

Problematics of An International Literary Terminology

Jean-Marie Grassin

ABSTRACT

Continued efforts have been made to find a common reference, or universal terminology for eastern and western scholars in comparative literature since the very foundation of the ICLA in 1955. An obvious example is the preparation of the *International Dictionary of Literary Terms*, a world project founded by the ICLA in the sixties under the leadership of Robert Escarpit. Drawing on his personal experience involved with the project, the author analyzes some of the problems confronted by the project and the responses the international community of comparatists has given to these problems. Some suggestions for a better integration of literary studies at the world level are also proposed.

KEY WORDS

International Dictionary of Literary Terms

Robert Escarpit

terminological project

universal terminology

common references

metalanguage of criticism

André Lévy

John Deeney

lemmatization

literary terminology

May I start, without preliminaries, from the standard definition of comparative literature in western handbooks and contrast it with the one I find in the announcement of the oncoming 1991 congress of the International Comparative Literature Association in Tokyo? The opposition may help us focus on the problems of finding common terms, common concepts, common purposes between eastern and western scholars within one discipline like comparative literature; in fact these are some of the problems the “*directeur scientifique*” of the Observatory of Literary Terms is confronted with in the preparation of the *International Dictionary of Literary Terms*, a world project founded by the ICLA in the sixties under the leadership of Robert Escarpit. In a second part of this presentation, I shall then attempt to analyze some of the responses the international community of comparatists has given to these problems in view of the completion of the Dictionary. Finally, drawing from this experience, from this experiment also, I shall try to put forward some practical proposals for a better integration of literary studies at the world level. Coming from someone who practically knows no Asiatic language, these recommendations can only be expressed with modesty, simply requesting advice and contributions from comparatists in Asia for the description of our common metalanguage.

For the first conference of the newly founded Brazilian Association of Comparative Literature which met at the Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul in 1988, I surveyed all the definitions of comparative literature which can be found in reference works, textbooks, university catalogues, etc, and colligated them into a common proposition; it appeared that all definitions amounted to variations on four paradigms. *Comparative literature is 1) the study 2) of international 3) literary 4) relations.* The generic element (“comparative literature is . . .” defines the discipline with terms which can be put on an axis ranging from art to science, the study of literature being conceived as personal aptitude or as conceptual knowledge. The second paradigm refers to the identity of the discipline, to what makes it different from connected fields of research: its internationality; by doing so, it takes notice that, at least since the beginning of the 19th century, the *champ littéraire* (the literary field) has been partitioned according to so-called national borders (Spanish literature, Chinese literature, American literature, Japanese literature, Korean literature, and whatever); it also assigns to comparative literature the task of bridging those divided bodies of texts in order to construct a (truly) general, a universal theory of literature. Incidentally, this “science of internationality” has to deal basically with the com-

ponents of the modern idea of nation, which are: language, the most important one in the case of verbal texts, but also culture, history, politics, identity, religion, tradition, philosophy; that makes comparative literature also the ground of interdiscursivity and interdisciplinarity. The last element of the definition refers to the specific approach of the discipline: establishing relationships between bodies of texts, between literature and the arts, between the study of literature and the social sciences.

The four paradigms are present in the Tokyo definition of comparative literature as the congress theme: "The Force of Vision": "Comparative Literature is a discipline [both art and science, but here mostly a practice], which by focusing on the peculiarities and mutual relationships of various individual visions, aims to understand their proper forces and limitations in an attempt at better consonance and heightened originality." We can only note that, contrary to all Western definitions, the idea of "nation" is not explicitly present, the Tokyo definition stressing only the study of differences ("peculiarities") and similarities ("mutual") between individualities. Now, whether these "individualities" are personal, national, ideological, or textual, is not mentioned; Western definitions, on the contrary, explicitly declare the "national" determinative (inter- trans- cross- national) to be the hallmark of comparative literature; comparatists traditionally teach their students that they are not doing comparative literature unless they are crossing a linguistico-national border.

Here is a much more interesting difference: the Tokyo definition does say what literature is: "vision," comparative literature becoming the confronting of "various individual visions." The preceding paragraph on the theme of the congress explains that "literature is the most effective means of conveying [. . .] as well as creating new," "visions through which [people] grasp the world." Many a Westerner must have been surprised by this novel definition of literature by the vague (to him) notion of vision. The diversity of meanings of the word in the titles of papers accepted for the congress at least illustrates the flexibility of the concept.

There could be two "visions of the world," at least two visions of literature in opposition here. The standard definition of comparative literature in the West is an epistemological curiosity: comparative literature is the study of literature. One would not say: geology is the study of geology. A stone does exist outside the observation of the scientist, at least people think so. Not so with the theory of literature as a cognitive

science. It does not pose a given object, an objective object if I may say so, as its purpose. The purpose of literary science is to define an object which does not exist by itself. Literature is what people care to call literature; what is considered as literature varies in time and space. The prevalent idea of literature to-day which roughly date from, say, the beginning of the 19th century, is not exactly what was previously understood as Belles-lettres or poetry (such as lyrical poetry, dramatic poetry, narrative poetry). To-day popular literature, oral literature, infra- or para- literature stretch the limits of the notion, and the divide between canonical literature and popular literature in Chinese does not follow the same lines as in Europe. Is encyclopedia literature? It was, but it is no longer. Are TV serials or cinema literature? Usually not, but then should theater be literature, etc.? The only practical definition we can use is this one: *literature is made of bodies of text to which cultures grant a specific status, the literary status*. The object of general and comparative literature is to examine different *ensembles littéraires*, bodies of text, literatures in order to arrive at a knowledge of what makes those texts literary. Thus, the object of literary science is not literature. It is literarity, literaturnost, the knowledge of literarity.

It is quite another purpose which is assigned to comparative literature by the Tokyo definition. Of course, nothing would allow us to induce that this single Japanese occurrence can validly represent the eastern way of thinking. Still it is an outstanding sample of an eastern reformulation of a widespread definition in the west; and this reformulation appears as the theme of the major gathering of comparatists from all over the world in Asia. In this case, the difference between eastern and western "visions" of literature is teleological; it hinges on the purpose, the final objectives of the study of literature. The western definitions offer knowledge: they tell us that the methodic observation of relationships between literary ensembles permits us to explain general literary phenomena through a logical discourse.

I do not doubt that eastern scholars just want to do that, but it is not what the Tokyo definition says: comparative literature, in its view, will help the researcher not to know, but to feel, and to improve his personal vision. It aims at understanding to "proper forces and limitations [of individual visions] in an attempt at better consonance and heightened originality. While western definitions almost take the cognitive purpose of the discipline for granted and implicitly distrust the intrusion of personal feelings in an scientific observation, the Tokyo statement insists on teleologi-

cal words: *aims, attempt*, with moral overtones: *better, heightened originality*, expressing faith in the improvement of the individual and its own community. Comparative literature appears more as an ethos than an experimental science. Here the discourse on different literatures (defined as different visions) produces a change in the moral attitude of the scholar: "living solely within the scope of one's own vision; however, one tends to lose sight of its relativity and to come to feel as it were natural and universal"; thus, comparative literature aims at correcting one's feelings toward the outside world.

The cliché holds true in this case. The traditional Western definition shows a progress toward abstraction, with a taste for classifying in kinds and species (even more in the French intellectual vein than in English). The Japanese statement on comparative literature is more impressionistic; it shows a movement toward personal appropriation of reality; it centers less on the contents of the notion itself than on an individual approach using an image, a subtly symbolic term, *vision*, to qualify the relationship between the scholar and his or her activity.

The term, *comparative literature*, is the same: the object is the same, *literarity of texts pertaining to different entities*, but the conception and the approach is different. To-day's literary metalanguage as practiced by scholars from different cultural, historical and linguistic horizons raises fundamental and practical problems in constructing a common theory of literature and a universal history of literature. That is the kind of difference in the conceptual point of view which is at the origin of the *International Dictionary of Literary Terms* as it was blueprinted by Robert Escapit's report at the ICLA congress in Fribourg, Switzerland, in 1967 and overhauled in Limoges, France, after 1988.

The debate over the need and the difficulty of a universal terminology, common terms and common concepts, parallels the history of comparative literature; it reflects the history of contemporary criticism and the extension of the notion of literature. As long as comparatists discussed international literary relationships within their own country (which was largely the case throughout the 19th century down to the middle of the 20th), they could use the prevalent concepts of their own cultures without fearing much misunderstanding, even in translation. Things changed after the Second World War, when they worked increasingly in international, multilingual teams on common projects, created international associations with several working

languages, met in some sort of ecumenical congresses, integrated in their own culture the knowledge of distant or emerging literatures.

The origins of the *Observatory of literary terminology* upon whose materials the Dictionary is now based can be traced to the very foundation of the FILLM (Fédération Internationale des langues et Littératures modernes) in Oxford in 1955, and of the International Comparative Literature Association the same year at Venice. The necessity of common references was much debated during the second ICLA congress at Chapel Hill, North Carolina in 1958: the famous opposition between the supposedly French and American schools of comparative literature made it urgent to agree on the metalanguage of criticism. It was decided that the definition of literary terms on an international basis would be a theme of the next congress at Utrecht in 1961.

The first **International Committee Literary Terminology** appointed by the ICLA had one representative from Asia, Professor Kobayashi from Tokyo, Japan, amidst a congregation of West Europeans and North Americans. Some Asian delegates had participated in the early meetings. They were four of them at the Chapel Hill congress, one from Ceylon, one from Indonesia, two from Japan, more already at the Utrecht congress. Scant attention had been given for a long time to eastern literatures in ICLA gatherings, while the Arabo-Persian area, Africa, even South America were practically absent of programmes. But thanks to a steady and growing participation of Asian delegates, comparative literature was in the process of organizing itself into a world-wide discipline.

Its truly international purpose did not appear so much in the list of papers to the congresses as in the projects on terminology: that was a clear indication that some conceptual integration was at work. Japanese scholars had studied comparative literature in Paris with the respected masters of the old school, and the Japanese Society of Comparative Literature was the first to organize, preceding even the French one established soon after the ICLA constituting assembly in Venice. The Japanese committee on literary terminology elaborated a list of "national" terms which they thought were to be included in the inventory of concepts and notions necessary to build a universal history of literature.

For lack of similar contacts in China during the sixties, a French Sinologue, Professor André Lévy at the Ecole des Langues Orientales in Paris, later at the University of Bordeaux attempted to do the same for the Chinese area. When I more recently took up the responsibility of the Dictionary, I

found that it was not satisfactory, so I tried to help a Chinese committee to set at work by inviting visiting professors from mainland China in the department of Comparative Literature of my university at Limoges, France. The experiment taught me how difficult it can be to build a common theory of literature between the east and the west. These colleagues were authentic products of the Chinese educational system; they had gone through the political ordeals of their country. They spoke beautiful French and were able to teach French literature to French students in a novel way with quite some success. The two problems were 1) being Chinese, *de jure* and *de facto* inheritors of the ancient Chinese tradition, in itself did not make them specialists of Chinese literature in international perspective (in fact Sinologues in the West could often be in a better position to analyze Chinese literary phenomena and to describe them according to the academic standards of objective research); 2) they had little previous experience of comparative literature: having studied French literature in China, or the reverse, did not necessarily qualify someone as a specialist of Franco-Chinese, or East-West, or Sino-Japanese relationships.

The objective became clear: the Dictionary needed comparatists with at least a double knowledge in East and West literatures in an international perspective, even more than Chinese with a competence in a Western literature, or Western specialists of eastern literature.

The obvious example of what must be done for the Dictionary is given by the *Tamkang Review*, a few issues of which had been providentially presented to me at the VIIth ICLA congress in Montréal and Ottawa in 1973, where the integration of eastern criticism into the main stream of comparatistics made tremendous progress notably through a panel on "Western theories and the study of Chinese literature" and an East-West symposium. The way had been opened in 1971 by the International Comparative Literature Conference held here in Taiwan; I studied the proceedings published in the *Tamkang Review* (vol. II, no 2, vol. III, no 1, 1971-1972)

As no organized Chinese terminology committee was available to produce the kind of survey the Japanese society of comparative literature or the Hungarian Academy of sciences, for central European literatures, had undertaken in the sixties for the foundation of the Dictionary, or "national" committees such as the German, or the Brazilian are contributing now, seminars could at least be organized within the Limoges Observatory of literary terminology to have comparatists discuss the integration of Chinese criticism into the Dictionary with Sinologues and whatever

Chinese scholar who could be invited. Dr. Muriel Détrie from the University of Tours, France, the editorial secretary of the *Revue de littérature comparée*, an accomplished comparatist with a specialization in Chinese literature has been instrumental in helping revise the original nomenclature of the Dictionary.

So far, only Chinese genres have been described in the Dictionary. Getting to matters of poetics, rhetoric, taxonomy: classifying categories is much more difficult, especially if the purpose is to integrate them into a common system of reference. I cannot think of better circumstances than this conference, or the ICLA congress in Tokyo, to chart the work of East-West committees. It is also an opportunity to establish some kind of cooperation with other terminological projects in the Chinese sphere. Last year at the FILLM congress in Novi Sad, Yugoslavia, the metalanguage of modern literatures was put on the agenda. Professor Edward P. Vargo, of Fu Jen University, informed us there of several Chinese dictionary projects with which the Observatory could associate. Fortunately, professor John Deeney, from the Chinese University of Hong Kong, included the IDLT in his survey of Chinese and international terminology projects in the report he was recently preparing for the international conference on the translation of Chinese literature last november here in Taipei, then in Kuala Lumpur in view of the ICLA congress in Tokyo: "Foundations for critical understanding: the compilation and translation of encyclopedic dictionaries of Chinese literary terms." The Chinese part of the IDLT cannot be suitably completed without some kind of association with the encyclopedic dictionary of Chinese literary terminology Professor Deeney is compiling and translating, and possibly with the other two major literary projects underway in mainland China now, a world dictionary of poetics and a dictionary of Chinese classical literature. I hope the present conference gives us an opportunity to organize such cooperation. In this perspective, I shall outline a few solutions that must be sought to arrive at a truly international terminology.

In the first place, a thirty year experience (or so) of descriptive terminology in international comparative literature projects indicate that a unified metalanguage is not practicable. No supra-national Academy would likely impose a world standard on a field which is the scene of a conceptual explosion. Any project of a common dictionary must be preceded by a descriptive analysis. The originality of the IDLT is that it is based on a standard lexicographical survey.

Three objectives were given to the project: first: to identify literary

terms commonly used by scholars in different countries, then: to provide practical definitions which could serve as references in international communication, finally: to clarify obscure or semantically complex literary terms by comparing the positions of various national traditions, theoretical schools, critical approaches.

Identification of international literary terms is done through permanent lexicographical research allowing the Observatory to keep up with the history of the idea of literature, the development of new methods of investigation, the varying concept of internationality, etc. A term is entered into the inventory after it was attested in several international contexts. As an example, are considered as international sources the proceedings of ICLA or FILLM congress, the *Revue de Littérature Comprée*), reference books on literary history and theory. In an effort to determine the terms through which Asiatic literatures are described in international contexts, the *Tamkang Review* was added to the corpus last year.

If a term, very roughly, is a word that has a specific meaning inside a science, a discipline, an organized school, the difficulty to spot Asian terms, other than genres, is more difficult than establishing nomenclatures of technical terms of rhetoric or poetics in the western tradition. Words like *genre*, or discourse clearly belong to the realm of literature; there are many doubtful cases; I should say that *vision* was one of them except in the lexicalized German term *Weltanschauung*, "vision of the world" on which much theorizing has been made. But I should not say that *impression*, the theme of the *sea*, *the mountain*, *love*, etc., *Chinese*, *American*, *French* literature constitute terms, as they have no meaning specific to literature, nor they determine literary categories. Of course they could find a place in an encyclopedia of literature dwelling on literary realia: it could well include an interesting article on Malay literature, which the IDLT would not consider as a literary concept.

The sampling of the first surveys made at the Limoges Observatory seems to indicate that eastern literatures are massively described on the international scene either by terms borrowed from European languages, which then acquire a status of truly international terms, or by what I call *near-terms*, metaphors, images, allusions, parallels in a figurative language. Compared to the traditional definitions of comparative literature, for instance, the Tokyo statement shows a low term rating.

I have no statistics on this. It is one of the preliminary tasks an east-west team could undertake in common. It could be that the definition of a

term, internationality, the idea of literature itself, of poetics, of criticism would have to be stretched. Either we set a standard derived from one literary tradition (it would probably be the western one, since eastern literatures are mostly described, I mean on the international scene, in European languages; this conference is an example), either we forget all ethnic, linguistic, political pride, and work from a descriptive point of view, identify the signifiers actually used in international contexts, establish their functional status, and register their different acceptations. Even this procedure needs to be examined in common with eastern comparatists. It appears to me as the only scientific approach of the problem, but I suspect that it may be dictated by my own Greco-Latin education and my French cartesian tendency. So many years already observing African thought expressed in imported languages have taught me to distrust the side effects of a language we adopt for communication sake.

Lemmatization (the regrouping of the vocabulary thus collected according to fields and concepts in order to provide a practical list of entries for the common dictionary) is another problem. But is one lemmatization system, or a single list of terms, possible when several languages are used at the same time in "international context"? Probably by assigning a standard equivalent to a term in other languages (*romanticism* = *romantisme* = *romantismo* = **ДОМАШТЕСМ** = *Romantik*, etc)¹, Robert Escarpit (*Report . . .*, p. 16-17) finds that "the basic vocabulary remains very nearly the same" in French, English, Spanish, German, Italian and Russian. It would hardly be possible to argue in the same way if one include Asian languages. Obviously, we are faced with another system. The task then would be to see what has passed from non-European nomenclatures into the languages most commonly used on the entire world scene in criticism, that means English of course, in a smaller scale: French, and possibly in regional practice; Spanish, Portuguese and Russian, which are European languages, but then increasingly Chinese and Japanese. In this last eventuality, we are forced again to reconsider the traditional limits of recognized concepts to allow room for the "visions" of literature carried by these two languages fast emerging in world usage, not to mention Arabic.

Should the Dictionary be confined for coherence's sake to the sphere of European tradition, to European literatures, to literatures in European languages? Should the number and length of articles dealing with Arabic, Chinese, Japanese or other non-European literatures commensurate with the weight of the notion in case within its own sphere, or with the import-

ance Western critics have assigned to it? These basic questions find no explicit answer in the Escarpit report. The Limoges Observatory was greatly concerned with them when it took up the project in 1988; they were debated in a series of meetings on the "mondialisation du DITL" aimed at entering terms related to African or other emerging literatures which were practically absent, and Asiatic terms which remain a meager minority amidst terms of European origin. The answer came from another question: Do these terms belong to the literary metalanguage as it has been practiced in "international contexts"? The founding fathers of the AILC in the sixties had found a solution that solved empirically and diplomatically the practical problem, but offered little justification. Once the basic vocabulary of literary criticism had been established from a body of critical texts on major European literatures, they asked national committees on literary terminology to suggest lists of terms they deemed worthy of international attention. The Japanese committee notably responded with a specific nomenclature which was included in the inventory. On the contrary, the Observatory in Limoges after 1988, while soliciting suggestions from national committees, stuck to the descriptive principle and the lexicographical approach. Non-European terms were treated on the same basis as international terms: only those which were attested several times in valid "international contexts," in this case in documents not mainly devoted to the study of those literatures, "mondialisation" was not achieved by implanting forcibly a quota of Eastern terms, but by enlarging the body of sources to include such documents as the *Tamkang Review* devoted to "comparative studies between Chinese and foreign literatures." There is therefore an objective reason whether a non-European term is or is not entered in the Dictionary. If one takes as a standard evidence the proceedings of the congresses of AILC, it is clear that non-European literatures are mostly described with a terminological apparatus which is of European origin on the international scene. The object of the Dictionary is precisely this metalanguage; to think that mixing terms of Western and Eastern origins in the same document endangers its coherence would be to assimilate the Dictionary to an history of literatures which could not legitimately deal at the same time with such different phenomena as Chinese and Greek literatures. If Chinese terms are included in the international nomenclature, it is not because they describe Chinese literary realities, but because they are actually used by critics outside China, in non-Chinese works not dealing specifically with Chinese literature, whether they refer to notions of Chinese literature like

genre (which they usually do), or not.

I shall sum up the conclusion I have reached at this stage of my experience in six propositions:

1. It is possible to build a coherent terminology system within the western area of European languages.
2. It is doubtful whether a similar unified terminology is possible in Asia, except, maybe, for languages using a similar ideographic system.
3. It would be a fallacy to attempt to create a normalized universal literary terminology. It would only result in a watered-down Coca-cola kind of a culture.
4. The two major literary systems: eastern and western must develop their own values and be made to communicate.
5. We already have a communication system in international contexts. Eastern and Western teams must work in common to identify its terms through lexicographical research and describe it through semiological and philological analysis.
6. All that necessitates the common definition of a wide area of interdisciplinary studies in humanities and social sciences in some kind of a renewed *Geistesgeschichte*.

The international terminological project needs increased contributions from eastern scholars:

1. The lexical research must be continued on a larger sampling of eastern sources.
2. Eastern terms included in the inventory must be broken by comparatists well versed in eastern literature and international theory of literature.
3. Eastern lexicographers well trained in philology and semiology should seek possible equivalents in Chinese and Japanese to international terms of western origin.
4. A greater proportion of eastern comparatists should be entrusted, not only with the description of eastern terms, but mostly of general terms of poetic, rhetorical, semiology.
5. Specialists of eastern literature should add a comment on eastern literatures to general articles treated solely from a western point of view.

But most of all, we need opportunities to work in common like the conference in Taipei or the coming terminology seminar in Limoges, Sept. 25 to Sept. 29, 1991. I should be happy to meet many of you there.

Notes

1. Robert Escarpit does not explain how, but this is how the Limoges *Observatoire...* proceeded after 1988.

DICTIONNAIRE INTERNATIONAL DES TERMES LITTÉRAIRES
INTERNATIONAL DICTIONARY OF LITERARY TERMS

Fondé par l'Association Internationale de Littérature Comparée

Publié aux éditions Francke Vg Bern und München par H. G. Saur Verlag à Munich

Nouvelle direction scientifique (E->)

Jean-Marie GRASSIN
 Université de LIMOGES
 39 rue Camille-Guérin
 37036 LIMOGES Cedex

(antérieurement: R. ESCARPIT,
 A. et F. BOISSON, Bordeaux)

Tél.: (33) 65 01 26 19 Fax: (33) 55 46 72 01

LA PUBLICATION DU
DICTIONNAIRE INTERNATIONAL DES TERMES LITTÉRAIRES

L'idée d'un *Dictionnaire International des Termes Littéraires* appuyé sur un observatoire permanent de la terminologie littéraire (*standing project*) a été émise dès 1955 lors la fondation de la Fédération Internationale des Langues et Littératures Modernes (FILLM) à Oxford puis de l'Association Internationale de Littérature Comparée (AILC) à Venise; elle a été au centre des débats entre les écoles dites américaine et française de littérature comparée au congrès de l'AILC de Chapel Hill, Caroline du Nord, en 1958. Aussi le troisième congrès de l'AILC à Utrecht, Pays-Bas, en 1961 a-t-il été en partie consacré à la définition de notions fondamentales de littérature comparée en vue du Dictionnaire (v. les Actes publiés chez Mouton à La Haye, Pays-Bas, en 1962). A cette occasion un premier comité international de terminologie littéraire a été constitué de personnalités d'Europe, d'Amérique et aussi du Japon désignées par l'AILC, et le secrétariat initial a été installé à l'Université d'Utrecht. Entre temps, le projet avait commencé à prendre forme au sein de la Société Française de Littérature Comparée sous l'impulsion d'Henri Roddier, alors à l'Université de Lyon, puis à la Sorbonne; Robert Escarpit, directeur du Centre de Sociologie des Faits Littéraires à l'Université de Bordeaux, avait effectué des enquêtes lexicales préliminaires, et les premiers résultats avaient été publiés dans la *Revue de Littérature Comparée* en 1961. C'est lui qui a présenté le *Rapport* fondateur du Dictionnaire devant le congrès de l'AILC à Fribourg, Suisse, en 1964. Son collaborateur technique Alain Boisson, responsable devant les réunions du Bureau de l'AILC, s'est chargé de gérer et d'enrichir la documentation terminologique rassemblée en vue du Dictionnaire.

Un volume expérimental consacré à la lettre L (comme Littérature) a été publié par l'Association Internationale de Littérature Comparée sous la direction de Robert Escarpit chez Mouton à La Haye, Pays-Bas en 1973 (28,5 cm, 85p.).

La publication régulière par fascicules encore «sous la direction scientifique de Robert Escarpit» a commencé en 1979 aux Editions A. Francke, de Berne en Suisse, grâce au travail d'un «secrétariat général» d'édition animé par Alain et Francisca Boisson à l'Institut de Littérature et de Techniques Artistiques de Masse (ILTAM), Bordeaux, «équipe de recherche associée» du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique (CNRS). Sont parus les volumes suivants (ISBN 3-7720-1475-5):

- Fascicule 1: Académie - Autobiographie*, 1979, pp. 1-96.
- Fascicule 2: Autobiographie - Bourgeois*, 1980, pp. 97-192.
- Fascicules 3 et 4: Bourgeois - Corrido*, 1984, pp. 193-384.
- Fascicule 5: Cosmopolitisme - Dialectique*, 1986, pp. 385-480.

Après la retraite de Robert Escarpit, la publication a repris en 1989 sous la nouvelle direction scientifique de Jean-Marie Grassin, Université de Limoges, France, aux Editions A. Francke, devenues en 1990 Francke Verlag Bern und München, filiale de K. G. Saur Verlag de Munich, Londres, New York et Paris. Les matériaux rassemblés à Bordeaux par Alain et Francisca Boisson ont été largement utilisés dans la poursuite du projet. Un volume de transition a d'abord été publié (ISBN 3-317-01475-X): *Fascicule 6: Dialectique - Emblème*, 1989, pp.481-576.

Le congrès de l'AILC à Munich, Allemagne, en 1988, a permis la constitution, ou la reconstitution d'un comité international de terminologie et de comités nationaux ou thématiques en vue du Dictionnaire. A la suite des rencontres de Munich, la relance du projet et sa mise à jour au moyen d'un inventaire lexical permanent ont été pris en charge par l'Observatoire International de Terminologie Littéraire à l'Université de Limoges; le comité de rédaction pouvait dès lors s'appuyer sur un réseau grandissant de collaborations: groupement des centres de recherche en littérature comparée dans les universités françaises en 1987 sous l'égide de la Société Française de Littérature Générale et Comparée, comités de terminologie littéraire liés dans divers pays aux associations de littérature comparée membres de l'AILC, puis, à partir de 1991, échanges avec l'URL n°5 de l'Institut National de la Langue Française (INALF) au Centre National de Recherche Scientifique (CNRS), «Lexicologie et terminologie littéraires contemporaines, etc.

A partir de 1987, des colloques annuels de terminologie littéraire à l'Université de Limoges ont permis de tenir le projet à jour et de préparer la publication des articles. Un organe de communication entre les chercheurs, le *Cahier de terminologie littéraire*, édité à Limoges, diffuse des documents d'accompagnement du Dictionnaire.

En 1991, les articles parus jusqu'à la lettre E, y compris les textes préparés sous la direction de Robert Escarpit, ont été rassemblés et publiés en volume par les soins de Jean-Marie Grassin, à l'Université de Limoges, France, aux éditions K.G. Saur de Munich, Londres, New York et Paris.

On pourra se reporter aux troisième et quatrième de couverture des publications en fascicules et à l'annexe de la publication en volume pour la liste des collaborateurs et des équipes de recherche qui, dans le monde et au fil des années, ont contribué à la réalisation du *Dictionnaire International des Termes Littéraires*.

Dictionnaire International des Termes Littéraires (Association Internationale de littérature comparée)
 List of terms on the lexical inventory not yet assigned (lemmatization, in French with pertinent exceptions, still in progress; further groupings to be made, Arzices in English or French). Please write to the editor: J.-M. Grassin, Faculté des Lettres, 87036 Limoges-Cedex, France.

EPIDICTIQUE ETHNOTEXTE EUPHEMISME EUROPEANISME EXODE EXORDE EXPLICATION EXPLICITE EXTRAVAGANZA
 FABULA(ital) FACONNE FAIT LITTERAIRE FANTACCIO FATALITE FATRAS, FATRASIA FEERIE FERMETURE DU TEXTE FETE FETE
 FREQ(esp) FINALE FLAMENCO(esp) FLEUVU(roman) FLORILEGE FONCTION DRAMATURGIQUE(Souras) FORMATION FORME
 GAG GALSBERG/GALIA SCIENS(Accentia) GALANTERIE GAPE/CART GARE(ital/français de) GEIST(alt) GENERACION DEL 98(esp) GENERATEUR
 GENIUS LOCI GENOALGIE GENOTEXTE ENTHYEMATIQUE GENRE SOMBRE GEORGIANISM GESAKU(jap) GESELLSCHAFTLIED(alt)
 GESTE GESTUALITE GNOMIQUE GENOTEXTE GNOLIARD GORE GRADATION GRAND JEU GRAND STYLE GRANDUEUR D'AME
 HALLEL(heb) HANSWURST(alt) HAPPY END HARLEM RENAISSANCE(americain) HARMONIE HEBRAISME HEIKYOKU(jap) HEMISTICHE
 HERMENEUTIQUE(Vercode/séquence/fiction) HERMETISME HEROI-COMIQUE HEROIDE HEROINE HEROISME HEROS POSITIF/NEGATIF
 HETEROLOGE/TIQUE HISTOIRE FICTION HISTORIA/DOXA HISTORICITE HOMOLOGE/TIQUE HORS CHAMP HORS TEXTE
 HUMANISME HUMEUR HYPERBATE HYPERBOLE HYPERTEXTE HYPOGRAMME HYPOSTASE HYPOTYPOSE HYSTERIQUE
 IAMBIC IDEALISME IDENTIFICATION IDENTITAIRE IDEOGRAMME ILOCUTION ILLUSION ILLUSTRÉ IMAGIERS IMAGISME IMPACT
 INDICE INDIRECT INSERTION INSTANCE MEDIATRICE INTENTIONALITE INTERCULTUREL INTERACTIF INTERDISCIPLINAIRE
 INTERDISCOURS INTERFACE INTERHISTORICITE INTERMEDE INTERPRETATIVE CRITICISM INTRODUCTION INVARIANT
 INVENTION IRONIE ISOTHEIE ISOTOPIE ITALIENNE(écène 4 1)
 JA(chin) JACOBAIN JEU DRAMATIQUE(MA) JEU-PARTI JEUNESSE LITTERAIRE JING(chin) JOURNAL JOURNALISTIQUE(crique)
 JOURNEE JOUTE POETIQUE JOYEUSE ENTREE JUDICIAIRE
 KABUKI(jap) KARAGEUZE KASPERLE(alt) KODAN(jap) KOTEB(Afr) KUNSTLERROMAN(alt) KUNSTLIED(alt)
 LAID LAMENTATION LANGAGE ENCRATIQUE(Burthe) LANSONIEN LEBENSBIID LEBENSFLUCHT(alt) LECTEUR LECTORAT LECTURE
 SCENTIQUE LEGITIMATIV LEITMOTIV LETTRÉ LETTRINE LETTRISME LIBIDO LIEU LIEU-COMMUN LISIBILITE LITTERATURE
 AUTHENTIQUE LITTERATURE DE TOMEIGNAGE LIVING THEATER(americain) LIVRE D'ARTISTE LIVRET LOCUTEUR LOGOGAPHE
 LOGOGRAPHE LOUANGE LOVE LYONNAISE LYRISME
 MACARONIQUE MACHENBERG MACROPROPOSITION MACROSTRUCTURE MADRIGAL MANTEAU(écène 4) MARKET LITERATURE
 MARQUEUR MASS MEDIA MATERIALAESTHETIK(alt) MECENAT MEDIATEUR MEDIATION MESSIANISME MESTER DE JUGLARI(esp)
 METALANGAGE METAPHYSIQUE METATEXTE METONYMIE METRE MICHIVUKU(jap) MICROSTRUCTURE MILIEU MILLENNARISM
 MIME MIMODRAME MIRACULA MOCK EPIC MODALISATION MODALITE MODE LITTERAIRE MODELE DIALOGIQUE MODELISATION
 MODERNE(alt) MOI MOMENT MONDE(Modalia) MONOLOGISME MONOLOGUE DRAMATIQUE MORABEZA(port) MORALE MORALE MYRTE
 Y CRISTIANOS(esp-port.) MOTET MOUVEMENT M.DU 4 MAI 1919(chine) MULTIMEDIA MUPPETS MUSICAL/COMEDY MOTYS
 PERSONNEL MYTHEME MYTHOLOGIQUE MYTHOLOGISME
 NACHEMPFINDEN(alt) NACHERLEBEN NARCOSISME NARRATEUR OMNISCIENT NARRATIF(écène, prog., pers., syst.) NARRATIVE
 NARRENTLITERATUR(alt) PASTORAL(alt) NATIONALISME NATIONALISME NATIONALISME NATIONALISME NDIUM(alt) NEGRISME
 NEVROSE NEW HISTORICISM(écène 20th) NIALS NIVEAU D'ANALYSE NOBUD NOMINALISME NONFICTION NOUVELLE CRITIQUE O
 BJET(pyc) OCCIDENTAL OEDIPÉ(écène 1) OEUVRE OEUVRE DE JEUNESSE ONE MAN SHOW ONIRIC ONITSHA LITERATURE(Afr)
 OPEN THEATRE(Samantia) OPERATIFIVE OPERETTE ORNEMENTALISME OULIPO OUVERTURE OUVERTURE DE L'OEUVRE OXYMORE
 PALIMPSESTE PANACHE PANSORH(écène) PANTAGRUELISME PARABASE PARACRITIQUE PARADIGME PARADOXE PARAGRAMME
 PARALLELE PARAPHRASE PASSION(greco) PATHETIC FALLACY PATHETIQUE PATRONNAGE(écène de) PAYSANNERIE PEINTURE(écène)
 PENSEE PERFORMATIF PERIODE PERIPETIE PERIPHRASE PERORAISON PERSONNIFICATION PAYTE REVUE PENTARQUISME
 PHENOMENOLOGIE PHENOTEXTE PHILOSOPHIQUE(monte, roman, etc) PLAN WEN(chantefable chine) PICHELHERRING(écène)
 P.I.DIYES P'EN UN ACTE PIETISME PLAGIAT PLAIDOYER PLAISIR DU TEXTE PLATEAU(écène) PLATONISME POCHADE POESIE
 AMOUREUSE P.OIDACTIQUE POETASTER POETIQUE(alt) POETISME POINT OF VIEW POLIQUET FICITION POLYBEMIE POSE
 POPULAIRE POPULISTE(alt) PORTAIT POST ROMANTISME PRATIQUE CULTURELLE PRESUPPOSE PRETERITION PREUIVE PRINCIPE
 PROBLEM PLAY PROBLEMATIQUE PROBLEMGESCHICHTE(alt) PROCÉDE PROCESSUS PRODUCTION LITTERAIRE PROGRAMMATIQUE
 PROJECTION PROLEPSE PROLOGUE PROPAGANDE PROPOS PROPOSITION PROSAIQUE PROSODIE PROSOPPEE PROTAGONISTE
 PROVINCIALISME PROXEMIQUE PSYCHE PSYCHO-RECIT PUBLICATION PUBLIKUMSBESCHIMPFUNG(alt) PULCINELLA(italien) PULSION
 PUNCH AND JUDY PUPPET QUANTITE QUART D'HEURE QUATRAIN QUERELLE QUESTISME
 RAISON RAPPORT REALISME MYTHOLOGIQUE REALIST CRITICISM RECEPTEUR RECIT DE CHASSEURS(Afr) RECIT DE REVE R.DE
 VIE R.FILMIQUE RECIT-CADRE REFERENCE REFERENT REFLET REFOULEMENT REFRAIN REPUTATION REGE(Hongrois)
 REGIONALISTE REGISTRE R.INFERIEUR/SUPERIEUR RELATIONS INTERLITTERAIRES REPETITION REPLIQUE REPRESENTATION
 RESUME RESURGENCE RETROSPECTIVE REVOLUTION(littéraire) REVOLUTIONNAIRE RHAPSODE RHETORIQUE RHETORIQUEURS
 RHODIANISME RIDIGUE RIME R.COUVE RITH(Samantia) ROBINSONNADE ROMAN A DEFINITION, A SENSATIONS BOURGEOIS
 CONTEMPORAIN, COURTOIS, D'ANTICIPATION, D'IMAGINATION, DE CAPE ET D'EEPE, DE FORMATION, DE LIBERALISME ABSTRACT, DE
 MOEURS, DE PRODUCTION BESSINE EXPERIMENTAL FAMILIAL FEUILLETON IDYLIQUE PAR FASCICULE PASTORAL
 PHILOSOPHIQUE PSYCHOLOGIQUE ROMANCE(francis) ROMANCEIRO(port) ROMANCIER ROMANTIQUE RONDEAU RUBAI(perseo)
 SACRE SALON SAMBA(alt) SAMZIDA(Tuono) SAUDADE(port) SAUVAGE(écène) SAYNETE SCAPIGALIA(italien) SCATOLOGIQUE SCENE
 PRIMITIVE SCPTISME SCHAUDER SCHAUERLICH SCHAUERROMAN(alt) SCHEMA SCHEMA SCHMELZEN(alt) SCHNORKEL(alt)
 SCHOLARSHIP/LITERARY SCHRECKROMAN SCHWANKLITERATUR(alt) SCIENCE DE LA LITTERATURE SCIENTIFICITE
 SCOLAIRE(drame) SCOLASTIQUE SCRIPT SCRIPTIBILITE SEMANALYSE SEMANTIQUE SEME SEMOTIQUE(écène) SENS SENTENCE
 SENTIMENT SENTIMENTALISME SENTIMENTALITE SEQUENCE SERENADE SESTIN(Accent) SHAKESPEARIN(drame) SHIFTER
 SHORT-STORY SIGNATURE SIGNIFANCE SIGNIFICATION SINGIE SLAPSTICK SOAP OPERA SOCIAL SOCIOLECTE SOLILOQUE
 SONDAT SOUS-ENTENDU SOZIALISTISCHER REALISMUS(alt) SPACE OPERA SPANNUNG(alt) SPECTACLE SPIRITUALISME STADE
 STANCE STICHOMETRIE STICHOMYTHE STOFF STOFFGESCHICHTE(alt) STORY STRATEGIE STREAM OF CONSCIOUSNESS
 STREITBIDCHT(alt) STRUCTURE STYLE DIRECT SU(chin) SUBIMATION SUBTILISATION SUBTILISATION SUBTILISATION SYMBOLIC ACTION SYMBOLIQUE
 SYMBOLIC ACTION SYMBOLIQUE SYMBOLISME(de qch) SYNCHRONIE LITTERAIRE SYNECDOQUE SYNESTHESIE SYNOPSIS
 SYNTAXE NARRATIVE SYSTEMES(littéraire, poétique, etc.)
 TABLEAU TALE TARIK(alt) TEMPERAMENT TEMPORALITE NORMATIVE TENDI TENSON(écène) TERCET TEXT THEORY TEXTEME
 TEXTUEL(organisateur...) TEXTUELLE(crique) THEATRE D'AMATEUR ,DE BOULEVARD DE L'ABSURDE EN ROND EXPERIMENTAL
 ,LABORATOIRE POUR LA JEUNESSE SUR CHARS, TOTAL THEATRICALS THEMATIQUE(crique) THEMATOLOGIE THEME THESE
 THESE THRILLER TIRADE TITRE TROPHEE TOTALITE TRAIT TRAITÉ TRAME TRANSCENDANTALISME TRANSCULTUREL
 TRANSFORMATION DU TEXTE TRANSITION TRANSMETTEUR TRANSNATIONAL TRAVESTI TRIFAGONISTE TROBAR(écène) TROPE
 TROUBADOUR(greco, XDe) TROVA(écène) TRUCULENT TURNING POINT TYPE D'OEUVRES TYPE(personnage) TYPOLGIE
 UCHRONIE ULTRAMISM(écène) UNANIMISME UNDERSTATEMENT UNITE NARRATIVE UNIVERSAUX UTENDI(écène) UTOPIAN(TI)
 VALUERS LITTERAIRES VANGARD VARIANTE VARIATION VERDICTION VERS DE SOCIETE VERSET VERIFICATION VICTORIEN
 VID(écène) VIE DELTIGKEIT(alt) VIELENG(alt) VILLANCICO(esp) VILLANESCA(esp) VIRELAI VISION(écène) VITA VITESSE
 VOLKSGEIST(alt) VOLKSLIED(alt) VOLKSTRECK(alt) VOLTAIEN VOYAGE(écène) VOYAGEURS VULGAIRE
 WACKER WANDERLUST(alt) WESTERN XING(chin) ZIEI(écène) ZUGEN: ZUGERENUNTES BEWUSSTSEIN(alt) juillet 1922

