Topicality of Michel Pêcheux

International conference

Introduction

Is Michel Pêcheux still being read? Where does he fit in the field of discourse analysis (DA)? How have the concepts he contributed to shape been developed – particularly those of interdiscourse, preconstruction or discursive formation – and how do they fit together with others more recent ones, such as the concept of discourse genre? And finally, why is it necessary, and how to read Pêcheux today? Those are the guiding lines that we wish to address in this conference, the questions that we wish to invite the researchers with a more or less central position in the field of DA to confront.

Although Pêcheux is frequently mentioned in the introduction of dissertations in discourse analysis, his texts are not widely read, and his concepts rarely discussed or put to the test – to the noteworthy exception of the reflection led by E. Orlandi in Brazil (for example 2007) or works such as those of M.-A Paveau (for example 2008), or N. Marignier (2020). Often put together with Foucault, Pêcheux's name is generally associated to the "French" discourse analysis movement – a movement of which the rather blurred outlines also include pragmatics, although it is fundamentally what Pêcheux aims to distance himself from.

Despite being in constant renewal between 1967 and 1983 (see Helsoot and Hak 1995 and 2000), it is also a production that is very often reduced to its political dimension, now considered "outdated". Is it then necessary to think, along with Maigueneau, that "En France, l'analyse du discours ne saurait [en effet] se réduire aujourd'hui à ce courant, dont les objectifs et les méthodes initiaux appartiennent désormais à l'histoire des idées."[1] (Maingueneau 1995 : 5) ?

De facto, works dealing head-on with political discourses apparatus (tracts, programs, conference resolutions) seemed to have been overshadowed after the *Matérialités discursives* conference (1981), which put emphasis on "ordinary discourse". Notwithstanding, it is noteworthy that since then, and long before, the reflection of Jacques Rancière has not ceased to address labor archives, amongst others, taking on perspectives dear to discourse analysis, especially those that consider enunciation as a possibility of the emergence of the singular within what is shared in language and discourse. Regardless, the research in the following decades, in France at the very least, mostly focused on professional discourse, science popularization discourse (see the research lead at Cediscor, such as Beacco and Moirand 1995 or Moirand 2007) or institutional discourse (a research axis specifically represented at Ceditec, see for example Krieg-Planque 2012). The dialogue with historians, very present in the 80s (see Guilhaumou, Maldidier, Robin 1994), has become more distant, and it is rather collaborations with researchers in media and communication studies or sociology that have emerged.

---

[1] In France, discourse analysis cannot be reduced today to this movement, whose initial aims and methods now belong to the history of ideas

Yet, for the past decade, the scientific environment seems to be marked by what we could call a somewhat political awakening, in DA as well as sociolinguistics or other humanities: some researchers focus on relations of domination (gender questions, discourse on migration – see for example Veniard 2018), others seek to identify the outlines of "neoliberal discourse" (Guilbert 2007) and put forward the question of ideology. Henceforth, researchers specifically in DA are led to position themselves in relation to Pêcheux's work, either to extend it (Marignier 2020) or to distance themselves from it (Guilbert 2010). Particularly Pêcheux's explicitly materialistic and Marxist approach is often brought forward as an obstacle to formulate the resistance to domination in its various forms (such as the Butlerian agency).

It is also noteworthy that the key concepts forged by Pêcheux and his colleagues have continued to circulate… although with a few twists: we know that the concept of interdiscourse, closely linked to those of preconstruction, discursive formation and intradiscourse in Pêcheux's texts, has become somewhat autonomous and closer to Bakhtinian dialogic, in part, no doubt, because of its formal proximity to "intertext" (see Paveau 2008).

De facto, the constant return to his theoretical and methodological apparatus, which characterizes the intellectual adventure led by and around M. Pêcheux, is ill-fitted to the fixed version that the doxa seemed to have imposed. And so it is of the political corpus: research undertaken within the framework that Pêcheux called "third period" of DA also included corpus other than those taken from political speech apparatus (Pêcheux 1983 in Pêcheux 1990 p. 317-318) – to which politics is not limited. So is the case, on another level, of the complex relationship between Pêcheux and psychoanalysis: to the "empty" subject of the first period succeeded the conception of a "split subject", leaving room to enunciation (Authier-Revuz 2020 : 405-421).

These evolutions and remodeling are based on a constant point of reference: language ("langue") as "proper order" and linguistics as fulcrum for DA. However, this proposal is now the object of head-on rebuttal in the field of discourse analysis and, on a larger scale, linguistics – a rebuttal based on scientific (language ("langue") being defined, not as a system, but as the sum of its uses – cf Legallois and François 2011) or political grounds (language ("langue") being contested as an instrument of domination – cf. Canut 2021). Furthermore, the possibility of a concept of language that makes room for enunciation is largely unknown, a possibility made even more impossible to consider by the confusion between Saussurism and structuralism that runs deep in the theoretical history of linguistics (see Toutain 2014). Yet, such an enunciative conception, at the heart of Benveniste's work, is already present in Pêcheux as early as AAD 69, as shown by Dumoulin (2022).

Likewise, Pêcheux's interest for computer science, and the heuristic dimension he gives it, is relatively unknown at a time when corpus digitalization and automated calculations through easy-to-use software puts DA to the test of computer tools. On the contrary, the linguist's itinerary cannot be separated from the history of the automatic discourse analysis tools (AAD69, 3AD75, AAD80) he and his teams set up: their success and limitations punctuate the epistemological inflections of his career. Going back on it to develop all the implications of this work seems fundamental.

It therefore seems that the current scientific environment calls for a rereading of the texts and a return to the concepts – both supported by the publication of an unpublished text (Pêcheux 1983) and the recent dissertation of H. Dumoulin (2022). In the end, it is to reflect on the concepts and methodology of DA that we wish to invite researchers, whether they are explicitly within the field or on its margins, or even in a dialogue with the themes addressed above. To that end, we have identified several axes for reflection.

Axis 1: Foundation of a field: concepts for discourse analysis

M. Pêcheux's intellectual trajectory throughout the entire period it unfolded, is characterized by constant feedback on the methods and very goal of the endeavors called "Discourse Analysis" – feedback that produced a certain blur in the definition of its concepts, however without altering the non-subjective foundation in the grasp of language, subject and meaning. As underlined by Maldidier:

> D'un bout à l'autre, ce que [M. Pêcheux] a théorisé sous le nom de discours est le rappel de quelques idées aussi simples qu'insupportables : le sujet n'est pas à la source du sens ; le sens se forme dans l'histoire à travers le travail de la mémoire, l'incessante reprise du déjà-dit ; le sens peut être traqué, il échappe toujours. (Maldidier, introduction à Pêcheux 1990 : 89)[2]

Therefore, the concepts of "discursive formation", "interdiscourse" and "preconstruction", while not produced at the same time, are nevertheless theoretically articulated – preconstruction being the implicit track in the statement by which we can trace back the discursive formation in which the "dominantly complex whole" constitutes the inter-discourse. Have those concepts undergone redefinitions that may have undone this appearance of systematicity? In the end, the "preconstruction" "uncovered" in *Les Vérités de la Palice* regarding the two types of relative clauses that marks the articulation of discourse and language as well as the anchoring of M. Pêcheux's discourse analysis in linguistics has changed very little; it is not so of the concepts articulating discourse and politics. "Discursive formation", conceptualized in the dual tradition of Althusser and Foucault to account for the historical determinations weighing on discourse, is first considered in the form of "semantic domains" related to "social positions" (Pêcheux, Haroche, Henry 1971 : 148). Quickly criticized (Guilhaumou, Maldidier and Robin 1989) for its taxonomic nature and the risk of circularity to which it exposes (Borillo & Virbel 1973), it was abandoned in this form. At the same time, the central notion of interdiscourse, defined in *Les Vérités de la Palice* in an admittedly somewhat opaque wording ("the complex whole in dominance of discursive formation"), appears to have subsequently weakened in Pêcheux himself, into a "socio-historical body of discursive traces constituting the memory space of the sequence" (Pêcheux, "Lecture et mémoire : projet de recherche", in Pêcheux 1990: 289), opening the way, in later work, to an alignment with Bakhtinian "dialogism", with intertextuality or "doxa". Therefore, according to D. Maingueneau, "interdiscourse is to discourse what intertext is to text" (Charaudeau et Maingueneau 2002 : 324), while R. Amossy

---

[2] From one end to another, what [M. Pêcheux] theorized under the title of discourse is the reminder of some ideas as simple as there are insufferable: the subject is not at the origin of meaning; meaning is formed in history through the work of memory, the incessant repetition of what has already been said; meaning can be tracked down, but it always escapes.

defines it as "the whole of discourses circulating at a given moment, from which speech feeds *nolens volens"* (Amossy in Raus 2019 : 127).

Several questions can then be raised, several research axes be explored, in connection with recent works.

For example, can the concept of "discursive formation" recently convened in conferences or research in DA (including Maingueneau 2011, Mayaffre 2004, see also Sassier 2008) (still) be used to account for the ideological determination of a discourse, and if so, under which conditions? What would be the specificity of interdiscourse if it is not equivalent to dialogism or intertextuality? How can more recent concepts fit into this structure? If the notion of discourse genre appears in parentheses in the definition of discursive formation as determinant of "what can and must be said (articulated in the form of a harangue, a sermon, a pamphlet, an exposé, a program, etc.) from a given position in a given conjuncture" (Pêcheux, Haroche, Henry 1971 : 148), how does this notion, which has become indispensable in AD, relate to other concepts (see Sitri 2022)? Going further, can concepts from very different epistemological paradigms enrich Pêcheux's Discourse Analysis device, as suggested by Marignier 2020, with the concept of agency taken from Butler?

From a DA perspective, we can also go back to the concept of "preconstruction", to which a conference was recently devoted in enunciative linguistics ("Le concept de préconstruit en linguistique énonciative", conference organized by LISAA): is it connected to the enunciative interpretation of certain syntactic structures such as (determinative) relatives or nominalizations (Dumoulin 2022)? Is it akin to notions close to "common ground" (see conference "Le common ground en linguistique : de sa construction à son incidence dans le paramétrage du sens", organized in Nanterre in April 2024 by Crea) or implicit (Von Munchow 2016)? What connection to the Culiolian preconstruction? Finally, is preconstruction the only access to discursive formations?

Axis 2: Language ("langue") as proper order

We know of Pêcheux's proximity with linguists – one might even go as far as saying that he made himself linguist. De facto, it is through the analysis of linguistic structures – such as the determinative or appositive dual interpretation of relative clauses – that the central notion of preconstruction emerges, itself a gateway to discursive formations. This example shows that the heart of the matter is language insofar as it allows ambiguity, equivocation, or what Pêcheux calls "miroitement" (mirroring), i.e. language as an abstract system that "works" – Saussurean language, one might say – and not language as a mean of communication to the service of the speaking subject's transparent intentions – a position that can be found in the opposition between shown heterogeneity and constitutive heterogeneity (Authier-Revuz 1984). In fact, this is precisely where the subject of enunciation resides, a subject that is nonintentional but that is lodged in the entanglement of discursive formation to which it identifies.

And so, the initial anchoring to the materiality of language – constant throughout the entire development of Pêcheux's thinking – has durably rooted the "French" DA into the field of linguistics: a DA that is preoccupied by "marks" and the shape of messages, a DA initially built against content analysis. In a time when the approach to language as an abstract system is the

object of a contestation that takes many forms, and a time when the pragmatic paradigm seems to dominate the field of discourse studies, we can reflect upon the meaning of the asserted affiliation to Pêcheux's thinking. Several questions may be of interest to discourse analysts.

From a theoretical perspective, we could first go back to the way Pêcheux articulates the recognition of proper order of language and the dimension of discourse. Which language for which discourse, or which discourse for which language? We can also question the logic at work in the choice of linguistic observables and ask, just as Marignier 2020 does for example, if and how the blurriness in the theory translates into, or entails, blurriness in the choice of linguistic observables. We could also go back to the place given in Pêcheux's work to syntactic rather than lexical structures.

Axis 3: Discourse analysis at the crossroad of social sciences

From the very beginning, Pêcheux establishes his theoretical research under the banner of interdisciplinarity, which places it without any possible doubt in the field of (post)structuralism (Angermuller 2013). From a reflexive observation of social sciences as situated sciences (an observation also made in other terms and places by Foucault), Pêcheux extends the Marxist criticism of political economy to a criticism of social sciences, particularly of social psychology (Pêcheux/Herbert 1966). Adopting the Althusserian approach, this critical work gives hope of creating an "epistemological break" in social sciences based on the science trio that makes up the "Triple Entente": linguistics, historical materialism, and psychoanalysis. According to this program, this break was to lead to "discourse" as the scientific object of social sciences, (re)defined as the science of ideological representations of individuals and social groups.

Today, this ambitious "Discourse theory" by Pêcheux (Maldidier 1990) appears as a fantasy born out of an era spurred by Althusserian theoricism (1974). As it happens, it was also Pêcheux's meticulous work that contributed to outline the impossible nature of such discourse theory by uncovering the irreducibly situated nature of discursivity and therefore the interpretative nature of discourse analysis (Pêcheux 1983).

This evolution of Pêcheux seems to have several points of origin. On one side, it is noteworthy to point out the discussion with Michel Foucault that starts as early as 1971, which then appears in several of his works (Pêcheux 1977, 1978, 1983). Pêcheux's attitude seems to then oscillate between Marxist "rectification" and sincere concessions to the philosopher. And indeed, the "micro-political" perspective adopted by Foucault creates a new space to think the relation between discourse, science, and politics (Revel 2010, Macherey 2014), which constitutes a step away from the Althusserian theory of ideology. But it is also noteworthy that the critics of the illusions of "discourse science" was based on a theoretical reflection on linguistics, particularly through the concepts of language and enunciation (Pêcheux 1975, Henry 1977) that opened a dialogue with psychoanalysis.

Within this framework, we can expect submissions that go back to the epistemological issues at stake in the founding of discourse analysis as a field of study, particularly the relationship between Pêcheux and discourse analysts to Michel Foucault. We can also expect papers that explore more generally the dynamic within discourse analysis between theory and practice,

science and politics, knowledge and activism, following the reflection on "discourse analysis between description and intervention" suggested by the 2019 conference in Poitiers.

Furthermore, although "science of discourse" did not come about, it seems that we may consider from Pêcheux's theoretical adventure the opening of the discourse "field" as a common constituent of social sciences and humanities, regardless of the objects of studies and formalism adopted respectively. Throughout Pêcheux's career, this premise led to fruitful discussions between the field of DA in linguistics and the work of historians and sociologists – as, for example, through the creation of the research group ADELA "Analyse du discours et lectures d'archive" (Discourse analysis and archives readings). This premise also existed through the linguistics section of the CERM where the debate has constantly been maintained with sociolinguists such as Jean-Baptiste Marcellesi (see Authier-Revuz & Dumoulin, to be published). Within this framework, it may be fitting for papers to reflect on the current state of interdisciplinary connections between discourse analysis and other fields of social sciences.

Axis 4: Automatic discourse analysis: where a tool-based approach meets textometry and Natural Language Processing (NLP)

While textometry has reach remarkable breadth, following in the footsteps of lexicometry – to the point that it now represents the tools and statistics counterpart of discourse analysis – the proximity and differences between the devices born out of this history and Pêcheux's work is rarely examined. However, it is profitable to wonder how those approaches can be compared: thus, Reinert's method (Alceste, Iramuteq) and the AAD69 device (Pêcheux 1969) are both based on the recording of "elementary statements", yet the construction of these statements can appear to be very different in more ways than one. We can expect papers to choose a comparative approach between the techniques and tools specific to textometry and Pêcheux's work.

But it is also necessary to wonder how these approaches challenge each other from an epistemological point of view: while today, strong proposals from textual data analysis make co-occurrence the basis of the meaning of words in discourse (Mayaffre 2014), Pêcheux, who also sought the basis of a discursive semantics in the notion of a word's context, never formulated it from the strict angle of co-occurrence – although he did show a definite interest in the relationships established by the calculation of co-occurrences (Pêcheux 1969: 4). We can then expect from papers to show how a mutual epistemological enlightening is possible between Pêcheux's work and some of the major debates of textometry.

Finally, beyond the field of textual data analysis, it is in a more general sense that Pêcheux's work is part of the history of natural language processing in France – pioneer of a "1970s NLP" (Léon 2010), with its limitations as well as its theoretical foresight. Thus, if we consider, together with Jurafsky and Martin (2023), that the "word embeddings" – that have now become part of the state of art for NLP– implement the Harrissian hypothesis of representation of a word by its context according to different devices, whether static with word2vec (Mikolov et al. 2013) or dynamic with the Transformer (Vaswani et al. 2017), it should be reminded that the AAD69 device was already based on a similar hypothesis while confronting the linguistic issues associated with defining the notion of context.

Axis 5: The subject between linguistics and psychoanalysis

Reference to psychoanalysis is present from the outset in the thinker's reflection. Mentioned in the 1966 paper, psychoanalysis is part of the "Triple Entente" of the discourse analysis "allied" sciences; likewise, some of the phrasings of Lacan's thoughts punctuated the reflection on interpellation in *Les Vérités de La Palice* (1975). This raises the question of how psychoanalytic concepts can be put to work in a theoretical structure that claims to be from Althusser above all else. If the professor from Rue d'Ulm undoubtedly discusses psychoanalysis in his reworking of the notion of ideology (Gillot 2009), we can perceive however a certain difficulty in reconciling the Lacanian conception of a subject with what Pêcheux would come to refer to as an "automaton" in Althusserian theory (Pêcheux 1983), which resembles a "non-subject" in many ways (Authier-Revuz 2020).

However, from 1977 onwards, particularly from the paper « Il n'y a de cause que de ce qui cloche » (1978), the question of the subject regains decisive importance as the "flaws" that can be observed both in the process of ideological interpellation and in the homogeneous systematicity of language are considered. Under the figure of the subject of enunciation, it is an irreducibly heterogeneous singularity that appears at the heart of the formalization of discursivity. As a continuation of the discussion started by Paul Henry in *Le Mauvais Outil* (1977), the lasts of Pêcheux's writings voluntarily open a deeper dialogue with Lacanian works. Thus, in *La Langue introuvable* (1982), Pêcheux and Gadet question the possibility of a discourse analysis that could escape the dichotomy between knowledge and truth outlined by Jean-Claude Milner in *l'Amour de la langue* (1978). By doing so, Pêcheux brings an original production to the itinerary of encounters that punctuate the history of linguistics and psychoanalysis, which is updated today in the work of numerous linguists (Authier-Revuz 2020, Toutain 2018).

Within this framework, we can expect of papers to directly question the evolution of Pêcheux's connection to psychoanalysis, but also more generally the complementary or opposing relationship between linguistics, discourse analysis and analytic practice.

Bibliography

Althusser, L. (1974). *Éléments d'autocritique*. Paris. Hachette.

Angermuller, J. (2013). *Analyse du discours poststructuraliste. Les voix du sujet chez Lacan, Althusser, Foucault, Derrida, Sollers*. Limoges. Lambert-Lucas.

Authier-Revuz J. (1984), « Hétérogénéités énonciatives », *Langages* 73. 98-111.

Authier-Revuz, J. (2020). *La Représentation du Discours Autre. Principes pour une description*. Berlin/Boston. De Gruyter.

Authier-Revuz, J. & Dumoulin, H. (à paraître) « Le CERM linguistique (1977-1979). Entretiens avec Jacqueline Authier-Revuz », *La Pensée*. Approches matérialistes du langage, Fondation Gabriel Péri.

Bakhtine, M. (1984). « Les genres du discours ». In *Esthétique de la création verbale* (p. 265-308). Paris. Gallimard.

Beacco J.-C. et Moirand S. (1995). (dir.) *Les Carnets du Cediscor* 3, « Les enjeux des discours spécialisés » URL : http://journals.openedition.org/cediscor/457 ; DOI : https://doi.org/10.4000/cediscor.457

Borillo, M., & Virbel, J. (1977). « Une maladie infantile de l'analyse des données textuelles dans les constructions scientifiques en histoire : La théorie du discours ». In *Analyse et validation dans l'étude des données textuelles*. Paris. Éditions du CNRS.

Canut C., (2021). *Langue*. Paris, Anamosa.

Charaudeau P. et Maingueneau D., (2002). *Dictionnaire d'Analyse du Discours*, Paris, Hachette.

Dufour F. et Rosier L. (2012). « Introduction. Héritages et reconfigurations conceptuelles de l'analyse du discours « à la française » : perte ou profit ? », *Langage et société*, 140, 5-13. DOI : 10.3917/ls.140.0005. URL : https://www.cairn.info/revue-langage-et-societe-2012-2-page-5.htm

Dumoulin, H. (2022). *Les théorisations du discours de Michel Pêcheux et Michel Foucault à la lumière du concept d'énonciation.* Thèse de doctorat soutenue le 9 décembre 2022, Université Paris Nanterre.

Gillot, P. (2009). *Althusser et la psychanalyse*. Paris. Presses universitaires de France.

Guilhaumou, J., Maldidier, D., & Robin, R. (1994). *Discours et archive. Expérimentations en analyse du discours*. Paris. Mardaga.

Guilbert T. (2010). « Pêcheux est-il réconciliable avec l'analyse du discours ? Une approche interdisciplinaire », *Semen,* http://journals.openedition.org/semen/8803 ; DOI : 10.4000/semen.8803

Guilbert T. (2007). *Le discours idéologique ou la Force de l'évidence.* Paris, L'Harmattan.

Helsoot N. et Hak T. (2000). « La contribution de Michel Pêcheux à l'analyse de discours », *Langage et société* 91. 5-33. DOI : 10.3917/ls.091.0005. URL : https://www.cairn.info/revue-langage-et-societe-2000-1-page-5.htm

Hak T et Helsoot N. (eds.) (1995). *Michel Pêcheux, Automatic discourse analysis*. Amsterdam. Rodopi.

Henry, P. (1977). *Le Mauvais outil. Langue, sujet, discours.* Paris. Klinsieck.

Jurafsky, D., & Martin, J. H. (2023). *Speech and Language Processing.* Stanford University, online edition (3rd edition draft), consulté sur https://web.stanford.edu/~jurafsky/slp3/

Krieg-Planque A. (2012). *Analyser les discours institutionnels*. Paris. Armand Colin.

Legallois D. et François J. (2011). « La Linguistique fondée sur l'usage : parcours critique », *Travaux de linguistique* 62. 7-33. DOI : 10.3917/tl.062.0007

Léon, J. (2010). « AAD69 : Archéologie d'une étrange machine ». *Semen* 29. 89-90.

Macherey, P. (2014). *Le Sujet des normes*. Paris. éd. Amsterdam.

Maingueneau D. (1995). « Présentation ». *Langages* 117. 5-11. www.persee.fr/doc/lgge_0458-726x_1995_num_29_117_1702

Maingueneau, D. (2011). « Pertinence de la notion de formation discursive en analyse du discours ». *Langage et Société*, 87-99.

Maldidier, D. (1990). « (Re)lire Michel Pêcheux aujourd'hui ». In D. Maldidier (Éd.), *Michel Pêcheux, L'inquiétude du discours. Textes choisis et présentés par Denise Maldidier*. Éditions des cendres.

Marignier N. (2020). « Pour l'intégration du concept d'*agency* en analyse du discours », *Langage et société* 170. 15-37. DOI : 10.3917/ls.170.0015. URL : https://www.cairn.info/revue-langage-et-societe-2020-2-page-15.htm

Mayaffre, D. (2014). « Plaidoyer en faveur de l'Analyse de Données co(n)Textuelles. Parcours cooccurrentiels dans le discours présidentiel français (1958-2014) ». In I.-S. nouvelle (Éd.), *JADT 2014* (p. 15-32). Emilie Née and Jean-Michel Daube and Mathieu Valette and Serge Fleury. https://hal.science/hal-01181337

Mayaffre, D. (2004). « Formation(s) discursive(s) et discours politique : l'exemplarité des discours communistes *versus* bourgeois durant l'entre-deux-guerres ». *Texto !* [en ligne]. Disponible sur : <http://www.revue-texto.net/Inedits/Mayaffre/Mayaffre_Formations.html>.

Mikolov, T., Chen, K., Corrado, G., & Dean, J. (2013). Efficient Estimation of Word Representations in Vector Space. *1st International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2013, Scottsdale, Arizona, USA, May 2-4, 2013, Workshop Track Proceedings*. http://arxiv.org/abs/1301.3781

Milner, J.-Cl. (1978). *L'Amour de la langue*. Paris. Seuil.

Moirand S. (2007). *Les discours de la presse quotidienne*. Paris. Puf.

Münchow P. (von) (2016). « Quand le non-dit n'est pas l'implicite : comment rendre visibles les silences dans le discours? ». *Signes, Discours et Sociétés : Revue semestrielle en sciences humaines et sociales dédiée à l'analyse des Discours.* L'implicite : entre préconstruits sémantiques et détermination générique, 17. ⟨halshs-01419431⟩

Orlandi, E. (2007). « L'analyse du discours et ses entre-deux : notes sur son histoire au Brésil », *in Un dialogue atlantique. Production des sciences du langage au Brésil*. Paris. ENS Editions, p. 37-61.

Paveau M.-A. (2008). « Interdiscours et intertexte.. Linguistique et littérature : Cluny, 40 ans après » *in* Ablali D. et Katsberg Sjöblom M. (dir.) *Linguistique et littérature : Cluny, 40 ans après*, Presses Universitaires de Besançon, collection Annales Littéraires, 93-105. hal-00473985

Pêcheux A. (1986). « Bibliographie des travaux de Michel Pêcheux » *Mots* 13. 195-200. www.persee.fr/doc/mots_0243-6450_1986_num_13_1_1314

Pêcheux, M. (1969). *Analyse automatique du discours*. Paris. Dunod.

Pêcheux M., Haroche C., Henry P. (1971). « La sémantique et la coupure saussurienne », *in Michel Pêcheux, L'inquiétude du discours. Textes choisis et présentés par Denise Maldidier*. Paris. Éditions des cendres.

Pêcheux, M. (1975). *Les Vérités de La Palice*. Paris. Maspero.

Pêcheux, M. (1977). « Remontons de Foucault à Spinoza ». In *Michel Pêcheux, L'inquiétude du discours. Textes choisis et présentés par Denise Maldidier*. Paris. Éditions des cendres.

Pêcheux, M. (1978). « Il n'y a de cause que de ce qui cloche ». In *Michel Pêcheux, L'inquiétude du discours. Textes choisis et présentés par Denise Maldidier*. Paris. Éditions des cendres.

Pêcheux, M. (1983). *Le Structuralisme brûle-t-il ?* Texte inédit conservé au Fonds PCH (Numéro 10), IMEC, Caen.

Pêcheux, M. (1990). *L'inquiétude du discours. Textes choisis et présentés par Denise Maldidier*. Éditions des cendres.

Pêcheux, M. (Herbert, Th.). (1966). « Réflexions sur la situation théorique des sciences sociales et, spécialement, de la psychologie sociale ». *Cahiers pour l'analyse* 2, 174-203.

Pêcheux, M., & Gadet, F. (1981). *La Langue introuvable*. Paris. Maspero.

Pêcheux, M., Haroche, C. L., & Henry, P. (1971). « La sémantique et la coupure saussurienne : Langue, langage, discours ». *Langages* 24. 93-106.

Rancière J., Entretien avec Vianney Griffaton : « L'archive, c'est le témoignage d'actes de paroles qui marquent l'arrachement à une condition » (Partie I, 9/II/2024) ; « L'important, c'est l'effort pour briser l'ordre normal du temps » (Partie II, 11/II/2024) ; Paris, Groupe d'études géopolitiques / ENS, *Le Grand Continent*.

Raus R. (éd.) (2019). *Partage des savoirs et influence culturelle : L'analyse de discours « à la française » hors de France*, Essais francophones vol.6, Gerflint (Groupe d'Etudes et de Recherches pour le Français Langue Internationale), https://www.gerflint.fr/Base/Essais_francophones/essais_francophones_vol_6_2019.pdf

Revel, J. (2010). *Foucault, une pensée du discontinu*, Paris, Agone.

Sassier, M. (2008). « Genre, registre, formation discursive et corpus ». *Langage et société* 124, 39-57.

Sitri, F. (2022). « 'Genre de discours' et/ou 'formation discursive' : quelle articulation ? », *Congrès Mondial de Linguistique Française - CMLF 2022,* SHS Web of Conferences 13**,** https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/202213801001 **8**, 01001

Toutain, A.-G. (2014). *La Rupture saussurienne*. Louvain-la-Neuve. *Academia*.

Toutain, A.-G. (2018). « La théorie de la psychose du psychanalyste Alain Manier : Une articulation inédite entre linguistique et psychanalyse ». In I. Vilela (Éd.), *Saussure et la psychanalyse.* Paris. Éditions Langage et inconscient. 273-292

Vaswani, A., Shazeer, N., Parmar, N., Uszkoreit, J., Jones, L., Gomez, A. N., Kaiser, Ł., & Polosukhin, I. (2017). "Attention is All you Need". *In* I. Guyon, U. V. Luxburg, S. Bengio, H. Wallach, R. Fergus, S. Vishwanathan, & R. Garnett (Éds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* (Vol. 30). Curran Associates, Inc. https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2017/file/3f5ee243547dee91fbd053c1c4a845aa-Paper.pdf

Veniard M. (2018). « La définition européenne de l'intégration des immigrants : définition consensuelle ou polémique ? Comparaison entre discours institutionnel européen et discours médiatiques en France ». *Le Discours et la langue* 10. 147-161. ⟨hal-02185992⟩