

INTRODUCTION TO DISCOURSE ANALYSIS: MICHEL PÊCHEUX'S PROGRAM



<https://doi.org/10.56238/arev6n4-002>

Submitted on: 10/30/2024

Publication date: 11/30/2024

Mara Rúbia de Souza Rodrigues Morais¹.

ABSTRACT

This work seeks to contribute to the research carried out in different areas of knowledge interested in mobilizing Discourse Analysis as a materialist theory of reading. In this sense, this article presents the results of a bibliographic study that addressed the epistemological, conceptual and methodological aspects of the Discourse Analysis (DA) program, conducted by Michel Pêcheux between the 1960s and 1980s. The history of the historical-ideological current of Discourse Analysis that is presented in this text contemplates the revisions and reelaboration undertaken by Pêcheux on the concepts that make up the theoretical and methodological apparatus of this field of knowledge. As a result of the research carried out, it is concluded that, despite the displacements produced within it, Discourse Analysis, developed and permanently reformulated by Michel Pêcheux and collaborators over more than two decades, remained faithful to its constant challenge of understanding the processes of constitution of meanings, engendered in and by discursive practices. Therefore, the importance of understanding the foundations and history of Pecheuxtian Discourse Analysis is reiterated, especially in the context of research that proposes to analyze the production of the effects of meanings, constituted in the imbrication of language with discursive exteriority.

Keywords: Discourse Analysis, Michel Pêcheux, French DA, Discourse.

¹ Email: mara.morais@ifg.edu.br

INTRODUCTION

The Discourse Analysis of historical-ideological bias derived from the postulates of Michel Pêcheux has been the basis for numerous researches, in different areas of knowledge, which seek to understand the processes of production of meanings developed in the confluence of language with a discursive exterior.

In order to contribute to a better understanding of this important aspect of discursive studies, this article exposes the theoretical-epistemological aspects of Pecheuxtian Discourse Analysis. Here we find a retrospective of the revisions and reelaborations undertaken by Michel Pêcheux and collaborators on the concepts that make up the theoretical and methodological apparatus of this field of knowledge.

It follows, therefore, an approach of the Pecheuxtian platform for Discourse Analysis.

EPISTEMOLOGICAL CONTEXTS AND FOUNDATIONS OF DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

The historical-social transformations that occurred in the twentieth century led to the emergence of an epistemological order in which the autonomy and homogeneity of the disciplines were not sustained. In this context, according to Fernandes (2004, p.43), "the decentralization of a linearity proper to the organization of a scientific field is observed and it is questioned (...) the delimitation of objects and knowledge claimed as proper to each discipline".

Constituted in this process of rupture, the Discourse Analysis² of Pecheuxtian affiliation (hereinafter AD) emerges as an interdisciplinary domain, crossed by Althusser's theses on the historical and material existence of ideologies, by the Lacanian theory of subjectivity and by a dissatisfaction with the immanentist analysis of language.

In the text *Elements for a history of discourse analysis in France* (In: Orlandi, 1997), the linguist Denise Maldidier refers to a double foundation of discourse analysis, as a discipline instituted in the encounter of linguistics with historical materialism, through the formulations of Pêcheux and Jean Dubois. Despite the existence of common traits or interests between the projects of these two "founders", the author identifies crucial

² According to Fernandes (2005, p.79), the project for the elaboration of the disciplinary field of Discourse Analysis is configured in three epochs (AD-1 or AAD-69; AD-2 and AD-3), which translate the revisions and reelaboration of the concepts that make up the theoretical and methodological apparatus of this field of knowledge. These three periods of AD are described by Michel Pêcheux himself, in the texts collected in Gadet & Hak (1990).

differences related to the way they position themselves in relation to theory. According to Mالدیدیر (ibidem, p. 18),

on the side of J. Dubois, the institution of DA is thought of within a *continuum*: the passage from the study of words (lexicology) to the study of the utterance (discourse analysis) is 'natural', it is an extension, a progress allowed by linguistics (...). On the side of M. Pêcheux, on the contrary, discourse analysis is thought of as an epistemological break with the ideology that dominates the human sciences (especially psychology) (...). More generally, it is the way of theorizing the relationship of linguistics with an exterior that differentiates the two DAs. For J. Dubois, it means relating two models: the linguistic model and another model, sociological (or historical), psychological (or psychoanalytic). In M. Pêcheux, since *Automatic Discourse Analysis*, in 1969, although concealed by a circumstantial façade, the theoretical object articulates the question of discourse with those of the subject and ideology.

In addition to this observation about the double affiliation of Discourse Analysis, it should be noted that attributing to Pêcheux the founding gesture of French Discourse Analysis requires that one recognize the construction of a theory of discourse within DA as a result, not of his individual action, but of "dialogues and duels" (cf. Gregolin, 2004) raised in/by his proposals over the last decades.

By affirming the articulation of language with society and with the historical contexts in which the subject is inserted, DA goes back not only to historical materialism, but also to Lacan and postulates a constitution of subjects – as effects of language – *in / through* discourses. This postulation reacts to the thesis of a synthetic³ and sovereign subject, as well as to the immanent analysis of linguistic materialities, because:

because they are inserted in interdiscursive dialogues, the utterances are not transparently legible, they are crossed by speeches that come from outside – their emergence in the discourse is cleaved from footprints of other discourses (Gregolin, 2001, p.71).

In this movement, the focus of the analysis is the constitution of meanings and subjects in the socio-historical processes in which discourses are formed affected by the interactions of the subject in different social contexts. Therefore, as much as it refuses the internal analysis of language, DA also does not propose to restore a system of thought

³ In pursuit of some elements of the epistemological configuration of DA, it is essential to make explicit the displacements and resignifications suffered by the conception of *subject* throughout the history of the Pêcheuxian project for Discourse Analysis. Due to the imbrication between the notions of *subject* and *discourse*, it is necessary to restore some elements of the path in which the notion of *subject* went from *being elaborated circumscribed within the framework of imaginary formations* to a *concept reformulated in the light of historical materialism* and, finally, to the *heterogeneous dimension, decentered and divided between the other and the same*.

underlying texts, nor to rescue the intentions of a speaking subject who, in a conscious activity, would construct and order the utterances of a discourse. The interest of Discourse Analysis lies in the interdiscursive and intradiscursive mechanisms of the constitution of meanings, since:

inserted in History, the subject constructs his saying in the repeatable (in the interdiscourse, in the discursive memory), but, at the same time, occupies a position of authorship by moving from what has already been said, by moving and ensuring the uniqueness and coherence of the discourse (Gregolin, 2001, p. 75).

Regarding the concept of *interdiscourse*, Michel Pêcheux, in the work *Semantics and Discourse* (1995, p. 162), presents this concept as "the complex whole with dominance of the FDs", characterizing it as a theoretical category of the order of the unrepresentable and the interpenetrable. In the wake of Pêcheux, the Glossary of Discourse Terms (Ferreira, 2001, p. 6) states that *interdiscourse* encompasses the set of discursive formations and is inherent to the constitution of discourse, "to the extent that it works with the subject's re-signification of what has already been said, the repeatable, determining the displacements promoted by the subject at the borders of a discursive formation". In the same vein, Courtine (1981, p. 16) defines *interdiscourse* as "a series of formulations marking, each one, distinct and dispersed enunciations, articulating between them certain linguistic forms (quoting, repeating, paraphrasing, opposing each other, transforming themselves...)".

Regarding intradiscourse, Courtine (1981, p. 16) characterizes it as "a place where the sequencing of the elements of knowledge takes place, where the interdiscursive unevenness is linearized". Eni Orlandi (2002), in turn, and based on the formulations of French researchers enrolled in DA, such as Pêcheux, Courtine and Maingueneau, defines *intradiscourse* as the "horizontal axis, of formation, what we are saying at that given moment". In the same sense, it is read in Ferreira (2001, p. 6) that the *intradiscourse* consists of the

material simulacrum of interdiscourse, insofar as it provides-imposes "reality" on the subject, raw material in which the individual constitutes himself as 'reality' to the subject, raw material in which the individual constitutes himself as a speaking subject in a certain discursive formation that subjects him (...) it is the "thread of discourse" of a subject; Strictly speaking, it is an effect of interdiscourse on itself, since it incorporates, in the syntagmatic (linear) axis, the relationship of possibility of substitution between elements (words, expressions, propositions), as if these elements, thus linked to each other, had an evident, literal meaning. What is in evidence, in intradiscourse, is the formulation of a discourse based on the present reality.

Based on the assumption that "it is necessary to welcome each moment of discourse in its irruption as an event, in the punctuality in which it appears and in the temporal dispersion that allows it to be repeated, known, forgotten, transformed" (Foucault, 2000, p.91), studies in DA reflect on the interdiscursive and contextual configurations that enable the emergence of some (and not others!) discourses glimpsed in the *corpora* Analyzed. They are interested, among other relations, in the coexistence, reciprocal determination and transformation of discourses within a discursive formation⁴, which, according to Pêcheux (1995, p.314), is constitutively crossed by elements coming from other discursive formations. In this movement, such studies focus on the memory networks that enable discursive functioning and the historical configurations that determine the ways of saying and what should be said (Foucault, 2000) in the contexts described.

However, due to the opaque and dispersed nature of interdiscourse and the analytical-interpretative character of AD studies, what is proposed is not a totalizing analysis that intends to refer to the origins of discourse. An analytical enterprise is postulated that, in search of the discontinuities and dispersion systems of discourses, reflects on discursive events and their functioning in the contexts in which they emerge.

By means of a theoretical movement operated in the book *The Discourse: Structure or Event* (1983:1997), Pêcheux, shortly before his death in 1983, claims a rearrangement of the work of the historicity of meaning in AD studies. By preventing discursive analyses against an erasure of the event, provoked by its absorption in an anticipatory overinterpretation, Pêcheux (1983:1997, p. 56) contests the homogenization of *discursive formation* and inscribes, in the order of *identification effects*, the relationship of discourse and subject with its constitutive exteriority. In this way, the author rejects the analytical posture that includes discourse in a series whose structure is taken as "historical

⁴ The notion of *discursive formation* was initially developed by Foucault [1969 (2005)], in *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, as a set of statements that obey a similar system of dispersion, and between which a regularity can be detected. Inserted in Foucault's archaeological project – which focuses on the analysis of the conditions of knowledge production in Western culture – this concept of FD authorizes a descriptive model that, however, does not concern itself with resolving the contradictions inherent to discursive formations. Thus, although the Foucaultian concept of FD accentuates the contradictory character of all *discursive formation*, its "entry" into the Pêcheuxian Discourse Analysis required a reformulation in the light of historical materialism. Articulated with the Marxist category of class struggle, the concept of *discursive formation* is resignified, initially in Haroche, Henry & Pêcheux (1971), becoming a component of ideological formations. In *Saussurian Semantics and Cut: Language, Language, Discourse* (Pêcheux, Haroche & Henry, 1971), *discursive formation* is defined as that which determines what can and should be said from a given position in a given conjuncture. Constantly resignified by some theoretical-methodological undertakings, the discursive theory of DA progressively accentuates the heterogeneity of *discursive formation* and affirms the dialectical order in which meanings are constituted between regularity and dispersion.

transcendental, reading grid or anticipatory memory of the discourse in question" (ibidem, p. 56). In these formulations, Pêcheux incites a redimensioning of the theoretical-methodological device of DA, affirming the paradoxical dimension of discourse – situated between the singular and the repeatable. More specifically, it constitutes the clash between structure and event as the analytical-conceptual order of DA that begins to underlie the analysis of discursiveness.

CONTENT ANALYSIS, LINGUISTICS AND DA: DIALOGUES AND DISPLACEMENTS

First of all, it is necessary to make an observation related to the title of this section. Although we reject the position that contests the scientific status of Discourse Analysis and excludes it from the domains of Linguistics, we refer here, by the term *linguistics*, to the immanentist studies of language developed from the General Linguistics Course. Having made this clarification, this article continues with the recovery of the epistemological and theoretical-methodological aspects of the Pecheuxtian DA.

In proposing Automatic Discourse Analysis (AAD-69), Michel Pêcheux (In Gadet & Hak, 1990) postulates the replacement of the traditional paradigm of Content Analysis by a theoretical method capable of attributing scientificity to the study of texts. In this sense, the author points out the need to relate the form to the content of saying and reiterates the criticism of content analysis, which does not separate the practice and theory of language and restricts the analysis of texts to their *function* of expressing meaning. Inscribed in the classical perspective of linguistic science (which claims to be both the *science of expression* and *the means of this expression*), Content Analysis presupposes the apprehension of the meaning of a text based on the reader's psychological abilities and, according to Pêcheux, does not configure a scientific method of reading that allows the achievement of a univocal result. In short, Content Analysis disregards the articulation between language/subject/ideology⁵ and circumscribes the semantic-grammatical study and the means of expression to their respective functions, namely: *understanding the text* and *making oneself understood*.

⁵ According to the *Glossary of Discourse Terms* (Ferreira, 2001, p. 5), *ideology*, as a dominant element that is present within the discourse and that, at the same time, is reflected in the exteriority, is *constitutive* of the discursive practice. Understood as an effect of the relationship between subject and language, it allows the identification of the subject with the *discursive formation* that dominates him.

From a different perspective, the French Discourse Analysis, in its first phase, called AAD-69 (or AD-1), presents itself as a procedure guided by a "non-subjective analysis of the effects of meaning that crosses the illusion of the subject-effect and that returns to the discursive process (understood as the relations of paraphrase within what we call discursive formation) by a kind of regular archaeology" (Pêcheux & Fuchs, 1990, p. 170).

The search for an algorithm that would enable a formal description of the discursive processes reflects the pretensions of scientificity of this first moment of Discourse Analysis. Although it postulated the articulation of linguistic materiality with the conditions of production of saying, the AAD-69 program pursued an automatic analysis of discourses that would be made possible by descriptive models committed to uniqueness and stability. However, at a later time, the interface between DA and psychoanalysis, especially in the early 1980s, instituted *failure* and *equivocation* as constitutive elements of speech, senses and subjects, which made unfeasible and destabilized, within DA itself, the pretension of automatically analyzing discourses.

Constituted in this context of rupture, Discourse Analysis from the Pêcheuxian perspective carries out important dialogues and displacements in relation to traditional practices of text analysis and modern linguistics. It distances itself from Content Analysis because, while this analysis is limited to the supralinguistic level and seeks to rescue a meaning underlying the texts, DA focuses on the *effects of meaning* produced in the subject's relationship with the socio-historical-ideological contexts of discourse production. As the same utterance can take on different meanings according to the *discursive formation* in which it is (re)produced, the gestures of interpretation produce the illusion of a literal meaning, that is, that the utterance means what it really says. In this sense, according to Pêcheux, discourse is nothing more than *an effect* of meaning between interlocutors. Thus, an analysis in DA is therefore interested in the "formal mechanisms that produce a given discourse in given 'circumstances'" (Pêcheux, in: Gadet & Hak, 1990). As Nunes (2005, p.103) attests:

The AAD-69 makes a regulated comparison between several texts that constitute a discursive corpus that is supposed to be representative of a certain state of the conditions of production characteristic of a given discursive formation.

In the process of its constitution, DA includes *exteriority* in the construction of *discourse* as its conceptual object and moves away from Saussurean linguistics, which, by considering *speech* as a non-scientific residue of analysis, excludes the *situation* and the

subject from the domains of linguistic science. Linguistic exteriority is constituted by *conditions of production*, which are configured in the strict sense (referring to the circumstances of enunciation) or in a broad sense (related to the socio-historical-ideological context in which the subjects are inscribed). However, it is important to remember that the domain of *the conditions of production* that interests Pecheuxian Discourse Analysis goes back to the socio-historical-ideological context of the production of discourses and is not limited to the immediate circumstances of enunciation.

Established as the conceptual object of DA, *discourse* distances itself from the meaning of utterance and differs from the notion of *text* (empirical reality of discourse), since it combines the forms of linguistic materiality with the socio-ideological positions of the subject⁶ in certain historical conjunctures. From this perspective, DA breaks with postulates arising from the opposition *between language and speech*, such as the establishment of *language* as a homogeneous object of scientific linguistic research, and with a conception of transparent and sovereign subjectivity arising from the individual character attributed to *speech*. Since, for DA, the meaning of words changes according to the positions⁷ assumed by the subject within his social interactions, Discourse Analysis proposes, according to Robin (1977, p. 129), the challenge of analyzing the place of discursive practices in a *social formation*⁸. In theory, as the conceptual object of the 1st phase of DA is conceived as a "discursive machine" capable of reflecting the structuring of subjection⁹ *in and through* language, it is important for DA-1 to describe the relations of linguistic materiality with the conditions of production of the saying of an ideologically constituted subject. Thus, DA is situated among the disciplines of interpretation and seeks, according to Pêcheux (1999, p.

⁶ "As a result of the relationship with language and history, the subject of discourse is not totally free, nor totally determined by external mechanisms. The subject is constituted from the relationship with the other, never being the only source of meaning, nor an element where the discourse originates". (Ferreira, 2001, p. 9).

⁷ Discourse Analysis designates with the term *subject position* "the result of the relationship that is established between the subject of the discourse and the subject-form of a given discursive formation. A subject-position is not a physical reality, but an imaginary object, representing in the discursive process the places occupied by the subjects in the structure of a social formation. In this way, there is not a single subject, but several subject-positions, which are related to certain discursive and ideological formations". (Ferreira, 2001, p. 9).

⁸ "Space from which one can predict the effects of meaning to be produced. For DA, the positions that the subjects occupy in a given social formation condition the conditions of discursive production, defining the place they occupy in the discourse. The functioning of social formations is linked to the functioning of ideology, related to the class struggle and its economic motivations." (Ferreira, 2001)

⁹ Pêcheux & Fuchs (In: GadeT & Hak, 1990, p. 166), inscribed in Althusser's Marxist perspective, affirm that the *subjection* (or ideological interpellation of the individual as an ideological subject) occurs in such a way that each one is led, without realizing it and having the impression of exercising his free will, to *occupy his place* in one or the other of the two antagonistic social classes of the mode of production.

14), "to construct procedures by exposing the reader-gaze to levels opaque to the strategic action of a subject".

Despite the ruptures that the constitution of the theoretical object of DA operates in relation to modern linguistics, Pêcheux (1990) adheres to the shift from *function* to *functioning* in linguistic studies introduced by the Saussurean cut. However, he assumes a distance from Saussure (and the Chomskyan formulations *competence* and *performance*) by seeking to describe a functioning that, because it is affected by the conditions of discourse production, is not exclusively linguistic. Therefore, DA does not care about the functioning of language – conceived as "a set of systems that authorize combinations and substitutions regulated by defined elements" (Pêcheux, 1990, p. 78) – nor the access to the meaning of texts through psychological or sociological methods. What is sought, in the context of the AAD-69, is the outline of a formal description of the *discursive processes*, translated by the creation of an algorithm that provides the automatic analysis of the discourses. It seeks to construct a descriptive model that enables the displacement of *function* to *functioning* within the scope of a terrain that linguistics has left uncovered by establishing *language* as its conceptual object: the effects of meaning and the conditions of production of saying.

In the flow of theoretical-epistemological developments undertaken by discourse theory, DA suffers ruptures produced within itself. The constitutively contradictory character of the notion of *discursive formation* that emerges in Pêcheux's work configures a second phase of DA theory, which calls into question the homogeneity of the conditions of discourse production and destabilizes the concept of the discursive machine of the AAD-69. At this moment, Discourse Analysis distances itself from Pêcheux's initial project of automatically analyzing discourses and undergoes the displacements and revisions that continue to constitute it, in phases AD-2 and AD-3, as a theory of intervening between Linguistics, Historical Materialism and Psychoanalysis.

THE THIRD PHASE OF DISCOURSE ANALYSIS: LIMITS OF STRUCTURALISM IN DA-3

In the *Note to the Reader* of the Brazilian edition of *O Discurso: estrutura ou evento* (Pêcheux, 1997, p.9), Eni Orlandi defines Michel Pêcheux's path in the constitution of DA as "a form of reflection on language that accepts the discomfort of not settling into the evidence and the place already made". Having made the alert, it is possible, even to the reader unaccustomed to the in-between and rupture character of Discourse Analysis, to

understand the emergence of some displacements undertaken in the Peuceuxian discourses of the third phase of DA in relation to the phases AD-1 and AD-2.

In the epistemological context of interdisciplinary movements and reconfiguration produced by DA, Pêcheux's condemnation, from the 1980s onwards, of what he considers a *Marxist ontology is not surprising*. According to Pêcheux, Marxist structuralism – by supposing that "the things to know that concern the socio-historical real form a structural system, analogous to the Galilean conceptual-experimental coherence" – denies interpretation and approaches positivist procedures that presuppose the homogenization of the real. To define the scope and character of *interpretation*, Pêcheux (1997) discusses the category of the *real*, which cannot be circumscribed to the logically stable. Alien to logical univocity, and decharacterized as a defect or as a knowledge that is transmitted, learned, taught, the real of DA consists in the space of the non-logically stable that exists producing effects.

Constitutively crossed by psychoanalysis¹⁰ and Lacanian formulations on the *unconscious*¹¹, DA-3 reflects a theoretical-methodological redimensioning developed within Discourse Analysis itself. This revision is based on the conception of *the real of language*, which according to Milner (1987), consists of the impossibility of saying everything in language, a series of points of the impossible, a place of the unconscious, from where the subject speaks what cannot be said. The actual term *of the language* is designated in French as *lalangue*, which corresponds, in Portuguese, to *alanguage*. This terminological distinction expresses in a singular way, already in spelling, the difference between the notion of language, which is of the order of the whole, of the possible, and the notion of the real of language (*alanguage*), which is of the order of the not-whole, of the impossible, also inscribed in language. This term came from psychoanalysis, brought by Lacan, and was developed in linguistics, especially by Milner (1987), in an attempt to name that which escapes the univocity inherent in any name, pointing to the register that, in every language, consecrates it to equivocation. In the theoretical perspective of discourse, a conception of language affected by reality becomes fundamental, as this will allow us to operate with a

¹⁰ Despite the emphasis on the psychoanalytic bias of DA-3, it should be noted that the interface between AD and psychoanalysis is visible at the beginning of the constitution of Discourse Analysis. In this sense, Ferreira (2004, p. 38) states that the border coexistence between them comes from the beginning.

¹¹ "... The unconscious is nothing more than a "chain" of signifiers, such as words, phonemes and letters, which "unfolds" according to very precise rules over which the self has no control." (Fink, 1998, p.26)

"concept of language that recognizes the equivocation as a structural fact that is constitutive and implied by the order of the symbolic" (Pêcheux, 1997)

Determined by the relationship with psychoanalysis, this last phase of DA is constituted from the "theoretical primacy of *the Other* over the *same*, which is accentuated, pushing to the limit the crisis of the notion of the structural discursive machine" (Pêcheux, in Gadet & Hak, 1990, p.315). In this movement, a new phase of linguistic-discursive analysis is configured, in which *equivocation is recognized*¹² as a "structural fact constitutive and implied by the symbolic" (Pêcheux, 1997, p. 51). In other words: *failure* and *equivocation* (incompatible with an automatic analysis of discourses and with a homogenizing conception of FD) emerge in the HC-3 program as a way of access to language, meanings and subjects, which, in turn, are redefined as structures marked by a constitutive heterogeneity¹³.

Based on Lacan's scores on the unconscious and on the Bakhtinian notion of *dialogism*, the French linguist Jacqueline Authier-Revuz affirms the constitutive heterogeneity of the language of a subject divided between the Other and the same. From some theoretical-analytical developments that thematize the linguistic-discursive forms of the discourse-other, the author points out the crossing of the subject and its discourse by a constitutive exteriority, which configures the heterogeneity of speech and subjects. As the subject is marked by the desire of the Other¹⁴ and his discourse is crossed by the unconscious, it is constituted by different meanings, among which "many escape and many others are equivocal" (Ribeiro, 2004, p. 34).

In this interface with psychoanalysis, Discourse Analysis is re-inscribed, in its third phase, as a discipline of interpretation. Since it does not seek to rescue meanings given *a priori*, nor does it presuppose the homogeneity of the sequences analyzed, DA reaffirms, in this last phase, that "the elements will only have (will make) meaning in the enunciative

¹² *Equivocation*, according to Ferreira (2001), is the "mark of resistance that affects the regularity of the language system. This concept arises from the way language is conceived in DA (as a materiality of discourse, a non-homogeneous and open system). Some of its manifestations are failures, lapses, slips, misunderstandings, ambiguities, which are part of the language and represent a mark of resistance and differentiation in relation to the system".

¹³ "Under our words 'other words' it is said, (...) behind linearity, according to the 'emission of a single voice', a polyphony is heard and (...) the discourse is constitutively crossed by the discourse of the Other." (Authier-Revuz, 1982, p. 140-141)

¹⁴ According to Ribeiro (2004), *the lapses* in the discourse induce DA to question the location of a subject of desire in a discursive space that, like the subject, is ideologically determined. As an answer to these questions, the author points to the reflections of Authier-Revuz (1994) on the non-coincidences of saying, which is necessarily lacking, incomplete.

chain (signifier), in the discourse produced (historically)" (Ribeiro, 2004, p. 28). From this perspective, he continues to affirm the articulation of discourses with the socio-historical conditions of their production, but begins to postulate an order in which the analysis of the conditions of production does not imprison the discursive event in the series in which it includes it. This can be seen in the following statement by Pêcheux (1997, p. 56):

The notion of discursive formation lent to Foucault by discourse analysis has often drifted towards the idea of a discursive machine of subjection endowed with an internal semiotics and for this very reason aimed at repetition: at the limit, this structural conception of discursivity would lead to an erasure of the event, through its absorption in an anticipatory overinterpretation.

Faced with the risk of absorbing the event in the structure, what is proposed – at this moment when DA recognizes the mistake and the failure as vestiges of the emergence and crossing of the Other in the discourse of the same – is the exposure of the opacity of the text. If, according to Pêcheux (1997, p. 53), "every utterance is intrinsically susceptible to becoming other, different from itself, discursively moving from its meaning to drift to others", DA-3 is interested in the points of drift at which subjects and meanings "pass" in the other. If the strategic control of discourse is possible to escape a dispersed subject affected by the misunderstanding of language, what matters to DA, in its current procedures, is the movement of "insistence of the other as a law of social space and historical memory"¹⁵ (Pêcheux, 1997, p. 54-55). It is therefore important to make possible "gestures of interpretation" (Orlandi, 1986, p. 64) and not the attribution of meanings within discursive spaces conceived as logically stabilized. After all, the search for a "deep, essential and unique meaning" (Chamana, 1983, apud Ribeiro, 2004, p. 34) slides into the analysis of the very functioning of discourses, which are affected by the discourse of the Other, in its multiple configurations:

- discourse of an other, placed on stage by the subject, or discourse of the subject placing himself on stage as an other (cf. the different forms of "shown heterogeneity");

¹⁵ The concept of *discursive memory*, according to Pêcheux (1999, p. 52), refers to "that which, in the face of a text that appears as an event to be read, comes to reestablish the "implicit" (that is, more technically, the pre-constructed, quoted and reported elements, transverse discourses, etc.) that its reading needs: the condition of the legible in relation to the legible itself". According to Courtine and Haroche (1994), "there is a memory inherent to language and the discursive processes are responsible for bringing out what, in a collective memory, is characteristic of a given historical process". Therefore, according to the authors, language is "the fabric of memory". In the same vein, Achard (1999, p. 16) states that "memory does not restore phrases heard in the past, but judgments of verisimilitude about what is reconstituted by the operations of paraphrase. These operations displace what is historically probable, because the resumption operation is located at this level."

- but also, and above all, the insistence of an interdiscursive "beyond" that comes, below all functional self-control of the "ego-I", a strategic enunciator that puts on stage "its" sequence, structuring this staging (at the points of identity in which the "ego-I" is installed) at the same time that it destabilizes it. (Pêcheux, 1983, p. 317)

In the midst of the movements of rupture and slippage produced by DA throughout its permanent (re)constitution, paradoxically, within the analysis of discourses itself, the Other, "strange that is familiar to him" (Ferreira, 2004), represented by psychoanalysis, erupts. Strange, because Other, with its singular constitution; familiar, because it echoes within DA, not with the intention of overlapping the same of another field, but legitimizing, precisely, the constitutive alterity of language, meanings and subjects, so dear to DA.

Safeguarding their limits and distances, DA and psychoanalysis come together in a space of displacement of structures in which *lack*, *equivocation* and *failure* ensure the very existence of meanings, subjects and sayings. They re(inscribe), in the space of their clippings and injunctions, the order of dispersion and decentralization in which "knowing what one is talking about" is nothing more than the illusion of certain structuralisms.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

The epistemological context of movements produced by French Discourse Analysis requires continuous reflection on the historicity and foundations of its formulations. By reflecting on the history of the constitution of DA and its theoretical framework, this article focused on some displacements established within this field of linguistic analysis, which significantly affects the view of meaning, the subject and history. Based on the contributions of Michel Pêcheux – and the interfaces established by this theorist with the philosophical elaborations of Michel Foucault and with the works of some other theorists, inscribed in the perspective of French DA – we sought to discuss some theoretical-epistemological aspects of Discourse Analysis, articulated in the axis: subject / history and language.

In this movement, it is pointed out that, despite the theoretical-methodological displacements produced within it, Discourse Analysis, developed and permanently reformulated by Pêcheux and collaborators over more than two decades, remains faithful to its constant challenge of understanding the processes of constitution of meanings and subjects, engendered in and by discursive practices. In this way, DA reaffirms an analysis that neutralizes the notion of transparency of meanings, subjects and language and re-inscribes the search for the dialogical plane in which subjects affect and are affected by ideology, the Other and history.

REFERENCES

1. Achard, P. (1999). O papel da memória. Pontes.
2. Authier-Revuz, J. (1982). Heterogeneidade expressa e heterogeneidade constitutiva: elementos para uma abordagem do outro no discurso (S. D. Costa, Trans.). Uberlândia/MG, 91-151. (Original work published 1982).
3. Authier-Revuz, J. (1994). Falta do dizer, dizer da falta: as palavras do silêncio. In E. Orlandi (Ed.), Gestos de leitura: da história no discurso (pp. 91-151). Campinas: Ed. da UNICAMP.
4. Courtine, J. J. (1981). Quelques problèmes théoriques et méthodologiques en analyse du discours; à propos du discours communiste adressé aux chrétiens. Langages, 62, 9-127. Paris: Didier-Larousse. (Translation by S. Possenti).
5. Fernandes, C. A. (2004). Linguística e História: formação e funcionamentos discursivos. In C. A. Fernandes & J. B. C. Santos (Eds.), Análise do Discurso: unidade e dispersão (pp. 43-70). Campinas: EntreMeios.
6. Fernandes, C. A. (2005). Análise do Discurso: reflexões introdutórias. Campinas: Trilhas Urbanas.
7. Ferreira, M. C. L. (2001). Dicionário de Termos do Discurso. Porto Alegre: Gráfica da UFRGS.
8. Ferreira, M. C. L. (2004). Análise de Discurso e Psicanálise: uma estranha intimidade. Porto Alegre: Instituto de Letras da Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul.
9. Fink, B. (1998). O sujeito lacaniano: entre a linguagem e o gozo. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar Editor.
10. Foucault, M. (2000). Sobre a Arqueologia das Ciências: Resposta ao Círculo de Epistemologia. In M. Foucault, Ditos e Escritos II (pp. 82-118). Forense Universitária.
11. Foucault, M. (2005). A Arqueologia do Saber (7th ed.). Rio de Janeiro: Forense Universitária.
12. Gadet, F., & Hak, T. (1992). Por uma Análise Automática do Discurso: uma introdução à obra de Michel Pêcheux. Campinas: Editora da Unicamp.
13. Gregolin, M. R. V. (2000). Recitações de Mitos: a História na lente da mídia. In M. R. V. Gregolin (Ed.), Filigranas do Discurso: as vozes da História (pp. 19-34). Campinas: Cultura Acadêmica.
14. Gregolin, M. R. V. (2004). Foucault e Pêcheux na análise do discurso: diálogos e duelos. Campinas: Claraluz.

15. Haroche, C., Pêcheux, M., & Henry, P. (1971). La sémantique et la coupure saussurienne: Langue, Langage, Discours. *Langages*, 24, 93-106. Paris: Didier-Larousse.
16. Milner, J. C. (1987). O amor da língua. Porto Alegre: Artes Médicas.
17. Nunes, J. H. (2005). A semântica e o corte saussuriano: língua, linguagem e discurso. In F. Indursky & M. C. L. Ferreira (Eds.), *Michel Pêcheux e a Análise do Discurso: uma relação de nunca acabar* (pp. 99-104). Campinas: Claraluz.
18. Orlandi, E. P. (1983). *Análise de discurso: princípios e procedimentos*. Campinas: Pontes.
19. Maldidier, D. (1997). Elementos para uma história da análise do discurso na França. In E. Orlandi (Ed.), *Gestos de leitura: da história no discurso* (pp. 91-151). Campinas: Editora da UNICAMP.
20. Pêcheux, M. (1983). *O discurso: estrutura ou acontecimento* (2nd ed.). Campinas: Pontes.
21. Pêcheux, M. (1990). A Análise de Discurso: três épocas. In F. Gadet & T. Hak (Eds.), *Por uma Análise Automática do Discurso* (pp. 61-105). Campinas: Editora da Unicamp.
22. Pêcheux, M. (1999). Sobre os contextos epistemológicos da Análise de Discurso. *Escritos*, 4. Campinas: Labeurb/Nuderc/Unicamp.
23. Pêcheux, M., & Fuchs, C. (1990). A propósito da Análise Automática do Discurso: atualização e perspectivas. In F. Gadet & T. Hak (Eds.), *Por uma Análise Automática do Discurso: uma introdução à obra de Michel Pêcheux* (pp. 163-189). Campinas: Editora da Unicamp.
24. Pêcheux, M. (1990). Análise Automática do Discurso – (AAD-69). In F. Gadet & T. Hak (Eds.), *Por uma Análise Automática do Discurso: uma introdução à obra de Michel Pêcheux* (pp. 61-105). Campinas: Editora da Unicamp.
25. Ribeiro, M. S. M. (2004). A questão da interpretação na análise do discurso e na psicanálise: interseções. C. da APPOA.
26. Robin, R. (1977). *História e Linguística*. São Paulo: Cultrix.