

Igor Ilić*
UR 1339 LiLPa
University of Strasbourg

ARGUMENT NARRATIVIZATION THROUGH DISCOURSE REPRESENTATION: EXAMPLE OF ONE PUBLIC APPEARANCE

Abstract

It seems that direct and indirect speech, terms used in the schooling process, are not a topic of interest even in grammar textbooks¹ (e.g. Klikovac 2010, Stanojčić & Popović 2012). With this fact in mind, one could think that this is not a topic worthy of interest in the research community. However, the aim of the present paper is to refute such a belief. One acquires very early that both of these speech types serve as a transmitter of other people's words, the latter being transmitted in their original form using three models, whereas within the reported speech these words are being transformed and integrated in the enunciator's statement. The term discourse representation will be used in the present paper for both types of speech, and their simplified typology based on three main features – direct, indirect and free, will be presented as well. A corpus which is composed of a transcript of a 80-minute political speech is explored and its analysis has shown numerous very descriptive, sometimes plastic, examples of represented discourse that serve not as an indicator of what another speaker had stated but as a picture of the situation in which the main speaker is on one hand and the presence or the absence of the other speaker's credibility, or even the main speaker's credibility on the other. The argument narrativization rests in fact on representation, a sort

* ilicigor@hotmail.rs

¹ In Serbia.

of staging of other people's words – which is described within the concept of polyphony – and this representation is a cohesive factor since it either introduces a part of argumentation or connects one part with another related part of argumentation, i.e. the represented discourses speak on behalf of the speaker.

Key words: discourse representation, narrativization, polyphony

1. UNRAVELING

How does one language phenomenon keep being extremely familiar to the scientific as well as to the non-scientific community and yet still dubious in regard to its function(s) within the language? One could naturally think of that well-known phrase *Secrets are best hidden in plain sight*, and not without a reason. On the other hand, it is needless to point out another aspect of this phenomenon, and that is its frequency, given the fact that in the second of the two preceding sentences the phenomenon is already present. To say discourse representation (in further text DR), a term used in line with N. Fairclough, is less a way of 'starting with a clean slate' and more a way of defining a broadly studied field in order to include and underline some pragmatological aspects that weren't under the linguist's microscope – "[...] there is always a decision to interpret and represent it [what was said or written] in one way rather than another" (Fairclough 1995: 54). Other familiar terms – 'reported speech' in English, 'discours rapporté' in French, '(ne)upravni govor' in Serbian, tend naturally to associate this type of discourse with a statement of what a person said or wrote thus somewhat transforming the efforts to describe it into a matter of stylistics. With this in mind, another doubt one could have concerns the delimitation of the phenomenon: how can 'words of others' be noticed, and eventually analysed, especially if the bakhtinian maxime of multilayered enunciation is applied?

It may be easier to answer this question in the case of written language, since language is stabilised there. However, within the framework of this dualism between spoken and written language, we

should not, as Koch & Oesterreicher (2001) point out, limit ourselves to distinguishing two completely distinct poles. Rather, it is a continuum in which the point of discrimination is no longer the code (phonic or graphic), but another aspect that could be described as the conception or the spatio-temporal realisation of a verbal exchange, which the authors call immediate or remote communication. In other words: (a) a written text would belong to the graphic code and to distant communication, (b) an oral utterance to the phonic code and to immediate communication, while (c) a written text spoken orally would belong to the phonic code, but to distant communication and (d) an oral utterance retranscribed to writing would belong to the graphic code, but to immediate communication. We would like to point out, along with Koch & Oesterreicher, that this type of encompassing dichotomy allows us to take into account the hybrid cases mentioned in (c) and (d), which, in terms of DR, result in situations in which α tells *viva voce* what β has written to them, or the latter writes what the former has told them orally.

From the conceptional point of view, the ‘text’ we have based ourselves on – a presidential address – is in the communicative distance, since the speaker relies on a scriptural support prepared in advance. We are therefore not in a context of spontaneous speaking, however there is a certain amount of improvisations, which we will see in some examples. We are not in an explicit dialogue either, since the speaker is addressing an audience that is there to listen given the very status of the empirical subject. Since our aim is to understand more about the use, and even the utility, of DR from a pragmatic perspective, we focus on this aspect and leave aside not only the social, but also the rhetorical baggage of the speaker, of which we are fully aware, but which, for the moment, does not seem essential to our analysis. When we say ‘speaker’ (*locuteur*), we mean ‘abstract entity responsible for a given utterance’, in particular in the tradition of O. Ducrot (1984).

Given the fact that our corpus is in Serbian, it seems appropriate to review a general definition of our subject taken from Peco & Stanojčić (1972):

(1) **DIREKTNI** (ili **UPRAVNI** ili **NEPOSREDNI**) **GOVOR**,

1. prenošenje poruke, saopštenja trećeg lica u obliku u kojem je to rečeno. Kako se njime prenosi neizmenjen govor, onaj koji to čini uvodi slušaoca u saopštenje upotrebljavajući prvo nezavisnu rečenicu koja sadrži neki glagol govorenja, mišljenja, iskazivanja rečima ili sl. i posle pauze, koja odvaja govor trećeg lica od govora govornog lica, navodi reči trećeg lica. [...]² (id: 72–73)

(2) **NEUPRAVNI GOVOR**,

način govora u kojem se nečije reči ne daju onako kako su izgovorene, nego samo iznosi njihov osnovni smisao. Tada pretvaramo upravni govor u nepravni, a rečenična interpunkcija je kao kod izričnih rečenica. [...]³ (id: 242)

The French-speaking reader will find an almost identical equivalent definition for French in Riegel et al. (2014: 1009–1016) or in Le Goffic (1993: 268–270), which underlines a certain tendency, i.e. a certain vision of the DR phenomenon. Is there another possible way?

2. POSSIBLE FRAMEWORK

First, let us look more closely at the implications of the definition (1). *Conveyance of a message*: these words essentially point out the usefulness, even the finality, of the process, but is the purpose of a speaker representing a discourse a mere transmission, a mere report

² **DIRECT** (or **GUIDED** or **PROXIMATE**) **DISCOURSE**,

¹ conveyance of a message, a statement of a third person following the form in which it was uttered. Given that this form is used to convey unchanged discourse, the person doing it introduces the listener to the statement by using firstly an independent clause with *verba dicendi*, *verba putandi*, some kind of expression with words or something similar, and after the pause that separates the speech of the third person from the speech of the enunciator, cites the words of the third person [...] [our translation]

³ **UNGUIDED DISCOURSE**,

speech type in which words of another speaker are not given in the way they were pronounced, only their basic sense is presented. In this case we transform guided into unguided speech, and the punctuation is the same as in declarative clauses. [...]

disinterested of any contextualisation? *The message of a third person*: isn't the third person an ambiguous term, given the cases cited by the author of the article where the speaker seems to be quoting himself, but also, even if it is somewhat trivial to recall, the cases where the speaker seems to be quoting his interlocutor – the 'second' person or you? *The message follows the form in which it was uttered*: this implies a more or less complete respect for the original utterance of the speaker who is quoted. Although we have not yet managed to find similar results for Serbian, it is worth mentioning that analyses of DR in spoken French have shown that a significant number of DRs produced are not *retransmitted*, but probably *staged* (Rosier 2008: 19). As for the form more precisely, we ourselves noticed during the analysis carried out for the purposes of our Master's thesis (Ilić 2021) that speakers sometimes completely modify the speech of others, thus making it incompatible with the original statement. It is not clear why within the same definition (Peco & Stanojčić 1972: 72–73) we find under 2. the *free unguided speech*, which is there related to artistic language, but the author uses an interesting criterion in defining it. Indeed, we read that it is “[...] direktni govor kojim se u umetničkom jeziku ističe pripovedač koji – navodeći tuđe reči kao deo svoga govora, – ističe i svoj stav prema tome što te reči kazuju” (our modified emphasis). We are approaching a fairly conclusive description here since we are given an interpretive characterization, but let us observe before proceeding the definition (2).

To give not the form of the words, but their basic sense, or in other terms their ideational content: the discrimination that this definition makes legible between direct and indirect speech on one hand, and which is based precisely on having either a complete authentically quoted utterance or a kind of paraphrasing reformulation of the same utterance also joins its syntactic translation – the author explains further in definition (2) that the quoted utterance is a declarative subordinate proposition, its punctuation therefore being identical to that of declarative sentences, whereas for direct speech it is explained that there would be two independent propositions. If we focus on this aspect in the Normative Grammar of the Serbian Language (Piper

2014: 492–521), we come across a mention of DR in the paragraph devoted to declarative sentences. The authors point out that these are used in indirect discourse, whilst asyndetic sentences are employed for direct discourse (*id.*: 497).

Let us now take an example from our corpus and test it against the definitions cited:

(3) [...] samo želim da vam kažem da su stvari mnogo komplikovanije od onih kakvim ih predstavljamo jer nisu stvari hoćeš da priznaš nećeš da priznaš nećeš i neće ali imamo milion stvari kompromisnih koje moramo da rešimo [...](00:42:32)

[...] I just want to say that things are a lot more complicated than what we present them to be because things are not like you want to recognize it or you don't want to recognize it I won't and we won't but we have million compromise matters that we have to solve [...]

It is immediately noticeable that the citing cotext – the one in which the quoted speech is inserted – prepares the ground: the speaker makes a statement that is supposed to summarize an image they have just created and represents two DRs to support their thesis. Given that there is no “independent clause with *verba dicendi*, *verba putandi*, some kind of expression with words or something similar” (*cf.* (1) above), these two DRs could be qualified as *free direct discourses*, as it seems to us, for the first of the two, that the group *jer nisu stvari/because things are not* is far from being a usual introducer of the DR. This is the first problematic point with regard to the definitions because there is no mention of free direct speech, which is not surprising since descriptions of this phenomenon are late in French as well (Rosier 2008). It can also be stated without hesitation that it is not a question of “conveyance of a message, a statement of a third person following the form in which it was uttered”, because on one hand the presupposed genuine utterance did not take place (as it is) and on the other hand the third person is consequently non-existent. In fact, this is what Roulet defines as *diaphonic (diaphonique)* discourse (1985: 73), which occurs when the speaker represents an apparent exchange between themselves and an interlocutor. In this case, it is a *potential* diaphony because the exchange did not really

take place and an *implicit* one because the exchange is represented without any introducer.

Another element of definition (1) above seems useful, even if it is impossible to reconstruct the author's thought in this passage – *and after* the pause that separates the speech of the third person from the speech of the enunciator, *cites the words of the third person*. The pause would be perceptible only in spoken language, its written equivalent being a simple space possibly with a colon. And indeed, the speaker makes a pause (audible in the audiovisual recording of the document) between the two DRs and changes the tone of the second DR somewhat, thus marking this diaphonic setting.

This apparently effective existence in (3) of another *voice* is part of what Ducrot or E. Roulet (1985) generally characterise as *polyphony*, namely that in enunciation seen as the process of creating an utterance there is a superposition of several voices (Ducrot 1984: 171–233). It should be noted that in Ducrot's descriptions, the DR is seen as the trace of a double enunciation, i.e. the utterance bears witness to the presence of two speakers, but it is nevertheless one of the two forms of polyphony that Ducrot distinguishes. The other case involves the presence of another discursive being to whom the speaker does not explicitly attribute words – the *enunciator* (*énonciateur*). These two entities are also sufficient for our own analysis because they are naturally compatible with the DR: on one hand a *speaker* who is presented as responsible for the utterance and on the other hand an *enunciator* who shows through the utterance without actually being marked in the utterance (*ibid.*). The reader will observe this phenomenon in (4) below, where the underlined sequence among others is entirely attributable to an enunciator whose position would be equivalent to the content of the sequence. The speaker does not take this attitude on their own, but only quotes it in order to make the previous sequence explicit, hence a *zato što/because*.

(4) [...] ne smete da govorite zamislite o svojim ekonomskim uspesima koje potvrđuje Eurostat zato što Srbija kao parija mora da bude naviknuta na to

mesto jer Srbija sme da pobeđuje u košarci ponekad u odbojci i vaterpolu a ovo drugo Srbija ne sme da pobeđuje [...] (00:40:26)

[...] imagine you can not talk about your successes in economy confirmed by Eurostat because Serbia like a pariah must be accustomed to that place because Serbia may win in basketball sometimes in volleyball and water polo but in this other aspect Serbia mustn't win [...]

In his modular approach to discourse, Roulet distinguishes several dimensions, one of which we are particularly interested in – the enunciative dimension (*cf.* Roulet 1997), and we have also retained the way in which this author sequences the different discourses in order to use it, in our case, to mark the DRs. When annotating the corpus, we placed them in square brackets [] and preceded them with the source of the voice, for example L for speaker (*locuteur*). The criterion Roulet uses to make a first differentiation is that of the formulation of the speeches of others (*cf.* Roulet 1999) – unlike Fairclough (1995: 55) who distinguishes five parameters including the mode, corresponding roughly to the type of DR in the canonical terms, and including more or less the less usual examples in relation precisely to the canon. It is only when the DR is explicitly *formulated* that the traditional direct/indirect dualism can be introduced. If the DR is *not formulated*, it remains to be determined whether it is designated (*désigné*), i.e. the statement indicates that a previous speech act has taken place (*cf.* (5) below), or whether it is implied (*implicité*), i.e. the statement implies and relies on previous speech without comprising a citation (*cf.* (6) below).

(5) [...] a onda kada sam primereno odgovorio L [] onda je rekao [...]
(00:50:07)

[...] and then when I responded appropriately L [] he said [...]

(6) [...] C [pa ne možemo znate mnogi od njih imaju dosijea neki su činili pre neki posle toga različita krivična dela i prekršaje pa sad nije u redu da oni budu u blizini predsednika] C [] je li i onda sam napravio [...] (00:54:12)

[...] C [oh you know we just can't we have files on lots of them some of them committed different crimes and delicts before that some of them after and so it's not appropriate to have them near the president] C [] is it so and then I made [...]

From the examples in our corpus quoted so far ((3), (4), (5) and (6)), it is clear, to say the least, that these utterances are likely to stretch any attempt at theoretical framing to the extreme. Nevertheless, they can be described using the standards mentioned above, because in this work it is more important for us to understand why speakers invest themselves so much in discourse representation – wouldn't it be easier, more direct and more economical to make their positions explicit?

3. EXPLORATION

All of the questions arose on the base of a corpus made out of a speech that Serbian president A. Vučić gave in Serbian in front of the Serbian Parliament in June 2021. It is a political speech consisting of closely 50 minutes of material that has been completely transcribed for the purpose of the analysis. The time indicated in brackets behind each example corresponds to the beginning of the quoted sequence in the recording of the speech available online. The spelling is respected as it facilitates the reading of the transcript, but there is no punctuation given that it is spoken language. We could be criticised for intentionally citing more complex examples in the introduction, so let's start with a 'more classic' case.

(7) [...] u tom trenutku vi shvatite da više ne razgovarate ni o čemu nekako su nas vratili uspeli da nas vrata Borelji i ostali do nestalih osoba da pre toga smo vodili dijalog L+K [] oko zajednice srpskih opština šta god da ste rekli od svih pravila L [pacta sunt servanda] do toga da L [sve što je odlučeno ne može da se menja potpisano od tri strane potpisnice i da mora da bude ispunjeno da bi postojalo poverenje u nastavak procesa] na to je njegov odgovor bio da K [ustavni sud Kosova je to odbio] i da K [njega to ne zanima] a onda je [...] (00:35:05)

[...] in that moment you realize that you're not discussing anything anymore they somehow managed to restore the focus Borrell and others to the missing persons oh yes before that we had a dialogue L+K [] about the community of Serb municipalities no matter what you said of all the rules L [pacta sunt servanda] to the fact that L [everything that was decided can not be changed signed by three signatory parties and that it has to be accomplished so that we believe in the continuation of the process] his

answer was that **K** [the constitutional court of Kosovo has disputed it] and that **K** [he's not interested in it] and then he [...]

It is necessary, in order to allow a good contextualisation, to quote slightly longer passages, which will be the case with the following two examples, but there is no more economical way to show the effects we intend to describe. In (7) the speaker tries to show that the dialogue between the two parties is not working, and that it is not the fault of the speaker's side. The latter narrates an episode by first designating a speech (*vodili dijalog/had a dialogue*) and then quoting examples of what they said in two direct speeches, thus underlining their efforts already mentioned by *šta god da ste rekli/no matter what you said*. The L2 refuses to cooperate, to dialogue, which is supported by the two indirect discourses at the end of the example. The L puts the L2 on stage in order to better illustrate what they have personally experienced in their own view of things.

(8) [...] morate da razumete da sve što rade su trikovi samo da bismo priznali nezavisnost Kosova a deklaraciju o miru možete da potpišete samo sa suverenom i nezavisnom državom sad moje pitanje šta da mu kažete ako kažete ne onda ste vi protiv mira a oni su za mir i onda morate da uđete u objašnjenja L [] koja traju po 20 minuta pola sata zašto to tako ne može ali vi vidite iza svake rečenice koju izgovaraju L2 [] to je samo L2 [nateraće Amerika i EU Srbiju da prizna nezavisnost Kosova a mi im nećemo čak ni ponuditi ništa] vidite ne postoje ni želje za razgovor a to je ono što me brine mi smo spremni da štitimo tu najvišu vrednost uz slobodu a to je mir ali nismo [...] (00:57:55)

[...]you have to understand that everything they do is tricks only to get us recognise the independence of Kosovo so you can sign the declaration of peace only with a sovereign and independent country now my question is what should you respond to him if you say no then you are against peace they are for peace and then you have to make 20 30 minute long explanations about why you can't do such a thing but you see behind every sentence they pronounce it's just L2 [USA and EU will force Serbia recognise the independence of Kosovo and we won't even offer them anything] you see there is not even willingness to talk and that's what concerns me we are ready to protect that most important value beside freedom and that's peace but we're not [...]

Example (8) is similar to the previous sequence in that we have the same L-L2 pairing, but unlike (7) it can hardly be said that the direct speech imputed to L2 in the second part of the example is based on an explicitly presented statement. Moreover, the L indicates this by more or less specifying that it is his own interpretation ‘between the lines’ in *ali vi vidite iza svake rečenice koju izgovaraju/but you see behind every sentence they pronounce*. The L must therefore have understood the L2’s intentions through their utterance during the conversation in order to summarise and represent them in their own speech in this DD, which could be described as free since its only lexical link with the previous part is *to je samo/it’s just*. This representation further degrades the image of the L2, while the context weighing on the L’s perspective tells us about the latter’s apparent tactics. It is worth mentioning here the distinction made by Ducrot (1984: 199-203) between the speaker as such (*locuteur en tant que tel*), who is thus presented as responsible for the utterance, and the speaker as a being of the world (*locuteur en tant qu’être du monde*), who is the complete person behind the discourse. This second differentiation, after the first one between the empirical author and the speaker as there is no default sign of equivalence between the two, helps to better account for these effects on the speaker’s image described above. The speaker who describes a scene like the one in (8) and corroborates it with a DR does not give us information about themselves as a physical person, but about themselves as a simple speaker who is open to discussion and tries to discuss with L2, but they do not receive any answer and their efforts are doomed to fail because of the L2.

(9) [...] dakle bezbroj rizika ima bezbroj problema naše ponašanje mora da bude odgovornije ozbiljnije mi moramo narodu da govorimo istinu da ga ne obmanjujemo da ne pričamo bajke zato što nam predstoje izbori neka pričaju bajke oni koji ga lažu sve vreme znate kako izgledaju ti njihovi razgovori O+F [] sa strancima O [mi moramo da smenimo ovog diktatora Vučića vidite on ne želi da prizna nezavisno Kosovo] onda ih oni pitaju F [a je l’ vi želite] O [ne ne pa mi mislimo znate dragi drugi sekretaru i treća sekretarice i prvi zameniče druge sekretarice mi želimo da vas obavestimo da je najveći problem u razgovorima sa Prištinom nedostatak transparentnosti znate i demokratskog kapaciteta] ovi ljudi gledaju šta ove budale pričaju pa

kažu F [pa dobro sve je u redu nego nam recite kakvo vi rešenje vidite konačno] O [pa znate ta transparentnost i taj demokratski kapacitet je strašno važan vi nam pomozite da pobedimo Vučića a mi ćemo da se dogovorimo sa Albancima brzo za 15 dana mesec dana] F [u redu je to ljudi da ćete vi da se dogovorite sa Albancima nego šta će da bude to rešenje rezultat vašeg dogovora] O [pa nemojte sad mnogo da nas pitate nismo još spremni do ovog nivoa nismo došli da razgovaramo sa vama ali je najvažnije da nam pomognete da se ratosiljamo diktatora a onda će sve da bude drugačije i lakše] i zamislite kada imate takve neodgovorne tipove sa jedne strane i ovako neodgovorne ljude u Prištini sa ovakvim pristupom o čemu sam već pričao u šta to sve može da se pretvori u šta to sve može da se pretvori samo u jednom jedinom danu [...] (01:10:49)

[...] so there are countless riskscountless problems our approach must be more responsible more serious we have to tell the truth to the people and not deceive it not tell fairy tales because the elections are approaching leave fairy tales to those who lie to people all the time do you know whattheir conversations with foreign diplomates look like O [we must replace this dictator Vučić you see he doesn't want to recognise the independent Kosovo] then they ask them F [and do you want it] O [well no no we think you know dear Mr second secretary and Mrs third secretary and Mr first deputy of the Mrs second secretary we want to inform you that the biggest problem in the conversations with Priština is the lack of transparency you know and of the democratic capacity] those diplomates look at what these idiots are saying and respond F [well good everything is alright but can you present us your final solution] O [well you know that transparency and that democratic capacity is really crucial help us win against Vučić and we'll make a deal with Albanians quickly in 15 days or in a month] F [that's okay you'll make a deal with Albanians but what will be the result of your deal] O [well don't ask us now we're not yet ready at this point we did not come to talk to you but the most important thing is that you help us get rid of the dictator and then everything will be different and easier] and imagine when you have this kind of irresponsible individuals on one side and those irresponsible individuals in Priština with this kind of approach that I have already explained what can become of that what can all of that become in just one day [...]

Indeed, example (9) is one of the most complex, as the L enters into a digression depicting a whole conversation almost worthy of a theatre scene. After stressing the importance of a certain behaviour *naše ponašanje mora da bude odgovornije/our approach must be more responsible*, the L has to validate this instruction, contrast it in a

dialectical confrontation with another behaviour. This is why the L launches into an episode where, through the DRs, they make see and understand this behaviour. This episode is already in a 'difficult' context posed by the L with other DRs which it would be too cumbersome to reproduce here, but which would further facilitate the understanding of the L's behaviour. Once the introduction is made *ti njihovi razgovori sa strancima/their conversations with foreign diplomats*, and this discourse is designated, the second DR, which is a free direct discourse, makes things explicit and gives us a voice representing the opposition, marked O. This free DD characterizes the L as a being of the world and problematizes its position by containing, among other things, a polemical negation (Ducrot 1984: 217) *on ne želi da prizna/he doesn't want to recognize* supposedly countering the opinion of a supposed content *mi želimo/we do want*. The following direct speech attributed to F is based exactly on this point, and the free direct speech attributed to O immediately afterwards responds to it. This response is all the more interesting because we find a characterization of F as a being of the world also in *dragi drugi sekretaru.../dear Mr second secretary...*, these characterizations by a progressive reversal ending up characterizing the main speaker as such in a good way. By discrediting these potential speakers in the continuation of this diaphonic representation, the L regains and emphasizes their credibility, also by summarizing these DRs in the final part of sequence (9) by *i zamislite kada.../and imagine when*.

(10) [...] zadovoljan sam što smo juče sa delom ljudi koji su van parlamenta dakle drugačije misle imali dobar ozbiljan sadržajan razgovor i mnogi od njih su uprkos protivljenjima našoj politici rekli da P [su spremni da pomognu svojoj državi ne nama kao političkim subjektima ne personalno ali svakako da pomognu svojoj državi] ja im izražavam zahvalnost na odgovornom pristupu [...] (01:13:55)

[...] I'm pleased that we had a good serious meaningful conversation yesterday with a part of the group that isn't in the parliament they think differently so to say and lots of them said in spite of their objections towards our policy that P [they are ready to help their country not us as political subjects not personally but non the less help their own country] and I express my gratitude to them for their responsible approach [...]

The last example seems, at first sight, simpler than the previous ones, but here too there is some confrontation. The speakers represented in the indirect discourse are opposed to an enunciator whose attitude could be expressed by the content *da pomognu političarima na vlasti/to help the politicians in charge*, but it is difficult to say whether the negation *ne nama.../not us...* is a quotation or the attitude underlined by the L. We are inclined to say that it is also a content represented by the words *uprkos protivljenjima.../in spite of their objections...* In the end, this representation by a somewhat paradoxical return (*zahvalnost na odgovornom pristupu/gratitude for their responsible approach*) confirms again the validity of the argument and the good intentions of the L.

4. CONCLUDING REMARKS

After examining all the examples in the corpus, it can be affirmed on one hand that what they show can be fitted into the framework posited by Vincent & Dubois (1997: 131), namely that the direct/indirect bicephalous structure persists and that direct DRs are prevalent – 85% of the occurrences in the French corpus of the cited authors, 44% in our Serbian corpus. However, this shift needs to be studied further on a multitude of examples in order to draw definite conclusions. On the other hand, we can also agree with these authors that ‘conveying a message, simply reporting words’ is not, in the majority of cases in our corpus, the function of the DR. This process often seems to be, as Vincent (2006: 128) points out, a tool of persuasion, because the examples we have presented here show to what extent speakers can, against a certain linguistic economy, especially in (9), use different tools in order to make the listener understand the elements they want to demonstrate.

If we deconstruct the definitions analysed in part 1, we can assume to some extent that they are based on written language, except possibly ‘the listener’ and ‘the pause’, which are elements of spoken language. It should be pointed out that the studied examples show that this type

of traditional definitions of discourse representation, whether it is the case of Serbian or French, fail in the pragmatical frame, which implies the need for redefining the phenomenon in a more comprehensive way thus creating more stable theoretical tools for further analysis. Besides the longly debated question of the unicity of the uttering subject (*unicité du sujet parlant*) – establishing that the one who speaks is not necessarily and automatically the one who is spoken (about) (*c.f. e.g.* Ducrot 1984: 171) –, the examples emphasize yet again the question we tried to call attention to in this work, and that is the need of discourse representation strategies. The speaker's tendency to represent in various contexts is marked in our corpus to the point that we asked ourself who is really speaking. It seems to be evident at this stage that nearly every time the speaker in the corpus represents discourses, there is a point to be made argumentatively speaking, and we describe this conditionally as argument narrativization given that the represented discourses in context are 'on their own', i.e. the speaker generally does not provide any elaborate interpretation of the RDs, the RDs *speak on behalf of the speaker*.

In a complementary perspective, we would like to draw the reader's attention to an aspect that is important for representation in spoken language in our opinion, and that is the prosodic component, i.e. the actual material voice of the speaker. There are examples in our corpus of what L. Perrin observes when he writes that "[...] le locuteur s'emploie à montrer, reproduire mimétiquement, pasticher un discours objet ou un point de vue, à en produire une sorte de réplique qu'il prétend plus ou moins fidèle ou approximative [...]" (2005: 183). This kind of reproduction can be based on the lexical component (see (11) below), but also solely on intonation.

(11) [...] i pet puta ponovio **K** [kada kada kada] i to jedino pitanje **K** [kada] [...]
(00:33:26)

[...] and repeated five times **K** [when when when] and that single question
K [when] [...]

In the ongoing research for our doctoral thesis, we hypothesized that the speaker can use the elements of intonation to express his

or her attitude towards a represented content. S. Günthner (1999) provides an initial exploration of this subject. Indeed, this author investigates the way in which speakers communicate their points of view on the dialogues they report in order to understand which prosodic means are used by the speaker to express their agreement or disagreement with a represented statement. Although her findings on the use of prosodic features and voice quality to produce plurivocal discourses apply to everyday conversations in German, we believe that this phenomenon needs to be studied in Serbian as well as in French or English, but this would require a separate article just to begin with.

REFERENCES

- Bahtin, M. (1980). Marksizam i filozofija jezika. Nolit.
- Carel, M., Ducrot, O. (2009). Mise au point sur la polyphonie. *Langue française*, n° 164 (4), 33–43.
- Ducrot, O. (1984). Le dire et le dit. Minuit.
- Faireclough, N. (1995). Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language. Longman.
- Günthner, S. (1999). Polyphony and the 'layering of voices' in reported dialogues: An analysis of the use of prosodic devices in everyday reported speech. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 31 (5), 685–708.
- Ilić, I. (2021). Le discours représenté à l'oral (dir. A. Kuyumcuyan). Mémoire de master préparé et soutenu à l'Université de Strasbourg.
- Klikovac 2012: Кликовац, Д. (2010). Граматика српског језика за основну школу. Креативни центар.
- Koch, P., Oesterreicher, W. (2001). Langage parlé et langage écrit. *Lexikon der Romanistischen Linguistik*, I, 2, 584–627.
- Le Goffic, P. (1993). Grammaire de la phrase française. Hachette supérieur.
- Peco, A., Stanojčić, Ž. (dir.) (1972). Srpsko-hrvatski jezik (t. 1). *Enciklopedijski leksikon Mozaik znanja*. Interpres Beograd.
- Perrin, L. (2005). Polyphonie et séquence écho. *Dialogisme et polyphonie : Approches linguistiques*, 173–185.
- Piper 2014: Пипер, П. (2014). Нормативна граматика српског језика. Матица српска.

- Riegel, M., Pellat, J.-C., Rioul, R. (2014). *Grammaire méthodique du français* (5. éd.). Presses Universitaires de France.
- Rosier, L. (2008). Le discours rapporté en français. *Ophrys*.
- Roulet, E. (1985). L'articulation du discours en français contemporain. P. Lang.
- Roulet, E. (1997). L'organisation polyphonique et l'organisation inférentielle d'un dialogue romanesque. *Cahiers de linguistique française*, 19, 149–179.
- Roulet, E. (1999). La description de l'organisation du discours: Du dialogue au texte. Didier.
- Stanojčić & Popović (2012). Станојчић, Ж., Поповић, Љ. Граматика српског језика за гимназије и средње школе. Завод за уџбенике.
- Vincent, D., Dubois, S. (1997). Le discours rapporté au quotidien. Nuit Blanche éditeur.
- Vincent, D. (2006). Polyphonie et interaction. *Le sens et ses voix, dialogisme et polyphonie en langue et en discours*, 28, 127–142.

Igor Ilić

LA NARRATIVISATION D'ARGUMENTS VIA LA REPRÉSENTATION DE DISCOURS : EXEMPLE D'UNE INTERVENTION PUBLIQUE

Résumé

Le présent article tend à montrer en quoi consiste l'objectif d'un locuteur par rapport à la représentation de discours dans le cadre d'une argumentation. À partir d'un cadre théorique reposant sur les travaux de Ducrot (*cf. e.g.* Ducrot 1984) et ceux du cercle genevois de Roulet (*cf. e.g.* Roulet 1985), un corpus constitué d'une allocution d'un président serbe a été retranscrit et annoté en DR et ce corpus a permis de constater un phénomène qui peut être décrit sous réserve comme une narrativisation, à savoir que le locuteur essayant de prouver une certaine position représente des discours soit pour introduire cette position, soit durant l'argumentation, soit pour corroborer, en tout cas pour faire comprendre une position opposée à la sienne à l'aide du DR. Plusieurs exemples ont été tirés du corpus et analysés en détails afin de décrire ce procédé qui est loin bien sûr d'être généralisable, mais qu'il faudrait davantage étudier dans de différentes situations de communication.

Mots clés : représentation de discours, narrativisation, polyphonie