



# First and Second Enunciators, Points of View, Modality and Intentionality Confronted to the Principles of Interpretation

Alain RABATEL\*\*

THE paper "First and second enunciators, points of view, modality and intentionality confronted to the principles of interpretation" offers a linguistic approach for the notion of point of view, based on an enunciative and pragmatic theoretical framework, which attempts to justify the locutors' intersubjective choices and the effects that they intend to produce on their addressees (including the readers of texts or speeches).

Firstly, the article reviews several external or internal conceptions of enunciation and of the various enunciative instances at work in any text (written or spoken). It compares Ducrot's and Culioli's enunciative approaches. It also emphasizes the originality of Ducrot's contribution, which consists in highlighting the existence, in the first locutor's voice, of other points of view than his own; these points of views of non-speaking second enunciators are expressed in the voice of the first locutor who, empathically, steps into someone else's shoes whose point of view he strives to reconstruct without necessarily making him speak (so without using a reported speech or explicit judgments), without necessarily sharing the validity of this point of view. In other words, these speechless points of view emerge in descriptive, narrative, informative, etc. utterances, which describe the real world and give information, in addition to the denotation, on the enunciator's point of view – who is not necessarily the locutor behind the utterance (or utterances, or even texts). The paper highlights the distinction between the locutor, whose voice is the source of

the utterances, and the enunciator, who is the source of the points of view; it then ranks the locutors and the enunciators, according to whether they are first/primary (i.e. the locutor who is the source of the primary utterances or responsible for the choice of the quoted/reported/represented utterances), or second (i.e. the locutor(s) represented in the first locutor's speech, or the non-speaking enunciators). The paper describes several cases of syncretism between the locutor and the enunciator – the locutor takes responsibility for the point of view (he considers it true and shares its values) –, or cases of disjunction – when a locutor reports or reconstructs a point of view that he does not share, (especially when this point of view co-refers to a non-speaking enunciator).

Secondly, the paper offers an integrative enunciative theorization of the notion of point of view, based on the construction of the objects of discourse (meaning their referenciation). Beyond the meanings of the complex lexicon *point of view*, in natural language, it gives the linguistic definition of the notion of point of view (POV), that is any utterance that gives information about any object of discourse, information not only on the object and its denotation, but also on how the enunciator considers/imagines/visualizes the object, expressing by this a POV.

The object of discourse expressed through the donation of the reference contains traces from the enunciator's the point of view on the object, regardless of the fact that the enunciator expresses an explicit judgment on the object, because of the implicit value judgments underlying the choice of (de)nominations, qualifications, modalizations, connections, aspectual-temporal markings...), as it is impossible to dissociate the object from its comment, as if subjectivity manifested itself only in terms of connotation and not of denotation. This enunciative formal definition is not totally unrelated to the meanings of the natural lexicon: the linguistic definition implies that POVs might include perceptions, opinions, or judgments, but remains much broader than that since any choice of denotation, any choice of words order makes sense. The POV can thus refer to a conception restricted to the study of perceptions or concern any utterance, if the analysis considers the choices of referenciation of the objects of discourse. The point of view is not limited to the propositional content of utterances, but also takes into account the enunciator's modal intent on the object as well as the speech acts underlying the predications. Thus, any utterance (or set of utterances) can be read in two ways: objectively, the denotation describes a reality that seems separate from the enunciators; subjectively, the descriptive, informative, argumentative elements, etc. are reinterpreted according to the enunciators' desires, motivations, determinations. Furthermore, these strategies are made up by the locutor/first enunciator (the narrator in a narrative context, the journalist in a media context, etc.),

who gives his POV on the POV of his character(s) whose acts and speech he reports. Based on a large number of literary examples (fictional texts, third person) or media examples, the paper highlights several important characteristics:

- A) The fact that the POV is indicated by full or empty words, or by grammatical morphemes. Thus, it draws up a large list of marks of the POV requiring a cross-linguistic analysis, which, while being anchored in the analysis of sentences, opens up to transphrastic issues, of the textual order.
- B) The fact that the POV can be expressed by a word (*micro-POV*) or by a predication (*meso-POV*), or even by several convergent predications (*macro-POV*) and can include more or less traces of the enunciator's subjectivity. The fact that these POV can apprehend, in a global manner, the object of discourse (*embryonic POV*), then go on to a more analytical stage of the object (*represented POV*), possibly appear in judgments, explicit comments (*asserted POV*).
- C) Nevertheless, the paper stresses that it is arguable to consider that only the marked elements are subjective and only the unmarked elements are objective. They might seem so, but one must always keep in mind the (subjective) strategies can give the utterances an objectifying turn. This remark is decisive for analyzing the phenomena of enunciative deletion, which are legion in the media discourses, where the marks of the first person are almost forbidden, but where the subjectivity is not absent. The same goes for the effects of the implicit or of putting into text.
- D) The POVs can refer either to the first enunciator – auto-POV – (the narrator in a narrative context, the journalist in a media context, etc.), or to second enunciators – hetero-POV – individual (characters in narrative context, personalities in media context) or collective.

Thirdly, the article examines the notions of subject and of intentionality. It begins by rejecting the linguists' reluctance towards the notion of subject, justified by an anti-psychologism that would reduce the language to an aware intention to speak of a subject that exists outside the language. It is not because the subjects speak and think based on preconstructions, pre-speech, not because they are strongly constructed and constrained by them, by norms and genres, as well as by their personal history and their time, that we must deny them this responsibility of making certain choices and not others. "What speaking means" does not correspond to the expression of a completely clear and fully conscious intention to speak, anterior and external to language, which would only have to be encoded then decoded,

but plays on the tension between what the utterance/text says and what the addressee knows about the locutor and his intentions. In all cases, the subjects are related to a certain intentionality, essential for the addressees' interpretative process, but also for the interaction and the action. In reality, the subject is mostly constructed by the text itself, by the choices of referenciation. These choices help explain the abstract notion of enunciator and are crucial for the interpretation of points of view. This intentionality is reflected in the (motivated) relationships between perceptions, thoughts, words, actions, and it may correspond to the intentions of enunciators or second locutors, who are often agents of the utterances, and/or those of the first locutors/enunciators, or those of the addressees who interpret the texts, seeking to reconstruct the two previous levels of intentionality and to combine them with their own assumptions, their own desires, their own history.

In conclusion, the paper underlines how the notion of the POV helps the reading of (all) texts by going beyond their pseudo-transparency, by revealing their complexity, by offering tools to describe an intricate web of intentionalities and of POV, not for the sake of complexity in itself, but because things are indeed complex. Such a lesson concerns both the analysis of literary and non-literary texts, of narrative, descriptive, informative/explanatory, argumentative or injunctive/instructional texts. The same applies in the case of reception and of the addressees/allocutors or recipients who are more or less passive or active, and who can benefit from adopting an active posture.

**Keywords**— enunciator, points of view, intentionality, interpretation.

#### SELECTIVE REFERENCES

- [1] DUCROT Oswald, 1980, « Analyses pragmatiques », *Communications*, 32, 11-60.
- [2] DUCROT Oswald 1984, *Le dire et le dit*, Paris, Éditions de Minuit.
- [3] DUCROT Oswald, 1989, *Logique, structure, énonciation*, Paris, Éditions de Minuit.
- [4] Ducrot Oswald, 1993, « A quoi sert le concept de modalité ? » dans Dittmar Norbert, Reich Astrid (éds), *Modalité et acquisition des Langues*, Berlin, Walter de Gruyter, 111-129.