

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24297/jal.v10i0.8514>

Analyzing Literature Discourse of Being Unpredictable Aspect of the War Based on the Sociogram

¹Mohammad Rabieifar ²Anahita Sadat Ghaemmaghami

¹PhD student of French language and literature, Islamic Azad University, Central Tehran Branch

²Assistant Professor of French language and literature, Islamic Azad University, Central Tehran Branch

¹Humanitarianism755@yahoo.com ²Anahita.ghaemmaghami@gmail.com

Abstract

This article attempts to study the topic of war based on literary studies. For this purpose, this article examines the lecture of Claude Duchet about the sociogram of war. In this study, the unpredictable aspect of war, which means that we cannot imagine and understand the war, is studied. In all societies, you can find special thoughts and statements about war, but we always keep in mind incomplete parts of the war that do not encompass the integrity of the war. So, we need to look at this in other respects. Although war is not a literary subject, literature has to deal with it, ever since war is a human subject. Literature cannot escape war, whether it speaks about it or not.

Keywords: Discourse, Sociogram, War, Thought

Introduction

In the first decade of the twenty-first century, one wonders what has become of socio-critics born in the early 1970s around the review *Literature* and the works of Claude Duchet. In France, the term has almost no more course and we could see what must be called a progressive disaffection. Yet, the socio-critical project proposed to explore an essential aspect of literature that seems difficult to economize: the sociality or social dimension of literary texts. He intended to apprehend it, not in the vicinity of the written word, in what is often called the context, but in the very materiality of the speech. According to Duchet, it is because it is language, and work on language, that the literary text says the social. He does this not only from his theme but also through his ways of saying, modulating social discourse, directing the reader's gaze on reality. This remains to this day the main interest of socio-critique. Seeking the social dimension at the very heart of writing, she is committed to discovering what texts reveal to us about past and present society, even when they refuse to deal with it explicitly.

Hence, one of the striking features of war is the relation of war to the type of thought. In this case, the issues raised by the war for literature, social criticism must be able to find the right questions and answers. On the first side of the coin, war is a sort of challenge for thinking and also for literary analysis. On the other side of the coin, it is also a type of literature. This article attempts to analyze and examine the sociogram of war from the point of view of Claude Duchet. Claude Duchet (****), at the beginning of his lecture on the sociogram of war, refers to the "unpredictable aspect of war", defining it as the unpredictable aspect of war "meaning all that we cannot imagine of war or more precisely, war as an unpredictable category". He brings out the perspective of literature and discourse to the war. Therefore, this article starts with a short definition about discourse and literature.

Discourse

Etymologically, the word 'discourse' dates back to the 14th century. It is taken from the Latin word 'discourses' which means a 'conversation' (McArthur, 1996, p.35). In its current usage, this term conveys a number of significations for a variety of purposes, but in all cases, it relates to language, and it describes it in some way.

Discourse is literally defined as a serious speech or piece of writing on a particular subject. In this general sense, it incorporates both the spoken and written modes although, at times, it is confined to the speech being designated as a serious conversation between people. This restriction is also implied in the word when it is used as a verb. Carter specifies several denotations of the word discourse. "First, it refers to the topics or types of language used in definite contexts. Here, it is possible to talk of political discourse, philosophical discourse and the like. Second, the word discourse is occasionally employed to stand for what is spoken, while the word 'text' is employed to denote what is written. It is important to note, however, that the text/discourse distinction highlighted here is not always sharply defined (Carter, 1993, p.186). Nunan tells, "these two terms are sometimes used interchangeably and, in many instances, treated differently" (Nunan, 1993, p.233). Carter adds, "the discourse/text dichotomy is often correlated with the 'process/product' dichotomy respectively. Third, this word is used to establish a significant contrast with the traditional notion of 'sentence', the 'highest' unit of language analysis: discourse refers to any naturally occurring stretch of language" (Carter, 1993, p.188). In this connection, Trask clarifies that "discourse is not confined to one speaker or writer, but it can embrace the oral or written exchanges produced by two or more people. It is this last sense of the term that constitutes the cornerstone of the approach known as Discourse Analysis. Despite that discourse is defined as a chunk that surpasses the sentence, not all chunks of language can fall within the scope of this definition. In fact, what characterizes discourse is obviously not its supra-sentential nature as much as the entirety it has_ its coherence. To be more explicit, discourse is a complete meaningful unit conveying a complete message" (Trask, 1999, p.23). The nature of this whole cannot be perceived by examining its constituent parts, "there are structured relationships among the parts that result in something new" (Schiffrin, 2006, p.171). In the light of this, larger units such as paragraphs, conversations, and interviews all seem to fall under the rubric of 'discourse' since they are linguistic performances complete in themselves.

Literature

Definitions of literature have varied over time. Rose claims, "it is a culturally relative definition. In Western Europe prior to the 18th century, literature denoted all books and writing. A more restricted sense of the term emerged during the Romantic period, in which it began to demarcate imaginative writing" (Rose, 1996. P.406). Terry said, "Contemporary debates over what constitutes literature can be seen as returning to older, more inclusive notions; cultural studies, for instance, takes as its subject of analysis both popular and minority genres, in addition to canonical works. The value judgment definition of literature considers it to cover exclusively those writings that possess high quality or distinction, forming part of the so-called belles-lettres 'fine writing' tradition". He also mentioned, "anything can be literature, and anything which is universally regarded as literature has the potential to be excluded, since value judgments can change over time". Alternatively, Terry also said, "The formalist definition is that literature foregrounds poetic effects; it is the literariness or poetic of literature that distinguishes it from ordinary speech or other kinds of writing, e.g., journalism" (Terry, 2008, p.22-33). Meyer considers, "this a useful characteristic in explaining the use of the term to mean published material in a particular field (e.g., "scientific literature"), as such writing must use the language according to particular standards" (Meyer, 1997, p.87). Indeed Terry claims, "The problem with the formalist definition is that in order to say that literature deviates from ordinary uses of language, those uses must first be identified; this is difficult because ordinary language is an unstable category, differing according to social categories and across history" (Terry, 2008, p.79).

Sociogram and Sociocriticism

Sociogram First proposed by Claude Duchet, the concept has undergone, over the years, a new acceptance, including the contribution of the theory of social discourse. Duchet admits, "A student or a researcher who would like to learn about the concepts or get an idea of the sociogram's operatively by comparing several tests would have the greatest harm" (Duchet, 2011, p.67). Duchet does not pretend to make up for the situation. First, because the task would require a work of a magnitude too considerable, then because this work has already been completed, in part, by Claude Duchet, Regine Robin, Pierre Popovic, and Marc Angenot. Above all, it is for me, dissecting the concept, to report, at the same time, to a greater extent, on the general heuristic framework

that has guided and underpins the whole of my approach: socio-critics. Thus, it will also take advantage of this to situate socio-criticism historically and epistemologically, to confront the specificity of the comic medium and to circumscribe the interest of primary object: the diachronic study of a sociogram.

The term sociogram and sociocriticism was introduced in the first issue of *Litterature* in 1971 by Claude Duchet. The sociogram is, in its first definition, the mechanism of aestheticization. Moreover, the sociogram does not work, does not aim at the whole social discourse but the borders of a context. Duchet explained as follows, "The city, when it serves as a space for fiction, is as much spoken as it is shown or described: it is at the same time this space-environment and the textual result of preformed discourses that integrate it into these shifting, but polarized, co-textual sets of representative schemas, of idea-images, which have proposed sociograms. These discourses express just as well the global preponderance of the social discourse, its various actualizations and the outlines of collective imagination, that the speech of the writer engaged in his text and which makes text of his parole" (Duchet, 1988, p.88). He also claimed, "As a consumer and producer of ideologies, the text encounters, crosses and necessarily works on these diagrams and or sociograms, the diagrams are like the veins of these sets of representations, suspended in the text, which have proposed to name sociogrammes, which manifest themselves either by ensuring the coherence of an iconic system, by introducing a dysfunction, by provoking secondary images, or by producing diagrammatic and sociogrammatic extensions in a narrative or a description" (Duchet, 1986, p.105).

However, the theorist has given this version, which has become canonical. Duchet mentioned, "the sociogram as a fuzzy, unstable, conflictual set of partial representations interacting with each other, centered around 'a kernel itself conflictual'" (Duchet, 1986, p.52). Each term deserves a complete review and, again, the contribution of Régine Robin is valuable. Régine Robin mentioned, "Let's take the last definition proposed by Claude Duchet. Blurred together. This is a vague constellation. The word fuzzy here has almost a mathematical meaning. It means that this set is affected by randomness, a coefficient of uncertainty, that it is responsible for undecidability. The sociogram is defined by probable but uncertain elements. Unstable because the sociogram is constantly changing. It is impossible to fix it. Through socio-historical practices that are themselves moving, the sociogram can at some point become freezing in doxa, cliché, stereotype, but most of the time, the work of fiction will consist in making it move, to transform it, to move it by adding new elements, by sliding of meaning, by semantic reversal or by semiotic extinction. The sociogram never stops reconfiguring itself, changing its sense regime, moving the meaning of words. Conflictual, this is the essential word of the definition. No sociogrammatic activity without controversy. The absence of conflict is the sign of consensual and censoring fossilization. Set of partial representations. There are only fragments, fragments of representations, never a totality, a totality. Fiction plays on traces, not on assemblages. Interacting with each other. The set of representations, however partial, are interdependent. This set of representations is constituted, is configured around a nucleus, a conflicting nuclear utterance that can be presented in various forms: a stereotype, a maxim, a lexicalized sociolect, a cultural cliché, a motto, an emblematic statement, an emblematic character, an abstract notion, an object, an image. As it stands, worked through fiction, the sociogram is constitutive of the formation of the social imaginary" (Régine, 1986, pp.106-107).

It is by giving it as its object the text considered as linguistic matter, aesthetic process and semiotic device that Claude Duchet traces his program at the end of the sixties. The "sociality" of the text is attained by an internal reading, immanent, textual to use words loaded with contempt by sociologists. Duchet says, "It is in the aesthetic specificity itself, the value dimension of the texts, that the sociocritical strives to read this presence of works to the world that she calls sociality" (Duchet, 1979, p.4). Pierre in his article mentioned, during the analysis of the procedures of putting into text, the "socio-critique questions the implicit, the presupposes, the unspoken or the un-thought, the silences", writes Duchet, to which can be added the contradictions, the enigmatic passages, semiotic excesses, uselessness (supernumerary characters, risky enumerations), pure and simple invention (of a language for example), curious semantic relations, poetic conflicts or narrative aporias, in plain language: all this which is a matter of meaning and not of meaning (understood that the meaning is always movement and the meaning stop), all that testifies to a productive semiotic displacement, all that bears the trace of a semantic complexity and of this jump true in the imagination that characterizes the texts of literature. It is understandable

from this point of view that sociocritical is not a theory, a method or science. Not that it does not mobilize theoretical resources, not that it does not pose methodological questions, not that it is driven by a desire to know, but it necessarily aims first of all at the individual and not the general. The study of textualization feeds on the methods of description of the texts developed in what is called the "literary theory" and it is the actual invoice of the text in question which calls the description mode. This means that socio-criticism can be done by convening simple text analysis, thematic, narratology, rhetoric, poetics, discourse analysis, textual linguistics, and so on. and what it will take, including, for example, praxematics or psychoanalysis, but this convocation will be one of means, not of an end. It is up to the sociologist to choose the appropriate method of analysis and description; he will also go to his personal inclinations and will be asked to have imagination. Even if they would seem self-evident, these precisions are not useless at a time when the teaching of letters itself tends to reduce the interpretative freedom of young readers to a level of sorrow. They posit that sociocriticism is an active reading of texts without any other than very secondary consideration of the processes of creation and reception, which are axiomatically beyond its reach. And they emphasize why socio-criticism cannot be a sociology of literature: indeed, to connect a hermeneutic construction of which the critic/reader is responsible for material facts concerning the career or the existence of the author, that these are formatted in "position in the field" or indexed in a "sociological biography", it is either to join an occultist tradition which saw everywhere the paw of a conspiracy of the material or to cherish without knowing it the epistemological fetishism.

Claude Dochet in his speech in (****) claims and point out, "we are confronted with a strange word called sociogram". He offers various definitions of the sociogram. "Sociogram, in general, is a literary term, meaning a sociological analysis of literary texts. The term social is a concept that helps to understand what discourse is. Legal, political and everything that happens in the context of literary text".

On the other hand, he points out, "Sociogram is a way of imagining the world and literary text. A sociogram is a way of describing society in the literal sense of the word in French, not the practical meaning". And finally, he points out, "once again, He gives a simple definition, so sociogram is a set of opposing images that interact with each other around a semantic core".

Discussion

The important subject that Claude Duchet is considered the starting point in his speech is "war thinking or philosophy of war". In his view in the present time at the end of the 20th century, the idea of war has become relatively impossible. The war is here, the wars are there, and the human being can no longer think of its nature. The concept of war and its thinking influenced the whole of humanity at the end of the 20th century.

Claude Duchet in his speech claimes was from the Napoleonic wars of the 18th century, and especially from 1870, that the war was considered a problem for literature in the West. Of course, earlier in ancient times, too, the topic of war for literature had been raised, and from this point of view we can say that literature was born of the idea of war. But through national literature we can recognize values such as the methods of warfare and heroism recognitions to heroes and warriors.

However, in the 19th century, we see a literary approach to war in the form of a narrative or a literary novel. This has never happened. Napoleon's wars, for example, were not immediately novel. Balzac intended to write a war-themed novel that was to be called *Battle*, a novel that was never written but whose main idea is visible in other Balzac novels. Indeed, it was after Napoleon's wars in the 19th century that the narratives of war became literary novels. Here are two examples: Tolstoy's *War and Peace* and Emil Zola's *La Débâcle*. Thus, the 19th century is defined literally by the narrative and writing of war for the Duchess. Digest, understand and explore the concept of war.

With the First World War and the conflict of literature and the real war, the literature of war became more and more and explore. Several studies have shown that hundreds of novels, narratives, memories, and evidences have fed literally Europe and especially France since the beginning of World War I. This led to a new form of war literature until World War II through extremist ideas: the threat of nuclear war, the hypothesis of a Third World

War, and especially death camps. These events question the literature about what exists and not what it can or cannot say.

To cut a long story short, we can say that the literature of war is not able to speak of war when there is a great deal of change, as it has no reference philosophy. The 20th century loses all of its reference philosophies on war thinking, in fact the end of the century is the philosophy of war. None of the philosophies of the 19th century, in which we saw civilization and atrocity (in the 20th century), are not applicable.

After the First World War, philosophy no longer permits war thinking, but for moral warfare there are human ethics related to war rights, legitimate war, and defense war. Looking back to the books of philosophy in the 20th century, we can see that political, international, or moral rights have replaced philosophy of war.

In addition to what was said about the war in the 19th century, also in the 19th century, we are witnessing the interplay of literary discourse and narrative. Duchet says, "If I'm interested in war, it's not just because it's a matter of human involvement, but because it's a literary subject, and if literature fails to answer that question, then what comes next?" And since discourse and literature interact with each other so literary discourse can examine and portray war.

Conclusion

Duchet points out, "war is not a literary matter, but a human one that engages in human beings, and literature must deal with it in the ordinary sense of the word." Therefore, the war is the subject of different shows. We all have images of war, different pieces of lectures on the subject of war and for different purposes, to justify or condemn it, to think of it for better understanding and to attribute it to a value or anti-value system.

There is always talk of wars and wars in society, but we all have imperfect portions of war imagery that do not encompass the entirety of the war. All that is said and heard about war is only part of the reality. Religious War, Legal War, Cold War and etc. These different representations of war that all form a single social cohort, at least for a particular culture at a particular historical juncture, are usually incompatible and represent part of the apparent truth that there are wars.

In Duchet's point of view, we cannot write about war, and even if we can, we should not write about war, because writing about war even as a witness is a betrayal, because the reality of war cannot be attained, and in such a vast experience one cannot simultaneously be a subject and a witness. This is what literally begs the question, literature that cannot escape the war or talk about it! From this point of view, Duchet does not believe in the literature of war.

REFERENCES

1. Carter, R. (1993). *Introducing applied linguistics*. Penguin English.
2. Claude Duchet. (1971). *Pour une Socio-critique ou variations sur un incipit*, Littérature, vol. 1, n 1.
3. Claude Duchet. (1979). *Sociocritique*, Paris, Nathan.
4. Claude Duchet. (1986). *La Manoeuvre du bélier*. Texte, intertexte et idéologie dans *L'Espoir*, Revue des Sciences humaines, n 204.
5. Claude Duchet. (1988). *Pathologie de la ville zolienne*, dans S. Michaud et José Corti (dir.), *Du visible à l'invisible*, Paris, José Corti.
6. Claude Duchet et Patrick Maurus. (2011). *Un cheminement vagabond*, Paris, Honoré Champion.

7. Eagleton, Terry. (2008). *Literary theory: an introduction: anniversary edition (Anniversary, 2nd ed.)*. Oxford, Blackwell Publishing.
8. McArthur, T. (1996). *The Oxford Companion to the English language*. Oxford University Press.
9. Meyer, Jim. (1997). *What is Literature? A Definition Based on Prototypes*. Work Papers of the Summer Institute of Linguistics, University of North Dakota Session. 41 (1). Retrieved 11 February 2014.
10. Nunan, D. (1993). *Introducing discourse analysis*. Penguin Books.
11. Pierre Popovic. (2011). *La Sociocritique. Définition, histoire, concepts, voies d'avenir, Pratiques*, n 151/152.
12. ROBIN, Régine. (1986). *Le Réalisme socialiste: une esthétique impossible*, Paris, Payot.
13. Ross. (1996). *The Emergence of Literature: Making and Reading the English Canon in the Eighteenth Century*, p. 406. 1996. John Hopkins university press.
14. Schiffrin, D. (2006). *Discourse*. In W.F. Ralph & J. Connor-Linton (Eds.), *An Introduction to language and linguistics* (pp. 169- 203). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
15. Trask, R.L. (1999). *Key concepts in language and linguistics*. London: Routledge.