

# Methodology and Discourse Analysis: Containment or Paradox? (Methodological Approach)

Malika Dehamnia

M'hamed Bougara University - Boumerdes (Department of Arabic Language - Faculty of Letters and Languages), Algeria.  
Email: m.dehamnia@univ-boumerdes.dz

## Abstract

Discourse "in general" and "literary discourse" in particular opens up a space of questions and inquiries, as it is characterized by density. And allegorical Language, subjectivity and ideology There is the first meaning that we notice at first glance... and there is the second meaning that is not understood until after a stage of putting thought into practice and understanding what is between the lines. Therefore, it is necessary to look at the curricula that dealt with the idea of "discourse in the text" from a balanced perspective, including flexibility and comprehensiveness, which makes the "other"(i.e. the discourse) (the idea of containment) contains many problems, questions, and perhaps even contradictions that these approaches suffered from until they reached theorists, critics, and scholars who built their research and reflections on explaining and analyzing the discourse based on the credibility of those approaches, which they saw as the only "savior" for the dilemmas of the text. Which he suffered a lot and still is. So what is meant by the term discourse analysis? How have contemporary curricula extensively crystallized this concept?

**Keywords:** *Discourse, Analysis, Method, Text, Interpretation.*

## A- DISCOURSE AND ANALYSIS: IN EXPLAINING THE ROOTING OF THE CONCEPT

### 1. DEFINE THE TERM DISCOURSE

#### According to the Arabs

#### Linguistic level:

The lexical material of the word "khtb" indicates a number of linguistic connotations, So, "the speech" is the great and solemn matter, and it also includes "the greatness of the speeches," meaning great, and its plural is engagement. The sermon is published, proselytized, recited speech and the like, and a preacher or a man who preaches well in the sense of speaking well and who is proficient in the art of sermon, in the sense of good speech, (2)

The word "discourse" is mentioned in the Holy Qur'an, in many different ways and forms, including the Almighty's saying: (and when the ignorant address them [harshly], they

The source is in the Almighty's saying: (the Lord of the heavens and the earth, and whatsoever is in between them, the Most Beneficent, none can dare to speak with Him) (on the Day of Resurrection except after His Leave). (4)

What is meant is that they are not able to address God, as they do not have the logic of arguments or disputes. As for the Almighty's saying, (And We gave him wisdom and decisiveness of speech) (Sahih International)

And we strengthened his kingdom and gave him wisdom and discernment in speech what is meant by “determined speech” means (5) as for what is meant by “separating the discourse,” its meaning is:

- The ability to express what is in one’s mind and conscience
- As well as the ability to control the meaning and express it to the utmost of goals. What is meant is brevity in making a lot of meaning in a small word.

It also means clarifying what is right from what is wrong, what is real from what is fake, and what is right from what is wrong. In the end, it is a “clarification of speech,” as Ibn Abbas says, where things are not mixed and stations are not separated

On the other hand, no one is wrong when he asserts that the word “discourse” was mentioned in a striking way among the fundamentalists who based their work on it. Indeed, the basis of their research was that it was a real event and practiced by real speakers and in a given context based on communication between a sender who has the intention of understanding and a recipient who is prepared to understand. Discourse, then, is a verbal given and a speech event. (6)

In the dictionary of Ibn Faris, (7) the article “khtb” is mentioned, meaning speech between two people or between two talking parties. It is the exchange of speech between two people. It is said: he addresses him and he addresses him in a speech. In the past, the term “discourse” was used under the name “oratory,” and the latter was considered the record of nations and peoples and their historical awareness...

Oratory also had its place among the Arabs before and after the advent of Islam. “Before” considering those well-known literary markets - such as Souq Okaz, which speaks with eloquence and eloquence, and “after” when the concept of the new Islamic religion became established and impeccable speeches became inflamed and inflamed souls.

As for linguists, “Ibn Jinni” defined discourse, by which he means “speech,” as every utterance independent of itself, restricted by its meaning, emphasizing that the sentence is independent of itself, sufficient in itself, rich from anything else. (8)

**The terminological level:** We find in the book “Kashshaf Encyclopedia of Arts and Sciences Terminology” a definition of the concept of discourse - as stated by “Al-Tahnawi”

(9) - as “directing speech towards others for understanding,” (10) and what is meant by understanding is the ability to perceive and depict.

We conclude, then, that discourse is an expressive practice issued by two or several dialogue parties in order to understand and express various human needs. The goal - above all is for the other to understand the discourse, message, or code - as confirmed by the owners of communication theory - and this issued discourse can be either verbal or technical and is directed towards the other party, the interlocutor, and since the discourse is based on the principle of “understanding”. In the end, it is “a discourse on discourse, that is, it reveals the creative discourse parallel to it and extending with it.” (11)

As for contemporary Arab thought, the term “discourse” appeared in the middle of the last century - all of which is a contemporary period - and it is also a period of awakening for Arab thought. Even if the classifications of discourse in this thought are numerous and vary in terms of being renaissance, political, national or intellectual discourses, we adhere to some opinions of primarily philosophical thinkers. Muhammad Abed Al-Jabri is considered one of

the most prominent thinkers who dealt with the issue of discourse, its dimensions, and its intellectual and philosophical boundaries. The latter says in his book “Contemporary Arab Discourse,” defining the concept of discourse as a group of texts that have two sides: the sender’s side and the receiver’s side. The sender, by which he means the discourse, and the receiver, by which he means the interpretation. Or in other words, what the sender presents is the discourse and what reaches the recipient is the interpretation. (12) In this sense, it is the construction of ideas and their translation through points of view formulated in an inferential structure between premises, hypotheses and results.

In this context, Al-Jabri cites two types of reading the discourse:

The first: a literal reading, which reproduces reality and repeats it, thus creating a negative and naive reception of the discourse, which does not exceed the set limits.

The second: a live and effective reading through which the meaning is represented and assimilated, so that research is carried out at the level of the density of the text and beyond the apparent and obvious intentions until we stop at what is silent about and what is hidden in the discourse.

After all of this, according to Al-Jabri, the discourse is considered an extended debate between trends that differ in terms of both ideology and cognitive frameworks.

## 1.2 To the west

### Discourse in ancient Greek thought

#### Plato:

This concept has been in circulation since the Greek era, and precisely with the philosopher Plato, who tried to control the limits of the term based on his philosophical and intellectual dialogues (13) “about poetry,” considering the latter a form of “oratory” or one of its arts.(14)

What is the basis on which these dialogues were based? What is its purpose?

We limit our discussion of these dialogues to matters of rhetoric and nothing else.

It is worth noting that despite the flourishing of the art of rhetoric, philosophers saw it as one of the reasons for the decline of thought - as Plato emphasizes - because it would eventually become: “merely the ability to persuade and demagoguery... because it often distances itself from analysis and argument. ..And it will become mere rhetoric,” (15)that is, mere talk. Plato also called it “sophism,” and those who practice it are the sophists, or orators. His view of poets was contemptuous when he called them “orators” or “speech makers,” as he described them in his famous dialogues, because in his opinion, “they made mistakes on all important issues.” (16)

#### Aristotle:

On the other hand, Aristotle believes that rhetoric actually exists and is present by force and without a person having a will to do so. It is more and more effective to employ it in achieving lofty goals, away from sophistry and sophists. Meaning the necessity of establishing a kind of scientific rhetoric, and this is what made him think about his own rhetoric (or rhetoric). In his book “Rhetoric,” (17) he defines it as the ability to find the best way to persuade in every situation, and this is a reference to three basic contexts: A - the context of the statement B - the personality of the speaker C - the emotional intelligence of the recipient, and what is

meant by the emotional intelligence of the recipient is his comprehension of the code or The message is done using persuasion techniques in each of these cases.

### **Discourse in the contemporary linguistic and critical concept (Harris, Saussure, Foucault)**

In the modern linguistic concept, Leo Spitzer's book "Stylistic Studies" in 1928 was perhaps one of the oldest examples of discourse analysis. The first beginnings of the term appeared with the linguistics of Bezig Harris (L. Harris) in 1952, as he is considered the first to launch this term - the term discourse analysis - based on a report in which he developed a "generative grammar" in the late thirties of the twentieth century, and this Without providing a definition of dialogism, he only hinted that this field would be interested in studying dialogical dualities and some positions. Harris's work developed over the following decades and was transformed into "sublinguistic analysis" in 1982.

As for Ferdinand de Saussure, after the revolution he brought about in the field of linguistics after the publication of his book "Lessons in General Linguistics," he highlighted several dualities, including: the signifier and the signified, the inside and the outside, the synchronic and the diachronic, and the tongue and speech.

This last one: that is, the duality of language and speech, is what we will stop at as we talk about the problem of the term discourse according to this great linguist.

Saussure considered the tongue (or language) to be an encapsulating structure that refers only to itself, and by that he meant the scientific study of language. For him, language - in the first place - is a tightly closed linguistic system that does not refer to anything else outside of it. It is self-sufficient and specific to a particular society and no other. It is recognized and termed within the framework of a system of agreements and cognitive signs used by a group of individuals to express their daily needs, both individual and general. (18)

As for speech, it represents the aspect of actual practice or practical practice of language rules or linguistic signs, and it is subjective and individual, in which the aspect of creativity comes next to language and is subordinate to it. To the extent that the speaker understands the language and understands its rules, to the extent that he masters the art of speech, he is thus characterized by being individual, personal, emanating from the self, and characterized by impermanence. In the end, it is instantaneous, accidental, not homogeneous or consistent because it is a unique sign for each individual person. (19)

And because he (Saussure) did not give importance to the "speaking self," and we know the importance of the speaking self and its role in the manifestation of discourse, from this standpoint he has absent discourse, whether on the conceptual or terminological level, and thus he has opened the doors wide for the emergence of multiple approaches that investigate In the nature of this problem, we mean "the issue of the absence of discourse" and the attempt to fill its voids and clarify its differences by digging into its layers and cognitive system, which Michel Foucault calls epistémé.(20)

As for the contemporary critical concept, there is no critic or philosopher who has burdened this concept with connotations more than Foucault when he spoke about discourse, saying: "Discourse is the thing that we place at the center of contemplation... Discourse is no longer anything but a reflection of a truth that is in the process of emerging... Even when everything can take the form of discourse, and when everything can be said, and the discourse can be said about everything, because all the things that have revealed their meaning

and exchanged it can enter into the silent interior of consciousness and the self. (21)

What do we understand from this text? What are the meanings of the discourse according to this philosopher?

We infer from the text the following:

- Everything that has meaning is in some way “discourse.”
- This meaning can be spoken or written (oral or written discourse).
- The meaning cannot be reduced, because truth is always in the process of emergence and advancement, meaning that the discourse applies in time and place, and what prevails is the historical character; That is, continuity, permanence and change.
- Foucault's discourse is also characterized by its specificity when it talks about consciousness and the self, and thus it is independent of other discourses.
- Since discourse is the descendant of consciousness, if it is not consciousness itself, it regulates social relations and regulates behavior, it is - therefore - not only a product of the individual self, but may go beyond that until it becomes an institutional discourse or a specific branch of knowledge.

Thus, Foucault has opened a wide scope for researchers in the field of human sciences to research in the field of discourse analysis, as long as this discourse is - in general - “what has never been said yet.”

## 2. DEFINE THE ANALYSIS TERM

**Linguistic level:** It was mentioned in Lisan al-Arab by Ibn Manzur in the article (Hall Ll): He came to a place, meaning he descended, and he becomes a solution, meaning he descended, and the opposite of solution is migration, meaning anchoring at a specific point, and its opposite is departure and migration, and analysis of the body (i.e. particles) is returning it to its primary elements, and by that we mean dividing it into its original materials, with the aim of revealing it and revealing its hidden things, and this brings us to another term, which is “permissibility”, that is, making the text accessible or accessible as long as we search into its folds and hidden secrets, and then after that revealing them, revealing them, and revealing them.

The word analysis may have a physical, sensory meaning based on dividing complex matter into parts, as is the case in mathematics and logic, and its basic meanings become: division, fragmentation, and disassembly. (22)

It can also take on a psychological and moral meaning, represented by meanings such as: feeling, detection, inspection, diagnosis (diagnosing an individual’s behavior)...etc. from the meanings of analytical psychology. It also includes self-analysis, that is, studying oneself and analyzing one’s emotions.

As for the field of language: analysis means: explaining the components (components of language) such as: sounds and what falls within their framework: such as speech and how it is used, the origins of the word, its historical explanation and meanings, as well as the structure of the sentence, its parts and functions...etc.

Sentence analysis enters into social frameworks and cognitive contexts such as: psychology, sociology, anthropology, neuroscience, and literature.

**Terminological level:**

It is the explanation or interpretation and the work to make the text clearer and clearer. The word appears in the context of interpreting the text from within it without referring to its outside.

Analysis is one of the methods of literary criticism in dealing with texts. It includes detailed document study, analysis, and explanatory statement. From this standpoint, the critic focuses on the language, style, and mutual relationships between the parts and the whole.

There are many types of analysis in the text due to the many approaches used, and each approach has its own perception and mechanisms that distinguish it from all others.

**What does it mean to analyze a discourse?**

By this we mean that we discover that we have read another book similar to it. To this or that extent, the meaning then is that the discourse does not emerge from a vacuum, but rather from the fabric of a previous discourse. The text is a discourse on the discourse and a statement on the words that preceded it. The matter is related to previous cognitive and linguistic accumulations and transformations upon which the immediate event (which takes shape in the here and now) is built. The horizon of the future (or the reader) is based on the integration of previous and subsequent experiences through an accumulation of knowledge through which the past and the present merge in order to build a new future experience. Therefore, no matter how the reader feels or believes that he is facing a new reading experience, in reality it is only a small percentage. This is because discourses are renewed with the renewal of social issues, but always on the basis of a past that always affects and acts upon it and through which future experiences are built. To analyze a discourse means to talk about the tools of the discourse, how it expressed its meanings, the connotations that the tools carry, and how it used language, statement, and insinuation. However, the term discourse analysis remains ambiguous and highly ambiguous, and the possibility of saying and re-saying it remains open and constantly.

**B- MANIFESTATIONS OF THE DISCOURSE IN CONTEMPORARY CRITICAL APPROACHES**

The concept of “discourse analysis” had never existed before with all this critical orientation, and with all the meaning that this term carries, that is, the aesthetic, linguistic, educational, and even philosophical representations it carries, to the extent that we see today in both the literary and critical arena. Indeed, interest in it has increased in the contemporary era - with philosophy - in particular, and then with other sciences, curricula, and critical schools in general. Everyone made discourse their main subject, but it is clearly visible that the field of work in philosophy and literature had the largest share of this treatment. This is despite the fact that the literary and critical approaches in general have ancient philosophical origins and go deep into history. This is because the sophistication that we see in various aspects of the sciences (the sciences of language, aesthetics, psychology, linguistics, poetry, and the field of stylistic studies - all of this falls into the focus of this new and distinctive rhetorical discourse).

So how have contemporary critical studies - represented by contemporary approaches - addressed issues of text and discourse analysis? From what angles? From what perspectives? Is this because the vision of the text varies according to different viewing angles and multiple visions? What is the impact of all of this on the process of analyzing and interpreting the text?

Each critical approach or school has its own complex discourse emanating from a comprehensive discourse, and we even find They themselves have their own discourses, through which they represent their opinions and ideology, each within the framework of its own cognitive and productive field, especially after the important revolution that Saussure brought about in language, which changed the outlook on literary discourse, such that the latter seemed to be coexistent and compatible at times, and discordant and divergent at other times. So that each had its own angle from which the meaning was perceived. Examples of this include the following:

### **1. Structuralism and the problem of discourse analysis:**

Structuralism described the discourse as a scientific description based on an objective basis that is far removed from issues of ideology, standard and value, in order to reach the desired scientificity that is intended to be achieved in the human sciences, including literature, drawing parallels in this with scientific methods in mathematics, physics, natural and life sciences, and others. This was the famous phrase by Valéry Nothing outside the text is the cornerstone of structural analysis, as there are no external contexts to determine meaning, and all work is from within the text and within it only. (23)

How did structuralism lend the text to scales?

That was when it made him live in estrangement, the estrangement of denying his center or origin, when it changed the course of discourse, transforming it from a continuous discourse that delved into the depths of traditions (past, present and future) into a fragile discourse that lived in isolation and estrangement and faced the unknown. There is no talk about dynamism and significance outside the walls of the text, through what emanates from its codes and its superficial and deep structures. Through the concepts of simultaneity and binary opposites, the discourse is founded on the basis of “what is” and not on the basis of “what should be.” The basis of this discourse is discipline, harmony, and standardization, as there is no room to talk about the incidental and the individual in the text. There is the essence of what is called the relationships between the signs of the text. Every single word, every word refers to another, and the essence of everything is the identical relationships within the single text system. There is no room for examining the text as it was. It is seen by those who preceded the sonship. (24)

So what do we conclude from the above?

We conclude that structuralism viewed discourse on the basis that:

- Discourse from within the text only, where the language is integrated through a network of successive relationships.
- Isolating aspects of historical variables in the text and fixing the element of time - albeit temporarily - and this is an indication of praising the Synchronic study at the expense - if not rejection - of the Diachronic study based on the principle of difference and conflict (i.e. the study of the fluctuations of discourse)
- The meaning is centered within the perceptions and structural patterns of the text as a single block.
- Deferring the reader or recipient of the text and ignoring him completely during the process of decoding the discourse, as he is the absent or excluded party in the interpretation equation.

## 2. The poetics of discourse according to Tzvetan Todorov (25)

Todorov aims to interrogate the meaning in the text. He is the pioneer of the emergence of “poetics” in the field of literary discourse. In revealing the secrets of the discourse and its connotations, he uses multiple and heterogeneous tools, (26) either interpretation, interpretation, or explanation of the text, or reading, analysis, or criticism. Although the tools of use differ and differ, the goal is the same, which is to clarify the discourse and reveal its hidden intentions, and the basic goal behind this is to interrogate the text: “The literary text is not the one that delivers its paths to the reader from the first reading, but it is the one that takes the reader’s thinking and imagination to the furthest extent.” (27) “. Even more than that, it is the one that creates in its circle the largest number of questions and inquiries that may have no answers at all, because the text is the one that establishes itself by itself, weaving its own fabric and it is in constant solution and migration through a constantly changing reading path. Reading the text from Todorov’s point of view is a very important process through which deletion and addition are made according to what the requirements of the discourse require, because the meaning is multiplied by the multiplicity of recipients of the literary discourse, and from here also became clear his objections to the linguistic and structural theories that ignored other contextual aspects of studying the text, which he considered It is of utmost importance in clarifying the direction of the text and its interpretation.

Hence, his focus was also on the sender or the recipient of the text. The latter has a fundamental role in building the meaning, far from any copying process, as long as the reader’s presence is characterized by effectiveness and vitality, so that the contrast appears even at the level of a single text, given that the viewpoints of readers differ and their inquiries differ. As much as their structural peculiarities. (28)

## 3. The sociology of reading and issues of discourse analysis

After structuralism ended, isolated from the self and society, social approaches appeared and seemed close to reality and had a productive character that achieved its identity based on a social practice that attracted all the elements of discourse in the text, whether on the internal or external level of the effect. Sociological studies of reading and interpretation came to root the text once again in its historical context. It gives him nobility and origin and prevents him from the depressing isolation imposed on him by filial study. How did the sociological school view the discourse and how to analyze it in the context of the text?

The sociological approach to discourse gives importance to the discourse, the recipient (or future), and also to the text itself. In doing so, it seeks to present and explain the circumstances and circumstances through which the discourse is manifested, committing itself to a kind of comprehensive or comprehensive vision of the text, and at the same time drawing careful attention to the details.(29) This "Pierre Zema" looks at the text based on its crystallization of the ideas of his predecessors Lukács and Goldman... through what he called the sociology of the literary text, meaning the formulation of meaning based on the societal structure that produced it and from a sociolinguistic perspective, because the nature of the text is that it combines two linguistic and literary elements. Language, the language of discourse in the text, is not innocent at all, as it combines value, ideology, and subjectivity. Therefore, the discourse here is so burdened with connotations and conflicts that it infiltrates its edges: religious, linguistic, philosophical, and social, all alike, and in that there is a strong response to the structural practices that excluded the outside world. And its isolation, as everything is based on “representation” (représentation), and discourse - whatever its type - does not deviate from



the framework of its being a concrete reality. (30)

In particular, that is, conveying a reality that preceded it. Here the principle of the process of creativity is evident, not as a literal transfer, but as a representation.

## CONCLUSION

The term discourse analysis has become a critical term that has to do with the openness of the text and its intertextuality with other possible texts and other interpretations that sometimes conflict and support each other, in a growing process that keeps on going until it returns again. This is because the discourse has always been characterized by uncertainty, ambiguity, and density, within a textual network or fabric that is woven every time, but in a “different pattern” or with a will different from the previous will.

## Notes and References

- 1) In this study, we started from the axiom that “the text is more comprehensive than the discourse,” and on the basis of this axiom we built the parts of this article.
- 2) Abdel-Wasih Al-Himyari, *Discourse and Text: Concept, Relationship, Authority*, University Foundation for Studies, Publishing and Distribution, Beirut, Lebanon, second edition, 2014, p. 11.
- 3) Surat Al-Furqan, verse 63.
- 4) Surat Al-Naba, verse 37.
- 5) Surat Sad, verse 20.
- 6) Abd al-Wasi’ al-Himyari, *Discourse and Text*, Op. cit., p. 15.
- 7) Ibn Faris, *Dictionary of Language Standards*, Arab Heritage Revival House, first edition, 2001, p. 304, article (K-P)
- 8) Ibn Jinni, *Al-Khasa’is*, vol. 1, edited by Muhammad Ali Al-Najjar, Dar Al-Kutub Al-Misriyah Press, Cairo, Egypt, 1952, p. 17.
- 9) Al-Tahnawi (Muhammad Saber Al-Farouqi), an Indian scholar, who likely died in 1191 AH.
- 10) Al-Tahnawi, *Kashshaf Terminology of Arts and Sciences*, General Book Organization, Cairo, Part 2, 1972, p. 175.
- 11) Salah Fadl, *Rhetoric of Discourse and Textual Science*, Lebanon Publishers Library, first edition, 2014, p. 4.
- 12) Muhammad Abed Al-Jabri, *Contemporary Arab Discourse (Critical Analytical Study)*. Dar al Tala’i Publishing House. Beirut. Lebanon. 1994, p. 35.
- 13) What is meant by philosophical and intellectual dialogues: the “Ion” dialogue.
- 14) This concept “about poetry” is included in his famous dialogues.
- 15) Rhetoric and poetry according to Plato.
- 16) Ibid.

- 17) Public speaking. Aristotle. The writer highlights rhetoric techniques and their refinement in order to achieve the goal of persuasion.
- 18) Jaafar Laziz, The Concept of Linguistic Discourse, Diae Network, <https://diae.net/57410/dated> January 12, 2018.
- 19) Ibid.
- 20) Epistemé. Muhammad bin Sebaa, Discourse Analysis according to Michel Foucault, Dirasat Magazine, Volume 5, Issue 1, 2014, p. 132.
- 21) Ibid.
- 22) "The Discourse between the Arabs and the West," Samia Al-Zomrouda Al-Khadra, Maamri Science Forum, [maamri-ilm2010yoo7.com/t5282-topic](http://maamri-ilm2010yoo7.com/t5282-topic), 09/25/2011. Quoted from Ibrahim Abdullah: The problem of critical terminology (discourse and text), Afaq Arabiya magazine, Baghdad. Year 18. March. 1993.
- 23) Saussure talks about the internal text system.
- 24) Kamal Abu Deeb, The Dialectic of Invisibility and Transfiguration, p. 8.
- 25) Tzevetan Todorov (1939/2017) was born in Bulgaria and died in Paris. Literary critic, semiotician, and historian of ideas. Among his most important works are: Literature and Meaning, Poetics, Introduction to Wonderful Literature ... and others. He founded the magazine Poétique with Gerard Genette and contributed to reviving rhetoric and establishing the concept of poetics.
- 26) Muhammad Hammoud. Teaching Literature: Reading and Reading Strategy. Dar Al Khattabi for Printing and Publishing. Casablanca. Morocco. 1993, p. 19.
- 27) Khadija Hami: "Literature and Meaning. Tzvetan Todorov. Transforming a Poetics and Synthesizing a Method." Journal of Intellectual and Cultural Representations, p. 20.
- 28) Muhammad Hammoud, Op. Cit., p. 19.
- 29) Bart, Todorov, R. Maheu, F. Halin.. Theories of reading from structuralism to aesthetic reception. Translated by Abdel Rahman Bouali. Dar Al-Hiwar for Publishing and Distribution, Lattakia. Syria. First edition. 2003, p. 67.
- 30) Abdel Rahman Bouali, Op. Cit., p. 36.