

On the Relation between Linguistics and Literature in the Teaching of the Albanian Language and Literature

Tomorr PLANGARICA

Abstract

The relation between linguistics and literature in the teaching of the Albanian language and literature in our schools has constantly been in the focus of many researchers and educators alike. As a very tangible issue affecting two key subjects in the education and training of our students (because of the indispensable role they play in our students' cultural, intellectual and civic education), it has been for years the subject of considerable debate academic or otherwise, on different levels and by various groups of the society, from linguist and educator roundtables to forums of teachers of language and literature, to other stakeholder groups in the society. In the course of these discussions, however, the argument has often been reduced to an oversimplified 'shadow' of itself, treating it as a mere matter of a relation between language and literature in teaching. In spite of the real and objective foundation underpinning it (literature is created and developed through language and the teaching of language is based on models of writing from literature), it still seems that the bearings have been lost and the focus has shifted from the real problem. Indeed, literature is conceived through language and language means, but it has admittedly a special way of organizing linguistic messages, characterized by *literality*, which distinguishes them from other ways of organizing linguistic messages that are common in any school environment. This is precisely why it is essential that we use and exploit the knowledge acquired through subjects such as linguistics or discourse studies in the examination and decoding of the message of literary texts¹.

Why does this issue seem so complicated and fraught with contradictions?

A literary work or a literary text is specific by its very nature, in that presupposes a special relationship between linguistics and literature, with *language* as the starting point. This relationship appears to be different from those existing between linguistics and other

1. Here, the term *discourse studies* is used, in line with the experience of the past 30 to 40 years, especially of the French scholars and their studies, where the scope of linguistic studies has expanded to include examination of elements outside the system of linguistic unit, including other components such as utterance, discourse/discursive outcome, text and other related indicators, that have been introduced from other disciplines including theories of discourse and enunciation, pragmatics, narratology, dialogics, text/textual linguistics, etc.

areas of knowledge, including history, sociology, anthropology, archival science, etc.. Although these are similarly reliant on language and examine language-based facts and messages, theirs does not display the same degree of complexity seen in the relationship between linguistics and discourse studies. (It has to be emphasised that at the present day, discourse studies are also lending a hand in these disciplines in certain respects – suffice it to mention the interpretation of messages in the light of linguistic pragmatism, discourse analysis, etc.)

The relationships and links between linguistics and literature (both as exemplified in teaching and in a broader sense) are far from simple and have continually placed linguists and scholars of literary sciences, as well as educators and teachers, in front of several challenges that often give rise to each other, because the interpretation of a *prima facie* extremely obvious marker may give rise to a second issue, which in turn may give rise to a third issue, and so on. For this reason, these relationships and links must be considered in the framework of a secure epistemological context and in the entirety of their multi-faceted existence. A summary list of the challenges arising from the process of explaining and interpreting these links, which gain stability precisely due to their constant and inherent contradictions, is the following:

- Although linguistics and literature seem to be placed in the same context of study that is *language*-related, they belong to different epistemes or fields of knowledge; they approach it (language/speech/discourse) in different ways by outlining different objects of study from the epistemological point of view; and the correlation and relationships between the two are complex in many respects; Although the links and relations between the two domains are complex, their intersection is clearly defined and concrete - what they converge in is the text, more specifically the literary text;
- Although the literary text is a concrete area of intersection between the two domains, its nature and the way it is conceived of and defined both by linguistics and discourse studies, and by other literary studies for that matter, have continually evolved; as a result, their area of intersection has constantly shifted into territories and areas that draw considerably from other epistemes or fields of knowledge, mostly the humanities and socio-cognitive sciences, but also from pragmatics, text linguistics, discourse analysis, theories of utterances (*parole*), etc.
- Although the relation is invariably posited in the form of a binary relationship between linguistics and literature, the fact that their area of intersection shifts to other domains, makes these relationships more complicated still, thus making the contributions from various branches of what is termed as “external linguistics” even more essential²;
Although the relationships and examination of linguistic disciplines aim, first and foremost, to help shed light on the specific factors that contribute to what is

2. The term “external linguistics” is used here in the meaning it assumed following the publication of *Cours de Linguistique Generale*, by Ferdinand de Saussure [de Saussure, 1916: 40-43] (although Saussure himself did not focus in this area of study), and it generally accepted to involve the study of language in relation to the historical, political, economic, religious, literary and geographical facts of the time; by contrast, “internal” linguistics deals with the study of language in itself and for itself.

called the *literarity* of a literary text, by looking at the text as a discursive form in the communication process, they also help shed light on a number of its other characteristics (other than literarity). Some would consider this a ‘desanctification’ of the literary text, as it is seen as a departure from the principles of romantic aesthetics which was very influential during the 19th century and well into the 20th century;

- Although it is part of the teaching process in the various tiers of the educational system (primarily in the 9-year primary education stage), the intersection between linguistics and the literary text is only partial or insignificant, because it usually consists of a mere process of reading the literary text (in order to understand, interpret, and internalize the values that the literary text seeks to carry and convey, one ought to know how to read it and, in order to read it, one must make use of a series of cognitive processes. This is precisely where linguistics enters into play, especially in primary education);
- In order to interpret these areas of convergence between linguistics and literature in the teaching process – i.e. the literary text and the cognitive processes help decode its messages - it is important to master the most effective techniques and trends of pedagogical action and have a conceptual apparatus in place that helps adapt the operational principles of discourse sciences to teaching.

The link between linguistics and literature in teaching is an issue that has been vigorously posited and discussed in the European experience of the past four or five decades, when linguistics expanded the boundaries of its object of study to include constructs such as *speech act, utterance, discourse, and text*. In a similar fashion, broader criteria began to be applied in literature by including written work whose message is examined not only in terms of its literarity or the aesthetic function it seeks to fulfil, but also as a form of discourse representing a collective culture, taste, and experience in the discursive process.

The new approach and context have given rise to a reformation of notions about the teaching of language and literature, by giving priority to the mastery of *forms and types of discourse* in teaching. This will lead, for instance, to a better and improved readability of a literary text as a form of discourse in communication, especially in the primary 9-year education tier. In secondary education, where the overarching aim is to achieve knowledge of the literary process and its products (through multifaceted examinations of literary works, experiences, literary tendencies, etc.), linguistics will directly facilitate the examination of a literary text by making use of knowledge gained and elaborated from theories of style, theories of the utterance/enunciation examining enunciation-related

phenomena³, knowledge of pragmatics⁴, text linguistics⁵, discourse analysis⁶, etc.

In what contexts is the explanation of these challenges made possible?

It is the very specific nature of the object of study of literature and its even more profound conceptualization that presupposes a link with linguistic knowledge that derives from linguistics and discourse studies, rather than the simplistic notion that regards literature simply as something that is produced through the use of language. A present-day scholar studying these issues, perhaps with a slight dose of irony, notes: "Literature is produced from language in the same way as Burgundy wine is made from grapes [...] This does not mean that when drinking the wine, we still perceive the grapes, nor is this necessary for that matter. Literature and linguistics belong to two different epistemes, they have different objects of study and their co-relation is fraught with complex issues and challenges." [Marie-Anne Paveau, 2011:93].

But interpretation of the relationship between linguistics and literature in teaching is difficult and problematic for yet another reason: the object of study of linguistics in the scientific examination practice was, at least in the course of the past century, informed by various linguistic schools, thus creating more room for its examination and interpretation.

As already mentioned, up until the 1960s and 1970s linguistic research focused on the study of linguistic units and the linguistic code - it studied language *in* itself and *for* itself. In the recent decades, however, a new kind of linguistics has been emerging, one that transcends the confines of the units of the linguistic code, (with phrases/sentences being the largest units of communication), which has made it possible to study language not simply as a system or a code and has enabled us to study speech and its internal workings in given communicative and speech situations.

3 "In addition to phenomena of a morpho-syntactic nature, an increasingly important role has been attributed to phenomena that stem from theories of the utterance/enunciation, a discipline that has only been defined as such in the recent decades. An act of utterance/enunciation is defined as an act of language used by one speaker. Every act of utterance/enunciation constitutes an event and the utterance bears the traces of that event... The phenomena that identify utterances are numerous: person, tense, and mood markers of verbs, the types of phrases/sentences used, thematization processes, reported and direct speech, linguistic polyphony, etc. The linguistics of the utterance/enunciation is organized around the imprints the speaking subject leaves on their utterance. One often notices the tendency to integrate theories of linguistic enunciation into pragmatic trends. The two disciplines, however, have different origins and aims; the first were developed, as a matter of fact, by linguists with a view to analysing linguistic phenomena, while the second mostly originate from schools of the philosophy of speech and sociology, and are concerned, first and foremost, with communication." [D.Maingueneau, 2009:126-127].

4. "Pragmatics is specifically concerned with the relations established between the interlocutors through the act of utterance/enunciation; with the way in which an utterance carries you to its context and with the processes used by the receiver of the utterance to make an interpretation of it in a given text... Linguistic pragmatics is concerned with a large range of varying linguistics phenomena: deictics, connectives, interjections, noun modifiers, politeness, interaction during conversation, etc. Furthermore, the main concern in studying these phenomena lies with a conceptualisation of speech and more generally, with human communication. Such conceptualisation of speech revisits some of the concerns of traditional rhetoric, giving primacy of place to the force of markers and the active nature of speech. According to this way of thinking, emphasis is placed on the reflexive nature of speech (the fact that it refers to the world thus bringing the enunciative activity to the fore), the interactive nature of speech, its essential relations with a framework that enables the interpretation of utterances, the judgmental dimension (the speech activity presupposes a restrictive network of rights and obligations on the interlocutors exchanging messages)." [D.Maingueneau, 2009:129-130].

5. "Because speakers do not produce isolated sentences/phrases, but texts, and given that linguists must necessarily take into account the totality of the text which a sentence or phrase is part of, a new branch of linguistics has been born - text linguistics. Its object of study is textuality, based on the assumption that a text is a unit of a different order, and not simply a sequence of sentences occurring one after the other. The unit called "text" is made possible by arrangements conditioned to produce its cohesion and coherence." [D.Maingueneau, 2009:92].

6 "Discourse analysis is a field of knowledge that examines various types of discourse which correspond to numerous areas of activity in the society (administrative discourse, advertisement discourse...), the various genres of discourse used within one single institution (a hospital, a school), the body of texts belonging to different genres but which are characterised by the same ideological positioning (party, doctrine, trend, literary movement, etc.). Thus, discourse analysts operate with units which can be called *transcendental*, in the sense that they analyse texts from different discourse genres that are examined pursuant to linguistic, functional or communicative criteria." [D.Maingueneau, 2009:138-139].

On the other hand, in the 20th century, due to the development and elaboration of new experiences in the production of a literary text, and as a result of the use of new technologies in communication, the messages carried by the communication process and the principles of evaluation in terms of the functions they [the messages] fulfil, have led to a widening of ‘territories’ where literary texts can be found.⁷ By now it has been widely discussed and accepted that literarity and inherent aesthetic values of a text are not the only markers that indicate a literary text; it (the literary text) is now regarded as a form of discourse in the communication process which is conditioned by a series of other factors of an enunciative nature, and its analysis must necessarily take into account criteria that are gleaned from various disciplines that form part of discourse studies. That is to say, the literary text itself, in its evolution and as a product of time, becomes an object of examination that today’s linguistic disciplines do not seek to avoid; indeed, they are even attracted by the new realities it helps create. In any case, this does not mean that the problems related to its production, and further, the methodologies used in studying it, are to bypass the literary science and its research methodologies; on the contrary, they themselves assume and enlist the help and contributions of linguistics and discourse studies.

In what respects do two different objects establish links and relations between each other?

If we accept that linguistics and literature belong to two different epistemes, then while attempting to define the links and relations between them one must pay attention to the specific nature of their object of study and only on that basis determine the relations they establish with each other, be it “as false cousins or true friends” [M. -A. Paveau & S. V. Luigi, 2011:3]. Furthermore, when these two disciplines assume the role of school subjects in teaching, the nature of their object of study must be more closely scrutinized in order to further determine the links and relations between them.

The difficulty in examining these relations becomes even more evident in the light of the fact that these two disciplines also differ from each other in two additional obvious respects: firstly, from the epistemological point of view, there is a certain asymmetry between the two. Linguistics is characterized by a multitude of possible objects of study some of them theoretical (*language, languages, systems, forms...*), and others empirical (*utterances, texts, discourse/speech production and interaction...*). Literature, on the other hand, only has an empirical, extremely specific and unique object of study manifested through linguistic creation, irrespective of the variety of genres, literary forms and sub-forms, and the co-relations they establish among each other. Secondly, the difference lies also in the non-uniform ways of reading texts by the methodologies developed in these two different disciplines. [M. -A. Paveau & S. V. Luigi, 2011:3].

So then, in order to look at the relations and links between the two areas it is necessary to look more closely at the object of study present in each of them. Such clarification will make it possible to identify the common ‘territories’ they share and the types of relations they establish in these territories.

As already accepted, *linguistics*, the science that studies language/languages is defined

7. *This very tangible problem, especially for the student reader, has sometimes led to somewhat extreme stances in relation to the way literature is perceived in schools. Christophe Romeaux emphasises: “What is literature? There is a difference between those who consider literature a cultural heritage and those who regard it first and foremost as a cultural production which includes comic strip narrations, detective stories, children’s literature and children’s albums. Some teachers continue to make the distinction between genuine, pure literature and non-genuine literature, regarding adult literature as the only genuine literature. I am not sure that Harry Potter is less of a literary work and I think it is more interesting if we posed the question of the status of a literary work. It is worth considering the reasons for the success of this or that literary work.” [C. Romeaux, 2002:1].*

as “organized knowledge structured in line with methods accepted by the reason, which correspond with factual observations and leads to generalisations and/or instructions on the basis of such observations. It makes use of examination methods that enable the description of the various markers of a language and also the interaction among these markers. It is concerned with grammar and also with a range of other phenomena that enable the use of language: pronunciation, phonetics, phonology, accent, prosody, spelling, word formation, lexicology, etymology, syntax; but it is also concerned with phenomena of a pragmatic nature upon which the effective functioning of language depends (relations between markers and users), language registers, errors made by interlocutors, history of language (philology). As such, on the one hand it [linguistics] makes observations and does not define rules, i.e. it is descriptive (it records and interprets facts). But on the other hand, it consists of and presupposes grammar as its component part. Grammar itself is concerned with the correct use of language and formulates rules which enable people to speak and write a given language correctly; indeed it is a necessary precondition to learn and know language. Grammar is prescriptive; it urges us to use language in a certain way or with a certain meaning, presented in a certain form. It is developed as such through normative efforts.” [P. Guelpa, 1997:9]. It might follow then, that what linguistics undertakes to do and, consequently, what the teaching of language undertakes to do, are not directly related to the object of study of literature and its relations with literature are not in any way straightforward and simple. There is a tendency in today’s thinking however, that even the teaching of what is arguably the most prescriptive part of linguistics – grammar – should take into account context-imposed conditionalities and the aims conveyed by speakers in the use of language as they speak. “A teaching of grammar that does not take into account what can be said about what we seek to say and similarly, what we think should be understood by what is said or read, might lead to acquisition of knowledge that is detached from the language practices and consciousness of the text producer. According to Marlo Ponti, ‘the theory of discourse should be the pathway that connects us to the experiences of the speaking subject.’ [D. Ducard, 2001:28]. The emergence of new linguistic theories and more complete methodologies in the examination of linguistic messages, the emergence and refinement of new concepts of discourse, utterance, and text, have led to the adoption of a new viewpoint in linguistic analysis which addresses the relations between a prescriptive morpho-syntactic grammar with a grammar that is more concerned with discourse, more specifically, with utterances in discourse. “The first focuses on an analysis of the distribution and status of already defined terms and their specialized functions in the construction of correct utterances as syntactic categories equipped with certain taxonomical characteristics. The second is concerned with utterances and text semantics, the way they are shaped, their dynamics and effect.” [D. Ducard, 2001:30]. The shift towards other text “territories” (including literary texts) and their reading are obvious.

Literature, too, is a concept that has evolved in the course of centuries, originally simply denoting something presented in written form, then knowledge acquired from books, and then a written cultural heritage. The definition of the term continued to evolve: it was further qualified to denote written texts that are essentially literary works of various genres that fulfil a primary function – the aesthetic one. Central to the definition of this body of literary work that evokes aesthetic experiences is, as already emphasized, literarity, i.e. what makes a text ‘literary’, as opposed to other forms of written text, from other

areas of human knowledge and culture. It is precisely around this notion that research has focused in areas akin to linguistics; indeed there have been findings that seem to support interpretations in both domains, starting with structuralist approaches to literary text (as used by Roland Barthes, for instance), the narratological approach (used by G. Gerard Genette), stylistic approaches (Michael Riffaterre), or the poetic-linguistic approach (championed by Roman Jakobson) etc. [For more information see Wikipedia.org/Wiki/Littérature]. These schools in the examination of literary text were born at a time when linguistic structuralism was at its zenith, thus giving rise to close collaborative relations between literary sciences and linguistics.

The multitude of angles used by linguistics to address its object of study - namely language/speech - and the nature of knowledge obtained through it has created an initial asymmetry that distinguishes linguistics from literature, assigning it 'territories' that are completely apart from those of literature, thus complicating the relations and links between them; but in the case of text, more specifically of literary texts, then there are 'territories' where linguistics is engaged and where it can make its contribution in the examination of such texts.

However, the complexity of these relations is manifested in more mitigated forms in the teaching of teaching of language and literature in schools, mainly due to reductionist practices adopted by various approaches, thus creating a second experience – the school experience – where use is made of some linguistic knowledge traditionally derived from disciplines such as linguistic stylistics and rhetoric to help analyse literary texts, and where examples and models of literary messages used to exemplify illustrate language usage are mainly of a normative nature. In such modified settings the co-relation between the two disciplines cannot lead to an optimum and comprehensive usage of linguistic knowledge in the service of the mastery of the values of literary text.

In order to shed more light on these relations, therefore, one has to determine in what respects can linguistics contribute to the study of literary text and, to do this, linguistics must be on the same wavelength and co-operate with disciplines and schools of literary thought that examine the specific features of the linguistic composition of a literary text. The links and relations between the two disciplines are of an indirect nature as far as other areas of examination are concerned.

The text, more specifically the literary text, is where linguistics and literature intersect today

Linguistic studies have helped elucidate new and more numerous values, features and characteristics of the literary text – this unique *product* in the process of communication among people, primarily in the process of communicating with readers. The concepts elaborated by new linguistic disciplines, such as theories of the utterance, discourse/linguistic interactions, communicative situations, speech-act situations, etc., etc., have produced new ways for the examination of texts, literary texts, or literary works in their entirety, and have enabled mastery of their values by the reader. As a result they have enhanced the role and influence of literature in the aesthetic, intellectual, and civic education of readers and have arguably helped readers attain a more all-round linguistic education⁸.

By accepting that the text, more specifically literary text, is the meeting point between linguistics and literature we are also accepting the new status that the notion *text*

8. In this instance reference is not made to the more straightforward matters of mastering the spelling, grammatical, or lexical norms of a language, which cannot be loaded onto this area where domains of the two disciplines overlap. These are matters that are tackled by linguistics and which form part of the tasks of the teaching of the Albanian language, independently of literature and literary text.

has assumed as a result of what these sciences have achieved in our times.

The notion of *the text* has been present since earlier on in analyses of a rhetorical nature but it only gained full status during the second half of the 20th century with the development of knowledge from areas such as semiotics, text linguistics, narratology, etc. The recognition and acceptance of the notion of *the text* (and consequently of the *literary text*) in the domain of linguistic studies “is the result of a certain shift and divergence of views from the traditional definition of text as a written product towards an understanding of it as a unit of discourse, larger than sentences/phrases in the letter-word-sentence-text progression.” [A. Carlotti, 2011:36]. Two approaches were derived from this concept: a “text grammar” conceptualized after the model of sentence grammar; a “textual grammar” which aims to replace “text grammar” by asserting itself as a grammar whose confines do not extend beyond the phrase –also known as translinguistics. Any levels above the phrase are studied with the help of cohesion *markers* and the essential feature of this category is *textualisation*, which presupposes a higher level of organization and, as such, it also presupposes *coherence* in what is created linguistically, i.e. in relation to various sorts of referents.

These new approaches introduced the examination of parameters other than those related to the linguistic system - the code - which are related to the context, i.e. communicative and speech act situations. “The context forms part of the text; it leads to the meaning of the text, just like the text leads to its effect” ... The text includes universals, archetypes, *ideologemes* (ideological utterances, according to R. Barthes and J. Kristeva), which make up the “code in writing.” [C. Grivel, 1973:19-23]. The introduction of new parameters in the study of the text also made it possible to develop new taxonomies of its typology and new criteria for its description, mainly by making use of concepts and categories elaborated by linguistics and speech sciences. “The text [...] represents the material outcome of the act of communication. It shows a conscious (or unconscious) choice made by the speaking subject in terms of *linguistic categories* and the *ways of organizing discourse*, under the conditions dictated by the *situation*.... The text is a product-outcome of the act of communication. It is created through language and discourse but is not of an identical nature as these two components. The text is directly dependent on the speaking subject’s contract in relation to their *communicative situation* and *speech project*. This helps categorise texts into various types (journalistic, scientific, informational, instructional, etc.), which must not be confused with types of discourse, because a given type of text can be the result of one or more ways of organizing discourse and the use of several linguistic categories.” [P. Charaudeau, 1992:34-35].

The question of analysing literary texts is therefore placed within this framework of defining and conceptualizing text as a special discursive form manifesting specific typological characteristics. “The advantage of a literary text is that it is always a novel, even strange, but always coherent and masterable linguistic space ...albeit one which you have to reconstruct ...” [J. Adam, 2011a:105]. Indeed, “the text, be it old or modern, has a formative value in itself because it conditions all relations with culture. It is a special synthesis between the will of a historical individual to express himself and a body of codes (language, faith, a system of manifestations characteristic of an era). This synthesis is regulated: a text, because it is a sort of well-thought-through weaving, has a form, a regularity that provides meaning.” [J. de la Combe & Wisman, 2004:212]. Hence the necessity of the processes of reconstruction and mastering the reading process which enable the shaping of full linguistic and communicative competences by analysing language

in use and in the process of communication. “[...] Languages live only through their discursive realisation and these realisations by means of ‘discursive language’ assume the form of texts.” [J. Adam, 2011a:104].

Linguistic disciplines that deal with the examination of texts and especially those branches that focus more closely on the literary text have outlined methodologies and conceptual apparatuses conducive to a more in-depth examination of discursive forms and the multitude of voices that are expressed in it. By not confining itself to an inventorisation of expressive means, techniques of figurative expression etc., and by placing the emphasis on cultural and intellectual contextual conditionality in the selection and processing of linguistic means and by looking at the literary text as a special discursive form in the process of communication, these disciplines have also created new concepts of the literary text itself, the aesthetic principles guiding its creation, and its relations with the reader, which goes beyond a mere linguistic or, in the best case scenario, rhetoric or stylistic examination, aiming for a translinguistic approach, according to J. Adam’s programme. [J. Adam, 2011b].

It is precisely in these domains then - where text is conceived of in the framework of the parameters and features mentioned above - that we ought to look for relations of co-operation and links between linguistics and literature; these are, in fact, areas present in both epistemes, or rather, they are ‘shared territories’ by both epistemes. It is for this reason that we believe the teaching of literature also helps the students’ linguistic abilities as the literary text is rather like an orchestra of voices that enables a variety of discursive forms of communication produced and conditioned by pragmatic and utterance-related factors, the same as those encountered by people in their everyday lives and in order to be successful, they have to master them. Literary texts are, in this sense, excellent models for language training. The teaching of language will lead to a mastery of this domain - where linguistics intersects with literature - when it gives priority to the functional mastery and use of discourse or language interactions. The literary text is one of these forms of interaction. The aim in this case is not to achieve linguistic education by focusing on knowledge of a metalinguistic nature, but to develop the students’ language competence through models and practicing those models in a variety of enunciative and communicative situations.

In this context it becomes necessary to develop a sustainable significance of the notion “discourse/discursive outcome” (by way of explanation, it has to be noted that for our purposes “discourse/discursive outcome” is a theoretical entity and is not used in to mean “our everyday speech”). As a matter of fact, the *discourse* ends in the body of objects of study with which pragmatics is especially concerned (including theories of the utterance, textual grammar or speech analysis) manifests itself as the most polysemic one and compares and contrasts with other units such as *sentences/phrases, utterances, text*, etc. Various scholars have emphasized that since the 1930s, with the studies of Alan Henderson Gardiner and Gustave Guillaume, *discourse* is distinguished from language. In this classification, very similar to Saussure’s language/speech dichotomy, language appears as a system of virtual values while discourse is about the use of language in context. According to this approach, in the language/discourse dichotomy, language appears as a code that is detached from the members of a community while discourse is the use of this code as conditioned by them. Discourse is also distinguished from text (according to the definition provided by J. Adam, 1999:39), and understood as the “insertion of a text in its context”. In addition, discourse is also different from utterance almost in the same way

as it is different from text. In the context of these propositions, discourse may be defined as a sequence of sentences/phrases that function as utterances or a body of utterances produced in a given speech situation (i.e. in similarly to the pair speech act/speech act situation), thus producing certain models. [A. Carlotti, 2011:45].

Given that discourse is an extremely heterogeneous concept, in order to have a working definition that will lend itself easily to a teaching setting (but also to other situations) we have proposed and are using the syntagmatic notion of a “discursive outcome”, as a construct that could be more conducive to the more widely accepted features and characteristics covered by this concept. [T. Plangarica, 2010; 2011; 2012].

By channelling the aims of mother tongue teaching towards a knowledge of the specific features present in the use of discourse/interactions (which presuppose certain communicative and utterance situations), rather than towards a knowledge of the constituent parts of the linguistic code and the rules for combining them, language teaching will serve to prepare citizens of a modern society, whose challenges demand that they are equipped with a multitude of values that the use of language in society entails. In a number of European experiences, including for instance, the French experience, the mastery of discourse/discourse outcomes is placed in the centre of mother-tongue teaching in the 9-year primary education.

Irrespective of interpretations, whether someone is able or not to “master” language/discourse⁹, the tendency is to give discourse/speech outcomes as much space as possible in teaching, by conceiving of them as “means of making our worlds” on one hand but also as something that “processes our social, cultural and aesthetic universes ...” on the other [M. -A. Paveau, 2011:91]. In addition, the knowledge and ability to use various forms of discourse/discourse outcomes enables us to better understand and evaluate texts, more specifically literary texts, because it enables students to grasp the text in its entirety, as a whole, both as regards its internal linguistic connections and its contextual-situational conditions.

When are relations between linguistics and literature most prominent in research and teaching, and why?

The path to the present-day interpretation of the relations between linguistics and literature has been a long journey of evolving concepts and categories which saw a particularly intensive development starting from the second half of the last century.

Present-day research notes that until the 1960s the relations between linguistics and literature were not seen as problematic. Linguists approached literary text mostly along the lines of philological principles, while literary text itself was instrumental in providing information about the history of language and philology. In addition, these relations also found expression in examinations of a stylistic nature into the features and markers of the literary text, which were borrowed both from stylistics - the study of expressive means - which was in turn conceived of as an extension of rhetoric (the so-called atomistic stylistics), and from organic stylistics, according to which the work was regarded as an ‘expression’ of the conscience of a subject (author). [D. Maingueneau, 2011:75-76].

These practices have been and are still present in our experience of teaching the Albanian language and literature, more notably the practice of philological and stylistic

9. In this regard we take into account the following observation made by M. -A. Paveau, who noted: “...mastery of the language does not mean anything; at any rate, it does not bring anything good to the student: we do not ‘master’ language, we co-exist with it, we embody/ create it, we visit it, and all these metaphors are more valid than this illusion of ‘mastering’ it.” [M.-A. Paveau, 2011:91].

examination of expressive devices as an extension of classical rhetoric.

The 1960s were years where the structuralist method, already well-established in linguistics, was extending its influence in the study of literary texts and leading to the creation of a structuralist approach even in this discipline. The product of this influence and expansion of linguistics were studies that helped identify categories and concepts which were not directly related to the linguistic units of the linguistic code, or the linguistic categories of these units; by now, notions like *paradigm*, *syntagma*, *connotation*, *actant* were being used and processed and new study trends were being developed, which related to narratology, poetics (in the narrow sense of a theory of poetry).¹⁰

Our linguistic studies were not able to keep abreast of and reflect these developments contemporaneously; as a consequence they only appeared much later and in a very sporadic fashion in our teaching practices.

In the 1970s, “linguistic imperialism” begins to fade and retreat into domains directly related to linguistics. Linguistics focused on the study of language and did not ‘export’ its methods and concepts to other disciplines.

By comparison, in the 1980s, the relations and links between linguistics and literature saw a marked revival due to a new status of relations and links following the emergence and development of textual grammar, pragmatic schools, and theories of the utterance. A direct positive consequence in the examination of the literary text was the development of a discipline like the stylistics of the literary text, which provided much more effective and appropriate instruments of analysis than the stylistics of expressive means, and the study of more specific linguistic phenomena such as *modality*, *reported and loose discourse*, *polyphony*, *temporality*, *connectives*, etc., by theories of the utterance. “It can be said that due to the theories of the utterance, the ‘grain’, known by the name of text, is now an object whose dimensions have changed, as if by the use of a new, much more powerful microscope, which enabled a change in the level of our perception.” [Maingueneau, 2011:77-78].

In addition, theories of the utterance have enabled a shift from a linguistics of the phrase/sentence, to a linguistics of the discourse/interaction, thus providing new dimensions to the concepts related to the literary text itself. The introduction of the notion discourse/interaction in the examination of a literary text, as well as the use of discourse analysis methods in the study of literary texts, has led to “the shift of the axis of intelligibility from text to the speech mechanism, where the conditions of the utterance or the ability to utter transcends the very product/utterance itself, where the utterable leads to essential conditions for the utterance, from which one can more fully and generally establish the status of the writer as well as the way he/she is positioned in the literary domain, genre-related indicators, the connection with the audience/receiver that is established through the work, material supporters and the way utterances are circulated [...]. In this sense, to express oneself about literature means to rely on a mechanism of communication and to validate it through the very act of utterance itself.” [Maingueneau, 2011:78].

A new context of relations and methodological conditionalities is therefore created in the examination of the text and, consequently, new relations and links are

10. “Narratology, in spite of some terminological borrowings, mainly metaphorical, [...] has known development that does not owe too much to linguistics. Poetics’, especially as conceived of in its Jakobsonian version, has extended the programme of Russian Formalists of the beginning of the century, without owing too much to the study of natural languages[...]. The only field of linguistic nature that has been developed, is that of studies of the vocabulary of literary works, which is essentially lexical statistics, or the more wide-spread analyses inspired by structural lexicology: distributional studies, semantic fields, semic analysis ...” [D. Maingueneau, 2011:76-77].

established between linguistics and literature and new features and characteristics of the literary text are revealed, also leading to a gradual re-definition of the parameters of the values it conveys, on the basis of principles different from those of romanticist aesthetics, a characteristic feature of literary text creation in the 19th and first half of the 20th century. The mass introduction of concepts and methods stemming from theories of the utterance, textual grammar and pragmatic schools, whether deliberate or otherwise, has changed the way in which we view the relations between *linguistics* and *literature*; “linguistics, which historically provided only descriptive, elemental categories, was now placed in the service of interpretations deemed to be of a higher order. The deepening and expanding of knowledge about genres or types of discourse, enunciative polyphony, anaphora, oral interaction markers, argumentation processes, laws of discourse, indirect/implicit expressions, etc., have led to an understanding of a literary work as a whole, as a textual entirety and as an enunciative process, an integral part of the mechanism of communication. As such, in treating literature as discourse, today’s discourse studies today are not content with borrowing interpretations from other domains; they now say something about the work itself, especially as something that mobilises a certain number of invariants. This does not mean that the detailed manner of studying linguistic phenomena should be ignored; to the contrary – especially in teaching.” [Maingueneau, 2012:78-79].

Nevertheless, even in the countries where these theories emerged and flourished, there is still some reluctance on the part of literary scholars to implement them directly in literary text analyses; often there is preferential usage of certain pieces of knowledge as compared to knowledge coming from other related disciplines.¹¹

After the 1990s, discourse analysis carefully avoided prestigious texts while literary stylistics integrated some instruments borrowed from enunciative and pragmatic schools, but without questioning their essential aspects and the more significant markers they presuppose. [D. Maingueneau, 2011:80].

These European experiences that allow linguistics and discourse studies to make their contribution the study of literary text have been introduced to our schools of thought mainly in the form of linguistic-stylistic considerations and, in the recent years, as textual linguistic considerations.¹² Professor Xhevat Lloshi has developed a programme for examining and explaining linguistic features that enable the creation of a literary text (alongside features that affect the creation of linguistic messages in other functional styles). Nevertheless, this programme, which is a great contribution to the training of university students studying to become teachers of language and literature, has not been reflected to the extent necessary in the language and literature programmes and textbooks for pre-university students. It has to be noted also that a more all-round education and training of students will be made possible only when they are able to acquire knowledge in a systemic way in concert with other disciplines and schools of present-day linguistics

11. “It has been noticed that many literature experts remain very silent when it comes to matters of discourse analysis, while on the other hand, willingly integrate enunciation/utterance theories in their reflections. This is understandable: Our conception of literature is still dominated by a considerably strong opinion deriving from romanticist aesthetism, according to which literature should be confronted with the rest of the verbal productions of the society; there will be, on the one hand “transitive” utterances whose aims lies outside themselves; and on the other, the real “intransitive”, “autotelic” works, whose focus is on themselves – literary works which cannot be treated in any other way but by postulating their non-commensurability.” [Maingueneau, 2011: 79-80].

12. These publications include: Xb. Lloshi, *Stilistika e gjubës shqipe, 1987*, *Stilistika dhe pragmatika, Botimet Toena, 1999*, *Stilistika e gjubës shqipe dhe pragmatika, sbbllu, Tiranë, 2001*; K. Dibra, N. Varfi, *Gjübësi teksti, sbbllu, Tiranë, 1999*; Hasan Muja, *Gjübësia e tekstit, Faik Konica, Prishtinë, 2004*; *Arbër Çeliku Koberena tekstore, Hyrje në konceptet bazë të gjübësisë së tekstit nëpërmjet një qasjeje keruhastese të shqipes me gjermanishten, Shkup-Asdreni, Maqedoni, 2005*; *Barllb Rugova, Gjuha e gazetave, Koba, 2009*; *Tejfe Topalli Gjübësi teksti, USH “Luigj Gurakuqi”, Shkodër, 2011.*

and discourse studies. Only by having such systematic knowledge will they be able to conduct further research, have a good understanding of the right relations and links between their linguistic knowledge and literature, and put them to the service of the study of the literary text.

Why are the relations between linguistics and literature considered successful today?

Today's achievements in the field of discourse studies fully enable the link between linguistics and literature in both key stages of pre-university education – be it in the 9-year primary cycle, where the main aim is the reading of literary texts, or the secondary education level, where in addition to other phenomena related to the literary text, the study of which is aided by other branches of the literary science, the study, examination and mastery of the values of literary (and non-literary) texts is also aided by knowledge of linguistics and discourse studies.

As already mentioned, this relationship:

- Enables students to realise what they can do with language and by using language and consequently, through a cooperation across various disciplines and knowledge, it fulfils the requirement for developing the students' linguistic and cultural competences by addressing a very pressing requirement in today's teaching which is to overcome traditional practices of simply transmitting and ensuring the mastery of knowledge from the respective domains separately;
- Enables us to distance ourselves from a conception of linguistics as a 'suitcase' filled with linguistic means, or as a 'storehouse of linguistic means' which remain simply illustrations of the "goods" that are displayed from one shop window to another; on the other hand, it allows us to distance ourselves from the narrow technical tendency of useless inventorisation of the linguistic means used in the texts. In contrast, this relationship enables the examination of values obtained in the course of their use in concrete situations and contexts in the process of communication, thus making it possible to provide a clearer explanation of the relation between the producer, the text and the receiver of the message;
- Enables us to examine bodies of literary work (poetical narratives, theatre pieces, drama...) and non-literary work (press narratives, political discourse, etc.); Enables the study of the language of the text as a speech act produced in certain communicative and enunciative situations, thus shifting from a focus on the significance of words and sentences, to a focus on the meaning of utterances, the meaning that the producer/speaker intends to convey, as well as the meaning that the receivers or readers of the message construct in their minds;
- An examination on the basis of enunciative, pragmatic, textual linguistics and discourse analysis theories enables us to study literary texts in the light of methodologies and operational notions of literary discourse, thus shifting the intelligibility axis from the text to a speech mechanism where the ability to utter determines the utterance itself and where the utterable leads to the essential conditions of the utterance;

- By starting the examination at the level of the utterance and by conducting a close scrutiny of the utterance as conditioned by the situation in which it is uttered, we shall be able to conduct a closer study of the writer's status and his or her positioning in the literary domain, his or her relation with the reader/receiver established via the literary work. This will allow us to express our opinions of literature and at the same on the mechanism of communication and its evaluation through the act of utterance;
- The findings of discourse studies also enable a more direct connection of the literary work with the place, moment, collective cultural experiences engraved in history, and help the students establish relations of an aesthetic nature with discourse and develop new practices of literary production that are not merely literary or artistic compositions.¹³

"Reference knowledge", "teaching knowledge" and the teacher and educator as a mediator and conveyor

The issue at hand clearly displays another very important aspect that warrants the engagement and direct contribution of teachers and educators. This is a problem that manifests itself in at least two main directions: firstly, the need for a methodologisation of notions, concepts and categories operated by what is known as referential knowledge that comes from various branches, trends, or schools of linguistics, discourse studies, literature or literary science in order to transform these into notions, concepts or categories suitable for the teaching knowledge from these two domains. This is by no means a simple task - even in countries where educators and teachers have been engaged in such work for quite a long time now, they are still discussing and debating in search of better solutions and more effective ways of doing this. Secondly, the best possible orientation of teachers towards a philosophy of pedagogical action is necessary for the transmission of knowledge and for the cultivation of student knowledge and attitudes in this respect. An important element of this second direction is the teachers' work in developing the students' skills, enabling them to be able to evaluate and use the great variety of discourse forms found in literary texts, written messages, and situational interactions in the communicative processes they are involved in, both in educational and out-of-school settings. The literary text itself and the very nature of the linguistic knowledge that helps its examination and evaluation presuppose this philosophical conception of pedagogical action in teaching.

The examination of a literary text with the aid of knowledge from linguistics and discourse studies necessarily requires, then, the use of suitable methods so that the students cultivate their linguistic and communicative competences through language, speech and discourse, including literary discourse. We are of the opinion that this pedagogical action shall have effect through the alternate and complementary implementation of three methods of conceptualisation: the positivist, constructivist and pragmatist approaches to teaching.

In this context we are encouraged to present and to demand – both in terms of the relations between linguistics and literature and from the pedagogical point of view – the development of a contemporary pedagogical principle according to which knowledge and competences shall be selected, adapted and shaped in line with the three dominating forms

13. For further information see the articles published in *Lx français aujourd'hui*, Armand Colin/AFEF, December 2011. This commemorative issue was entirely dedicated to the question of relations between linguistics and literature under a publication entitled: *Literature and linguistics: dialogue or co-existence? It takes stock of the experience gained from the very first Colloquium on these matters held in Cluj, France, in 1968, entitled "Linguistics and Literature"*.

of knowledge about pedagogical functions: *descriptivism*, *constructivism*, and *pragmatism*, three forms that represent, in their development, the achievements of classical and logical positivism (one of the most revolutionising movements in the development of science in the 20th century), constructivism and the mentalist ways of representing knowledge, and pragmatism, where knowledge is achieved as a result of interacting subjects¹⁴.

Thus, there are three concepts that influence or should influence the acquisition of knowledge and especially the cultivation of linguistic and communicative competences of students: “to explain something to someone in line with descriptivist theories; to place someone in a suitable situation to explain something to him or her in line with constructivist theories; to explain something in conjunction with someone, in line with pragmatic theories.”¹⁵ The aim of these links between linguistics and the literary, text and its contributions to a mastery and evaluation of the text on various levels, primarily linguistic and contextual, are in full compliance with the above three areas of pedagogical action. A masterful combination of the three in teaching will enable the growth and development of the students’ linguistic and communicative competences, which is in fact the aim of both school subjects or alternatively, the aim of an integrated subject that draws from both domains.

In conclusion, it is worth noting that the relations and links between linguistics and literature in teaching are matters that must be treated in all their breadth and complexity. We think it would be more appropriate if they are described as “relations and links between linguistics and discourse studies and the text (first and foremost with the literary text) and the reading of literary texts in the teaching of language and literature at school”. The examination of these matters is a non-negligible task; indeed it is essential to establish a sustainable basis for further judgments about the integration of knowledge from these disciplines at certain educational levels, or about their separate development, albeit with clear relations and links on other levels.

In the absence of a clear perspective on these matters (alongside other technical and conceptual matters as yet unresolved), sporadic interventions in the conceptualisation of these subjects are not likely to be fruitful; they will just be like new patches on an old garment that does not even fit the growing stature of today’s students and will place them in constant difficulty in an ever-developing society.

References

- Adam, J.-M. (2011a). *Postface. Në Letëratë et linguistique: Dialogue ou coexistence?* Le français aujourd’hui, Armand Colin/AFEF, décembre 2011, p. 103-114.
- Adam, J.-M. (2011b [2005]). *La Linguistique textuelle. Introduction à l’analyse textuelle des discours*, Paris: Armand Collin.
- Carlotti, A. (2011). *Phrase, énoncé, texte, discours. De la linguistique universitaire à la grammaire scolaire*. Lambert-Lucas, Limoges.

14. The newly developed curricula of the Albanian language for the 9-year primary education cycle and the secondary cycle, include elements that presuppose the application of these forms of knowledge and knowledge development; however, they are not coherently outlined, which leads one to think that at times they have been conceived of intuitively and at other times they are the result of copying and pasting of Western methods, without an underlying and well-organised system of requirements. [For more information, see T. Plangarica, 2011.]

15. Lecerq, G. (2000), *Lire d’agir pédagogique: une lecture épistémologique*, *Revue des Sciences de l’éducation*, vol. 26, no.2, p. 243-262, citation p. 249 ; <http://ulerudit.org>

- Charaudeau, P. (1992). *Grammaire du sens et de l'expression*. Hachette Education.
- Ducard, D. (2001). *Langue, énonciation, discours*. In *Quelles grammaires enseigner à l'école et au collège? Discours, genres, textes, phrase*. Delagrave, CRDP Midi-Pyrénées.
- Guelpa, P. (1997). *Introduction à l'analyse linguistique*. Paris :Armand Colin.
- Grivel, Ch. (1973) *Production de l'intérêt romanesque. Un état du texte (1870-1880), un essai de constitution de la théorie, Volume complémentaire*. Mouton.
- Judet de la Combe, P. & Wismann, H. (2004). *L'Avenir des langues*. Paris: Cerf.
- Maingueneau, D. (2011). *Linguistique, Littérature, Discours Littéraire*. In *Littérature et linguistique: Dialogue ou coexistence?* Le français aujourd'hui, Armand Colin/AFEF, décembre 2011, p. 75-82.
- Maingueneau, D. (2009 [1996]). *Aborder la linguistique*. Edition du Seuil, Nouvelle édition revue et augmentée.
- Paveau, M.-A. (2011). *L'analyse linguistique du texte littéraire. Une fausse évidence*. In *Littérature et linguistique: Dialogue ou coexistence?* Le français aujourd'hui, Armand Colin/AFEF, décembre 2011, p. 97-102.
- Paveau, M.-A., Vaudrey-Luigi, S. (2011). *Présentation*. In *Littérature et linguistique: Dialogue ou coexistence?* Le français aujourd'hui, Armand Colin/AFEF, décembre 2011, p. 3-7.
- Plangarica, T. & Pernaska, R. (2012). *Mbi disa skaje filozofike-logjike-gjuhësore në fushën e sintaksës së shqipes, teorisë së të thënës/pragmatikës dhe gjuhësisë tekstore*. In Konferenca shkencore ndërkombëtare *Terminologjia në shkencat e ligjërimit*, Elbasan, 13 March 2012.
- Plangarica, T. (2011). *Gramatika shkollore, gramatika e tekstit/diskursit dhe disa dukuri gjuhësore/ligjërimore që mund të studiohen veçse në tekst/diskurs*. In *Aktet e Seminarit XXX Ndërkombëtar të Prishtinës*, 26 August 2011.
- Plangarica, T. (2010). *"Gjuha shqipe në arsimin shqiptar: çështje të metodës*. In *Politikat shkencore për lëndët e Gjuhës dhe Letërsisë në arsimin shqiptar*, National Consultation organised by the Centre for Albanological Studies, Tirana, in collaboration with the Ministry of Education and Scienc, Tirana 12 April 2010.
- Plangarica, T. (2009). *Koncepte të reja në një sistem të rinovuar dijeje në kurrikulën universitare të mësuesit të gjuhës shqipe*. In Konferenca shkencore ndërkombëtare *Kongres kombëtar – shkollë kombëtare*, Elbasan, 2-3 December 2009.
- Plangarica, T. (2002). *Në tekst, për tekstin*. Botimet Sejko.
- Ronveaux, C. (2002). *Enseigner la lecture via l'objet littéraire*, www.ordp.vsnnet.ch/mai 2002.
- Saussure, F. (de), (1995 [1916]). *Cours de linguistique générale*, éd. T. de Mauro, Payot-Rivages.