation of *Il était une fois l'interdisciplinarité.*

4. Initially published in *Langue, discours, société*, a festschrift in honour of É. Benveniste published in 1975 (Todorov, 1975), this article was reproduced in *Les Genres du discours* (Todorov, 1978) and in *La Notion de littérature* (Todorov, 1987).

5. From *Linguistique et discours littéraire* (Adam & Goldenstein, 1976) to *Souvent textes varient* (Adam, 2018a), and including *Le Texte littéraire* (Adam & Heidmann, 2009) and *Textualité et intertextualité des contes* (Heidmann & Adam, 2010).

6. [This sentence translated by Catherine Porter, Todorov, Tzvetan, *Genres in Discourse*, Cambridge University Press, 1990, p. 9]

7. [This quotation translated by Catherine Porter, ibid., pp. 11-12]

8. [ibid., p. 10]

9. I began these studies in "Labov et le récit" (Adam, 1981).

10. This is the thesis developed around J.-L. Chiss and G. Dessons (2005). On F. de Saussure's narrative semiology, I refer to the publication, by B. Turpin (2003a; 2003b), of a part of the more than 800 pages of manuscript written by the Swiss linguist. F. de Saussure defines legend as made up of a series of symbols "subjected to the same vicissitudes and the same laws as any other series of symbols, for example the symbols that are the words in a language", and adds: "They are all part of semiology" (Turpin, 2003b, p. 367). Which completes the famous manuscript note in which F. de Saussure (2002, p. 45) defines the general field of semiology: "Semiology = morphology, grammar, syntax, synonymy, rhetoric, stylistics, lexicology, etc., *all of which are inseparable* (italics by F. de Saussure).

11. The present article completes, around problems of narrative and narratology, what I develop in "*Pratiques*, textual linguistics and discourse analysis in the context of the 1970s" (Adam, 2016).

12. See also the genetic studies of I. Fenoglio (in particulier 2014, p. 211-213). I would aslo refer to my article "Le programme de la "translinguistique des textes, des œuvres" et sa réception au seuil des années 1970" (Adam, 2011c).

13. I would refer here to *Semen* 33, devoted to « Notes manuscrites de Benveniste sur la langue de Baudelaire », which I co-edited with C. Laplantine, in 2012.

14. For a critique of this distinction, cf. J.-M. Adam, G. Lugrin & F. Revaz, 1998.

15. I wrote at length about this article in p. 233-254 of *Texte narratif* (1994), in which I pursue further what I wrote in Adam, 1976a and 1976b.

16. See « Barthes et *L'Étranger.* Le blanchiment de l'écriture » (Adam, 2009). For a detailed study of the passage from the past simple in *La Mort heureuse* to the present perfect in *L'Étranger* see *Souvent textes varient* (Adam, 2018b, p. 101-139).

17. [This and the following translations of quotations from Barthes (2002a) from Barthes, Roland. *The Semiotic Challenge.* Translated by Richard Howard. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985.]

18. He discusses these questions at greater length in the seminar published in *Communications* 16 (1970b), entitled: « L'ancienne rhétorique. Aide-mémoire » (2002c, p. 527-601).

19. *Éléments de linguistique textuelle* (Adam, 1990), *Les Textes : types et prototypes* (Adam, 2017), *La Linguistique textuelle. Introduction à l'analyse textuelle des discours* (Adam, 2011d) and *Le Paragraphe, entre phrases et texte* (Adam, 2018a).

20. Significantly, the *Dictionary of Narratology* by G. Prince (2003) has no entry for "text".

21. This is also the case, for example, in C. Tisset's textbook (2000): *Analyse linguistique de la narration.*

ABSTRACTS

Do *narratives* concern only *narratology* or can they interest *linguistics*? If we suppose that linguistics cannot consider any unit beyond the sentence, then narratives are not an object for linguistics. But if linguistics do not stop at the sentence, then narratives may be the object of what R. Barthes called, with É. Benveniste, a "linguistics of discourse" or "translinguistics". Narratology limits investigation to narrativity and different forms of storytelling, whereas, text linguistics and discourse linguistics are not a specifically narrative theory but a theory that includes narrative as one of its objects. This essay shows that the move from a "classical" to a "postclassical narratology" is less a revolution than an evolution. R. Barthes's anchoring in É. Benveniste's linguistics of discourse showed the way to a distinctly French postclassical narratology.

Les *récits* ne concernent-ils que la *narratologie* ou peuvent-ils intéresser aussi la *linguistique* ? Si l'on considère que l'objet de la linguistique est la langue et que la phrase est sa limite maximale d'investigation, alors les récits ne sont pas un objet linguistique. Mais si la linguistique ne s'arrête pas à la phrase, alors le récit peut être l'objet de ce que R. Barthes appelait, à la suite d'É. Benveniste, une « linguistique du discours » ou « translinguistique ». La narratologie limite ses investigations à la narrativité et aux différentes formes de mise en récit, alors que, la linguistique du texte et du discours est une théorie générale dont le récit n'est qu'un objet d'étude parmi d'autres. Cet article monte que le passage prétendu de la « narratologie classique » à la « narratologie postclassique » est moins une révolution qu'une évolution prévisible. L'ancrage de R. Barthes dans la linguistique du discours d'É. Benveniste a rendu possible l'émergence d'une narratologie postclassique française, ce qui brouille les catégorisations actuellement en usage, fondées sur l'idée de rupture.

INDEX

AUTHORS

JEAN-MICHEL ADAM

Université de Lausanne, CLE, CH-1015 Lausanne, Suisse