

Interletral

Cited bibliography and some pointers for further reflection ¹

1.5 The Voices of the Text

1.5.1. Dialogue, Dialogism and Polyphony

- Ducrot, Oswald, *Le dire et le dit* (1985), Paris, Minuit.

Oswald Ducrot explores the distinction between what the speaker says explicitly (the *said*) and what he or she implies or suggests (the *saying*). He shows that many statements do not merely convey neutral information, but also guide the recipient's interpretation and convey implicit assumptions, judgements or points of view. Ducrot analyses the linguistic mechanisms—such as connectors, modal verbs and certain syntactic structures—that enable these effects to be constructed when arguing. The book thus offers a reflection on the relationship between meaning, pragmatics and argumentative strategies in the functioning of language.

- Bres, Jacques, « Savoir de quoi on parle : dialogue, dialogal, dialogique ; dialogisme, polyphonie... » (2005), in : Bres Jacques et al., *Dialogisme et polyphonie*, Bruxelles: De Boeck Supérieur.

Jacques Bres offers a clarification of the central concepts related to the theory of dialogue and polyphony in language. In particular, he distinguishes between *dialogue* and *dialogal*, two terms that refer to the relationship between speakers in an interaction, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, the *dialogic*, a notion that refers to the presence in an utterance of voices other than that of the speaker. Bres asserts that all these concepts help us understand how texts and discourses incorporate, respond to and anticipate other voices, revealing the social, interactional and argumentative dimension of language.

- Amossy, Ruth, « De l'apport d'une distinction : dialogisme vs polyphonie dans l'analyse argumentative », in: Jacques Bres et al., op. cit.

Ruth Amossy proposes to clarify two essential concepts for the analysis of argumentative discourse. She distinguishes *dialogism*, which refers to the constitutive, unmarked heterogeneity of prior points of view within an utterance, from *polyphony*, which denotes the marked coexistence of different voices within a single text or discourse. Amossy incorporates these notions into her analysis of argumentative strategies by identifying how a speaker anticipates, integrates, or challenges external opinions in order to persuade an audience. The article thus highlights the interactional and persuasive dimension of language.

1.5.2. Discours direct, indirect, indirect libre et narrativisé

- Rosier, Laurence, *Le discours rapporté. Histoire, théories, pratiques* (1988), Paris, Bruxelles, Duculot.

In this book, based on her doctoral research, Laurence Rosier summarises studies on reported speech (RS) from very different perspectives: grammatical,

¹ The title of a work in French indicates that no complete translation into English has been published and that it is necessary to consult the work in French.

enunciative and argumentative. The book includes a history of RS and a reflection on the stages and problems of its theorisation, as well as proposals for a descriptive and explanatory model of forms of reported speech and an extensive bibliography on the subject.

1.5.3. Other ways of representing another's voice : irony, concession, and negation

- Bres, Jacques, "L'ironie, un cocktail dialogique ?" (2010), *Deuxième congrès de linguistique française*, Juillet2010, New-Orleans, États-Unis, hal-00781439, <https://hal.science/hal-00781439/file/BresironieCMLF.pdf>

Bres considers irony to be a discursive dialogical phenomenon that brings two discourses into interaction. According to Bres, its distinctive feature lies in the combination of three ingredients: (i) the implicit nature of dialogical interaction, (ii) the discrepancy between what is said and the co-text and/or context, (iii) the enunciative dimension of the utterance. None of these ingredients properly belongs to irony. They are elements that are present separately in other speech acts or types of discourse, such as reported speech, allusion, paradoxical statements, lies and hypocoristic statements. Bres thus highlights the mechanisms of reading and interpretation specific to irony, linking discourse analysis, pragmatics and dialogism theory.