JACQUES GUILHAUMOU AND THE FRENCH SCHOOL

Jan Ifversen

Every summer I teach an introductory course on the history of concepts, at the *Concepta* PhD Summer School.[1] Apart from introducing Reinhart Koselleck's development of *Begriffsgeschichte*, I also give a lecture on what I call the French school of conceptual history. I do not think anyone officially refers to such a French school. Many French schools have been designated, but not within the history of concepts. In my lecture on this particular French school, historian and linguist Jacques Guilhaumou (born 1948) plays the leading role. Guilhaumou began his combined career as a linguist and a historian in the turbulent sixties. He was a student at the new 'revolutionary' *Nanterre* university. Already in his master's thesis, written in 1970, he outlined his interest in studying the political discourses of the French revolution. His dissertation, written in 1978, was an analysis of revolutionary discourse from 1792 to 1794, the most hectic period of the French revolution. As a Marxist historian he had a fundamental interest in revolutions, which he combined with an interest in studying the linguistic manifestations of ideology.

Since the 1970s, Guilhaumou has had an impressive career as a researcher at the CNRS (Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique), the national research institute in France. He has been a member of several research groups at this institution. At present, he is member of a group named *Triangle. Action, discours, pensée politique et économique*,

affiliated with the Lyon branch of the *Ecole Normale Supérieure.* Although he has been based in Paris and Lyon, most of his writing pours from his home office in Marseilles. In his 35 years as a scholar he has published an impressive number of books and articles, most of them dealing with various aspects the French revolution from a linguistic point of view.[2] Since his early years, Guilhaumou has been very active in developing what has been recognised as the French school of discourse analysis. In fact, through his many articles commenting on the different steps in the development of French discourse analysis (or AD – *Analyse du Discours* – as they say in French), he has played an active role in creating the school.[3] He has assembled some of these articles in his latest book, *Discours et événement: L'histoire langagière des concepts* (Guilhaumou 2006).

In this book, Guilhaumou traces the parallel developments of AD in France and his own scholarly contributions. In a typically French style, it is also an *égo-histoire* which emphasises the important roles played by Guilhaumou and his friends in developing AD. Although the history of AD has been presented differently by others (Maingueneau 1991; Mazière 2005), there is no doubt that Guilhaumou has played a crucial role. Judging by his writings (many of which are co-authored) and his attendance at conferences, he seems to know almost everybody worth knowing in the linguistic circles in France. And they know him. He contributes to the most prestigious dictionaries on AD (Charaudeau & Maingueneau 2002; Détrie, Siblot & Verine 2001), he is mentioned in many works on AD, and he is invited to all the important conferences. The same is certainly not true of the historians' guild, where he is seen – if he is seen at all – as a strange figure. His modest reception among historians has to do with a typical realist reflex – embedded in the discipline – towards constructivist theories of all kinds. Some historians, however, have been involved in what Guilhaumou calls "discourse analysis from the historical perspective" (L'analyse de discours du côté de l'histoire).[4]

The term *analyse du discours* was coined by Jean Dubois, a recognised linguist who, in 1969, edited an issue of the prestigious journal, *Langages*, on discourse analysis.[5] Guilhaumou does not connect directly to this more canonical version of the birth of French AD. The birthplace of his version, which, for convenience, we will abbreviate ADH (*H* being the historical dimension), was a seminar on political lexicology which took place at Nanterre in 1968. Lexicology, or rather

the lexicometry that came out of the *laboratoire de lexicométrie et textes politiques* at the *École Normale Supérieure* in Saint Cloud, just outside Paris, was to be an important location in the development of ADH. But Nanterre was not only about lexicology. It was also the meeting place of an Althusserian theory of ideology and discourse analysis. Guilhaumou mentions the influence of Althusser and Marxism in his book, but in a rather taken-for-granted manner.

Sources Of Inspiration

Althusser's famous 1970 text on ideology outlined the epistemological reservoir from which ADH would nourish itself (Althusser 1971). Althusser emphasised the dependence of ideology on social formation and mode of production, the cornerstones of Marxist ontology. But at the same time, he granted ideology a relative autonomy. Ideology had to be an "imaginary distortion" of the real world (Althusser 1971, 165), but it was effective in that it regulated individual expressions of ideas. Regulation was part of an ideology's 'materiality', its embeddedness in an apparatus with regular practices. Materiality was what dismissed all idealist understandings of ideology. Althusser combined this understanding of ideology with the grand epistemological claim of the decentred subject. As he stated, "all ideology has the function (which defines it) of 'constituting' individuals as subjects" (ibid, 171). Individuals were ascribed certain positions by ideology, or *interpellé* as he so famously referred to it. Individuals were thus acting in an ideological space of already existing subject positions, which it was the task of critical analysis to bring to light.

Althusser did not relate his concept of ideology to language. But his theory of subject position indicated a direction that was taken up by more linguistically oriented Marxists, foremost among them Michel Pêcheux (1939-1983).[6] Pêcheux introduced the concept of discourse into the study of ideologies within particular social formations. Basically, he understood discourse as the linguistic form of ideology (Pêcheux 1975, 127-135). Through a critical reading of Saussure, the usual suspect of poststructuralism, he introduced discourse to the famous couple of *langue* and *parole*. Discourse was certainly not identical with *parole*, the individual act of language use. On the contrary, it designated a system of rules regulating what it was possible to say.

In its formal workings, discourse was a system of paradigmatic relations, that is, a system of relations of substitutions (Wallis 2007). But this system was dependent on the operation of larger ideological formations within social formations. In contrast to Saussurian formalism, discourses were not viewed as formal systems producing meaning. They depended on the extra-discursive context ultimately located in the social formations. The task of discourse analysis was, accordingly, to describe the linguistic 'materiality' of ideology. With the introduction of discourse, language was added to the Althusserian theory of ideology's materiality. Pêcheux wanted to uncover 'the conditions of production of discourse' which specifically concerned the transference of ideology into discourse. He was particularly interested in tracing how ideological subject positions determined language use.

As Pêcheux discovered, the formal analysis of discourse tends to regard discourse as a stable system. This did not fit well with the Marxist idea of ideological confrontations based on class struggles. He therefore developed a theory of discursive instability which was rooted in *interdiscourse* (Pêcheux 1975, 150-152). As we shall see, the concept of interdiscourse was to become crucial to the development of ADH. Interdiscourse had two basic meanings. It meant that discourses were never fixed, but operated in a field of many discourses, that is, in a situation of heterogeneity (Helsloot & Hak 2000, 23). Interdiscourse thus signified the extra-discursive in the form of other discourses that constantly penetrated into, and thus destabilised discourse. In Pêcheux's view, the condition of production of discourse had to be understood as a constant process of inclusion and exclusion, played out within a hegemonic ideological formation. The workings of interdiscourse could be understood in a synchronic way as an engagement between discourses. But it was more important for Pêcheux to understand interdiscourse diachronically as an existing, "preconstructed" field which would determine what could be said (Pêcheux 1975, 148). As formulated by Maingueneau, interdiscourse is an analytical term that grasps the double constraint of what has already been said, and what can be said (Maingueneau 1991, 20).

Pêcheux's Marxist discourse analysis, with its emphasis on ideology, hegemony and struggle, was one source of inspiration for ADH; Michel Foucault's version of discourse analysis was another. Foucault, more radically than Pêcheux, introduced discourse as an autonomous dimension neither dependent on the language system (*langue*), nor on

any extra-discursive context. He stated, "…le discours n'est pas une mince surface de contact, ou d'affrontement, entre une réalité et une langue, l'intrication d'un lexique et d'une experience" (Foucault 1969, 66).[7] In *l'Archeologie du savoir*, he elaborated his theory of discourse as an autonomous entity. Although part of the same anti-subjectivist endeavour as Pêcheux, Foucault's concept of discourse differed from that of the former; it was less linguistically defined and richer in analytical range.

Foucault defined discourse and discursive formation in terms of a system regulating utterances (*énoncés*). The workings and effect of discourse on all kind of *practices*, he termed discursive practice. To conceptualise "a general system" of discourses, he introduced the metaphor of archive. In Foucault's theory of discourse, the archive signified the "law" regulating what could be expressed during a particular period of time (ibid, 170). The archive, however, was an analytical term that did not carry the extra-discursive weight of ideology. Foucault's theory of discourse outlined two further aspects that became important to ADH. When it came to the role of interdiscourse, Foucault went much further than Pêcheux, who tended to treat interdiscourse as a dimension external to a given discourse. Foucault, on the other hand, treated interdiscourse as an element of discourse. All utterances and all discourses were caught up in a general "play of differences" (ibid, 23), which was determined by "the economy of the discursive constellation" (ibid, 88), its "system of dispersion" (ibid, 53) or, particularly, "the strategic choices" (ibid, 89) of the discourse. Interdiscourse was thus seen as a constitutive part of discourse.

The other aspect that distinguished Foucauldian discourse analysis was its elaboration of the various elements to be analysed in the formation of a discourse. These consisted of the formation of the *objects* with which the discourse dealt; "the conceptual architecture" (ibid, 80) and the themes through which objects were formed; and particularly, the "enunciative modalities", which included the analysis of subject positions. The elements of concepts and themes directed the attention towards the semantic dimension of language (albeit in a less linguistic way than in Pêcheux's version); the enunciative modalities linked the Althusserian idea of subject positions with a linguistic understanding of speech as a relation between enunciation and utterance.[8] The subject could thus be seen as a position linked to the object and a form of utterance marked in language.

Guilhaumou locates three major sources of inspiration for ADH. The first is Pêcheux's Marxist theory of ideology and discourse, the second is Foucauldian discourse theory, and the third is lexicometry. In the late sixties and early seventies, the linguists at Saint Cloud took an interest in analysing political utterances from historically turbulent periods. They took their point of departure in very formalised studies of the distribution of key words in selected corpora developed by American linguist, Zellig Harris (1909-1992), under the label of discourse analysis. It was their ambition to use the new techniques available with the introduction of the first generation of data processors to statistically analyse word relations and word frequencies, in order to trace semantic changes at given historical junctures.[9] One group, to which Guilhaumou himself belonged, constructed corpora of political texts from the French revolution. The lexicometricians at Saint Cloud intended to use technically advanced methods to study semantic shifts during periods of dense ideological confrontation. In a way, their project was akin to Pêcheux's efforts to develop an automatic discourse analysis of the study of ideology, albeit using a more technically and linguistically advanced approach.

The Development Of ADH

Guilhaumou's first historical works on Jacobin discourse during the French revolution, based on a textual corpus compiled from the revolutionary journal *Père Duchêne*, were certainly influenced by lexicometry (Guilhaumou 1986). But he also had ambitions of engaging with historians. His interest in Jacobin ideology and discourse can also be seen as an effort to reinterpret the Marxist analysis of the French revolution, which in Albert Soboul's writings had a rigidly social-historical focus. In his rendering of the history of ADH, Guilhaumou distances himself from lexicometry because of its weak understanding of the role of historical context. According to him, the interest in reflecting on the link between discourse and context would, in the end, separate ADH from lexicometry.

Guilhaumou emphasises the importance of discourse analysis to the beginnings of ADH, particularly the role of interdiscourse, which allowed ADH to escape the construction of too-simple and too-homogeneous discourses, such as bourgeois discourse and aristocratic

discourse.[10] Instead, the focus would be on "the intertwining discursive strategies" and "the linguistic confrontations and alliances" (Guilhaumou 2006, 18). Foucault's specific legacy is acknowledged. Following Guilhaumou, Foucault's inclusive approach, which links the formation of objects with concepts, themes and subject positions, allows for a version of discourse analysis which combines semantic analysis with a sensitivity to enunciation (Guilhaumou 2005, 98).[11] This double orientation becomes a guideline for the development of ADH. It should also be mentioned that Guilhaumou gives a prominent place to the Foucauldian notion of the archive in his approach. The archive is the basic set of meaning-producing configurations in a given context.[12] The construction of the corpus for analysis depends on a particular 'reading' of the archive.

In his reconstruction of the history of ADH, Guilhaumou makes a clear division between the lexicometric years of the seventies, and the eighties, which see a refinement of the notion of discourse. As I read this history, two important steps introduced during these years demonstrate the originality of ADH. The first step was the introduction of the analytical notion of thematic trajectories (*trajets thématiques*). Through this notion, ADH could follow the emergence of certain themes in the archive. Theme was understood as the content which was being formed in discourse, that is, in the relations between objects, concepts and subject positions.[13] Guilhaumou suggests subsistence as a theme that follows a particular route during the French revolution (Guilhaumou & Maldidier 1986). In a meticulous analysis from 1986, done together with his *compagnon de route* since the seventies, the linguist Denise Maldidier, he analysed the concretisation of subsistence in demands for *bread*, as they appeared in texts before and during the revolution.[14] To describe the utterances in the corpus, or what Guilhaumou refers to as the materiality of discourse, they used the tools of lexicometry, which meant mapping all the syntagmatic and paradigmatic relations involving bread. Their purpose was to observe shifts in the way the theme was articulated. They were thus able to demonstrate how the demands for bread became politicised by being connected with liberty (in demands for bread and liberty) or, later on, with demands for violent action (in demands for bread and iron). The different connections to bread, which revealed a certain trajectory for the theme of subsistence during the revolution, could be analysed in the coordinated sequences in which bread appeared with other sig-

nificant terms. At a more general level, the analysis contributed to demonstrating how social questions became politicised during the revolution, for instance by being linked to liberty, and thereby to an emerging discourse of, or a "language of rights".

ADH was still targeted at the analysis of politically turbulent periods in history. The texts selected for the corpora were predominantly of a political nature (speeches, leaflets, pamphlets) with a strong focus on action. Theorising action in language became a second important step in the development of ADH. This was, first of all, accomplished by focusing on the emergence of new subject positions in the revolutionary discourse, particularly in the study of spokesmen (*porte paroles*). Through the study of revolutionary discourse, ADH, and Guilhaumou himself, in particular, intended to analyse the politicisation and democratisation produced by the revolutionary events. Politicisation meant the creation of a new political language which could open a space for democratisation. For ADH, these processes could be analysed in the linguistic materiality of the political language. In his important book on political language and the French Revolution, published in the run up to the *Bicentenaire* (Guilhaumou 1989), Guilhaumou proposed a model for the analysis of emerging political language. Political language not only had to be studied as a discursive manifestation; the reflexivity revealed by the historical actors in their use of political language was equally important.

From the perspective of discourse analysis, Guilhaumou was interested in analysing how political language could become an object. In keeping with his Foucauldian approach, he combined the analysis of thematic trajectories with a focus on enunciative frames. The analysis was built on the assumption that political language took form within a language of rights, which, with the revolutionary events, was opposed by a language of the people. The language of rights involved a fixed relation between the national representatives and the citizens, whereas the language of the people established an unstable position that required a spokesmen who could make the people act. In his study, Guilhaumou sees the appearance of spokesmen in the revolutionary events of September 1792 as the introduction of a new subject position, which changes the enunciative framework created in 1789. The demonstration of this thematic trajectory was, for Guilhaumou, a contribution of ADH to the classical debate within revolutionary historiography, of the struggle between the different political and social forces in the political institutions.[15]

In his book on political language and in his other studies of revolutionary discourse, Guilhaumou has developed a very sophisticated model for discourse analysis. Through the linguistic description of the positions of enunciation, he demonstrates how the emergence of new subject positions changes the historical understanding of political language. Although he reserves the term "spokesman" for a particular position produced by revolutionary events, I would argue that it is possible to generalise this position to include the positional struggles appearing with the democratisation of political language.[16] In this general understanding, the elected representatives in the national assembly are also spokesmen, as are the members of the different political factions. Furthermore, Guilhaumou combines the analysis of enunciation with an analysis of the semantics through which the positions appear in discourse. He has proposed the term "designators" (*désignants*) for the study of the semantics of subject positions. The first volume of the *Dictionnaire des usages socio-politiques (1770-1815)* was dedicated to the study of designators such as *aristocrate or sans culottes* (Dictionnaire 1985). I will return to this dictionary in a moment, and here only stress the interest of ADH to auto-designators as well as hetero-designators. The inclusion of the latter opened up a wider framework for the analysis of positions and positioning in the emerging political space.

The highlighting of subject positions in ADH was linked to an interest in the active dimension of language. Guilhaumou had already demonstrated how the formulation of slogans (*mots d'ordre*) was linked to demands which, at the discursive level, manifested themselves in the use of verbs of action, such as "to demand" and "to threaten". A subject position would then appear forcefully, when linked to a certain action.[17] The representatives would thus be linked to the action of making the law or, as Guilhaumou puts it, to the action of "making law talk" (Guilhaumou 1989, 18; Guilhaumou 2006, 29). With the continued development of political language, these actions would become institutionalised, but also challenged by new positions emerging from the language of the people.

The Meeting With Begriffsgeschichte And The Cambridge School

In his history of ADH, Guilhaumou signals another turn in the 1990s. Although Guilhaumou's retrospective narrative makes the turn ap-

pear more manifest, some remarkable shifts in focus can be observed. I would like to note three such shifts. The first is the growing interest in the "linguistic reasoning" or reflexivity of the historical language users. The second shift is marked by an interest in the rhetorical reflexivity of the actors. There is certainly a link here, between the earlier interest in language use and the focus on argumentative practices. The third shift, which is more correctly located in the 1980s, has to do with the interest in the political use of particular words and concepts. For Guilhaumou, the new turn in ADH can be placed under the heading of "a hermeneutic posture" by which he wishes to emphasise the necessity of understanding the normative and interpretative potential of language as demonstrated by the reflexivity of language users (Guilhaumou 2006, 28).

Guilhaumou's study of how language use forms or changes a situation has developed from an interest in explicitly political language, as expressed, for instance, by the radical Jacobin, Hebert, in the Parisian journal Père Duchêne, or in slogans on "the need for 'terror'" (Guilhaumou 1987), to the linguistic reflections of political actors. In his book on the formation of political language, he focused extensively on the language politics of revolutionary actors, that is, their grammatical and didactic reflections on how language could create a revolution (Guilhaumou 1989). Guilhaumou call this the linguistic rationality inherent in politics (ibid, 23). Since the 1990s, he has taken a great interest in studying the link between philosophical reflections on language, and reflections on political action performed by historical actors. He has particularly focused on one of the leading intellectuals in the French revolution, Abbé Sieyès, and has devoted a monograph to analysing the links between Sieyès' philosophical, linguistic and political thinking, his political deeds and the narrative he produced about these deeds (Guilhaumou 2002). Among other things, Guilhaumou demonstrates how Sieyès' semantic activity – such as inventing the term *assemblée nationale* – establishes "linguistic events" that anticipate the "discursive events" through which the assembly is made to speak the law (Guilhaumou 2001, 13; Guilhaumou 2006, 216). Guilhaumou thus reveals how Sieyès' highly abstract reflections on the role of language in the world affect the formation of a political language which shaped the revolution.[18]

In the 1990s, Guilhaumou discovered the works of the Cambridge school. He became particularly interested in the approach developed

by Quentin Skinner, which focused on the linguistic actions performed by historical agents when intervening in theoretical debates of a political and ethical nature. Guilhaumou saw Skinner's emphasis on the conscious rhetorical interventions of speakers as comparable to his own emphasis on reflexivity. Reflexivity and intentionality could thus be seen as similar capacities: "[il faut] identifier ce que telle ou telle intention signifie pour un auteur dans un contexte donné, ce qu'il en est donc de leur degree de réflexivité dans un universe langagier normé" (Guilhaumou 2006, 84). Like Skinner, Guilhaumou pointed out that intention or "subjective individuality" (ibid, 81) and reflexivity could only by observed within a particular context, which the historian had to reconstruct. It was this context that Guilhaumou, in the 1970s, would have called ideology or discursive formation. Although the new interest in intentionality and rhetoric seem to run counter to the earlier weight put on the calling (*interpellation*) of subject positions, it is not that difficult to see the continuity in Guilhaumou's work. In the 1980s he had already begun to emphasise the role of action in discourse. He dealt with how utterances were action-oriented, or *mise en acte*, to quote one of his favourite terms. He was interested in studying words and concepts that were part of political struggles. They were used in arguments formulated to persuade or challenge others. He therefore saw his own endeavour as 'a pragmatic history', close to Skinner's approach (ibid, 74).

Before discovering Skinner, Guilhaumou had already been engaged with Koselleck's *Begriffsgeschichte*. He worked together with Hans Jürgen Lüsebrink (born 1952) and Rolf Reichardt (born 1940), the editors of the *Handbuch für politisch-sozialer Grundbegriffe in Frankreich 1680-1820*. The *Handbuch*, which first appeared in 1985, was an effort to take Koselleck's Begriffsgeschichte further, in a pragmatic direction.[19] As early as 1981, Guilhaumou, together with Lüsebrink, wrote an article on text pragmatics for the journal, *Mots*, created the year before as a laboratory for the development of ADH (Guilhaumou & Lüsebrink 1981).[20] They exchanged views at conferences. Of particular importance was a conference organised in Aix en Provence in September 1983 on the concept of the event, and a 1985 conference in Bielefeld, organised by Koselleck and Reichardt, on the French revolution (Schmitt & Reichardt 1988). At the latter conference, Koselleck criticised Guilhaumou for denigrating the non-textual context in dealing with Jacobin discourse (ibid, 664-666). Koselleck's criticism seemed

to have hit a soft spot in Guilhaumou's approach. In later works, not least the one I present here, he has put a lot of energy into distancing himself from pantextutal tendencies in discourse analysis, and related approaches (Guilhaumou 2006, 85). I shall adress Guilhaumou's 'obsession' with reality in a moment.

Guilhaumou's exchanges with Begriffsgeschichte coincided with his involvement in a French project for publishing a dictionary of concepts that played an important role in the formation of political language during the French revolution. Together with colleagues from Saint Cloud, working on the "18ème-Révolution" team, he launched the first volume (or fascicule, as they less pretentiously chose to call it) of *Dictionnaires des usages socio-politiques (1770-1815)*.[21] As with the two German dictionaries, *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe* (GG) and *Handbuch*, the DUSP was intended to explore social and political semantics. The target was the French revolution, not the broader period of modernity addressed in the two German dictionaries. Furthermore, in keeping with its focus on discursive action in ADH, the DUSP emphasised that it was a dictionary of concepts and words in use.

The first *fascicule* came out in 1985, the same year in which the first volume of the *Handbuch* was published. It addressed words designating political actors such as *aristocrate* and *sans culottes*. As in the earlier years of the ADH, the focus was on positions of enunciation. But the scope was broadened to include the role of the words as part of the political struggle. To study the words, the authors of the DUSP relied on lexicometric methods, including the computerised sampling of word occurrences. The second fascicule concerned the analysis of important concepts – or what the editors chose to call *notions-concepts*[22] – of the French revolution, such as *liberal, liberté, république, terreur, vertu*. By notion-concepts, Guilhaumou and his colleagues understood "the conceptual range" of those terms often referred to by historians when narrating the revolutionary events, but which they rarely explored in their linguistic reality (Guilhaumou 2006, 75). They were interested in the "key concepts" that partook in forming the new order of things, which was not far from Koselleck's understanding of *Grundbegriffe*, although they maintained the strong focus on the discursive trajectories as prescribed by ADH. The analysis of *notions-concepts* would include discursive as well as argumentative strategies, and, as consecutive fascicules demonstrated, it included theoretical notions (e.g. notions from political economy) as well as practical notions. If we

leave out Guilhaumou's contextual concerns, which were triggered by the encounter with Koselleck, it is difficult, however, to identify precise sources of inspiration from *Begriffsgeschichte*, although it might be possible to claim that ADH manifested a shift from lexicometric word focus to concept, and that this shift was motivated by a broader understanding of context.

The Event

The followers of ADH have primarily understood their approach as targeted at discourse. The analysis of words and concepts has always been placed within the scope of discourse analysis. In this sense, ADH certainly distinguishes itself from *Begriffsgeschichte*.[23] Discourse is one thread that runs through ADH from the beginning; the reflection on event is another. Over the years, Guilhaumou has given much thought to event. Some of these thoughts are to be found in the book we discuss here. In fact, this latest review of the development of ADH is presented under the heading of *discours et événement*.[24] Guilhaumou understands event in two different ways. Events are, first of all, the emergence of the new within a particular horizon, and the creativity involved in this emergence. But he also deals with the conventional meaning of event as a basic building block of the narratives produced by historians. As a historian, he investigates the classical repertoire of events within a particular frame of reference, such as the French revolution (which is in itself a term used to condense a multiplicity of events) in order to examine the *événementialité* of the event, that is, the particular way in which the new appears. This means analysing how events are produced in language. The analysis begins with a description of a linguistic event which demonstrates what can be said in empirical language. It is only with "the discursive event" that the new emerges, which changes a historical situation. As Guilhaumou says of the discursive event "il est désormais question de la créativité de l'agir, de l'emergence de devenirs sans pre-existence aucune" (Guilhaumou 2006, 131). The discursive event is an event in the true sense. It is not caused by a prior situation or context, but appears out of nothing. The only context is the condition of possibilities existing within empirical language. Studying the context here means looking at the relations between the particular utterances: "l'énoncé est à lui-mëme

son propre contexte" (ibid, 124). In his understanding of discursive event, Guilhaumou is close to Foucault, who simply treated events as appearances to be described.[25] The linguistic invention of the term *assemblée nationale*, in 1789, is seen by Guilhaumou as a discursive event, because it had a great effect on what happened in the situation. It is not the effect itself that makes the discursive event, but the conditions – for instance, the new subject positions linked to it – that are the event.

Discursive events are oriented towards the future; they concern what is happening. When events become narrated they are past. They can thus be reinscribed in new discursive events, through which they acquire new meaning. In his book, Guilhaumou presents the results of a case-study of the way in which the reporting in the Parisian press of the death of Marat contributed to the discursive event in which Marat was turned into a Jacobin hero (Guilhaumou 2006, 140-153).[26] Guilhaumou shows how the orders coming from the Convention, together with the Press reports, were involved in forming the funeral ceremony that would later be narrated as the death of Marat, in Jacobin rhetoric. By combining discursive and narrated events, Guilhaumou opens up yet another field of study for ADH.[27]

Reality

In recent years, Guilhaumou has shown a growing interest in ontological and epistemological questions related to language theory. He ends his progress report on ADH with some rather abstract reflections on the relation between language and reality. Although strongly influenced by Foucauldian poststructuralist thinking, Guilhaumou maintains that he has never succumbed to pantextualism. Koselleck once criticised him of reducing the reality of sources to texts (Schmitt & Reichardt 1988, 664). It seems that Guilhaumou's answer has been first, to align himself with Koselleck (Guilhaumou 2006, 85), and secondly, to bolster his Koselleckian contextualism with a heavy ontological armour. He thus confidently claims there is a reality external to language. But at the same time, he hastens to include language in this reality: "…la langue participle de la meme réalité que tout objet…" (ibid, 199). This might look like a Solomonic solution. There is no doubt, however, that Guilhaumou has always been engaged in an

effort to go beyond a rigid Saussurian structuralism, and make room for a reality consisting of the 'someone' and the 'something' which are signified in language. So, Koselleck's judgement was not quite fair.[28]

There is a consensus about the existence of a French school in discourse analysis. ADH is a variant of this school which has engaged in a dialogue with *Begriffsgeschichte* and the Cambridge school. Whether this makes ADH a French school of conceptual history is debatable. By introducing ADH in our presentation of conceptual history at the Concepta Summer school, I hope to have contributed to opening the debate. I am confident, however, that were we to include the works of those historians – not least of which is Raymonde Monnier – who, with their analyses of key concepts have contributed to ADH, we would be able to see the foundations of a distinct French school.

NOTES

1. For information about *Concepta*, see http://www.concepta-net.org/

2. As of 2008 his list of publication numbers 305, see http://triangle.ens-lsh.fr/IMG/pdf/BiblioGuilhaumout07.pdf

3. Maingueneau uses the term 'l'école française d'analyse du discours' in his presentation of discourse analysis, (Maingueneau 1991: 9).

4. In the 1970s Guilhaumou worked closely with Régine Robin (born 1939) who was one of the first French historians to become acquainted with and practice linguistic methods in her studies of the social conditions of the French revolution (Robin 1970). Another historian who has been a long-time collaborator of Guilhaumou's is Raymonde Monnier, also a historian of the French revolution.

5. For different versions of the history of AD, see Maingueneau 1991 and Mazière 2005.

6. Michel Pêcheux, who came out of the French tradition of the history of epistemology, studied with Althusser and took a position at Nanterre. During his short life (he committed suicide in 1983) he was very influential in developing a Marxist discourse analysis, see Pêcheux 1975.

7. "'discourse' is not a slender surface of contact, or confrontation, between reality and a language (*langue*), the intrication of a lexicon and an experience" (Foucault 1972: 50).

8. Foucault never acknowledged any inspiration from structuralist approaches within linguistics dealing with enunciation, such as those formulated by Roman Jakobson (his model of communication) and Emile Benveniste (his theory of enunciation).

9. For an overview of the historical-lexicological research in France, see Reichardt 1985: 51-59. The technically complicated methods of lexicometry are explained in Maingueneau 1991: 48-70.

10. The use of these broad notions revealed the ambition of exposing the dominant ideologies at work during the revolution. For an example, see Robin 1971.

11. Guilhaumou uses Foucault to operate a double delimitation. The focus on semantics contrasts with the privileging of enunciation and positioning in the Foucauldian ver-

sion of discourse analysis propounded by Dominique Maingueneau and his colleagues (Maingueneau 1991: 17-18). On the other hand, the role given to the subject position in ADH delimits it from the more rigidly semantic approach of lexicometry.

12. Guilhaumou's use of the notion is not overtly precise; he alternately talks about the dispotifs, the configurations and the discursivity of the archive (Guilhaumou 2006: 21; Guilhaumou 1986: 43; Guilhaumou 2007: 4)

13. Nowhere does Guilhaumou present a clear-cut definition of theme. It is evident that his use differs from the one Foucault has in *l'Archeologie*. For Foucault, theme seems to be identical with 'theory' or with 'conceptions' (Foucault 1969: 88). In critical discourse analysis, the term 'topic' refers to the experiential content of language (Fairclough 1989: 160).

14. Denise Maldidier was killed in a tragic accident in 1993.

15. Guilhaumou has primarily referred to the classical social historical interpretations of Albert Mathiez and Albert Soboul (Guilhaumou & Maldidier 1986b). Although coming from a rather different approach, Guilhaumou is favourable to the interpretation of sans culottes democracy by Albert Soboul (1914-1982), the grand figure of Marxist, revolutionary historiography. For his ongoing controversy with François Furet, the proponent of a liberal reading of the revolution, see Guilhaumou 1989b.

16. I have argued at length for such an analytical move, see Ifversen 1997.

17. Guilhaumou acknowledges the linguist Denis Slakta (1938-2005) as the first to have studied the link between subject positions and action in the formation of the political language of the revolution, see Slakta 1971.

18. Guilhaumou has also shown a broader interest in Enlightenment thinking on language and reality from Adam Smith and Kant, to Condillac, Condorcet and Humboldt

19. The theoretical and methodological reflections behind the project were presented by Rolf Reichardt in the first volume, Reichardt 1985.

20. In this article, Lüsebrink's interest in textual pragmatics (in the German tradition) and Guilhaumou's interest in discursive action were combined.

21. To date, 8 *fascicules* have appeared. The various volumes have dealt with practical and theoretical concepts, designators as well as language policies. Guilhaumou offers a presentations of the various themes in Guilhaumou 2006: 74-78.

22. To my knowledge Guilhaumou has never given an explicit explanation for his choice of the rather strange term, *notion-concept*.

23. Through its strong focus on describing linguistic events, ADH also differs from the Cambridge school.

24. 12 years earlier, Guilhaumou, together with Denise Maldidier, published a sort of progress report on ADH, under the heading of *Discours et archive* (Guilhaumou, Maldidier & Robin 1994).

25. Event is not a key concept in Foucault's archaeology. He simply defines the appearance of a new discourse as an event, Foucault 1969: 38.

26. A book-length analysis can be found in Guilhaumou 1989.

27. Guilhaumou's analysis of the death of Marat focuses primarily on the immediate narration. Lüsebrink and Reichardt have studied the narration of the storming of the Bastille in a much longer time-frame (Lüsebrink & Reichardt 1990).

28. Melvin Richter reiterates Koselleck's criticism in Richter 2001: 73.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Althusser, Louis 1971. Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses (Notes towards an Investigation). L. Althusser, *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*. New York: Monthly Review Press. 127-86.
Charaudeau, Patrick & Dominique Maingueneau (eds.) 2002. *Dictionnaire d'analyse du discours*. Paris: Seuil.
Détrie, Catherine, Paul Siblot & Bertrand Verine (eds.) 2001. *Termes et concepts pour l'analyse du discours: une approche praxématique*. Paris: Champion.
Dictionnaire des Usages Socio-Politiques (1770-1815), fasc. 1, Désignants socio-politiques. Equipe '18ème et Révolution', URL 'Lexicométrie et Textes Politiques', Institut National de la Langue Française, Publications de l'INaLF, Paris: Klincksieck, 1985.
L'événement: Actes du Colloque d'Aix-en-Provence at the Centre Meridional d'Histoire Sociale, 16, 17 & 18 September 1983, Marseille, Université de Provence et J. Laffitte.
Fairclough, Norman 1989. *Language and Power*. London: Longman.
Foucault, Michel 1969. *L'archéologie du savoir*. Paris: Gallimard.
Guilhaumou, Jacques & Hans-Jürgen Lüsebrink 1981. La 'pragmatique textuelle' et les langages de la Révolution française. *Mots*, no 2, 191-203.
Guilhaumou, Jacques & Denise Maldidier 1986a. Effets de l'archive: L'analyse de discours du côté de l'histoire. *Langages* no. 81, 43-56.
Guilhaumou, Jacques & Denise Maldidier 1986b. L'apport de l'analyse de discours à la saisie historique de l'événement: la journée révolutionnaire parisienne du 4 septembre 1793. *L'événement, Actes du Colloque d'Aix-en-Provence*. Marseille: Université de Provence et J. Laffitte, 171-181.
Guilhaumou, Jacques 1986. L'historien du discours et la lexicométrie: Etude d'une série chronologique: le 'Père Duchesne' d'Hébert (juillet 1793 - mars 1794). *Histoire & Mesure*, vol. I, Is. 3/4, 27-46.
Guilhaumou, Jacques 1987. La Terreur à l'ordre du jour (juillet 1793-mars 1794). *Dictionnaire des Usages Socio-Politiques (1770-1815)*, fasc. 2, 'Notions-concepts Equipe' '18ème et Révolution', URL 'Lexicométrie et Textes Politiques', Paris: Klincksieck, 1987, 127-160.
Guilhaumou, Jacques 1989. *La langue politique et la Révolution française: De l'événement à la raison linguistique*. Paris: Méridiens Klincksieck.
Guilhaumou, Jacques 1989b. Furet, lecteur de Marx: Marx, lecteur de la Révolution française. *Actuel Marx*, no 6, 170-177.
Guilhaumou, Jacques 1989c. 1793. *La mort de Marat*. Bruxelles: Editions Complexe.
Guilhaumou, Jacques, Denise Maldidier & Régine Robin 1994. *Discours et archive. Expérimentations en analyse du discours*. Liège: Mardaga.
Guilhaumou, Jacques 2001. La connexion empirique entre la réalité et le discourse: Sieyès et l'ordre de la langue. *marges-linguistiques.com*, electronic journal, no 1.
Guilhaumou, Jacques 2002. *Sieyès et l'ordre de la langue: L'invention de la politique moderne*. Paris: Kimé.
Guilhaumou, Jacques 2005. Où va l'analyse de discours? Autour de la notion de formation Discursive. *Marges.linguistiques* no 9, 95-114. http://marges-linguistiques.com/
Guilhaumou, Jacques 2006. *Discours et événement: L'histoire langagière des concepts*. Besançon: Presses Universitaires de Franche-Comté.
Guilhaumou, Jacques 2007. *L'analyse du discours du côté de l'histoire. Une démarche interpretative*. http://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-00201543/fr/
Helsloot, Niels & Tony Hak 2000. la contribution de Michel Pêcheux à l'analyse de discours. *Language et societé*, no 91, 5-33.

Ifversen, Jan 1997. *Om magt, demokrati og diskurs: diskuteret i lyset af den franske revolution* Vol. II, Begrebshistoriske Studier [Studies in Conceptual history] . Aarhus The University of Aarhus.
Lüsebrink, Hans-Jürgen & Rolf Reichardt 1990. *Die Bastille: Zur Symbolgeschichte von Herrschaft und Freiheit.* Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag.
Maingueneau, Dominique 1991. *L'analyse du discours: introduction aux lectures de l'archive.* Paris: Hachette.
Mazière, Francine 2005. *L'Analyse du discourse: Histoire et pratiques.* Paris: PUF.
Pêcheux, Michel 1975. *Les Vérités de la palice.* Paris: Maspero.
Reichardt, Rolf 1985. Eimleitung. Rolf Reichardt & Eberhard Schmitt (eds.) *Handbuch politisch-sozialer Grundbegriffe in Frankreich 1680-1820.* München, Oldenbourg, 39-148.
Richter, Melvin 2001. A German Version of the 'Linguistic Turn': Reinhart Koselleck and the History of Political and Social Concepts (Begriffsgeschichte). In Dario Castiglione and Iain Hampsher-Monk (eds.), *The History of Political Thought in National Context.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 58-79.
Robin, Regine 1970. *La Société française en 1789: Semur-en-Auxois.* Paris: Plon.
Robin, Regine 1971. Histoire et linguistique: premiers jalons. *Langue française*, Vol. IX, Is. 1,
47-57.
Schmitt, Eberhard & Rolf Reichardt (eds.) 1988. *Die Französische Revolution als Bruch des gesellschaftlichen Bewusstseins.* München: Oldenbourg.
Slakta, Denis 1971. L'acte de 'demander' dans les Cahiers de doléances. *Langue Française* no. 9, 58-73.
Wallis, Darian A. 2007. Michel Pêcheux's Theory of Language and Ideology and Method of Automatic Discourse Analysis: A Critical Introduction. *Text & Talk*, Vol. XXVII, Is. 2, 251-272.