The Astuteness of As Astúcias da enunciação [The Astuteness of Enunciation] / *As astúcias d'As astúcias da enunciação*

Oriana de Nadai Fulaneti*

ABSTRACT

This article discusses issues related to enunciation, a dimension of fundamental importance to the conception and study of language. More specifically, it focuses on the way this issue is handled by the Brazilian linguist José Luiz Fiorin in his work *As astúcias da enunciação* [The Astuteness of Enunciation]. The construction of enunciation in his work will gain special attention because of its importance to Brazilian discourse studies, in general, and to studies in French semiotics, in particular.

KEYWORDS: Enunciation; Astúcias da enunciação; Semiotics

RESUMO

Este artigo tem por objetivo discutir questões ligadas à enunciação, dimensão de fundamental importância na concepção e estudo da linguagem, focalizando, de forma especial, a maneira como, no Brasil, essa questão é tratada pelo linguista José Luiz Fiorin em sua obra As astúcias da enunciação. Um dos aspectos a ser observado é, precisamente, a construção enunciativa da obra, cuja importância pode ser percebida nos estudos discursivos brasileiros em geral, mas sobretudo nas pesquisas relacionadas à semiótica francesa.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Enunciação; Astúcias da enunciação; Semiótica

---

* Universidade Federal da Paraíba – UFPB, João Pessoa, Paraíba, Brazil; od.fulaneti@uol.com.br

Introduction

One of the ways to discuss enunciation as a key aspect of language is taking the work of José Luiz Fiorin − *A astúcia da enunciação [The Astuteness of Enunciation]* [1] − as a guide for reflection. The first research question it has brought to mind, taking into consideration how this enunciation is produced in daily discourses and at the same time in a metalinguistic way, was: where is this astuteness in a very important work that deals with such a dimension of language? Quickly and promptly a possible answer came to mind: in the way the work is enunciated, that is, in its enunciation, in its enunciative thread. To some extent, especially for scholars of enunciative phenomena, this answer can seem obvious, although it is not. Later, however, the characteristic posture of this semiotician led me to a second question: How can enunciation imply astuteness and where is this astuteness in the work that is the object of this study? In other words, in what way is *As Astúcias* astute? In this context another question arose: Why is Fiorin's work astute? The search for these answers, especially the response regarding the reason for this astuteness in enunciation, is what guided the study presented here.

Regarding enunciation, it must be emphasized that the reader will also notice, in this article, a very conventional enunciative strategy: there is a clear distinction between the enunciator's indirect speech of this text and Fiorin's considerations concerning enunciation in the work that is the object of this study, as well as this enunciator's direct speech about what Fiorin has said. Therefore, most of this article tries to present a glimpse of the object of analysis, refraining from judgments, but making some comments on what I consider to be constitutive of the astuteness of the enunciated object.

At the end of this enunciative play, which is typical of a scientific article, the reader will decide whether the goal of this study was achieved and whether it was productive, enunciatively "speaking."

---

[1] Fiorin (1996). This work is a result of the author's study used in the process of his becoming a Full Professor at the University of São Paulo. The book's 303 pages contain Introduction, four Chapters, and a Conclusion.

1 On the Enunciative Proposal

In the passage that introduces the enunciative issues which will be discussed throughout the work that is the object of this study, the language, this mysterious and intriguing object, is the first subject matter to boost the author's reflection, who by evoking myth and science claims that

> The intention is to show that the myth, taken out of the place in which it is, constitutes a man's explanation for what is inexplicable, that is, it is a summary of the knowledge of each culture regarding the relevant questions human beings have always faced.
> [...]
> While science is not able to explain the origin of things and their meanings, there will be always a place for mythical thought [our translation] (FIORIN, 1996, pp.9-10).[2]

From there, several questions emerge, i.e., *Where do languages come from? Why are there so many?* Such questions have been continuously made by men since the beginning of the world as we know it and can be seen in narratives that generated different hypotheses. For example, the Genesis flood narrative served as a basis for the hypothesis of the monogenesis of languages; the Tower of Babel story explains the mystery of the diversity of languages, attesting that many scientific issues have emerged from myths. Not by chance both Generative Grammar and Philosophical Grammar, when trying to find linguistic universals, started from the idea of a single protolanguage, which is so common in mythical narratives.

Keeping the mythical, the biblical and the linguistic together, Fiorin points out that the expulsion from the Paradise leads to the entrance to human condition, that is, the placing of man in History. Within the scope of language, historical chronology corresponds to language instabilities, discourse, and the transition from a language system to discourse through enunciation. Such view is corroborated by Benveniste in his seminal works on enunciation, which were indubitably the basis for Fiorin's reflections. As already observed in the introduction of this reflection, through Fiorin's *Astuteness of*

---

[2] Text in original: "O que se pretende é mostrar que o mito, extraído do meio em que ele é, constitui uma explicação do homem para aquilo que é inexplicável, o que significa que é uma súmula do conhecimento de cada cultura a respeito das grandes questões com que o ser humano sempre se debateu. [...] Enquanto a ciência não puder explicar a origem das coisas e o seu sentido, haverá lugar para o pensamento mítico."

Enunciation and other scholars' studies, the thoughts of Benveniste come to the Portuguese language and to Brazil.

The introduction and insistence on the theme of the constitutive presence of the *instability of language*, for instance, is justified on the grounds of a historical linguistic study. According to Fiorin, after many contributions from traditional schools, such as Philology and the Hermeneutics − and the reign of the episteme of Structuralism − many theoretical trends started focusing on instabilities, among which are Sociolinguistics, Conversation Analysis, and, above all, Discourse Theories. Once more, Fiorin tries to give a universalizing character to his reflection on the historicity of the studies on enunciation. Even Chaos and Catastrophe theories are put by him in this historical cauldron in order to support the argument that the investigation of instabilities is found in the spirit of time in sciences related to languages. To Fiorin, insofar as myths and discourse theories have two central theses in common − the first being that discourse even under the coercion of system and structure belongs to occurrence, hence to History, and the second that occurrences cannot happen out of time, space and person − a parallel is drawn among the aforementioned myths and discourse theories.

In an astute way, from these considerations Fiorin establishes the major elements of enunciation, enunciative phenomenon, and their relation to discourse, leading the reader to think over the fact that through instabilities, discourse creates meaning effects and we, as scholars of discourse, when understanding enunciative creations, also comprehend the discursivization process. He emphasizes, however, that instability is not a synonym for chaos or disorder, but only something that changes place, a feature that ensures the possibility of a systematized work of language studies:

> To follow a principle of Chaos theory, this instability is not random, but it is a result of certain phenomena. The study of instability demands the establishment both of its conditions of being and the semantic matrices of meaning effects, which in a process of growing concretization will reveal such conditions and matrices in each text [our translation] (FIORIN, 1996, p.20).[3]

---

[3] Text in original: "Essa instabilidade, para seguir um princípio da teoria do caos, não é aleatória, mas resultante de certos fenômenos. O estudo da instabilidade exige que se estabeleçam suas condições de realização e as matrizes semânticas dos efeitos de sentido que, num processo de concretização crescente, vão manifestar-se em cada texto."

Before the emergence of Fiorin's work *The Astuteness of Enunciation*, most Brazilian linguistic studies used a certain enunciative category (i.e., the choice of time or person) randomly. However, Fiorin (1996), inspired by Benveniste (1974),[4] who presents person, time and space as categories of enunciation, conceived the hypothesis that there should be a single explanation for these facts, that is, all the categories of enunciation should be ruled by the same principles. Fiorin's (1996) double purpose is then established: on the one hand, he describes the categories of person, time and space in the Portuguese language, and on the other hand, he shows how they appear in discourse and in the effects of meaning they create. Thus, the innovative proposal is to build a typology of the operation of discursive categories in both stable and unstable situations, thereby signaling his intention of carrying out a careful study on enunciative instabilities and proving they are not random. On the contrary, they are under certain coercions, which ensure the existence of meaning. He reiterates that the explanation for instabilities is not in the systemic or phrasal order, but in the discourse domain.

The conclusion that can be drawn from this concrete enunciative proposal, which motivates important language study issues, is that when Fiorin (1996) mixes myth and science, enunciation and discourse, not only does he place linguistic studies in contemporary terms, but he also places their objects in human issues, as Benveniste and other scholars had done before him. In other words, Fiorin (1996) goes beyond methodological hermeneutic techniques typically used in the investigation of linguistic categories.

2 On Theoretical Principals

Here the path to reach the concept of enunciation in Contemporary Linguistics is traced by the author who briefly outlined a historical report on linguistic studies until the emergence of Enunciation Theories. Quite significantly, the starting point for the discussion of theoretical principles has the same title of the third chapter of the *Course in General Linguistics by* Ferdinand de Saussure: Object of Linguistics.

---

[4] BENVENISTE, E. *Problems in General Linguistics*. Translated by Mary Elizabeth Meek. Miami: University of Miami Press, 1974.

The first question approached here is the distinction between *langue* and *parole* and the Genevan master's choice, considering that his epistemological choice of studying the *langue*, *leaves out* use, history, and instabilities. Once again, it is important to point out that the return to Saussure is essential to understand, for instance, how Benveniste also evokes the Genevan master to reach the concept of enunciation, which to him was a link between language system and discourse. As a thinker and a knowledgeable scholar of language and his studies, Fiorin does not present Saussurean linguistic theory as obsolete. On the contrary, he emphasizes its importance for Linguistics and the advance of language studies on discourse. The change of perspective in language studies is seen by Fiorin as a necessity to broaden the object of analysis. Making use of Cervoni (1987) he comments that

> [...] the Saussurean proposal and a certain Structural linguistics, with respect to *langue/parole*, show three restrictions:
> a) they do not have an updated model (of converting *langue* into *parole*), [...]
> b) they do not realize that there are laws which organize discourse, by affirming that *parole* is the power of freedom and creation;
> c) they exclude from Linguistics every component of communication, but the code [our translation] (CERVONI, 1987, p.10 *apud* FIORIN, 1996, p.29).[5]

After Fiorin discusses what other linguists have considered limitations of a "certain" structural linguistics, he shortly explains Chomsky's generative proposal. In order to distinguish among different areas in Linguistics, he makes it clear that both the Saussurean and the Chomskyan theories are a Linguistics of *utterances* phrase-and-sentencewise, that is, they see enunciation as instances produced by particular subjects, in particular situations, without the possibility of systematization. At the end of this historical path, Fiorin mentions two remarkable linguists in this context: Roman Jakobson and Émile Benveniste, showing the importance of their work concerning the recognition of the centrality of enunciation in the constitution of discourse. In Fiorin's opinion these authors' reflections led enunciation to be viewed as a system, because they showed that

---

[5] Text in original: "[...] a proposta saussuriana e uma certa Linguística estrutural, no que tange à relação *langue/parole*, apresentam três limitações: a) não ter um modelo de atualização (de conversão da *langue* em *parole*), [...]; b) não perceber que existem leis de organização do discurso, ao afirmar que a *parole* é o reino da liberdade e da criação; c) excluir da Linguística os componentes da comunicação que não o código."

even in the variety of particular acts there is a general scheme that seems invariant. From this perspective, a new object of Linguistics has emerged: linguistic use.

Fiorin concludes this path by reiterating that as enunciation is a constitutive part of discourse the latter has to be treated as language in use and, as such, cannot be understood as a set of dissociated phrases; its signification has to be seen as a whole. It is with this thread of thoughts that the author makes the object of analysis alluded to in the title salient: *enunciation*. At this point, he brings to light the definition and the concept of enunciation and shows some fundamental elements that need to be taken into account so that its study can be undertaken.

Among the definitions of enunciation, Fiorin chooses the classic one given by Benveniste: "putting the language into operation through an individual act of use" (1974, p.80).[6] However, he also revisits the positioning of Oswald Ducrot (1976) and Eric Landowski (1989), showing that he hasn't lost sight of the various moments in which the enunciative dimension of language is brought to the forefront of discussions, a point that I have been trying to emphasize from the beginning of this paper. When he refers to Landowski, Fiorin begins to hold a close dialogue with French semiotics, the epistemological axis which will set the tone for his study from beginning to end. And his reader will be seen as competent in the semiotic terminology used, as the considerations made in the following paragraph show.

For Fiorin there are three aspects that are key to enunciation: the necessary competences to produce an utterance; the ethics of the information given, and the fiduciary agreement between enunciator and enunciatee. As he sees it, the necessary competences for the production of an utterance are of different natures: linguistic, discursive, textual, interdiscursive, intertextual, pragmatic, situational, etc. They are competences that are fairly shared between enunciator and enunciatee; the bigger the intersection between them, the better will be the comprehension of the utterances produced−in theory. What Fiorin calls discursive ethics is concerned with the cooperation principle, with conversational maxims and their violations and, in general, the "code of ethics" which establishes what is considered honest as a verbal exchange.[7] Finally, the

---

[6] For reference, see footnote 4.
[7] Cf. Grice (1979), Gordon & Lakoff (1971), and Orecchioni (1980).

fiduciary agreement between enunciator and enunciatee determines the truth status of the text.

To continue with these reflections, Fiorin details two instances that aim to clarify how enunciation is being understood: the presupposed linguistic instance and the instance of the establishment of the subject. Regarding the first, Fiorin mentions the semiotician Manar Hamad (1983), who discusses enunciation as a process and a system, as well as Catherine Orecchioni (1980), who differentiates between enunciative facts in a *broad* sense (essentially syntax and discourse semantics) and enunciative facts in a *strict* sense (basically the deictic). Then, he takes his theoretical position and these latter studies as a starting point to explain the concepts of *enunciated enunciation*, *reported enunciation* and *enunciated utterance*, explaining that his focus is on deictics.

Regarding the second, the instance of the establishment of the subject, Fiorin once again evokes Benveniste to deal with subjectivity in language, reaffirming that man only exists *in* language and *through* language and, thus the category *person* is the primary language axis; the existence of time and space depend on it. Under the semiotic perspective of enunciation, some concepts are crucial for this discussion, namely *shifting out* (internal, external) and *shifting in* (of enunciation x of enunciate); homocategoric x heterocategoric); enunciative *shifiting out*, *enuncive shifting out* and their meaning effects. At this point, he explicitly recalls French semiotics (GREIMAS; COURTÈS, 1979)[8] and the French discourse analyst Dominique Maingueneau (1981), deepening and widening fundamental concepts for the theory of enunciation. Benveniste is the starting point and is the epistemological inspiration that motivates Fiorin to think about the ways of enunciation in the Portuguese language. The other authors, either from Greimasian semiotics or from the French DA (Discourse Analysis), appear as a proof that enunciation is an instance which has been studied by an array of different lines of thinking regarding language studies and which plays a major role in both semiotic and discursive studies.

All this theoretical apparatus, with a clear Greimasian terminology, is associated with typical characteristics of Fiorin, who is also concerned with Literature and other Arts. In his study there are examples of the *shifting in* and *shifting out* phenomena, which are concepts with which not all linguists or discourse analysts are familiar in different

---

[8] GREIMAS, A. J; COURTÈS, J. *Semiotics and Language: An Analytical Dictionary*. Translated by Larry Crist et all. Bloomington, In: Indiana University Press, 1982 [1979].

languages and different planes of expression. By evoking films and paintings and clarifying the scope of these notions, he also demonstrates that the concepts presented are valid for all kinds of language and not only for verbal language.

In short, Fiorin follows a theoretical path that begins in Saussure and ends in Semiotics, and by doing so he determines the three elements of enunciation that will be the object of analysis, discussion and interpretation, namely person, time and space.

3 On Person

Benveniste is at the heart of Fiorin's (1996) study, when he deals with *person* under an enunciative perspective. Thus, he instructively discusses Benveniste's notions of *person* and *nonperson*, illustrating the theory by using literary and media texts. Articulating grammar and discursive knowledge, Fiorin shows how the category of *person* is defined in language by personal and possessive pronouns. Innovation in Fiorin's work results from the accomplishment of the aims of his research, that is, a full account of the senses of the possessive pronouns in the Portuguese language, as can be seen in the categories of *multiplied person*, *subverted person*, *spread person*, *split person*. For each one of them, Fiorin calls forth linguists, discourse analysts and semioticians who give support to his understanding while he continues providing examples.

On referring to the *multiplied person*, Fiorin starts from the concepts of constitutive and shown heterogeneity, examining the heterogeneity of language and presenting the variety of enunciative instances followed by numerous examples from literary texts. At the end, he gives a detailed explanation on the meaning effects of the use of quotation marks, meeting again with the work of Dominique Maingueneau.

With regard to *the modified person*, it is the functioning of direct, indirect and free indirect speeches, as well as the exploration of a variety of possibilities of meaning effects, which are produced by them, that paves the way to a comprehensive explanation of the topic, which is mostly exemplified by Brazilian literary works. The *subverted person* is characterized through a survey of the possibilities of the *shiftings in* of the category of person followed by a presentation of its realizations in language, as well as by an explanation of its meaning effects. To end his considerations on this category, Fiorin shows the regularities of the operations of the actantial *shiftings in*, demonstrating

and insisting that this operation is not chaotic, but systematic, and that, generally, it can produce meaning effects of *approximation* or *detachment*, of *objectivity* or *subjectivity*. The *spread person*, the one who exceeds, so to speak, is presented by the classic example of the way Italian people communicate in Brazil (he *me* arrives and *me* goes, always without saying anything).

Regarding the *split person*, Fiorin offers a close study on the narrator, with the help of different trends in language studies, essentially basing it on works of literary criticism (BARTHES, 1971; GENETTE, 1972; GALVÃO, 1972) and on French semiotics (GREIMAS; COURTÈS, 1979;[9] FONTANILLE, 1989; BARROS, 1988). Initially, it is the difference between the *narrator* and *observer* that is brought to the front; secondly, it is the *observer* categories, such as partial focalization (internal or external) and total focalization, to distinguish between observer/narrator and focalized narration. It is worth highlighting the shiftings in macro textual level, which occur when over the course of a narrative, for instance, an *I* refers to a *he* and vice versa. The example is from *Memorial de Aires* authored by Machado de Assis. In this narrative, the narrator seems to be Aires, but it is, in fact, someone else who reproduces his manuscripts.

In conclusion, the relationship among science, religion, myth and fiction that has been mentioned in the initial enunciative proposal recaptures the scope and the comprehension that Fiorin (1996) attributes to enunciation studies:

> The level boundaries are movable. To go beyond them, mix them, make the actant of a level the actant of another produces a meaning effect of fiction, of meta-reality, of setting free from rigid mimetic conventions. After all, fiction is pretense. It is the process by which man has the creative power assigned by myth to divinity. By means of the word, other realities as real as the one that gets this designation are created (1996, p.124). [10]

---

[9] For reference, see footnote 8.

[10] Text in original: "As fronteiras dos níveis são móveis. Ultrapassá-las, misturar os graus, fazer de um actante de um nível actante do outro produzem um efeito de sentido de ficção, de meta-realidade, de liberação das rígidas convenções miméticas. Afinal, ficção é fingimento, é o processo pelo qual o homem tem o poder criador atribuído pelo mito à divindade. Com a palavra, cria outras realidades tão reais quanto aquela que recebe essa denominação."

4 On Time

By putting myth and science together once more, the reflections made by Fiorin (1996) take into consideration the way time itself is conceived by Greek mythology, the Bible and Philosophy to finally reach temporality in Linguistics with the presence of Aristotle and Saint Augustine to illustrate its different conceptions. To Aristotle, time is not a question of poetry, but of physics; it is a "physical, natural and cosmic phenomenon." To Saint Augustine, who in the book XI of his *Confessions* reflects at length on time, the only time that can be measured is the present, which is divided into three tenses: the present of past things (memory), the present of future things (expectation), and the present of present things (attention). In other words, what is measured is the impression that things leave in our spirit.

On accepting linguistic time, Fiorin states that temporalization in language is imprinted in discursivization, because to him when man narrates he builds in discourse the simulacrum of his actions in the world, displaying in discourse "[...] what is past, what no longer exits, what does not yet exist; everything exists in language" (FIORIN, 1996, p.140).[11] In his study the distinct reflections on time and language end with the following words:

> The march of reflections on time sets off as myth and gives way to philosophy, which establishes the basis for the comprehension of physical time, and when it notices the subtleness and the complexity of temporal human experience it leads to linguistic analysis. Time is a language category because it is intrinsic to narration; however, each language reveals it differently (FIORIN, 1996, pp.141-142). [12]

Such considerations lead to the concept of *delimited time,* the moment in which the operation of time in language is emphasized. Here Fiorin necessarily refers back to Benveniste's inaugural speech on this issue in order to shed light upon the differences among *chronic*, *physical*, and *linguistic times.* Under this enunciative perspective of time, it is clear that the temporal center of language is organized from speech, having the

---

[11] Text in original: "[...] o que é passado, o que não é mais, o que ainda não é, tudo presentificado na linguagem."
[12] Text in original: "A marcha da reflexão sobre o tempo começa como mito, dá lugar à filosofia, que estabelece as bases da compreensão do tempo físico, e, ao perceber a sutileza e a complexidade da experiência temporal humana, desemboca na análise linguística. O tempo é uma categoria da linguagem, pois é intrínseco à narração, mas cada língua manifesta-o diferentemente."

present time as an axis. Thus, anteriority and posteriority correspond to movements backwards and forwards in relation to the moment of the utterance act, which in turn means that the vast specificity of linguistic time corresponds to the ordering process related to the moment of enunciation. Despite the differences aforementioned, linguistic time shares characteristics with other types of time, such as the notion of order (successiveness and simultaneity), duration and direction (retrospective and perspective). The two main features of linguistic time are thus set up: a) the moment of enunciation is both its originator and generator axis; b) the arrangement of states and transformations narrated in text are related to time (FIORIN, 1996, p.145).

Still immersed in Benveniste's thoughts, Fiorin (1996) discusses the concepts of *referent moment*, *event moment* and *enunciation moment* through numerous examples from literary discourse, always taking into consideration the possible temporal systems within discourse (enunciative and enuncive). And here is the point in his study in which three categories of time are discussed. In *systematized time* Fiorin goes into details about tenses and verbal aspects in the interior of enunciative and enuncive systems, developing the subsections "of adverbs," "of prepositions," and "of conjunctions" in order to completely exhaust the many possible manifestations of the category time in language. In *modified time* he addresses the internal projections of direct, indirect and free indirect speeches, as well as the changes required for the transition from one system to another. In *harmonized time* he explains harmonization in the agreement of more than one tense and the effects they have on meaning. In this section, the viewpoints of different grammarians are mentioned ─ and often met with strong disagreement ─ and discursive solutions that govern the operations of these agreements are presented.

Besides the three time categories mentioned above, there is also the category *subverted time*, in which the possible uses of a time with the value of another are analyzed, that is, the temporal shiftings in. After exposing ninety theoretical possibilities in Portuguese, Fiorin starts the description of the shiftings in found by dividing them into three groups: neutralizations in the interior of the same system; neutralizations among the same terms of the topological category of different subsystems, and neutralization among different terms of the topological category of distinct subsystems. The three groups are richly illustrated, highlighting, for instance, the use of the imperfect preterit by the present, unfolded in five classes: imperfect of attenuation; shared situation; hypocoristic

imperfect (phrases said to babies); imperfect of distance and imperfect suggesting fictitious evasion (FIORIN, pp.209-210). In addition to the presentation of the neutralization of verbs, Fiorin also approaches the neutralization of adverbs of time. Such classifications per se are of an exceptional value; however, Forin goes further and recalls and reinforces the idea of *systematicity in instabilities*, going back to the reasoning that supports his thesis:

> In discourse the times escape from the rigid conventions of the system; they mix, overlap, pursue each other, serve as counterpoint to each other, move away, get close, combine, occur in an imbricated game of articulation and meaning effects. However, as in counterpoint, they obey the rules of semantic coercions. The discourse creates the cosmos and abhors the chaos (1996, p.229).[13]

In order to reiterate all the points made so far, Fiorin (1996) opens an ample space to the concept of *split time*. The temporalities of micro and macro events of enunciation and enunciate are faced with a polemical dialogue with Genette (1972) and the greimasian theory. From his enunciative perspective, Fiorin (1996) proposes adjustments to the theory of place of three temporal systems. He claims that there are only two linguistic temporalizations: enunciation and utterance. With regard to Greimas, he intends to transfer linguistic temporalization to the scope of what the semiotician called *temporal localization*, leaving to Greimasian *programmation* only what is manifested by chronic time or what concerns the successiveness and simultaneity of happenings. In addition, he proposes the unfolding of shiftings out in shiftings out of enunciation and in shiftings out of utterance, justifying this (re)formulation by observing the presence of verbs in the enunciative system in narratives classified by Greimas as enuncive or, conversely, enuncive verbs in narratives of enunciative systems. Both shiftings out, as shown in Fiorin's studies, do not have the same status, since the shiftings out of the utterance are subordinated to the shiftings out of enunciation.

Fiorin continues dialoguing with different theories, particularly with different classifications, having as interlocutors the same Genette and Greimas in relation to the macro shiftings in, which rule "the global relationship between the time of enunciation

---

[13] Text in original: "Os tempos, no discurso, fogem das rígidas convenções do sistema, mesclam-se, superpõem-se, perseguem uns aos outros, servem de contraponto uns aos outros, afastam-se, aproximam-se, combinam-se, sucedem-se num imbricado jogo de articulações e de efeitos de sentido. No entanto, como no contraponto, obedecem a regras, a coerções semânticas. O discurso cria o cosmo e abomina o caos."

and time of utterance" (1996, p.238).[14] To prove his enunciative perspective, he explores the varying possibilities of realization of temporal unfolding in the instance of enunciation and utterance in all their internal projections. Finally, when he concludes his enunciative reflections on time, he merges the philosophical and the linguistic points of view in a definition of discourse:

> Discourse creates a time that simulates a temporal experience of man through a complex game between the temporalities of enunciation and utterance and among simultaneity, anteriority, and posteriority. If the narrative is a simulacrum of man's actions in the world, its temporality is simulation of the experience of time, which is constituted from the moment in which the *I* take the word, in which the present is the course, the past is memory, and the future is wait (FIORIN, 1996, p.248, original emphasis). [15]

5 On Space

Fiorin (1996) dedicates a lengthy discussion to space, because unlike the categories of person and time, which were extensively studied by language scholars ─ some of whom were invoked as interlocutors in Fiorin's enunciative perspective ─ little has been written about it. According to him, the reflections of literary studies on space typically focus on the semantic character, highlighting, among the semantic spatial studies, the philosopher and French poet Gaston Bachelard (1884-1962). Therefore, the theory of enunciation should be dedicated to spatial syntax, that is, to the relation between the space of the enunciation and the utterance and its projections. In his view, the category of space has less relevance in the discursivization process (when compared to person or time) due to the impossibility of not using the categories of time and person in speech, which are expressed by bound morphemes always present in the verbal lexicon, while it is possible not having the presence of space, since it is expressed by free morphemes.

Fiorin (1996) then returns to Benveniste and to some dichotomies proposed by French semiotics, emphasizing that space articulates itself around the i*nterior* vs. *exterior*,

---

[14] Text in original: "a relação global entre tempo da enunciação e tempo do enunciado."
[15] Text in original: "O discurso, por meio de um complexo jogo entre as temporalidades da enunciação e do enunciado, entre simultaneidades, anterioridades e posterioridades, cria um tempo que simula a experiência temporal do homem. Se a narrativa é um simulacro da ação do homem no mundo, sua temporalidade é simulação da experiência do tempo, que se constitui a partir do momento em que o *eu* toma a palavra, em que o presente é o transcurso, o passado é memória e o futuro é espera."

closing vs. *opening*, *fixity* vs. *mobility* categories. In the spectrum of *delimited space*, he distinguishes topical space (which belongs to the physical world) from linguistic space (introduced by enunciation), showing that it organizes itself from the *hic*, the locus of *ego,* which is the center of spatial reference in discourse. A similarity between the peculiarities of the space and the linguistic times can be observed here: both have their axis in *parole*. In *systematized space*, Fiorin gives a full account of the terms used to delimit space in the Portuguese language, explaining its operation and its constructed meaning effects. Here he also describes demonstrative pronouns, prepositions and adverbs – despite the fact that such descriptions were already successfully carried out by other authors (i.e. the descriptions of demonstrative pronouns in the Portuguese language by Câmara Jr., 1970).

After that, Fiorin (1996) continues his dialogue with other grammarians and slightly disagrees with Cunha (1972) when discussing *modified space.* To him, a direct model of transposition of pronouns and spatial adverbs from direct to indirect speech does not exist. In such cases he believes that the projections of the categories of space vary according to the relationship between the situation of narration and interlocution, that is, they change if the spatial point of view in the narration is the same or different from the one in interlocution.

Just as it happens with the categories of person and time, the category of space can produce neutralizations. In this case the spatial shiftings in are shown in two groups: firstly, shiftings in between distinct places of the enunciative system; secondly, shiftings in between spaces of the enunciative and enuncive systems. Like time, spatial categories unfold in enunciation space and enunciative space, the first being the place where narration occurs and the latter being the place where the narrated facts happen. The operation and the meaning effects that result from the play between different spatial instances are described in the last section of his work: *split space*. Finding support in the ideas of Eni Orlandi (1992), Fiorin concludes his reflections by claiming that silence, as well as time and space, is one of the extensions of discourse; it belongs to the enunciator and it is also a constitutive element of sense.

Conclusions

In this paper I used a contemporary Brazilian perspective of enunciation as a basis for discussion. I followed not only Fiorin's reflections, but also the interlocutions he maintains, in a polemical and/or historical way, with a large number of language scholars, who in some way have contributed to the materialization of the perspective presented here and which articulates tradition and novelty. Fiorin concludes his study in a brief, instructive and systematic way — using no more than three pages, two items and fourteen sub items — gathering what was disseminated throughout his work around two crucial elements: the enunciative and enuncive system of the categories time, person and space, and the instabilities to which these categories are submitted and which, in a deep level, create the same meaning effects because of the coercions they experience.

Discourse is the place where those who have been expelled from The Paradise produce meaning. It is the place for ambivalence, disputes between tradition and change, as well as fixity and transition. It is inserted in History, and thus it experiences limitations and instabilities. These characteristics are at the core of Fiorin's final considerations:

> We have not reached far; what has authorized us was the "system" of instabilities. We have followed tradition: what is authorized by the system exists. However, we have to bear in mind that as discourse belongs in History it can change the system (1996, p.303).[16]

Perhaps, Maria Helena de Moura Neves's review can illustrate the reason why this study on the theories of enunciation has focused on *As astúcias da enunciação*, as well as how the theoretical and methodological frameworks have drawn a map of previous studies:

> We are facing a book that links beginning and end. If this were not the case, how would it be possible to write the whole deictic system of the Portuguese language on mere three hundred pages? From beginning to end the book shows how the "imaginary body" (the space) and the "fictitious movement" (the time) that are submitted to "subject" (person) come to life in language. From beginning to end the book promotes an interaction between system and discourse, instability and

---

[16] Text in original: "Não fomos tão longe, o que nos autorizou foi o "sistema" de instabilidades. Seguimos a tradição: o que é autorizado pelo sistema existe. No entanto, cabe ainda lembrar que o discurso, sendo da ordem da História, pode mudar o sistema."

stability, science and art, nature and culture, myth and history, and finally, clay and breath (MOURA-NEVES: 1997, p.108).[17]

The astuteness of *As astúcias da enunciação* lies rightly in interaction and in integration. It is a serious and authoritative work, in which Fiorin dialogues with grammarians, literary critics, semioticians, discourse analysts, enunciation scholars, philosophers, among others, to delve into discourse and offer a new perspective, which is fundamentally based upon theory and methodology. As a reader, I rest my eyes on the countless examples that allow me to follow Aurélia's life, Rubião's expertise, Fabiano's distress.[18] I take a breath before I move to the next shifting, which demands mental effort and abstraction powers. Meanwhile, another reader fleetingly glimpses through the example, jumping to the next challenge of comprehension of a new temporal subversion. Fiorin's conquests of readers is what constitutes the astuteness in the title, which can also be detected in the formidable presence of literature in his study.

As a game of mirrors between the instances of enunciation and utterance, his study materializes the enunciative dimension that operates in different levels: the micro-level, through his precise work on the categories of person, time and space in language; the meso-level, which presents the notions of actoralization, temporalization and specialization and reveals meaning effects in discourse, besides promoting reflections on narratives and the act of narrating; and finally the macro-level, which approaches philosophy, religion, mythology, science and places his study, placing the work in the humanities. It is no wonder that Fiorin favors Machado de Assis in his quotations...

The fact that Brazilian semioticians are more prone to explore the level of enunciation than semioticians from other countries is solid proof of the usefulness of Fiorin's enunciation theory, as well as of his influence in enunciation studies. I have to reiterate that Brazilian semioticians are more prone to explore the level of enunciation than semioticians from other countries because of Fiorin's work on discursive syntax.

REFERENCES

---

[17] Text in original: "Estamos diante de um livro que ata pontas do começo ao fim. Se não, que é isso de conseguir colocar em parcas trezentas páginas todo o sistema dêitico da língua? De ponta a ponta o livro mostra como o "corpo imaginário" (o espaço) e o "movimento fictício" (o tempo) submetidos ao "sujeito" (pessoa) adquirem realidade e vida na linguagem. De ponta a ponta interagem sistema e discurso, instabilidade e estabilidade, ciência e arte, natureza e cultura, mito e história, afinal, barro e sopro."

[18] TN. Aurélia, Rubião and Fabiano are Brazilian literary characters from the novels *Senhora* by José de Alencar, *Quincas Borba* by Machado de Assis and *Vidas secas* by Graciliano Ramos respectively.

ANSCOMBRE, J.C; DUCROT, O. L'argumentation dans la langue. *Languages,* Paris, n.42, p.5-27, jun. 1976.

BARROS, D. L. *Teoria do discurso*: fundamentos semióticos. São Paulo: Atual, 1988.

BARTHES, R. et al. *Análise estrutural da narrativa*. Trad. Maria Zélia Barbosa. Petrópolis: Vozes, 1971.

BENVENISTE, E. *Problèmes de linguistique générale*. Paris: Gallimard, 1966. v.1.

_____ *Problèmes de linguistique générale*. Paris: Gallimard, 1974. v.2.

CÂMARA Jr., J. M. *Estrutura da língua portuguesa*. Petrópolis: Vozes, 1970.

CERVONI, J. *L'énonciation*. Paris: PUF, 1987.

CUNHA, C. *Gramática do português contemporâneo*. 3. ed. Belo Horizonte: Bernardo Alvares, 1972.

FIORIN, J. L. *As astúcias da enunciação*. São Paulo: Ática, 1996.

FONTANILLE, J. *Les espaces subjectives*. Introduction à la sémiotique de l'observateur. Paris: Hachette, 1989.

GALVÃO, W. N. *As formas do falso*. São Paulo: Perspectiva, 1972.

GENETTE, G. *Figures III*. Paris: Seuil, 1972.

GORDON, D.; LAKOFF, G. Postulats de conversation. *Langages*. Paris, n.30, p. 32-55, 1973.

GREIMAS, A. J; COURTÈS, J. *Sémiotique*: dictionnaire raisonné de la théorie du langage. Paris: Hachette, 1979. v.1.

GRICE, H. Paul. Logique et conversation. *Communications*. Paris, n. 30, p.52-72, 1979.

HAMAD, M. L'enonciation: procès et systèmes. *Langages*, Paris, n. 70, p.35-46, 1983.

KERBRAT-ORECCHIONI, C. *L'enonciation*. De la subjectivité dans le langage. Paris: Armand Colin, 1980.

LANDOWSKI, E. *La société réfléchie*. Paris: Seuil, 1989.

MAINGUENEAU, D. *Approche de l'énonciation en linguistique française*. Paris: Hachette, 1981.

MOURA NEVES, M. H. *As astúcias da enunciação*. Resenha. *Linha D'água*. São Paulo, n.11, p.107-110, 1997.

ORLANDI, E. P. *As formas do silêncio.* No movimento do sentido. Campinas: Editora da Unicamp,1992.