

## Saussure and Foucault; language and discourse

### *Saussure e Foucault, língua e discurso*

Cleudemar Alves Fernandes  
Universidade Federal de Uberlândia, Uberlândia, Minas Gerais, Brasil

Vanice Sargentini  
Universidade Federal de São Carlos, São Carlos, São Paulo, Brasil

**Abstract:** The article problematizes the notion of language that permeates Foucault's studies, especially in texts published in the late 1960s, with emphasis on *The Archeology of Knowledge*. It aims at explaining and/or discussing the implications of the concept of language for the construction of theoretical and methodological apparatuses that support its propositions about discourse. The hypothesis is that the dialogue with structuralism, which presents language as a system, acts as a foundation for the concepts of discourse and discursive practices, which will be important to him over several years of research. In the development of this article, initially the notion of language in Ferdinand de Saussure is presented, specifically in the *Course in General Linguistics*, and later, the notion of language in Foucault and in Saussure is compared, considering the development of the statement and discourse concepts. The results indicate the similarities and differences between the two authors, considering the notion of language.

**Keywords:** Saussure; Foucault; Language; Discourse; Statements

**Resumo:** O artigo problematiza a noção de língua que perpassa os estudos de Foucault, mais especialmente nos textos publicados no final dos anos 1960, com ênfase para *A Arqueologia do Saber*. Objetiva explicitar e/ou discutir as implicações do conceito de língua para a edificação de aparatos teóricos e metodológicos que dão sustentação às suas proposições sobre o discurso. Tem-se como hipótese que o diálogo com o estruturalismo, que lhe apresenta a língua como sistema, atua como fundamento para os conceitos de discurso e práticas discursivas, que lhe serão caros ao longo de vários anos de pesquisa. No desenvolvimento do artigo, inicialmente apresenta-se a noção de língua em Ferdinand de Saussure, especificamente no *Curso de Linguística Geral*, e posteriormente, faz-se o cotejamento da noção de língua em Foucault e em Saussure, considerando o desencadeamento dos conceitos de enunciado e de discurso. Os resultados indicam as aproximações e distanciamentos entre os dois autores, considerando-se a noção de língua.

**Palavras-chave:** Saussure; Foucault; Língua; Discurso; Enunciado



## 1 Introduction

We have in Brazil a Study Group (GT) named Foucauldian Discourse Studies, alongside the National Association of Graduates and Research of Languages and Linguistics (ANPOLL), that gathers Languages and Linguistics researchers around the thoughts of French philosopher Michel Foucault, focusing on subjects concerning language and its relations to social, historical, political and cultural aspects, which culminates on the understanding of discourse as object of analysis. The majority of members of the GT started their academic life through Languages or Linguistics bachelors, which have language as a frequent and central issue. Considering that - although being a productive notion to define statements - Michel Foucault does not address the concept of language, this article aims at problematizing the conceptualization of language that permeates Foucault's studies, specially within the texts published by the end of 1960 decade; emphasizing *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, and expliciting and/or discussing the implications of such concept to the construction of theoretical and methodological apparatuses that support his propositions about discourse. The hypothesis is that the dialogue with structuralism, presenting language as a system, acts as foundation for concepts of discourse and discursive practices, which will be essential over his long years of research.

In order to accomplish such a proposition, we shall initially revisit the notion of language in Ferdinand de Saussure, specifically in the *Course in General Linguistics*, for it is the central work that posits the reflexions over structuralism in several disciplinary fields. Later, we shall appreciate the notion of language in Foucault and Saussure, considering the unfolding of the concepts of statement and discourse. The French context of the 1960 decade is a special concern of ours, for it is a moment of intellectual effervescence characterized by epistemological disputes and the development of disciplinary fields; such context is also the beginning of discourse studies that arise in the proposition of the academic discipline of Discourse Analysis. In the decade there is also the emergence of Michael Foucault's thoughts, and its effects in the germination of discourse studies.

## **2 Regarding language in Saussure and discourse in Foucault**

The *Course in General Linguistics* (CLG), by Ferdinand de Saussure, is considered the central work to the edification of Linguistics as a science, which is taken as the foundation of Modern Linguistics. In his endeavors, Saussure<sup>1</sup> stands for the sufficiency of language as an object of a science and proposes the expositions of concepts and methods that support the scientific investigations of such a specific object. After his considerations for defining the object, Saussure (2011, p. 9) posits the question “What is language [langue]?”. Furthermore, the answer: “It is both a social product of the faculty of speech and a collection of necessary conventions that have been adopted by a social body to permit individuals to exercise that faculty. Taken as a whole, speech is many-sided and heterogeneous;” (SAUSSURE, 2011, p. 9).

On this initial proposition, the conceptualization of language - presented as “social product”, “collection of necessary convention” - implies that language [*langue*], taken as a human faculty, is exercised by the subjects (individuals). Undertaking language’s many-sided and heterogeneous characters, one can assume that the social body that adopts the same collections of conventions - language - is heterogeneous, allowed to present different styles and/or uses for it.

Whereas Saussure (2011) considers language “as a self-contained whole and a principle of classification” (p. 9); on the other hand, “speech [*langage*] has both an individual and a social side, and we cannot conceive of one without the other. [...] Speech implies both an established system and an evolution;” (p. 8). Being a social product, an “established system”, language has in these propositions a binary system; i.e the presence of two indissociable and intertwined elements. The presence of binary pairs in the definition and construction of an object, always dependent on each other, is noticeable throughout the *Course in General Linguistics*, and it characterizes Saussure’s operational method. Such method shall be named as structuralism by the readers, and it shall - furthermore - be taken as a parameter for scholars on the edification of several other disciplinary fields.

---

<sup>1</sup> We shall not attain the dispute around the authorship of the *Course in General Linguistics*, discussed by Silveira, Sá & Fernandes (2019). We shall consider CLG’s named authorship, to which we shall properly refer throughout the text.

---

Assuming language as an object of science, of Linguistics, Saussure posits the following reiterations on the characters of such specific scientific object:

“Language is a well-defined object in the heterogeneous mass of speech facts. [...] It is the social side of speech, outside the individual who can never create nor modify it by himself.” (p. 14)

“Language is a social institution [...]. It is a system of signs [...]. A science that studies the life of signs within society is conceivable.” (p. 15-16)

“Signs are studied from a social viewpoint” (p. 17)

Relying on these propositions, the presence of the social aspect is reiterated as a condition of the existence of language, and it is set, to our perspective, as one of Saussure’s - or more properly the CLG’s - pathways to other studies; most visibly for being a constant reference for researchers and scholars in France by the 1960 decade. On that note, we shall consider that the French context of the decade was still under Saussure’s statement that “Linguistics is very closely related to other sciences that sometimes borrow from its data, sometimes supply it with data.” (SAUSSURE, 2011, p. 6)

Taking this discussion into account, we shall see how Foucault dialogues with the concept of language elaborated by Saussure to support his own concepts of discourse, statement and discursive practices as presented in our hypothesis.

We shall investigate Michel Foucault’s standpoint on language unfolds knowing beforehand that language itself is not part of his objects of investigations and verify the extent - or manners - it is present both in theoretical and methodological propositions to the analysis of discourse and discursive practices as Foucault elaborates the archaeological method, which is designed, specially, in his reflections presented in *The Archaeology of Knowledge*.

For his elaboration, Michel Foucault approaches the linguistics studies, more closely, mainly in the second half of the 1960 decade, when discussing the notions of *espiteme* in *The Order of Things* (2001) and addressing the issue of language. When

assessing his work, critics would label him as structuralist, in a disqualifying manner which cost to the philosopher several clarifying texts, such as *Structuralism and Post-structuralism*, an interview given in 1983.

I should initially, emphasize that, deep down, on the concerns of what structuralism has been; not only - what is normal - none of the authors of the movement, but also that the ones who - willingly or not - were labeled as such, actually knew what it was all about. For sure those who applied the structural method in highly precious fields, like linguistics, comparative mythology, knew what was structuralist; but, out of the borders of such fields, no one really knew what it was (FOUCAULT, 2000a, DE II, p. 307) ... I have not been a Freudian, I have not been Marxist, and I have never been a structuralist. (Ibidem, p. 312).

However, if Michel Foucault refuses structuralism in a reflexive review of his own studies, it cannot be denied he has experienced France's welcoming environment to Saussure, risen lately, after World War II; along with the crystalized misunderstandings of the "(re)discovery" of the *Course in General Linguistics* (PUECH, 2014), The presence of Saussure's work becomes evident when, after first publishing *The Order of Things* in 1966, Foucault launches himself onto an academic production focused on the explanation of nature, and the definition of his own work. Initially, in a text written in 1968 named "Answer to a question", Foucault exposes discourse as an object of (or for) his reflections: "I studied alternately collections of discourses, characterized them; defined them in schemes of rules, transformations, thresholds, vestiges; I composed them amongst themselves, and described its beams of relations" (FOUCAULT, 2010, p. 5). Such explanation becomes more consistent and explanatory in his subsequent work - *The Archaeology of Knowledge* - in which language is referred to as an object, to be a condition to the study of another, not properly linguistic object, the discourse which existence requires language. Therefore, the dialogue with concepts found in the CLG is posited.

the material with which one is dealing is [...] a population of events in the space of discourse in general. One is led therefore to the project of a pure description of discursive events as the horizon for the search for the units that form within it. This description is easily distinguishable from an analysis of the language. Of course, a linguistic system can be established (unless it is constructed artificially) only by using a corpus of statements, or a collection of discursive facts; a language (langue) is still a system for possible statements, a finite body of rules that authorizes an infinite number of performances. (FOUCAULT, 2002, p. 31).

The proposition is centered, in this initial distinction, around the project of description and analyses of discursive events, seeking for the statements, the units that are formed, as Foucault explains in further pages. Such analysis places the language in opposition to discursive events, and distinguishes it from the statement, a concept to which several pages of *The Archaeology of Knowledge* are dedicated. Language, as posited by Saussure, is a linguistic system; and, in a Foucauldian perspective, a description of such a system explicits the use of a body of statements, a system of possible statements. The development of this project aimed towards an analytic view of discourses, in theoretical and methodological terms, will later clash with issues concerning language, such as conceived by Saussure. Let us continue with Foucault's own words:

The question posed by language analysis of some discursive fact or other is always: according to what rules has a particular statement been made, and consequently according to what rules could other similar statements be made? The description of the events of discourse poses a quite different question: how is it that one particular statement appeared rather than another? [...] a statement is always an event that neither the language (langue) nor the meaning can quite exhaust. It is certainly a strange event: first, because on the one hand it is linked to the gesture of writing or to the articulation of speech, and also on the other hand it opens up to itself a residual existence in the field of a memory, or in the materiality of manuscripts, books, or any other form of recording. (Ibidem, 2002, p. 31-32).

The Foucauldian proposition upholds the conceptualization of language designed by Saussure, as a system of signs, a socially elaborated system. Language requires combinatory rules so the production of statements is possible. However, through the archaeological discourse analysis, the statement, despite depending on language to exist, follows non-linguistic rules; in other words, it is not defined by the linguistic system itself, but rather it is determined by elements of other orders, exterior to language. The analysis of discursive events implies on describing the determinations of the statements, expliciting what has provoked its emergence so, then, as proposed by Foucault “we are able to grasp other forms of regularity, other types of relations” (Ibidem, p. 33). Once the discursive relations are not internal to language, the grasp of linguistic materiality seeks the observation of another object, not properly the language itself. “Of course, discourses are composed of signs; but what they do is more than use these signs to designate things.

It is this more that renders them irreducible to the language (langue) and to speech. It is this “more” that we must reveal and describe.” (Ibidem, p. 55)

The analysis proposed by M. Foucault, considering discursive relations external to the language - the system of signs - requires undertaking the discourse itself as a practice. In his words “I would like to show with precise examples that in analyzing discourses themselves, one sees the loosening of the embrace, apparently so tight, of words and things, and the emergence of a group of rules proper to discursive practice.” (Ibidem, p. 55). Foucault’s remarks on language, observed in conceptual terms, converge with what is found in the *Course in General Linguistics*. As of the power of this work in the French academic context in the decade of 1960, we shall reiterate that “Saussure [...] is ubiquitous in all sectors of Human and Social sciences”, as stated by Puech (2014, p. 23). We also restate that language itself is not an object of the foucaultian discussion, but rather taken as conditions to production of statements which are not considered a properly linguistic object. In his expeditions, Foucault presents the statement as a unit of analysis; and, in conceptualizing it, clashes with the conceptual character of language (langue), from which the statement is distinguished.

According to Foucault, the “statements [...] although they possess a highly rigorous grammaticality [...] this grammaticality cannot be judged by the same criteria that, in a natural language (langue), make it possible to define an acceptable, or interpretable sentence”. (FOUCAULT, 2002, p. 94)

For it is obvious that statements do not exist in the same sense in which a language (langue) exists, and, with that language, a collection of signs defined by their contrasting characteristics and their rules of use; a language in fact is never given in itself, in its totality; it could only be so in a secondary way, in the oblique form of a description that would take it as its object; the signs that make up its elements are forms that are imposed upon statements and control them from within. If there were no statements, the language (langue) would not exist; but no statement is indispensable for a language to exist (and one can always posit, in place of any statement, another statement that would in no way modify the language). The language exists only as a system for constructing possible statements; but in another respect, it exists only as a (more or less exhaustive) description obtained from a collection of real statements. Language (langue) and statement are not at the same level of existence; and one cannot say that there are statements in the same way as one says that there are languages (langues). But is it enough, then, that the signs of a language constitute a statement, if they were produced (articulated, drawn, made, traced) in one way or another, if they appeared in a moment of time and in a point in space, if the voice that spoke them or the gesture that formed them gave them the dimensions of a material existence? Can the letters of the alphabet written by me haphazardly on to a sheet of paper, as an example of what is not a

statement, can the lead characters used for printing books — and one cannot deny their materiality, which has space and volume — can these signs, spread out, visible, manipulable, be reasonably regarded as statements? (Ibidem, p. 96-97)

Language is the condition of the material possibility of statements; despite not being in the same plane of existence. If the statements, as considered by Foucault, occur in a moment of time, they have their own/particular historicity; if they occur in a specific point in space, they have a particular social place; if they are enunciated by a voice, or molded by gestures, there is a subject of the enunciation; whom we can investigate through the aforementioned inquiries. These highlighted specificities are followed by affirmations that the statement does not require a regular linguistic construction, for its ways of existing are not the same as language's; language provides the statements with material basis, i.e, a materiality inscribed in space and time.

Although Foucault's regards seem to be linked to the Saussurean standpoint that the sign should be socially studied, the sign itself is not the object under analysis, but rather the statement, which has a particular form of existence. If language, as Foucault singles out, "is only as a system for constructing possible statements", it happens because it is a system of socially elaborated signs, as conceptualized by Saussure. However, Foucault affirms that the statement "is neither a syntagma, nor a rule of construction, nor a canonical form of succession and permutation; it is that which enables such groups of signs to exist and enables these rules or forms to become manifest" (Ibidem, p. 100). The way signs exist and become manifest is not the same as how their own existence takes place. This mode of existence of signs is affected by social and historical determinations and are correlated to the placement of the subject within the statement; aspects that set an enunciative function and characterize the statement. The definition of statement is, therefore, given by the enunciative function, by the practice of such.

Once again, we bring the words of Michel Foucault to reiterate the characterization of statement as distinct from sign and/or language:

The statement is not therefore a structure; [...] it is a function of existence that properly belongs to signs and on the basis of which one may then decide [...] whether or not they "make sense", according to what rule they follow one another or are juxtaposed, of what they are the sign, and what sort of act is carried out by their formulation.[...] It is this function that we must now describe as such, that is, in its actual practice, its conditions, the rules that govern it, and the field in which it operates. (Ibidem, p. 98-99)



Considering it as an enunciative function, the analysis of statements aims at describing the exercise of this function, demonstrating its conditions of production, its rules of sequencing, as well as explicating the field in which it operates. The statement follows a principle of regularity under historical determinations, conversely to grammatical and/or linguistic rules to production of complete sentences; once the signs and the combinatory rules are sufficient for such constructions, due to the existence of countless sentences with the same rules. Furthermore, “there is no statement that does not presuppose others; there is no statement that is not surrounded by a field of coexistences, effects of series and succession, a distribution of functions and roles.” (Ibidem, p. 113). We also add that the statement does not obey to a game of previous meanings, but rather is a practice, which the events happen under historical determinations.

Despite all distinctions between statement and signs, discourse and language - as we have singled out -, the existence of the statement is completely dependent on the language, which provides it with materiality. “It is constitutive of the statement itself: a statement must have a substance, a support, a place, and a date. And when these requisites change, it too changes identity.” (Ibidem, p. 114). Regarding the material existence of the statement, Michel Foucault states, as example, that in a situation of discursive production in simultaneous translation - or an information in three or more different languages - although the language changes, the statement remains the same; i.e “text and translation constitute a single enunciative whole” (Ibidem, p. 118).

The analysis of a statement, distinguishing it from the sign and/or language, implies in its description on an enunciative level, which requires to “question language, not in the direction to which it refers, but in the dimension that gives it” (Ibidem, p. 126)

the fact that one can describe this enunciative surface proves that the 'given', the datum, of language is not the mere rending of a fundamental silence; that the words, sentences, meanings, affirmations, series of propositions do not hack directly on to a primeval night of silence; but that the sudden appearance of a sentence, the flash of meaning, the brusque gesture of the index finger of designation, always emerge in the operational domain of an enunciative function;[...] One should not object to linguistic methods or logical analyses. [...] The enunciative analysis does not lay down for linguistic or logical analyses the limit beyond which they must renounce their power and recognize their powerlessness; it does not mark the line that encloses their domain; it is deployed in another direction, which intersects them. (Ibidem, p. 12723-128).

Stating the distinctions between archaeological analysis of discourse, and the properly said linguistic analysis, Foucault goes further on a distinction between statement and sentence, attempting to indicate broader objects that both compose: “a statement belongs to a discursive formation as a sentence belongs to a text [...]. But whereas the regularity of a sentence is defined by the laws of a language (langue), [...] the regularity of statements is defined by the discursive formation itself.” (Ibidem, p. 132). And the analysis of a discursive formation requires the description of a collection of statements that present the same principle of regularity. In the words of Foucault,

[...] what has been described as discursive formations are, strictly speaking, groups of statements. That is, groups of verbal performances that are not linked to one another at the sentence level by grammatical (syntactical or semantic) links; which are not linked to one another at the proposition level by logical links (links of formal coherence or conceptual connection); and which are not linked either at the formulation level by psychological links (either the identity of the forms of consciousness, the constancy of the mentalities, or the repetition of a project); but which are linked at the statement level. (Ibidem, p. 130)

The statement, in the Foucauldian sense, distinguishes itself from the sentence, proposition, or acts of speech; being characterized by the connection to other statements and occurring within the exercise of an enunciative function. Thereby the statements that compose a discursive formation obey the same principles of regularity: historical determination, social place, associated field, subject placement, and so on; composing the discursive practice within the exercise of its enunciative function. Therefore, the discourse, in this field of analysis, “is a practice that has its own forms of sequence and succession.” (Ibidem, p. 188), and “in addition to methods of linguistic structuration (or interpretation), one could draw up a specific description of statements, of their formation, and of the regularities proper to discourse.” (Ibidem, p. 221).

The importance of linguistics, through its structuralist model, to the construction of other disciplinary fields, and other academic reflections - among them the proposition of discourse analysis - had already been evidenced by Michel Foucault, in a conference held in the University of Tunis, in March of 1968. Named “Linguistics and social sciences”, and later published (FOUCAULT, 2000b), the conference explicit the acknowledgement that structural linguistics had reached a high level of scientificity, and served as a model of other social and human sciences. “It has granted social sciences with

different epistemological, different from what they offered it insofar” (FOUCAULT, 2000b, p. 165). Concerning discourse analysis, Foucault considers that linguistics “enabled not only analyzing the language itself, but also the discourses, that is, it has allowed studying what can be done through language”. (Ibidem, p. 166). The matter is not about structuralist linguistics approaching discourse as an object, but - due to its particular epistemological structure, and being language its constituting material - “uncovering the conditions to change, thereby one can analyze historical phenomenon, and at last, accomplish at least the analysis of what can be called discursive productions” (Ibidem, p. 167), as Foucault demonstrated in the following year (1969) and we have scrutinized in *The Archaeology of Knowledge*.

### **3 The systems and the regularities: language and discourse**

Michel Foucault’s dialogue with predecessor thinkers led him towards suspending their accomplished syntheses rather than converging to them. It also occurs in relation to Saussurean thinking. We have seen that, in *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, Foucault problematizes, over the domains effective statements, the difference between description of language and of discursive events. The linguistic analysis is established around the function of a group of differences (system), assessing “according to what rules has a particular statement been made, and consequently according to what rules could other similar statements be made” (FOUCAULT, 2002, p. 31). On the analysis of the discursive field, in turn, it is considered “to grasp the statement in the exact specificity of its occurrence; determine its conditions of existence, fix at least its limits, establish its correlations with other statements”; (Ibidem, p. 31) to which the first connects or detach. It is then proposed not an analysis of language, but rather a project of description of discursive events, to seek for its units, aiming at answering how a certain statement came to be, in spite of another.

Having it settled, we can understand the nature of the statement is distinct for a theory of language description that seeks support in a system; and for a theory of discursive events that seeks to establish regularities within a system of dispersion. Thus, we shall return to the point: the emergence of a statement is “an event that neither the language (langue) nor the meaning can quite exhaust” (Ibidem, p. 32). The statement is

singular, but it has its existence remaining in the fields of memory, in the materiality of the manuscripts; it is open to repetition, transformation, and it is linked to situations that provoke its emergence in a frame of statements that precede or succeed it.

Whereas Saussure seeks the internal description of a system, Foucault aims at revealing the latent conflicts, depicting the division forms, describing - relying on statements - a system of dispersion.

We shall call the rules of formation. The rules of formation are conditions of existence (but also of coexistence, maintenance, modification, and disappearance) in a given discursive division. (Ibidem, p. 43).

Foucault states that the objects that compose the rules of formation are not reducible to language, or acts of speech. They are discursive practices that systematically form the objects of what is spoken. Thus, such objects (he exemplifies with the psychopathology discourse of the 19th century) do not exist prior to discourse, for they are constituted of it. Then, the enunciative modality that apprehend the use of language and its system, the formation of objects, the formation of concepts that organize a field of discourse, and the formation of thematic and theoretical choices are all entangled with discursive practices

For the philosopher, behind the visible façade of the system, one can suppose “the rich uncertainty” (Ibidem, p. 84); upholding “the final result of a long and often sinuous development involving language (langue) and thought, empirical experience and categories, the lived and ideal necessities, the contingency of events and the play of formal constraints.” (Ibidem, p. 84). Language, according to Foucault, takes place in this bigger system that is not mistaken by the existence of signs.

## 4 Conclusion

We have proposed this article intending to investigate whether (and how) the conception of language permeates the studies of Michel Foucault, specifically in the texts published by the end of the decade of 1960, emphasizing *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. Our primary objective was exposing the implications of such a concept in Foucault’s thinking, on the elaboration of methodological and theoretical apparatuses that support his propositions on discourse. In our exposition, we confirmed the hypothesis of a dialogue

between Foucault and structuralism - which presents language as a system, as proposed by Ferdinand de Saussure - acted as basis for the conceptualization of discourse, discursive practices, statement, and discursive events; from which the objects of the Foucauldian Archaeology constitute.

Given Foucault's convergences and divergences to Saussure, he elaborates a methodology of discourse analyses, alongside a conceptual apparatus, seeking to establish a distancing from structuralism, the structural method. To do so, he does not operate through binarism, which places two elements in relation as a condition to construction/comprehension/definition/existence of an object. In his proposition, Foucault turns to a system of dispersion, playing with elements sometimes intertwined, sometimes independent, marked by discontinuity; he refuses and denies structuralism, and - consequently - the structuralist label. As a matter of fact, there is not a single and precise classification for the thoughts of Michel Foucault. At given moments there is a closer relation to philosophy, at others, to history; and so on. Thereby, the attempt to define his method of analyses (which can be considered plural: methods) always result in inaccuracies.

Regarding the approximations, despite Foucault does not present a specific and explicit conceptualization of language, he scrutinizes it as a concept and an object, as proposed by Saussure, and lists predicatives of language that serve to the proposition of concepts and objects proper to the field of discourse analysis; which is currently named as Foucauldian Discursive Studies. Therefore, language is considered as conditions to the material possibility of statements, as a support to them; i.e, a materiality inscribed in time and space; after all, "a statement must have a substance, a support, a place, and a date" (FOUCAULT, 2002, p. 114).

In Saussure, language [langue] is a social product, and language is many-sided and heterogeneous; whereas in Foucault, language is the material condition to the production of discourse, and the discourse - produced under historical and social determinations, marked by discontinuity and dispersion - is heterogeneous. For Saussure, the sign should be socially studied, because it has a socially elaborated meaning; whereas in Foucault, the statement is defined by the exercise of an enunciative function under historical and social determinations, and only the linguistic materiality is susceptible to repetition, never the discourse; due to the fact that discourse is conceived as a discursive

practice, not as an element finished in itself. In our reading pathway, we have agreed that the structuralist label does not properly apply to Foucault, but structuralism served him for the construction of an academic thinking, wherein we glance at other methods of analysis.

## Contribution

**Claudemar Alves Fernandes:** Conceptualization, Investigation, Methodology, Writing - Original draft, Writing – Analysis & Editing; **Vanice Sargentini:** Conceptualization, Investigation, Methodology, Writing - Original draft, Writing – Analysis & Editing.

## References

FOUCAULT, Michel. Estruturalismo e Pós-estruturalismo. *In:* MOTTA, Manoel Barros (Org.). **Michel Foucault** Arqueologia das ciências e história dos sistemas de pensamento. Rio de Janeiro: Forense Universitária. (Ditos & Escritos. v. II), 2000a. p. 307-334.

FOUCAULT, Michel. Linguística e ciências sociais. *In:* MOTTA, Manoel Barros (Org.). **Michel Foucault** Arqueologia das ciências e história dos sistemas de pensamento. Rio de Janeiro: Forense Universitária. (Ditos & Escritos. v. II), 2000b. p. 160-181.

FOUCAULT, Michel. **The Order of Things: an archaeology of the human sciences.** London: Routledge, 2001.

FOUCAULT, Michel. **The Archaeology of Knowledge.** 2. ed. London; New York: Routledge, 2002.

FOUCAULT, Michel. Resposta a uma questão. *In:* MOTTA, Manoel Barros (Org.). **Michel Foucault** Repensar a Política. Rio de Janeiro: Forense Universitária, 2010. (Ditos & Escritos. v. VI) p. 1-24.

PUECH, Christian. A emergência da noção de “discurso” na França: Foucault e Pêcheux leitores de Saussure. *In:* PIOVEZANI, C.; CURCINO, L.; SARGENTINI, V. (Org.) **Presenças de Foucault na Análise do Discurso.** São Carlos: Claraluz: EDUFSCar, 2014.

SAUSSURE, Ferdinand de. **Course in General Linguistics.** New York: Columbia University Press, 2011. Tradução de: Wade Baskin.

SILVEIRA, Eliane; SÁ, Israel de; FERNANDES, Cleudemar Alves. Problemas da autoria em Ferdinand de Saussure: do percurso intelectual à constituição da obra. **Leitura**, v. 1, n° 62, 2019. p. 235-254.

Received on 22 March 2022

Accepted on 23 May 2022

Published on August 2022

---

Cleudemar Alves Fernandes  
E-mail: [cleudemar@ufu.br](mailto:cleudemar@ufu.br)  
ORCID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-2644-4705>

Vanice Sargentini  
E-mail: [sargentini@uol.com.br](mailto:sargentini@uol.com.br)  
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7760-3075>