

Enunciative Postures in *Deus Caritas Est* (2005): An Analysis of The First Encyclical Signed by Benedict XVI According to Theoretical Formulations by Alain Rabatel / *Posturas enunciativas em Deus caritas est* (2005): uma análise da primeira encíclica de Bento XVI segundo formulações teóricas de Alain Rabatel

Gabriel Fernandino*

ABSTRACT

Using Alain Rabatel's reflections on points of view and enunciative responsibility, especially those founded in his work *Homo narrans* (2016; 2021), we sought to describe and interpret the operation of internal – enunciative – and interdiscursive – external – in the introduction to the encyclical letter *Deus Caritas Est* (2005), signed by the Emeritus Pope Benedict XVI, through the description and analysis of enunciative postures. Our main conclusion is that the primary speaker (S1), operates the dialogism of the text, first, from under-utterance and, later, through co-utterance and even over-utterance. S1 assumes part of the enunciative responsibility and associates itself with the New Testament point of view while suggesting an update of the Old Testament. In our terms, the Old one that rules is overthrown in favor of the New one that loves – that is, Christian-Catholic love. This investigation is affiliated with a broad and ongoing research agenda of analysis of modern pontifical discourse.

KEYWORDS: Encyclical; Religious discourse; Enunciative postures; Enunciative responsibility

RESUMO

Recorrendo a reflexões de Alain Rabatel sobre pontos de vista e responsabilidade enunciativa, principalmente aquelas contidas em *Homo narrans* (2016; 2021), buscamos descrever e interpretar a gestão dos dialogismos interno e interdiscursivo na introdução da encíclica *Deus caritas est* (2005), assinada pelo então papa Bento XVI, por meio da análise de posturas enunciativas. Nossa principal conclusão é a de que o locutor primário (L1) gere o dialogismo do texto, primeiramente, a partir da subenunciação e, posteriormente, por meio da coenunciação e mesmo da sobre-enunciação. L1 convoca parte da responsabilidade enunciativa e se associa ao ponto de vista do Novo Testamento enquanto sugere uma atualização do Velho Testamento. Nos nossos termos, o Velho que manda é destituído a favor do Novo que ama – isto é, o amor cristão-católico. Esta investigação se afilia a uma agenda de pesquisa ampla, e em curso, de análise do discurso pontifício moderno.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Encíclica; Discurso religioso; Posturas enunciativas; Responsabilidade enunciativa

* Faculdade de Letras – FALE. Programa de Pós-Graduação em Estudos Linguísticos. Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais – UFMG, Belo Horizonte, Minas Gerais, Brazil; <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1573-2875>; gabrielfernandino@gmail.com

Introduction

This paper aims to describe and analyze the management of enunciative and interdiscursive dialogisms in the introduction of the encyclical letter *Deus Caritas Est* (2005), signed by pope emeritus Benedict XVI, based on the Rabatelian notion of enunciative positionings. To this end, we rely on Alain Rabatel's theoretical framework relating to point of view and enunciative responsibility, founded, above all, on the ideas developed in his work *Homo narrans* (2016; 2021). This study follows an analysis recently published in the *Revista Eletrônica de Estudos Integrados em Discurso e Argumentação* [*Electronic Review of Integrated Studies in Discourse and Argumentation*] regarding the encyclical letter *Fratelli Tutti* (Fernandino; Lima, 2021) and is part of a broader research agenda on pontifical discourse analysis – to which a dissertation currently in progress at the Graduate Program in Linguistic Studies at UFMG is affiliated.¹

In terms of organization, in this paper we first draw a distinction between the pope, the Holy See, and the Vatican; we briefly address the themes of religious and self-constituting discourses while also revisiting our concept of Vatican-ecclesia; and we present the definition of an encyclical letter, as well as the contextualization and content of *Deus Caritas Est*. In the following section, we address enunciative and interdiscursive dialogisms by presenting nuances based on Alain Rabatel's (2006, 2016a, 2016b, 2021) perspective regarding point of view, enunciative postures, and enunciative responsibility. In the third section, based on the theoretical framework and the corpus presented herein, we proceed to the complete analysis of the introduction of *Deus Caritas Est*. As references for the fragments quoted in this paper, we adopt the numerical notation in parentheses of the mentioned line in the introduction, consisting of 30 lines. We chose not to add the year of publication (2005) to every excerpt, we did not mention the occurrences of emphasis added to avoid unnecessary repetition.

In this paper, we consider the encyclical letter to be a sub-genre of the *pontifical discourse*, which, in turn, falls under the *religious discourse* category. We have specifically

¹ In our doctoral research, we analyze the values that underlie internal Catholic Church positions concerning issues such as homoaffectivity and love of neighbor in texts published between 1995 and 2021 by the Holy See, signed or ostensibly authorized by the Pope.

focused on the introduction of *Deus Caritas Est* and based our methodological choice on the understanding that the excerpt selected for the corpus of our research enunciatively justifies the theme, the objective, and the title of the encyclical letter; it presents the first enunciator-speaker and other second enunciators and speakers; it introduces the thesis of the argumentation and the programming of the document's content; it provides an argumentative-enunciative sequence representative enough to engender an analysis of dialogism management while meeting the length required for academic articles published in Brazilian journals with international relevance.

Furthermore, as far as the conclusions are concerned, we believe that even though our corpus is limited to the introduction of the letter, the management of interlocutory dialogism and enunciative postures that seem to extend throughout the entire length of the material have been satisfactorily interpreted. *God is love* was chosen because of its documental relevance since it was the first encyclical by Benedict XVI and it generally set the tone of his pontificate, but not only; we also considered the document's topicality and accessibility, as well as its pertinence in the contemporary Holy See's enunciative staging.²

The concepts discussed in the theory section that precedes the *corpus* description and analysis, such as *prise en charge* and enunciative responsibility, refer specifically to the Rabatelian perspective. We do not disregard the linguistic tradition from which the work of Rabatel stems, nor do we neglect competing or slightly different understandings of the same concepts addressed in this article, such as those found in Culioli (1999), Desclés (2009), Haillet (2004), and Laurendau (2009). Since the goals of the article are to apply concepts and perform the analysis – with potential development, in later works, of the state of the art of pontifical discourse – we have made a theoretical-methodological choice that revisits the works of a specific intellectual without the pretension of exhausting all the possibilities that Rabatel has explored throughout his career.

² Maingueneau (2014) has coined the term *scene of enunciation* to indicate both a frame and a process, as well as to avoid a *situation of enunciation* and a *situation of communication* that would indicate strictly linguistic and sociological uses, respectively. According to the author, the scene of enunciation consists of the following types of scenes: an *encompassing scene* (roughly, the type of discourse), a *generic scene* (discourse genres, in the sense of norms that raise expectations), and a *scenography*, which is “a singular staging of the enunciation” (Maingueneau, 2014, p.122) that legitimizes a given discourse.

In addition to the conclusions that we interpreted from a specific referential and a specific description, our study contributes to the current literature on this matter by indicating research niches to be deepened in studies on encyclicals and by demonstrating how the analysis of enunciative postures and interdiscursive dialogism can be satisfactorily applied to corpora inscribed in the pontifical discourse genre.

1 When the Triple Crown Speaks: The Bishop, The Head of State, and The Leader of the Church

In this section, we revisit and update the considerations previously organized in Fernandino and Lima (2021). The pope is a Catholic priest, necessarily male, elected for life by a college of cardinals to perform the triple function of the bishop of the Diocese of Rome, the head of the Vatican City State, and the supreme leader of the Catholic Church. Accordingly, the pope's jurisdiction radiates from the Diocese of Rome, the ecclesial district where he exercises the office of bishop, and reaches the entire ecclesiastical structure of this religious institution which is spread across the globe. Therefore, in addition to the ultimate authority deriving from the position of Bishop of Rome, the prerogatives of a State mandatar³ are assigned to the pope, backed by the internationally recognized sovereignty of the Vatican territory. Therefore, the functions of head of state materially related to the Vatican and of the highest authority in the Catholic Church structure, which are immaterially related to the Catholic presence spread throughout the world, coincide in the legal and symbolic position of the pope.

If, on the one hand, the *papacy* refers to both the ecclesiastical office and the institution or governmental system of the Supreme Pontiff, on the other hand, the pope's jurisdiction refers to the so-called *Holy Apostolic See of Rome*. This entity is endowed with

³ In his role as a chief of state, the pope enjoys the fullness of powers. According to Article No. 1 of the Fundamental Law of the State of Vatican City State (Available at: https://www.vatican.va/news_services/press/documentazione/documents/sp_ss_scv/informazione_generale/le_gge-fondamentale_po.html, accessed Feb 04, 2022), the bishop of Rome enjoys full legislative, executive, and judicial powers. Official documents of the Holy See adopt the designation "Absolute Monarchy," although classifications of the Vatican form of government as "theocratic-monarchical state" or an "ecclesiastical state" can be found in the literature. In addition to its intramural territory, the Vatican jurisdiction also extends extraterritorially in certain properties and micro-areas of and beyond Rome.

legal authority in the international sphere representing the Vatican State and the Catholic Church. The Holy See is administered by the Roman Curia, a body of institutions that assists the pope in exercising the papacy and acts on his behalf. In detail, the *Curia* is a complex of institutes and dicasteries,⁴ which can be roughly defined as ministries to which the pope delegates functions. Among these bodies is the Secretariat of State of the Holy See, the oldest dicastery, which has diplomatic and political functions.

The Holy See is often metonymically referred to its seat, the *Vatican*, an independent enclave located in the city of Rome. In effect, the Holy See, not the Vatican, is the authority that acts externally by maintaining diplomatic relations with states and international institutions. The creation of the Vatican, the smallest independent state in the world, alludes to the recent past, to the Lateran Treaty (1929), signed between the Holy See and Italy. In turn, the existence of the Holy See, a much older entity than the Vatican, dates back to the Roman Empire. According to Catholic mysticism, the Holy See was founded by saints Paul and Peter at the beginning of the Common Era as the Community of Rome, which was the primordium of what was to become the contemporary Diocese of Rome.

The noun *Holy See* derives from a Latin term meaning *Holy Seat*, which draws on the symbol of St. Peter's chair, the first of the popes, on which the cosmogony of the Holy See was founded. The chair symbolizes the figurative center from which the source of legitimacy and monolithic power of the Church's supreme leader emanates. For this reason, the Pope is the only religious authorized to celebrate under the *baldacchino* inside St. Peter's Basilica in the Vatican. The *baldacchino* is a monumental structure, made of bronze and marble, built over the crypt in which the believers accredit that Peter's mortal remains lie.

According to Catholic doctrine, he who inherits St. Peter's chair when he becomes pope receives the charisma of the first of the bishops of Rome. Therefore, by exercising the ministry of bishop, each pope would subscribe himself to the continuity of the divine conspiracy that led Peter to be the cornerstone of the Church. As claimed by the Catholic

⁴According to the Apostolic Constitution, available at https://www.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/en/apost_constitutions/documents/hf_jp-ii_apc_19880628_pastor-bonus.html and accessed Jul 04, 2022, "Art. 2, § 1 – By the word “dicasteries” are understood the Secretariat of State, Congregations, Tribunals, Councils and Offices, namely the Apostolic Camera, the Administration of the Patrimony of the Apostolic See, and the Prefecture for the Economic Affairs of the Holy See.

interpretation, Jesus reaffirmed the apostle Simon as Peter, by assigning him the role of leader of the Church that would be established: “and I tell you, you are Peter, and on this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of the underworld shall not prevail against it.” (Matthew 16:18)⁵ The preponderance of Peter among the apostles is known as the *primacy of Peter* or *Petrine primacy*.

Still regarding the Catholic Church, although the distinctions between the Vatican and the Holy See are considered, the latter is as much intertwined with its physical headquarters, as with the figure of the pope himself, from a symbolic standpoint. In our understanding, the very manner in which pontifical communication is carried out, whether in imagery or verbal terms, nurtures symbolic interpenetration. An example, inconclusive as it may be, is on the Vatican’s official website.⁶ There we can find the names *Vatican*, in the browser’s address bar, *Holy See*, in the page header, followed by the photo and the name of the current pontiff below. In this sense, the three instances seem to compose an integrated symbolic whole that emphasizes the confessional authority of the Church, which resorts to the speculated mass of more than one billion faithful scattered around the planet. A substantial part of these, both religious and lay people, who are the addressees of this *Religion with State*, lives in Latin America, specifically and massively in Brazil.

2 The Vatican-Ecclesia: A Succinct Articulation Between Papal Infallibility, Self-Constituting Discourse, and Religious Discourse

Departing from the notion of nation-state, we propose approaching this *sui generis* case through the *Vatican-ecclesia* binomial. By doing so, we articulate in our concept the dimension of the moral and religious entity composed of a State, the Vatican, with the one composed of the population of faithful and religious people essentially scattered around the globe, which we refer to as *ecclesia*. The engendered binomial is intended to be more than the sum of its two parts. It is a synonym of the proper noun *Holy See*, which seems to allow

⁵ Available at: <https://www.ewtn.com/catholicism/teachings/vatican-is-dogmatic-constitution-pastor-aeternus-on-the-church-of-christ-243>.

⁶ Accessed April 7, 2022, at: <https://www.vatican.va/content/vatican/it.html>.

an epistemic gain by making the physical and immaterial singularity of the entity, as well as by evidencing the allocution dimension from the enunciative point of view.

Although the primacy of papal authority is evident in Vatican-ecclesia, the distinction between this speaker and the Holy See itself is not given beforehand at the level of enunciation. In different texts or within the same text, the papal elocutions can either be equivalent to those of the Holy See or disarticulated and detached from them. In Fernandino and Lima (2021), we describe and analyze the process of overlapping/detaching from enunciative responsibility in the encyclical *Fratelli Tutti* (2020), signed by the speaker Pope Francis, based on Ruth Amossy's notion of Argumentation in Discourse. In any case, the pope's ultimate authority is dogmatically assured, regardless of whether the enunciative responsibility coincides or diverges – as explained in the next section.

The so-called *papal infallibility* is an *ex-cathedra* dogma attesting that, as the heir of Peter, the pope is preserved from error when defining the doctrine on faith and morals. According to chapter IV of the dogmatic constitution, *Pastor aeternus*,

in virtue of the divine assistance promised to him in the person of blessed Peter, *that infallibility which the divine Redeemer willed his Church to enjoy in defining doctrine concerning faith or morals; therefore, such definitions of the Roman Pontiff are of themselves, and not by the consent of the Church, irreformable* (Pius XII, 1870, emphasis added).⁷

Therefore, we consider that infallibility can attribute argumentative force to papal discourses before segments of its addressee, that is, the ecclesia. Assuming the openness with which the religious discourse resorts to the foundational dogmas of its mystique, the degree of argumentativity seems to be also amplified under the effect of what Maingueneau and Cossutta (1995) have called *self-constituting discourse*. As Maingueneau (2015) specifies, this type of discourse denotes the authoritative speeches that assign meaning to the acts of a collectivity, beyond which only the unspeakable meanings lie. Besides legitimizing subjects,

⁷ Original in Italian: “[...] per la divina assistenza a lui promessa nella persona del beato Pietro, gode di quell’infalibilità con cui il divino Redentore volle fosse corredata la sua Chiesa nel definire la dottrina intorno alla fede e ai costumi: pertanto tali definizioni del Romano Pontefice sono immutabili per se stesse, e non per il consenso della Chiesa.” (PIO XII, 1870) Available at: http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/i-vatican-council/documents/vat-i_const_18700718_pastor-aeternus_it.html. Last access: 5 oct. 2021.

self-constituting discourses *constitute* their existence as if their legitimacy is derived from the Absolute.

Although the notion of self-constituting discourse seems to lack a certain degree of precision as far as its operationalization is concerned (Maingueneau; Cossutta, 1995; Maingueneau, 2015), it provokes reflections that we deem pertinent to the study of religious discourse. In virtue of their self-founded status, self-constituting discourses can dialogically endorse other discourses – as is the case with philosophical and scientific constituting discourses and the religious discourse itself, whose greatest expressions are the Old and New Testaments of the Bible. In studying the Book of Exodus, Rabatel (2021) argues that the biblical text is pervaded by dialogical movements through which the speaker dialogues with tradition and himself in relation to rather complex discourse objects.

Enunciations endowed with this self-constituting nature attribute authority to the institution that issues them since they are ontologically shared in a collectivity and are constituted by multiple discourse genres. Thus, because of their enunciative attributes and social functions, self-constituting discourses are located in the interdiscourse as *archeion* (Maingueneau, 1995) – derived from the Greek word *arché*, and incorporated into Latin as *archiva* – that is, the source of principle, of power, the seat of authority. As for example the bodies of magistrates and the cathedrals – *See* in English and *Sedes* in Latin, which in turn mean *seat* and *episcopal chair* –, both of which are associated with legitimized speakers and an institutionalized social memory. The paradoxical space that these enunciations occupy in society is called *paratopia*; after all, self-constituting discourses are not located inside or outside the collectivity.

Among the various definitions in the literature, Orlandi (1987, p.242) defines religious discourse as “that in which the voice of God speaks: the voice of the priest – or the preacher, or, in general, any of his representatives – is the voice of God.”⁸ When speaking of the defining features of this type of discourse, Orlandi highlights intertextuality, antithesis, the use of the imperative and the vocative, as well as metaphors, explained by paraphrases,

⁸ Original in Portuguese: “aquele em que fala a voz de Deus: a voz do padre – ou do pregador, ou, em geral, de qualquer representante seu – é a voz de Deus.”

markedly in sermons. Likewise, there is the use of Latin quotations, translated by explanatory periphrases, performatives, and fixed syntagms (the prayers exemplify the latter case).

For the Brazilian researcher (Orlandi, 1987), religious discourse establishes a spontaneous relationship with the sacred, in a more informal way when compared to theological discourse. This, in turn, formalizes and organizes the dogmas. Orlandi summarizes that, despite this distinction, the non-reversibility between speaker and addressee remains in both cases. Thus, this distinction can be disregarded depending on the research objectives. We prefer to adopt in our research only the term religious discourse, although we take into account the principle of non-reversibility in the Vatican-ecclesia.

For the author, if that is *the voice of God*, there would be a hierarchical difference where the speaker (the divine) is on a spiritual plane and addresses the subjected addressee (the human being) located on a temporal plane, so that, “in inequality, God rules over men.” (Orlandi, 1987, p.243)⁹ Thus, if we take the Holy See as the voice (i.e., the representative) of god, the roles of speaker and addressee would tend to non-reversibility, given their structural asymmetry in relation to the ecclesia.

This representation of divinity in the agentivity of the Holy See configures what Orlandi (1987) has called *mystification*; that is, the erasure of how the representative incorporates this divine voice without explaining the mechanism or process of appropriation/representation. In the mystification of the religious discourse, the subject who represents the voice of God does not enjoy autonomy before it. Therefore, the religious discourse would tend toward monosemy since the interpretation of God’s word is intensely regulated. When certain limits of this strict regulation are exceeded, the act is regarded as a transgression. For Orlandi, the power imbued to the word in religion is evident since language is perceived as an action, in our example, as occurs in the performative formula *I pronounce you husband and wife*, related to the sacrament of matrimony.

⁹ Original in Portuguese: “na desigualdade, Deus domina os homens.”

3 The Triple Crown Circular Letter: *Deus Caritas Est* (2005)

Regarding the definition of our research *corpus*, an encyclical is a communication device of the Holy See that functions as an open letter. Originally and etymologically, it is a *circular letter* signed by the pope – which also justifies the title of this section. Thus, an encyclical letter addresses a broad and composite audience, ranging from cardinals and bishops to the faithful holding no ecclesial office. In terms of their content, encyclicals deal with topics related to the doctrine of the Church and indicate priorities at the time of publication. The definition we offer conceives only the modern sense of the term. Today, Anglicans and the Orthodox Church also use the noun *encyclical*.

Compared to other pontifical documents, encyclicals enjoy a greater degree of informality, even though they are considered second in order of importance. Therefore, an encyclical letter only holds less authority than an apostolic constitution. This is because, unlike a constitution, the circular letter does not modify dogmas but simply updates the doctrine of the Catholic Church and indicates the urgencies of a given moment. In the encyclicals, the High Priest undersigns and resorts to modal expressions and figures of speech and style that make his authorship evident and seem to purposefully disseminate a positive image of the speaker before the ecclesia. Thus, consubstantiated in the Holy See, it is possible to interpret that, in general, in this sub-genre of papal discourse, the pope tends to summon enunciative responsibility to himself.

In this article, we chose to analyze the introduction to *Deus Caritas Est* (2005) in its entirety, according to Rabatel's formulations. This encyclical, whose initial half was originally written in German, is the first of its kind signed by Pope Benedict XVI. Signed at Christmas 2005, i.e., the inaugural year of Benedict's papacy, the encyclical contains 42 paragraphs and 31 pages in length in the official Portuguese version. *Deus Caritas Est* was promulgated in early 2006, in Latin, as is customary practice, and translated into seven languages, including Portuguese.¹⁰

¹⁰ The English version can be reached at: https://www.vatican.va/content/benedict-xvi/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_ben-xvi_enc_20051225_deus-caritas-est.html Access in August 2022.

As the title and subtitle of the text – *God is love: on Christian love* – reveal, love, from the Catholic point of view, constitutes the thematic axis of the letter. It was based on the incomplete writings by the predecessor, Pope John Paul II, which resulted in the second part of the text, and Benedict XVI's own elaborations. Famed for his erudition in classical and theological studies, Joseph Ratzinger's informational and rhetorical-argumentative refinement is apprehended throughout the document:

As for the subthemes stemming from the thematic axis of love in part I, the letter deals with the concepts of *eros*, *agape*, and *philia*. The content of this part turns primarily to philosophy, invoking thinkers such as Nietzsche and Virgil through the prism of Catholic Christianity. For the speaker of Part I, *eros* and *agape* are not distinct forms of love (generous and possessive love, respectively) but two halves of the same love, which gives and receives. In part II, edited from John Paul II's drafts, the letter deals more objectively with liturgical activities and the promotion of social justice and charity *vis-à-vis* the cosmogony of (Christian) contemplative love.

Depending on the objectives of eventual research on style, when focusing on Benedict XVI as the speaker, one could specifically advocate the linguistic representativeness of the initial part of this encyclical, whose style is more theoretical than that adopted in the second half, which has been attributed to John Paul. However, from the enunciative perspective, both popes in the document are the speaker (S1). In this sense, the existence of these persons in the so-called real world is less important to the analysis than the problematization of their existence. Therefore, the enunciative study is located neither at the ontological, (philosophical), nor the material level (socio-physical), but metaphorically in between, that is, at the (inter)discursive level.

4 Enunciative and Interdiscursive Dialogisms: Point of View, Enunciative Postures, and Enunciative Responsibility According to Rabatel

By adopting the term *interlocutive dialogism* instead of *intersubjective dialogism*, we emphasize the exchange between locutions, a dimension dear to enunciation studies, to the detriment of terminology that would emphasize the interaction between subjects in the so-

called real world. Therefore, in principle, *intersubjective dialogism* would concern the objects of sociological studies and other fields of knowledge eminently centered on the basic category of the subject in society.

Interlocutive dialogism is divided into at least two primary types closely related to the theoretical framework addressed in this section. These are enunciative or internal dialogism and interdiscursive dialogism, which could be concurrently referred to as external dialogism. Enunciative dialogism is located in the realms of text modalization and the figures of the locutor and the enunciator, inserted in the interactional dynamics intrinsic to enunciation. In internal dialogism, we highlight the contributions by authors such as Jakobson and Benveniste on the deictic axis, and Bally and Ducrot, on the modal axis.¹¹ On the other hand, interdiscursive dialogism manifests itself in the broader scope of the interdiscourse, articulating the internal operation of the text, for example, with the representations of value systems and ideologies, as approached by leading authors such as Bakhtin, Authier-Revuz, and Charaudeau.

The concepts presented below, elaborated by the linguist Alain Rabatel as a continuation of the work of the authors mentioned above, are structurally articulated with interlocutive dialogism. After all, Rabatel develops his works based on the presupposition that enunciation is a linguistic phenomenon occurring in space saturated with internal and external dialogical interactions.

In the work translated into Brazilian Portuguese as *Homo narrans: por uma abordagem enunciativa e interacionista da narrativa: pontos de vista e lógica da narração, teoria e análise* [*Homo Narrans: For an Enunciative and Interactionist Approach to Narrative: Points of Views and Narration Logics, Theory and Analysis*] (2016),¹² Rabatel

¹¹ We deliberately decided not to specify the works of the authors who influenced Rabatel's project, nor do we detail explicit discussions about each author's proposal – and how Rabatel draws on them – given the length restrictions and the purpose of this section, which is to present a concise overview of some of Rabatel's concepts. For more information, see the introduction and Chapter I of *Homo Narrans*, vol. 1.

¹² Originally published in two volumes under the title *Homo narrans: pour une analyse énonciative et interactionnelle du récit*, the work will be translated into Brazilian Portuguese in four volumes, namely v. 1, *teoria e análise* [*Theory and Analysis*]; v. 2, *metodologia e interpretação* [*Methodology and Interpretation*], published in 2021 by UFRN; v. 3, *dialogismo e polifonia na narrativa, pontos de vista e discursos representados* [*Dialogism and Polyphony in Narrative: Points of Views and Represented Discourses*]; and v. 4, *dialogismo e polifonia na narrativa, posturas, apagamento enunciativo e argumentação indireta* [*Dialogism*

introduces us to *homo narrans*, that which narrates/enunciates in and by discourse through dialogical interactions. The author's thinking is part of a tradition that has reexamined the relevant contribution of the Saussurian distinction between *langue* and *parole* – which founded a science of language at first based on an ideal subject and detached from *langue* – whose key figures, some of whom have been previously mentioned, would be Bally and the notion of indicative subjectivity of the speaking subject; authors who addressed the problem of interdiscourse and interlocution based on the works of Bakhtin; Cuoli and the notion of co-enunciation; Goffman, who highlighted the role of the speaker in the process of signification resulting from symbolic interactionism; Authier-Revuz, with his widespread conceptions of heterogeneous subject and the constitutive and shown heterogeneities of language; and, especially, Ducrot and the polyphonic subject.

Therefore, in that work, Rabatel tries to organize the theory of point of view (that is, of its dialogism), which the author had already been working on in previous articles, by incorporating the indirect argumentative effects into the logic of argumentation. The Indirect argumentation (Amossy, 2020) is that which, on an inferential basis, relies on *doxical* and *topoi* representations, but not on the logical apparatus of demonstration or natural logic, as in the case of explicit (direct) argumentation. Rabatel adds that, since it is not evident, indirect argumentation does not, in principle, engender a counterargument.

Assuming the existence of indirect argumentation, Rabatel claims that the point of view (POV) is a propositional content whose way of assigning referents refers directly or indirectly to an enunciator located at the origin of this content. The propositional content that defines the POV may correspond to restricted semantic definitions or to a global approach that is indifferent to the semantic content. In other words, the point of view does not necessarily involve precise words. It is a propositional organization that may or may not contain a *subjectiveme*, that is, a word that carries traces (affective, axiological, etc.) of the enunciative position.

Thus, following the first broad and comprehensive notion of point of view and delimiting its object also from the Ducrotian definition, Rabatel states that a POV is

and Polyphony in Narrative, Postures, Enunciative Effacing and Indirect Argumentation]. Volumes 3 and 4 will be published by EDUFRRN (2022/2023).

established “through the linguistic means by which a subject considers an object, in every sense of the word ‘consider,’ whether the subject is singular or collective” (p.30).¹³ From this perspective, the POV is not necessarily expressed by the words of the speaker, nor does it reveal a clear Ballyan separation between *dictum* and *modus*, nor roughly between objective and subjective, since the so-called *dictum* would also enclose the taking of a position or a perception about the world.

On Ducrot’s perspective, the speaker (S) is the subjective instance that makes the utterance, phonetically or in written form, and assumes a POV, which may or may not manifest deictic markers; the enunciator (E), on the other hand, is the instance that engenders a POV and manifests modal markers. In other words, based on the Ducrotian notions of speaker and enunciator, Rabatel attributes the mechanisms of deictic action to the first and modal action to the second. However, while Ducrot works markedly on the level of the sentence, the author of *homo narrans* turns to that of the text.

We emphasize that Alain Rabatel focuses on the scope of the text without being structuralist. In other words, for him there would be no underlying structure to the text that would condition the subjective instances. Unlike the subjected subject that we find, for example, in the first phase of Pêcheux, Rabatel defends the existence of a relative autonomy of the enunciator in the management of dialogism. Therefore, we can say that the author adopts an enunciative-pragmatic perspective.

Thus, the author is not limited to the formal apparatus of enunciation solely in the deictic axis, nor does he solely consider the modal axis. The modal and deixis spheres may mix and even disarticulate, since there may be modal markers even in the absence of deictic markers. Although the enunciator and the speaker may be associated in the utterance in the enunciator-speaker position (E/S), the enunciator is not the speaker. This is the phatic author of the utterance.

For example, in the formula of proverbs, there is an enunciator but not a speaker, a priori. As in the case of the saying *In for a penny, in for a pound*, before the instance of the assumption of the statement by the speaker – being this assumption directly done, or through

¹³ Original in Portuguese: “Pelos meios linguísticos pelos quais um sujeito considera um objeto, em todos os sentidos do termo considerar, quer o sujeito seja singular ou coletivo.”

a deixis, or indirectly, without marks of the *ego, hic, nunc* –, it would be an assertion without a speaker. This assertion if not assumed by a phatic author, the speaker, would exist only in a cultural repertoire collectively shared in a given time and space.

It is important to note that, even in the case of a proverb in which, in theory, the *ego* is absent, there will be a POV nonetheless; after all, according to Ducrot and Rabatel, there can be no point of view without an enunciator, just as there is no enunciator without a point of view. To deepen this understanding in a metalinguistic mode, we could state that this proverb employed in this paper as an example (i.) originated from a primary enunciator (the *doxa/the collective imaginary*), (ii.) started to have a speaker (the one who signs this article) when brought to the enunciative staging of this text, carrying no deictic markers in principle, (iii.) is part of the indirect argumentation of this article that, on being explicit realized by the speaker, does not necessarily provokes a conter-argumentation.

While there are only two enunciative instances (speaker and enunciator), which, in theory, can be unlimitedly numbered, depending on the analyzed enunciation or *corpus* – first speaker (S1), second speaker (I2), first enunciator (E1), second enunciator (e2), etc. – there are three enunciative postures, namely, over-enunciator, co-enunciator, and under-enunciator.

Thus, when considering that the enunciators are not equivalent in the degree of importance – or authorization, as in the current phenomenon of (dis)authorization of specific voices in social media – Rabatel somehow advances the work of Ducrot, by promoting the idea of hierarchization of voices in the text, grouped according to their enunciative origin; their descriptive role/imposed and implicit content, and their argumentative function.

The author of *Homo Narrans* suggests a system of hierarchization by classifying enunciative postures as established in a relationship of symmetry (co-enunciation) or dissymmetry of points of views in the enunciative staging (over- or under-enunciation). These are gradual postures, that is, they imply a gradation of enunciative responsibility relative to a speaker's assumption of a point of view.

The over-enunciator is an enunciator whose POV is presented as dominant and who, therefore, enjoys a certain degree of authority over the other under-enunciated points of view. Over-enunciation does not necessarily imply a forced submission of the under-enunciated

speaker since over-enunciation can be deliberately adopted as an enunciative-argumentative strategy of voluntary submission or enunciative erasure. In this sense, the domination of the under-enunciator can be imposed, for example, by respect or admiration, or chosen, whether by free adherence or strategic use. For example, in the scope of the Brazilian Federal Supreme Court, when delimiting their decisions based on the content of the Federal Constitution, the Justices, as speakers, legislate/enunciate by mobilizing the Constitution as an evidential source of over-enunciation.

In turn, the co-enunciator, when it comes to a relation of symmetry of points of view in the scope of the enunciative staging, is the enunciator with whom the speaker assumes and shares a co-constructed POV. For Rabatel, co-enunciation concerns the level (of internal dialogism) of the construction of a point of view; that is, the addressee's consent in the utterance production is not taken into consideration. Revisiting the Supreme Court example, a Justice who evokes the previous decision of a colleague for co-construction and enunciation of their point of view on litigations to be judged asserts a co-enunciation. According to Rabatel, since POV agreement tends to be limited, co-enunciation is usually followed by an under- or over-enunciation, given the frequency of disagreements inherent in enunciative dynamics.

Fundamentally related to the over-enunciation posture, the under-enunciator is the position that necessarily comes into existence upon the enunciation of a dissymmetric POV relation. This is the enunciator whose point of view is presented as dominated. A Supreme Court Justice who enforces his or her enunciated authority based on what the House statute proclaims would take the position of an under-enunciator in relation to the statute – whereas the latter would be the over-enunciator.

We notice that in fallacy theory, the exemplified strategy could be normatively classified as an authority argument. However, in enunciation theory, we would interpret the example as an enunciative game of enunciative (dis)inscription and taking of positions among speakers. As we will see in the *corpus* analysis, the speaker's under-enunciation in relation to the over-enunciator of the New Testament, presented as the guarantor of truth that erases the apparent subjectivity of the speaker (Benedict XVI), can be interpreted, in certain passages, in the context of the dissymmetrical relationship between under- and over-

enunciators. The Holy Scriptures are presented as having the sole truth in a concomitant movement of effacing the subjectivity of the locutor of the encyclics.

For Rabatel and Chauvin-Vileno (2006), in the framework of the so-called enunciative staging, enunciative responsibility (ER) directly relates to the management of the enunciative sources of a given text. However, we emphasize that they do not necessarily have specific linguistic markers. Originally, ER is related to the propositional imputation of content to an enunciative position, which assumes (or not) the attribution in the step called assumption (*prise en charge*) that will result in ER. In fact, every *prise en charge* implies a precedent imputation insofar as the ER results from this imputation/assumption process.

Along these lines, Rabatel aims to understand who performs the *prise en charge* of a given perception, that is, the assumption of an (enunciative) representation of thoughts, considering that this representation occupies a place in the internal dialogism and the interdiscourse. Thus, the ER “relates to the point of view through the intervention made in what is perceived in the interactions, in other words, how S1/E1 positions him or herself in relation to the discourse of another” (Faria, 2015, p.74).¹⁴

As Faria (2015) adds, the term *prise en charge* and its conjugated version *prend en charge* impose some difficulty regarding its translation into English. The complexity of the word, present in different theoretical frameworks and not only in the Rabatelian’s, manifests itself associated with issues on modalization, dialogism, polyphony, and even enunciative responsibility, as well as the theories of enunciative operations and semantic blocks. In this paper, we interchangeably adopt the forms “assumption” and *prise en charge* in its original version and its respective acronym, PEC.

In cases of enunciative staging that dispense with the formula *I say X*, in which *I* is the first speaker, there will certainly be an enunciative source, although this is not compulsorily evident. To explain this peculiar enunciative configuration in which E1/S1 states that *according to Y*, where *Y* is a different speaker from *S1*, Rabatel (2009) offers us the notion of quasi-PEC.

¹⁴ Original in Portuguese: “se relaciona com o ponto de vista através da intervenção que se faz naquilo que se dá a ver nas interações, em outras palavras, de como L1/E1 se posiciona em relação ao discurso de outro.”

There is no PEC because here it is not updated by an “I say X”; it is assumed to have occurred previously. Therefore, the imputation is a limited-responsibility PEC because it was constructed by the enunciator, attributed by him to a second speaker/enunciator, and they can always argue that they are not responsible for S1/E1 and, as such, are unduly charged (Rabatel, 2009 apud Faria, 2015, p.78).¹⁵

In this sense, PEC defines a form of full responsibility towards the S1/E1’s POV and partial responsibility in expressing an extraneous point of view. In the latter case, responsibility is limited in the process of indirect imputation and presupposed PEC since e2/s2 may not assume the POV for which they had the enunciative quasi-responsibility. In other words, e2/s2 could at any given moment utter *I have not said* that, therefore disqualifying the imputation process.

Another concept, elaborated by Rabatel, which shed light over the process *prise en charge* is its paronym *prise en compte*. This is the name of the process in which S1/E1 takes on the imputation, but not its content. That is, when the first speaker does not assert agreement or disagreement as for the POV presented by S1, staging him or herself in a position detached from the enunciation.

In this article, for instance, the usage of the structure *according to Rabatel* could be understood as a *prise en compte*. This should not be confused with *prise en charge* (PEC), which is the assumption of an enunciative representation at the strictest level of the utterance. In *prise en compte*, the POV are retaken in a under-enunciation mode, and the first speaker does not manifest, a priori, the validity of the convened POV. In *prise en compte* S1 does not point out if he or she agrees with the point of view.

Finally, among all Rabatel’s concepts, we chose to present a final remark which would be useful to our analysis. It is also possible to speak of non-ER when E1/S1 operates a detachment of a POV imputed to another, a case that can occur even in dialogues with oneself, as in the example *it wasn’t a good idea to start editing this article so close to the deadline*, in the case of an utterance by a speaker about himself. In any case, the speaker has

¹⁵ Original in Portuguese: “Não há PEC, pois aqui ela não é atualizada por um “eu digo X”, pressupõe-se tenha ocorrido anteriormente. A imputação é, portanto, uma PEC com responsabilidade limitada, porque foi construída pelo enunciador, atribuído por ele a um locutor/enunciador segundo que sempre se pode argumentar que ele não é responsável pelo L1/E1 tem indevidamente cobrada.”

ER for all the POVs he brings and even those relevant to the enunciative staging he does not bring. Along those lines, an analysis of the forms of silence could also have a place in Rabatel's theory, however this is a topic for another enunciative staging ...

3 A Brief Rabatelian Analysis of the Introduction to the Encyclical Letter *Deus Caritas Est* (2005)

As attested by Rabatel (2016a; 2021), to analyze a POV is to recapture the contours of the propositional content, as well as its enunciative source, whether implicit or not through the attribution of referents and the intermediation of sentences. To this end, to describe and interpret the management of POVs and interlocutive dialogism through the study of enunciative postures – given the article's length restrictions and its primary objective – we turn specifically to the introduction of *Deus Caritas Est* (2005).

The title of an encyclical traditionally reproduces the first words, in Latin, of a quote that introduces the theme of the circular letter. It is a canonical practice concerning the form of the document. Examples include the encyclicals *Ut Unum Sint* (1995), signed by John Paul II, which dialogically redeems the Second Ecumenical Council of the Vatican; and *Fratelli Tutti* (2020), signed by Pope Francis, which summons the enunciative position of the Admonitions of St. Francis.

Therefore, being a deliberate act, the opening of a document fitting into the sub-genre of pontifical discourse is expressive of the enunciative-argumentative analysis. In the case of *Deus Caritas Est*, it is a direct quotation from the Vulgate, one of the Johannine Epistles, chapter 4, verse 16, which can be translated from the original Greek version as *God is charity* or *God is love*.¹⁶ Suppose every quotation invokes a new enunciative position in the encyclical letter sub-genre. In that case, the initial sentence of the text's body must establish a dialogical game that thematizes and affirms the credibility of the content, entangling it in an interdiscursive weave, at first, from the adoption of under-enunciation.

In the Portuguese version of the title, the Holy See opts for the translation *Deus é amor* (“*God is love*”), followed by the explanatory subtitle *sobre o amor cristão* (“*on*

¹⁶ Transcription of the Greek original in the Vulgata: “*Ho Theos agape estin.*”

Christian love”). Indirect argumentation delimits the title and the theme of the letter by addressing what kind of love *Deus Est*, that is, Christian-Catholic love. Since indirect argumentation (Amossy, 2020; Rabatel, 2016b) is not supported by the logical apparatus of demonstration, nor is it necessarily self-evident, it does not entail a counterargument, in principle.



Image 1 - *Deus Caritas Est* Header

Source: Vatican online repository. Free of rights. Available on: https://www.vatican.va/content/benedict-xvi/pt/encyclicals/documents/hf_ben-xvi_enc_20051225_deus-caritas-est.html. Last access: 20 Feb. 2021.

As illustrated in Image 1, the title *Deus Caritas Est* is preceded by the coat of arms of the Holy See – which, although it is not an enunciation per se, certainly generates an effect of meaning, which can be argumentative, from its iconic content and from the authority it summons – and is succeeded by the designation of the addressee *to the bishops, priests and deacons, men and women religious, all the lay faithful*, which refer to, in the scope of this research, the ecclesia.

The introduction begins as a self-constituting discourse, between quotation marks, with the biblical quotation “‘God is love, and he who abides in love abides in God, and God abides in him’¹⁷ (1 Jn 4:16)” (l.1), in a process of *prise en compte*, without ostensibly exposing the POV of the author of the letter (S1), that is, the one who signs the document,

¹⁷ For reference, see footnote 10.

Pope Benedict XVI. As we turn to the enunciative plane, which is the realm of the enunciative position of the speaker/enunciator but not the realm of the so-called real world, of the volitions and behaviors of social actors, we will deliberately avoid the problematization related to the person of the pope, henceforth S1.

Although referencing is never a neutral enunciative act, the first speaker does not show himself openly in favor of valuing the point of view of a biblical over-enunciator. In principle, this interdiscursive enunciator would not be John since the human author of the epistle would not express his own POV but only convey divine inspiration, according to Catholic mysticism. This is how we approach the notion of self-constituting discourse as an evidential source and a hyper-enunciator that supports the enunciative staging.

In lines 2 and 3, *prise en compte* is somewhat abolished in “These words from the First Letter of John express with *remarkable clarity* the heart of the Christian faith.” Indeed, specifically in the highlighted qualification, we notice the first elocution that exposes the POV of S1, which seeks to suppress himself in the enunciative erasure of the under-enunciation. Through this enunciative disengagement with an argumentative dimension, S1 attributes his POV to an over-enunciator and imputes quasi-PEC to this posture by taking the position of a dominated under-enunciator. Faria (2015) emphasizes that *prise en charge* is at the utterance/sentence level, whereas enunciative responsibility, which is a discursive behavior, is situated at a broader level.

Similarly, we notice the choice for a qualifying denomination in the highlighted syntagma “In the same verse, Saint John also offers a kind of *summary* of the Christian life: ‘We have come to know and to believe in the love God has for us.’” (1.4-5)¹⁸ Moreover, this passage gives continuity to the dialogical management that summons John to the s2 position – not only a vehicle of the self-constituting discourse – and this is maintained throughout the introduction. Thus, the semantic sequence *summary* qualifies the POV imputed to the center of s2’s perspective. We can also highlight the use of the deictic unit *we* in the quotation of the verse, which seems to refer to a specific *self* and not to the whole of society, that is, the specific-self of Vatican-ecclesia.

¹⁸ For reference, see footnote 10.

From line 6 onwards, in the opacity of the text, we notice that S1 begins to introduce himself more evidently as a co-enunciator throughout the process of imputation of enunciative responsibility to e2/s2. We highlight the syntagms *fundamental decision* (l.6-7), *new horizon* (l.8), *decisive direction* (l.8), and the passage “Christian faith has retained the core of Israel’s faith” (l.11-12).

Then, a new enunciator (e3) is mobilized in “the words of the Book of Deuteronomy which expressed the heart of his existence: ‘Hear, O Israel: the Lord our God is one Lord, and you shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul and with all your might’ (6:4-5)” (l.12-16).¹⁹ It is pertinent to our analysis that, while the Epistle of John converses with e2 of the New Testament, the Deuteronomy quotation brings e3 of the Old Testament into the enunciative staging. As a form of parallelism to the figure of John as s2, s3, in this case, is represented by Moses, who is the one who delivers the sermons in Deuteronomy. This quotation brought about by S1 is conventionally regarded as one of the most important quotes in the Book of Deuteronomy, which, interdiscursively, also appears in the New Testament, in Mark 12:28-34, as spoken by Jesus.

As a new enunciator, that is, as a posture that is at the origin of a POV but is not its speaker, Deuteronomy is brought into the scenography, engendering a constitutive tension in the text heterogeneity since this enunciator refers to the same evidential source (Bible) from which John proceeds (New Testament) while simultaneously summoning the sometimes-conflicting POV of the Old Testament. The apex of the New Testament-Old Testament tension that we interpret in the analyzed text seems to be reached and immediately attenuated in the following passage:

[l.15] Jesus united into a single [l.15] precept this commandment of love for God and the commandment of love for neighbour found in the Book of [l.16] Leviticus: “You shall love your neighbour as yourself” (19:18; cf. Mk 12:29-31). Since God has first loved us (cf. 1 Jn 4:10), love is now no longer a mere “command”; it is the response to the gift of love with which God draws near to us (l.15-18).²⁰

¹⁹ For reference, see footnote 10.

²⁰ For reference, see footnote 10.

Firstly, we highlight the enunciation of a new posture, Jesus – which we classify as an atypical e4/s4,²¹ since He, in the Christian cosmogony, is confused with the very source of the biblical constitutive discourse and tends, therefore, to be introduced as an over-enunciator –, which enunciates a reformulation of the Old Testament (Deuteronomy) through the previously mentioned Gospel of Mark (New Testament), whose quotation marks accentuate the volitional character of the enunciator.²² At this point in the discursive sequence, the utterance “19:18; cf. Mk 12:29-31” (emphasis added), i.e., cf. Leviticus with Mark, according to our analysis, establishes the most relevant management of the interlocutory dialogism of the introduction to the encyclical in question.

This passage can be interpreted as an over-enunciation that S1 articulates from the New Testament about the Old Testament. After all, the POV of (Christian-Catholic) love about which E1/S1 speaks throughout the introduction of the encyclical is remarkably similar to that of the New Testament, whose content, in totality, is marked by structures that generate meaning effects related to values such as unity and harmony, to the detriment of an argumentativity distinguished by punishment and/or fear of divine wrath, for example. Therefore, according to this interpretation, E1/S1 legitimizes its thesis from an interdiscursive over-enunciation that displaces the enunciative responsibility to the Holy Scriptures.

Thus, in (*cf. 1 Jn 4:10*), we notice that S1 imputes a POV with limited responsibility to the speaker John, but without quotation marks. In other words, it is quasi-PEC of the enunciation *God was the first to love us* that can promote the argumentative dimension of the text before the ecclesia. In Catholic hagiography, John is a hermeneutical breaking point because he is the one to whom is attributed a broadening of the vision of God’s love by evoking a novel, more comprehensive conception of agape.

In lines 17 and 18,²³ S1 legitimizes his main POV from values and lexicons recognized by the linguistic community of the ecclesia. The first speaker co-enunciates the

²¹ The notion of *atypical enunciator* or *speaker* as we begin to introduce in this paper seems to be an appropriate niche for further research in pontifical discourse analysis.

²² In our view, Authier-Revuz’s studies in discourse analysis on the use of quotation marks as an alterity marker that does not represent the speaker’s position, partially negating an utterance to broaden its scope is also a field to be explored in the study of pontifical discourse.

²³ For reference, see footnote 10.

New Testament (the second speakers are Mark and John) as an overcome, or updated version of the Old Testament in the passage *love is now no longer a mere 'command;'* it is the response to the gift of love with which God draws near to us. In that passage, which openly presents the thesis of the encyclical and the authority of S1 – an infallible speaker, when considering the specificity of the papal speaker in his papal infallibility – the deictic unit *now* stresses the present tense of the locution as the present of the inflection point, whereas the qualifier *merely* removes argumentativity from the Old Testament in favor of the new; that is, the Old that *commands* is dismissed in favor of the New that *loves*.

Moreover, while the lexical item *command* in quotation marks establishes a mark of detachment. The Ten Commandments are recorded in the Old Testament and only partially mentioned in the New Testament in Matthew and the Letter to the Romans. According to Rabatel (2016a, p.101), “a word, under certain conditions, may be sufficient to refer to a POV,”²⁴ since it refers to an enunciator and a POV identified by a given linguistic community.

On the other hand, the modal marker *but* emphasizes the most important part of the sequence, namely, *the response to the gift of love*. We emphasize that at this moment, the thematic axis of the encyclical (i.e., love) is reinforced, more notably a specific form, which is Christian-Catholic love, updated and adapted given the priorities of the Church before the ecclesia, at a given time, since this is the *raison d'être* of the encyclical discursive genre, as registered by the Holy See in the canonical codes.

Next, the thesis of love, as argued by E1/S1, is enhanced in the process of constructing an indeterminate, anti-oriented under-enunciator in relation to the first speaker, in the excerpt: “In a world where the name of God is sometimes associated with *vengeance* or even a *duty of hatred and violence*, this message is both *timely* and *significant*.” (1.19-20)²⁵ The agent of revenge, hatred, and violence is not named but is brought in to support the argumentative dimension of the encyclical, supported by the co-enunciation of the New Testament. This unknown agent could be the faithful of other religions or instances of the Catholic religion that justify acts based on the teachings of the God of the Old Testament.

²⁴ Original in Portuguese: “uma palavra, em certas condições, pode ser suficiente para remeter a um PDV.”

²⁵ For reference, see footnote 10.

Moreover, in the passage above, the over-enunciation of S1 is emphasized by the use of qualifiers such as *timely* and *significant* and confirmed by the enunciation that follows: “For this reason, I *wish* in *my* first Encyclical to speak of the love which God *lavishes upon us* and which we, in turn, must share with others” (1.20-22).²⁶ In this extract, S1 invokes the ER for himself by exposing and over-enunciating himself. Several deictic and modal markers refer to the first speaker, such as *my* and *wish*, as he is responsible for the management of the text’s entire POV – e.g., overcoming the over-enunciation of the Old Testament, co-enunciation to the New Testament, anti-orientation to the association of the name of God to values contrary to those of the encyclical letter – and for the hetero-dialogism realized in *lavishes upon us*.

This is followed by the excerpt: “(...) since I *wanted* here—at the beginning of my Pontificate—to clarify [in this first part] some essential facts concerning the love which God mysteriously and gratuitously offers to man, together with the intrinsic link between that Love and the reality of human love” (1.22-26).²⁷ In this fragment, already advancing his thesis of part I, which refers to the confluence of God’s love (agape) and human love (eros), S1 reinforces both his enunciative responsibility and overall argumentative position on which the various mobilized POVs are accommodated.

Finally, at the end of the introduction, the first speaker asserts, “I *wish* to emphasize some *basic elements*, so as to call forth in the world *renewed* energy and commitment in the *human* response to *God’s* love” (1.28-30).²⁸ By revealing his argumentative dimension, especially in the passages highlighted in italics, S1 concludes the enunciative sequence of the introduction starting from his under-enunciation, followed his its co-enunciation – and even by his over-enunciation in certain passages – in relation to the second enunciators and speakers summoned from the evidential biblical source.

Bringing up the enunciative staging in which the encyclical letter sub-genre is inserted, we can summarize that (i.) on a symbolic level, interdiscursively, the POV of S1 – the High Priest who signs the document – represents the POV of the institutionality that

²⁶ For reference, see footnote 10.

²⁷ For reference, see footnote 10.

²⁸ For reference, see footnote 10.

legitimizes it as such, the Vatican-ecclesia; (ii.) the first speaker (the pope) is accredited by the Holy See, instance to which the enunciative responsibility and symbolic power represented by its coat of arms in the document's header is attributed; (iii.) according to Orlandi (1987) the *mystification* of the religious discourse (of the voice of God), that is, the erasure of the way by which S1 assumes this divine voice without revealing the mechanism of representation, is grounded on argumentative-enunciative bases; (iv.) the thesis of S1 is endorsed by the over-enunciator that legitimizes it, i.e., the Sacred Scripture, for its specific addressee, the ecclesia.

Final Remarks

Through our own academic enunciative staging, we sought to perform our analysis from a descriptive-interpretative position in this paper. In other words, departing from specific categories, we aspired to initially expose the introduce the corpus in a non-normative/non-militant manner²⁹ (description) and, in the following step, to advance conclusions in light of the engendered description (interpretation). In dealing with the first stage of a thorough description of the linguistic material, Possenti (2006, p.19) states that “in essence, this is the difference between analyzing (being a discourse analyst) and commenting.”³⁰

Therefore, if the speaker is responsible for all summoned POVs, and even those relevant to the enunciative staging but not found in the text, we could examine the forms of silence throughout the content programmed in the encyclical letter. Still regarding the future developments of this analysis, we emphasize the denomination we adopted to the posture of Jesus in this paper, of an *atypical enunciator-speaker*. This denomination could be valuable also for the study of the speaker pope, who is supported by its dogmatic infallibility.

The primary conclusion of this study is that the first speaker resorts both to under- and co-enunciation towards the biblical evidential source, approaching (and even over-enunciating) the New Testament enunciator while detaching from (and updating) the Old

²⁹ See the text by Doury (2013), regarding the engagement of researchers.

³⁰ Original in Portuguese: “no fundo, essa é a diferença entre analisar (ser analista de discurso) e comentar.”

Testament enunciator. In this management of points of view characterized by interlocutory dialogism, the first enunciator/speaker assumes enunciative responsibilities and imputes propositional content to second enunciators and speakers. In such dialogical dynamics, the interdiscursive component is paramount to organizing the postures that operate the text argumentatively and enunciatively.

REFERENCES

AMOSSY, R. *A argumentação no discurso*. Coordenação da equipe de tradução: Eduardo Lopes Piris e Moisés Olímpio-Ferreira. São Paulo: Editora Contexto, 2020.

BENTO XVI. Papa. *Carta encíclica Deus caritas est* (Sobre o amor cristão), 2005. Disponível em: https://www.vatican.va/content/benedict-xvi/pt/encyclicals/documents/hf_ben-xvi_enc_20051225_deus-caritas-est.html. Acesso em: 15 jan. 2022.

DOURY, M. Positionnement descriptif, positionnement normatif, positionnement militant. *Argumentation et Analyse du Discours*. n. 11, p.1-17. 2013. Disponível em: <http://aad.revues.org/1540>. Acesso em: 28 ago. 2022.

FARIA, V. *Minha voz, tua voz, nossas vozes: uma análise da responsabilidade enunciativa em artigos acadêmicos/científicos*. Tese (Doutorado em Estudos da Linguagem) - Departamento de Letras, Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Norte, Rio Grande do Norte. 2015.

FERNANDINO, G.; LIMA, H. Uma análise da encíclica papal *Fratelli tutti* sob a perspectiva teórico-metodológica da argumentação no discurso de Amossy. *Revista EID&A*. v. 2, n. 21, p.161-180, 2021. Disponível em: <http://periodicos.uesc.br/index.php/eidea/article/view/3139/2140>. Acesso em: 9 out. 2021.

MAINGUENEAU, D. *Discurso e análise do discurso*. Trad. Sírio Possenti. São Paulo: Parábola Editorial, 2015.

MAINGUENEAU, D.; COSSUTTA, F. L'analyse des discours constituants. *Langages*, ano 29, n. 117, p.112-125, 1995. Disponível em: https://www.persee.fr/doc/lgge_0458-726x_1995_num_29_117_1709. Acesso em: 12 out. 2021.

MATEUS. *In: Bíblia*. Tradução ecumênica. São Paulo: Paulinas, 2002.

ORLANDI, E. *A linguagem e seu funcionamento: as formas do discurso*. 2. ed. São Paulo: Pontes, 1987.

POSSENTI, S. Explicar piadas, Freud explica: matar a cobra e mostrar o pau. *Revista Polifonia*. EduFMT v. 12, n. 1, p.1-20, 2006. Disponível em: <https://periodicoscientificos.ufmt.br/article/view>. Acesso em: 11 jan. 2022.

RABATEL, A. *Homo narrans*: por uma abordagem enunciativa e interacionista da narrativa: pontos de vista e lógica da narração, teoria e análise. Trad. Maria das Graças Soares Rodrigues, Luis Passeggi e João Gomes da Silva Neto. V.1. São Paulo: Cortez. 2016.

RABATEL, A. *Homo narrans*: por uma abordagem enunciativa e interacionista da narrativa: pontos de vista e lógica da narração, metodologia e interpretação. Trad. Maria das Graças Soares Rodrigues, Luis Passeggi e João Gomes da Silva Neto. V.2. Natal: EDUFRN. 2021.

RABATEL, A.; CHAUVIN-VILENO, A. La question de la responsabilité dans l'écriture de presse. *Semen - Revue de sémio-linguistique des textes et discours*, n. 22. 2006. Disponível em: <https://journals.openedition.org/semen/2792>. Acesso em: 31 jan. 2022.

RABATEL, A. Os desafios das posturas enunciativas e de sua utilização em didática. *Revista EID&A*. n. 12, p.191-233, 2016. Disponível em: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/314979051_Os_desafios_das_posturas_enunciativas_e_de_sua_utilizacao_em_didatica. Acesso em: 12 fev. 2022.

Translated by *Uirá Lima Catani* – ucatani@hotmail.com

Reviewed by *Gabriel Fernandino* – gabrielfernandino@gmail.com

Received April 18, 2022

Accepted August 29, 2022

Reviews

Due to the commitment assumed by *Bakhtiniana*. Revista de Estudos do Discurso [Bakhtiniana. Journal of Discourse Studies] to Open Science, this journal only publishes reviews that have been authorized by all involved.

Review I

Due to its significant importance for the study of modern religious discourse, the article presents an adequate and clear exploration of the theoretical foundations of the Rabatelian perspective. The text is written and organized according to the criteria required for the textual genre scholarly-scientific article; some typos (accentuation [especially crisis cases], pluralization, punctuation, numbering of subtopics...; in note 22, the form identified as “in Latin,” is nothing more than a transcription of Greek and not in Latin) need to be rigorously corrected in a subsequent rereading. Items 2, 3 and 4 present the corpus, in its genre, in a production context which is relevant to the discourse studies. The bibliography is up-to-date and adapted to the proposed objects. For those reasons, I consider the article suitable for publication. ACCEPTED

Moisés Olímpio-Ferreira – Instituto Federal de Educação, Ciência e Tecnologia de São Paulo, São Paulo, Brazil; <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2965-2734>; moisesolim@gmail.com

Review II

I consider that the article was built in an exquisite way, so my opinion is favorable to its publication without suggestions. I would just like to make a consideration for the next publications that the author will make in this or in other academic journals, which concerns the excessive use of footnotes, which occurred in the article about which I gave my opinion. As I expressed, the article is very well-built in all senses, so I do not feel comfortable to approve it with suggestions, even so, I must say that in general the journals have requested the authors to avoid footnotes and to choose to make the necessary explanations in the body of the text, this will allow reading to be carried out continuously and, aesthetically, the article will be better. However, I consider that it is very important that the article undergoes a careful grammatical review. ACCEPTED

Francisco Benedito Leite – Universidade Metodista de São Paulo, São Paulo, Brazil; <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7295-6285>; ethnosfran@hotmail.com

Research Data and Other Materials Availability

The contents are already available.