

Michel Pêcheux's Discourse Analysis: An Approach to Domain Analyses

Thiago Henrique Bragato Barros

Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul, Department of Information Science

Ramiro Barcelos, Porto Alegre 90040-060, Brazil

< sean.vogel@gmail.com >

Thiago Henrique Bragato Barros is Adjunct Professor at the Information Science Department of the Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul (UFRGS). He was post doctoral researcher in information science at the University of Brasilia (2018-2019). He is a member of research groups at UNESP, UNB, UFPA and UFRGS. He was president of the International Society Knowledge Organization Brazilian Chapter (ISKO) (2017-2019), President of ISKO (2022-2026), a member of ISKO-International Scientific Advisory Board and Deputy Editor of the journal *Knowledge Organization*. He has experience in archival science and information science and is conducting research on linguistic approaches in information science and knowledge representation and organization.



Barros, Thiago Henrique Bragato. 2023. "Michel Pêcheux's Discourse Analysis: an Approach to Domain Analyses." *Knowledge Organization* 50(1): 3-10. 34 references. DOI:10.5771/0943-7444-2023-1-3.

Abstract: This article discusses the aspects and points of contact between discourse analysis and knowledge organization, perceiving how Michel Pêcheux's discourse analyses can contribute to domain analyses. Discourse analysis (DA) deals with the theoretical-methodological development of social and scientific movements that took place in France from the 1960s onwards; this paper seeks to discuss aspects of discourse analysis and the possibilities of its use in the universe of knowledge organization (KO). Little work is done structurally and transversally when it comes to discourse itself, especially when the words "discourse" and "analysis" appear in the titles, abstracts, keywords etc. of chapters, books and journals that have KO in their scope. That is mainly due to those works are recent and that belong to fields far from those which have traditionally dealt with discourse. Therefore, viewing discourse as a theoretical contribution to KO means a new framework should be understood in the scope of the analyses carried out regarding the construction of systems, approaches, and studies, precisely because it sees in the terms not only what concerns their concepts, as is the traditional route in KO, but also the ideology, and understands the construction of meaning as something historical as well as social. So, there is a major contribution for domain analyses based in Pêcheux's discourse theory.

Received: 7 August 2021; Revised: 28 November 2022; Accepted: 30 November 2022.

Keywords: domain analysis, discourse analysis, meaning

1.0 Introduction

Knowledge organization (KO) is an area that provides fundamental contributions to the development of methodologies for representing and accessing information; in that sense, a series of advances have been proposed for the development of languages, structures, classifications, that is, knowledge organization systems.

Discourse analysis (DA) deals with the theoretical-methodological development of social and scientific movements that took place in France from the 1960s onwards. We can define DA as an interdisciplinary field of knowledge, guided by discourse as a theoretical object, understood, at the same time, as event and structure seeking to establish correlation between history and ideology in a given discursive formation.

We will discuss in this paper aspects of discourse analysis and the possibilities of its use in the universe of KO.

Among the theories adjacent to discourse, some authors have been used and remembered as fundamental to the analysis of epistemological phenomena in information science. Michel Foucault is always the most referenced due to his great impact on all human and social sciences; however, his role as a discourse theorist is peripheral to his work and to discourse theory. Furthermore, other important authors are utilised along this path (such as Jacques Derrida and his *Mal d'Archive: Une Impression Freudienne*), authors who are seen by some critics as postmodernists, post-structuralists or speculative structuralists. (Dosse 1993; Gregolin 2006).

The search for resonance with the authors mentioned above happens also in information science, especially in

studies that aim to escape the area's "traditional" positivist perspectives, and given that the French theories had a late impact in Canada and the United States, countries that have traditionally concerned themselves with the study of discourse-related problems in information science. We can see Foucault, for example, in the works of Frohmann (1992; 1994; 2001; 2004) and Campbell (2007), and Derrida in the works of Terry Cook (1997; 2001a; 2001b) and Tom Nasmith (2002; 2004), among others.

However, despite the importance given to these two authors and their presence in works that discuss anti-positivist perspectives, little work has been done systematically when it comes to discourse itself, especially when the words "discourse" and "analysis" appear in the titles, abstracts, keywords etc. of chapters, books and journals that have KO in their scope. That is mainly since those works are recent and belong to fields far from those which have traditionally dealt with discourse.

Countries such as France and Brazil have considered discourse and enunciation in the academy since the 1980s, which is a scenario completely different from that of North America, in which Chomsky's theory of transformational grammar and critical discourse analysis were more widespread and, in some cases, even confused with French discourse analysis.

Thus, two names and two theories are often forgotten in studies that relate discourse, organization, and information science: Jean Jaques Coutine and Michel Pêcheux, the theory of enunciation and historical materialism.

It is important to stress that DA is a theory that researches, based in enunciation and material history, how an ideology is constructed; that is, it understands that in every textual production there is a biased, particular, and affiliated perspective that takes the position of the discourse it is inscribed into. It has Pêcheux and his DA project as its founder, and discourse as an interdisciplinary object, that has at the same time a structure and an occurrence. Pêcheux was a student of Louis Althusser and so was seeking to apply an Althusserian version of Marxism to sociolinguistic theory.

Therefore, viewing discourse as a theoretical contribution to knowledge organization (KO) means a new axis in the scope of the analyses carried out regarding the construction of systems, approaches, and studies; precisely because it sees enunciation/concepts in a broader sense than the traditional route in KO (terms-concepts) but also in its ideology, and understands the construction of meaning as something historical as well as social. We see discourse as a practice that is not only a way to represent the world, but also a way to produce meaning in the world.

As Pêcheux's theory points out, language has its own structures in every language from the outset; in it is inscribed an omni-historical diligence of ideology as an una-

voidable trend representing origins and ultimate ends, the elsewhere, the beyond and the invisible (Pêcheux 1990, 8).

As a scientific field, KO can be based on several axes of study, notably those listed by Hjørland (2016): 1) practical and intuitive approaches; 2) consensus-based approaches; 3) approaches based on facet analysis; 4) cognitive and user-based approaches; 5) domain analysis and epistemological approaches.

Discourse, in its French branch as built and articulated by Michel Pêcheux, can complement approaches focused on domain analysis, epistemological approaches, and uses of knowledge that go beyond terminological and conceptual perspectives.

2.0 Delimiting the domain of knowledge organization

KO, as an area of knowledge, represents a specialization in information science, that is, it is a socially and scientifically institutionalized space for studies within information science to discuss theories and methodologies related to the many processes of representation and organization; "knowledge organization [...] as a separate field, considered today a subarea (or linked to Information Science.)" (Mazzocchi 2018, 54).

KO is a field that studies aspects of the construction of thesauri, controlled vocabularies, taxonomies, ontologies, that is, several instruments/processes that aim to seek and appropriate knowledge, an area traditionally linked to information science.

Thus, processes traditionally linked to KO are evidently related to libraries and to information *for* science. In that sense, the processes of reading, analysis, and the creation of specialized languages are, for the most part, related to this universe; however, in accordance with KO's trajectory, the main concern is the content and its representation. Therefore, discourse can complement representation and analysis, as it goes beyond what is said, reaching the unsaid.

The construction process in this area can be seen as based on these authors: "Cutter (1837–1903), Richardson (1860–1939), Sayers (1881–1960), as well as Bliss (1870–1955), who used the expression *Knowledge Organization* in two important publications, *The Organization of Knowledge and the System of the Sciences*, from 1929, and *The Organization of Knowledge in Libraries and the Subject Approach to Books*, from 1933". (Mazzocchi 2018, 55).

Dahlberg should always be mentioned as a researcher who institutionalized the (discursive) practices in the field of KO. That is the case of productions from the late 1970s and 1980s related to conceptual problems concerning the organization of human knowledge and the development of concept theory.

In KO's universe of action, according to Hjørland (2008), two large groups of processes/tools may characterize that action, namely: 1) KO processes: indexing, cataloging, subject analysis, and classification; and 2) knowledge organization and representation systems, created for those processes and essential to an effective organization.

In the field of knowledge organization systems (KOS), based on Mazzocchi (2018) and Hjørland (2008), we can observe that systems are essential to organization. However, the biggest issue surrounding them is that they change fast and often, and keeping up with that change is a difficult, recurrent task in the realm of KOS, and one of the biggest challenges to its development. In short, KOS addresses a vast field of organization tools, among them ontologies, subject headings, thesauri, and classification designs, and each of those has both a function and a distinct technological foundation, and is used in several social clusters. Their final objective is to fulfill KO's own mission: to facilitate management and access.

Hence, we believe in a KO that integrates and that seeks to make contributions that go beyond its own field of action, aiming to assist in the construction of better knowledge organization systems. Therefore, KO seeks to work in depth with the development of systems, aiming to represent a certain domain. We believe that discourse is a well-rounded way to design these systems or develop discursive analysis of discursive practices in this area.

On the other hand, in a recurrent approach that goes beyond knowledge representation systems and domain analysis, we believe that discourse can take on a role that is essential to the development of KOS and to the very conception of what is said from the point of view of the formalization (of discursive practices) typical of KO.

Hjørland and Albrechtsen (1995) formulated domain analysis as a new information science approach. The paper emphasizes the social, ecological, and content-driven nature of knowledge, in opposition to the more formal, computer-like approaches that dominated the field in the 1980s. In the same paper they affirm that the horizon most productive to organization would be the study of the domains of knowledge as thought or discourse communities, which are part of the division of labor in society. Since then, these objectives have represented the main characteristics of domain analysis.

From the outset, therefore, we can find a relation to discursive communities, that is, in a sense a way of looking at the production of discourse within a science scope. These discourse communities Hjørland, in later texts, would go on to characterize as "epistemic communities". Hjørland and Albrechtsen's paper mentions discourse communities as an element in the constitution of discourse, but it is not the intent of their programmatic essay to sketch the main outlines of the domain-analytic view. Nevertheless, we can argue that since the beginning there is a path to discuss discursive prac-

tices. As Foucault (1991) will point out these practices operate as a set of rules determined by space and time that determines the existence of a discourse.

These are the eleven initial approaches proposed by Hjørland (2002), which were later revised by Smiraglia (2015) and Tognoli and Guimarães (2015), they can be summarized as:

1. production and evaluation of literature guides and subject gateways;
2. production and evaluation of special classifications and thesauri;
3. research into indexing skills and retrieval of information in specialized fields;
4. knowledge of empirical studies with users in thematic areas;
5. production and interpretation of bibliometric studies;
6. historical studies of information structures and of services in specific domains;
7. studies of documents and genres in specific domains of knowledge;
8. epistemological and critical studies of different paradigms, postulates and interests in specific domains;
9. knowledge of terminological studies, SPL (special-purpose languages), and discourse analysis in different fields of knowledge;
10. studies of structures and institutions in scientific and professional communication in a specific domain;
11. knowledge about methods and results of analytical domain studies of professional cognition, knowledge representation in computer science, and artificial intelligence.

There is in the domain analysis approach, sufficient space to accommodate a social and discourse approach, since discourse analysis could be viewed as a synthesis of several of the other approaches enumerated by Hjørland, namely points 7 (studies of documents and genres in specific domains of knowledge), 8 (epistemological and critical studies of different paradigms, postulates and interests in specific domains), 9 (knowledge on terminological studies, and "discourse analysis in different fields of knowledge", and "studies of structures and institutions in scientific and professional communication in a specific domain". In short, discourse analysis does not represent a new approach to domain analysis so much as it represents a sophisticated interweaving of approaches that stress the socio-historical (i.e., ideological), conceptual, and linguistic aspects of a domain.

We agree with what was pointed out by Smiraglia (2015), that domain analysis is a methodological paradigm in knowledge organization and in this intersected view of axis, Michel Pecheux's approach can help deal with ideological, historical e social aspects of a domain.

3.0 Michel Pêcheux's discourse analysis

Discourse analysis (DA), in the francophone use of the phrase, concept and field is a theoretic development of the philosophical, scientific, political, and social effervescence that took place in France in the late 1960s, and in which Michel Pêcheux was one of the leading figures. In France during the 1960s and 1970s, together with a collective of collaborators, he theorized, above all, about the materiality of discourse. Continuing the theoretical elaborations of Louis Althusser (1918-1990). Pêcheux conceptualized discourse as a distinct form of materiality (historical and linguistic), directly intertwined with ideological materiality, proposing a "semantics of discourse".

The great novelty that the theories of Althusser and Pêcheux brought was that of breaking with a conception of ideology as a simple reflection of the economic instance, and with a conception of language as an instrument of communication and language as an ankylosed system to a sutured syntax. The specificity and irreducibility of ideological and discursive formations allowed the delimitation of a new field of studies for linguistics based on materialism. Since ideology is not only a mirror (with its effects of simple inversion and distortion of the "real" image) of the economic base class struggle, but has a specific mode of functioning, as it demands an analytical device adequate for its purpose. This device was constructed from research into the production of meaning (materialist semantics) of discourses, understood as the characteristic materiality of ideological formations.

Discourse analysis in this perspective, distinguished itself from the perspective of historical materialism, by dealing with a peculiar reality, endowed with an irreducible regularity and mode of functioning. In this way, the object of study of discourse analysis is differentiated, and its research gains autonomy in relation to other fields such as economic and social formations, even if this autonomy is relative, and discourse analysis makes use of conceptual keys external to its field (such as: class struggle, statement, imaginary, resistance). Michel Pêcheux's discursive approach has a fundamental difference from structural linguistics, which in his terms is seen as opaque, equivocal and with its own internal regularity (Saussure's theory of value).

From the perspective of linguistic sciences, Discourse Analysis, allows an alternative approach to understanding semantic phenomena. The materialist approach proposed by Pêcheux in the 1960s triggered a fruitful trajectory, with continuous rectifications, adjustments, deviations, and retakes. According to Pêcheux, the discourse, object of studies in Discourse Analysis, crosses the path of the event, the structure and the tension between description and interpretation of discourse analysis.

From the start, DA changed the terrain in relation to language studies and to ideology itself; its theoretic affiliations

are very well outlined between Marxism, through historical materialism, linguistics, through enunciation theory, and the development of its own theory related to discourse. That is, DA is, above all, an interdisciplinary approach that sits on the left of the political spectrum, but that is not limited to that, as emphasized in the introduction to this paper. As we pointed out in the commentaries related to domain analyses, we can see a well-structured way to look at a domain as a social, historical construct.

For discourse analysis, textual production works as an object in which discourse and ideology are inscribed; discourse is an open space that starts from language, given that its materiality is the text, and it is intersected by ideology, circumscribed by its own historicity; that is, discourse is, from the point of view of its formulation, an event and a structure, a single and a collective act. Texts are affiliated to ideological, historical, social, and cultural positions, and their authors are not necessarily aware of that.

In the literature on discourse analysis, it is possible to find, connected to the concept of discourse, the metaphor that connects it to a network of meanings that become a discursive fabric (Barros 2015). In Ferreira (2007, 19 (our translation)), the metaphorical relationship is exposed as follows. The network, as a system, is an organized whole, but it is not closed, because it has holes, and it is not stable, since meanings can pass through those holes and enter at any moment. Thus, we would say that a discourse is a network and, as such, it represents the whole; however, the whole holds in itself the not-whole; this system opens space for the non-systemic and the non-representable.

The object of DA is not the language itself nor its products. Therefore, its view begins with the semantic fabric of meaning and proceeds based on historical materialism in the economic, social and historical context. In Hjørland's work, there is a line that needs to be crossed in relation to the discourse and an empirical object in a given domain. When we talk about discourse analysis, we refer to a different understanding of discourse and its analysis; it means, just like the literature in the area that announces it, a change of terrain which, due to its theoretic affiliations, will present distinctive results; discourse requires linguistic elements, implications of something that is exterior to the language. Discourse is reflected in the text, but it goes beyond the linguistic scope; in this case, that means its ideological and social aspects to which the words refer when written or spoken. (Barros 2015). Thus, there are "holes" in the text that refer to its social, ideological, and historical construction, transversed by ideology and the subconscious. Therefore, it can be said that discourse is the "word in motion, language practice". (Orlandi 2007,15 (our translation)).

According to Henry (1997, 38, (our translation)): "There are many points of contact between what Michel Foucault devised concerning discourse and what was done by Michel

Pêcheux, at least at the theoretical level. [...] A notion of “discursive formation” that has some points in common”.

The notion of discursive formation as an instance superior to the discourse of the text itself is fundamental in this perspective, as texts always refer to their discursive and ideological exteriority. Orlandi (2007, 43 (our translation)) clarifies it:

Discourse constitutes itself in its meanings, because what the subject says is inscribed in a specific discursive formation, and not another, for a specific meaning, and not another. Hence, we can see that words do not have a meaning in themselves, rather they derive their meanings from the discursive formations in which they are inscribed. [...] thus, meanings are always determined ideologically. There is no meaning that escapes that. Therefore, everything we say has an ideological trait related to other ideological traits. And that is not in the essence of words, but in discursivity, that is, in how ideology produces its effects in discourse and materializes itself in it.

Thus, the discursive formation is a space of that which can be said about a certain “discourse”, that is, its universe of creation and practice; as such, words have no meaning within themselves, their meaning will be determined by psychic, ideological, and social instances. The understanding of an utterance and the production of meaning do not take place in the structure, but in the event.

Discursive formations can be seen as regionalizations of the interdiscourse, and, in turn, it is the interdiscourse, that which makes the sayings available, determining through what has already been said, what constitutes a discursive formation in relation to the other. Given this, the meanings are not predetermined by language properties; on the contrary, they depend on the relationships constituted in/by the discursive formations. In addition, Orlandi reiterates what was said earlier, when he says that it is necessary not to think of discursive formations as homogeneous blocks functioning automatically. They are constituted by contradiction, they are heterogeneous in themselves and their borders are fluid, continually configuring and reconfiguring themselves

For a theoretical exercise, we can see KO as discourse, and as such it is crossed by discursive formations, such as the technological imperative (always improving) or the need to organize scientific knowledge.

That means that in domain analysis, discourse represents a bigger whole to the analyzed domain; beyond conceptual problems, we are reflecting about the domain's ideological, social, and political problems, thus complementing the basis for the construction of analyses of specific domains, of knowledge organization systems (KOS), and epistemic-methodological works.

To exemplify this perspective, we can make up a hierarchical and terminological ontology starting from concept theory and terminology. It would be built in a “traditional” way, so that terms/terminology = concepts. The same ontology built through discourse analysis could complement this construction, so that terms+ concepts+ discursive formations and ideologies = concepts.

Discursive formations and ideologies are not the same as terms or their concepts; as we argued before, meaning is constructed based on ideological and social context, so meanings are historical and dated. Let us say, if this ontology is built in an autocratical state, how will we represent the concept of democracy? We can, based in discourse, give more social and historical contexts to the semantic relations within an ontology.

Therefore, there would be a denaturalization and defragmentation of the construction of KOS, and we believe that, in this sense, DA can significantly contribute to the area, even beyond systemic problems, also contributing to the conception of things themselves.

Analyzing discourse presupposes the effort of the analyst in defining and delimiting the object that will be analyzed within an infinity of possible texts. To analyze a discourse, one must build a corpus of analysis. “A discourse analyst is not someone unbiased. Ever. [...] He must also build an observatory for himself” (Mazière 2007, 23). Hence, there is an enormous potential for applying the discourse analysis designed by Pêcheux to KO, to domain analysis, and to the construction of knowledge organization systems, because we can see how meaning is constructed.

Concerning the analysis itself, the analyst must hold a critical position toward the object analyzed, and questioning must be present in his decision-making and in his attitudes, as already mentioned; we are talking about a theory of bias, which sees the viewpoint of the analyst as essential for the selection of texts and of the corpus of analysis. In other words, to Pêcheux, texts, systems, and everything that is circumscribed by human action has a bias that does not transfer from the action of ideology to the structure of discourse. However, every discourse starts from an act, an action, an authorship, that is, an event. For example, if one wants to represent a political domain, that means allowing oneself to be led by the utterances and discursive formations of the texts being analyzed.

Pêcheux and Fuchs in their famous work from 1975 (Pêcheux and Fuchs, 180 (our translation)) which updates the automatic discourse analysis, summarize the steps for a (possible) discourse analysis as follows:

- linguistic surface: understood as an oral or written sequence of variable dimensions, usually superior to the sentence. It is a concrete “discourse”, that is, an empirical object affected by forgetting No. 1 [unconscious] and

No. 2 [conscious], insofar as it is where its realization takes place, under the form, coherently and subjectively lived as necessary of a double illusion;

- discursive object: understood as the result of the transformation of a concrete discourse's linguistic surface into a theoretical object, that is, into an object linguistically unsuperficialized, produced by a linguistic analysis that aims to nullify illusion No. 2;
- discursive process: understood as the result of the regulated relationship of discursive objects that correspond to linguistic surfaces that themselves derive from stable and homogeneous production conditions. This access to the discursive process is obtained by a de-syntagmatization that befalls the illusion zone – forgetting No. 1.

We will make this approach more comprehensible. In this case, Pêcheux distinguishes two forms of forgetting in discourse: one, forgetting the order of enunciation, forgetting number 2, which understands that saying could always be another, which would form paraphrastic families, and which produces, in us, the reality of thought and meaning, a referential illusion, when there would be a direct relationship between thought/language/world; another, ideological forgetting, of the instance of the unconscious, forgetting number 1, which results from the way we are affected by ideology, given that, through it, we have the illusion of being the origin of what we say when, in fact, we resume meanings already pre-existing, in addition to the question that the meanings are determined by the way we inscribe ourselves in language and history. According to Orlandi (2009) forgetting is structuring, it is a constitutive part of the subject and meaning. These "illusions", as he qualifies them, must be understood as necessities for language to function in subjects and in the production of meanings.

In other words, when subjects become speaking subjects, there is a position taken, which should not be regarded, according to Pêcheux as an "original act" of the speaking subject; on the contrary, it must be understood as the effect, in the subject-form, of the determination of the interdiscourse, of the exteriority on oneself. In this sense, Pêcheux proposes to call interdiscourse this complex with dominant of discursive formations, clarifying that it is also subject to the law of inequality-contradiction-subordination that [...] characterizes the complex of ideological formations. This is how we work with discourse (an effect of meaning among speakers), and discourse depends on the material order of language and history to be effective. History exists as constitutive of the subject and meaning, not just being an external fact, as an aspect of complementarity.

In its approach, DA aims to unravel the role of ideology, forgetting number 2, by removing from the text, through enunciation theory, the apparent naturalization present in textual productions. Finally, through discourse theory, it

performs the de-syntagmatization, the idea to be the one that said something and reaches the center of these forgettings, which is subconscious, the history and ideology

Through the work developed by Barros (2017), that understanding has been used to analyze several discourses in KO and library and information science. Some of those discourses are: archival science's codes of ethics (Silva, Barros and Moraes 2018), indexing policies (Garcia, Redigolo, Barros and Moraes 2019), traditional knowledge (Dantas, Barros, Benchimol and Moraes 2018), archival principles (Barros 2017), archival description (Martins, Barros and Moraes 2019), and the International Society for Knowledge Organization (Evangelista, Barros and Moraes 2018).

Discourse analysis, through the works of Pêcheux, is known as a non-subjective theory of the subject, as it seeks to uncover in the text the relationships established between ideologies, institutions, and subjects. It is worth clarifying that that is precisely the approach observed throughout the course of the research, the uncovering of at least the relationships between technical and scientific texts and their historicity and ideology; thus, this work is affiliated to the French matrix of discourse analysis, heavily anchored in Pêcheux's studies on discourse.

4.0 An approach to domain analyses

Knowledge organization, as a field that stems from information science, represents academic and scientific maturity in this area as its studies become more specialized. That said, and based on its literature, it is possible to observe that research methodologies such as domain analysis are systematizations and aim to establish parameters, and a methodological framework for the replication of a model, that is to say, we are talking about a science that is verifiable and replicable.

From its inception, discourse analysis has been present in the axis of domain analysis and we have proposed ways based on the interrelation between the two, which could represent a new method of doing domain analyses, especially in what we call epistemic communities or discursive communities. Terminology, for example, is fundamentally a theory of linguistics, with significant applicability to information science, but not in an interdisciplinary field as we can see in discourse analysis.

Thus, its application should be different. We seek to emphasize studies that could be made using discourse analysis: 1) theoretical-methodological aspects of the analyzed domains; 2) development of auxiliary KOS for the representation of domains; 3) information ethics; 4) studies applied to specific domains. Discourse analysis has, fundamentally, great potential for complementing the area methodologically, given its ideologically and socially committed methodology, and its emphasis on language in social context.

Discourse analysis in the context of KO implies a change in how we understand meaning. As theorized by Orlandi (2007, 44 (our translation)): “meaning is always a word, an expression, or a proposition for another word, another expression or proposition; and it is through this relationship, this overlapping, this transfer (metaphora), that signifier elements come to confront one other”. That said, it means that there is no conceptualization if not that which is committed to its meaning and to the juxtaposition created through domain analysis. Orlandi's paraphrase means bringing discourse, position, what is said, and ideology to a place of evidence. All concepts, terms, ideas, notions are subject to that, or rather, are subjected to that, as proposed by Pêcheux throughout the trajectory of domain analysis.

Thus, the tools of discourse analysis in the context of KO can contribute significantly to an improvement in representation, through a device that is auxiliary to those traditionally used in KO. Based on discourse analysis we can see discursive practices in relation to the social, historical, and cultural aspects of discourse production from an ideological point of view, as well as historical in the domains in which this analysis is possible.

5.0 Final considerations

In this paper, we attempted to present and conceptualize fundamental notions from discourse analysis in relation to its history and memory, to delimit a space of action for KO based on domain analysis. We displayed the French contributions to the creation and emergence of discourse analysis as an interdisciplinary field of study of discourse as a scientific object.

The possible relationships between discourse analysis and KO as fields whose theories intersect were also emphasized; we considered the disentanglement of discourse analysis from terminological and semantic problems, as a combination of domain analysis approaches (given the complex problems of discourse analysis, enunciation theory, and historical materialism), worked in parallel with discourse itself and its application. Thus, we presented historically and conceptually how discourse analysis has developed, and how discourse can be approached by KO, be it in relation to its conceptualization, be it in relation to methodological approaches, seeking to facilitate and delimit its use.

A possible research plan was built for the relationship between those areas, which is especially impactful in the context of domain analysis as an axis of additional research. Fundamentally, interdisciplinary studies are recurrent and important in the field of information science. However, it is necessary to deepen the study of these interdisciplinary relationships and methodologies. Only then will it be possible to use and apply discourse analysis in the theoretical universe of information science and knowledge organization.

References

- Barros, T. H. B. 2017. “Discurso, Documento e Arquivística: Trajetória de Uma Área.” *Pesquisa Brasileira em Ciência da Informação e Biblioteconomia* 12: 97-110.
- Campbell, D. G. 2007. “The Birth of the New Web: A Foucauldian Reading of the Semantic Web.” *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 43(3/4): 9-20.
- Cook, T. 1997. “What is Past is Prologue: A History of Archival Ideas Since 1898, and the Future Paradigm Shift.” *Archivaria* 43: 60-100.
- Cook, T. 2001a. “Fashionable Nonsense or Professional Rebirth: Postmodernism and Practices of Archives.” *Archivaria* 51: 14-30.
- Cook, T. 2001b. “Archival Science and Post-Modernism: New Formulations for Old Concepts.” *Archival Science* 1: 3-24. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02435636>
- Dantas, C. F. N., T. H. B. Barros, A. C. Benchimol and J. B. E. Moraes. 2018. “A Produção Científica da UFPA Sobre Conhecimentos Tradicionais: Análise das Teses e Dissertações Disponíveis no Banco de Teses da Capes.” *IN-CID: Revista de Documentação e Ciência da Informação* 9: 48-70.
- Dahlberg, I. 1993. “Knowledge Organization: Its Scope and Possibilities.” *Knowledge Organization* 20: 211-22.
- Dosse, F. 1993. *História do Estruturalismo. Vol. 1.* Campinas: Ed da Unicamp
- Dosse, F. 1994. *História do Estruturalismo. Vol. 2.* Campinas: Ed da Unicamp
- Evangelista, I. V., T. H. B. Barros and J. B. E. Moraes. 2018. “Uma Análise do Discurso da Dimensão Cultural da International Society for Knowledge Organization.” *Informacao & Sociedade Estudos* 28: 37-48.
- Ferreira, M. C. I. 2007. “O Quadro Atual da Análise do Discurso no Brasil um Breve Perâm-Bulo.” In *Michel Pêcheux e Análise do Discurso: uma Relação de Nunca Acabar*. 2nd ed., edited by M. C. I. Ferreira and F. Indursky. São Carlos: Claraluz. DOI:10.5902/2176148511896
- Foucault, M. 1996. *A Ordem do Discurso*. 3rd ed. São Paulo: Edições Loyola.
- Foucault, M. 1997. *A Arqueologia do Saber*. 5th ed. Rio de Janeiro: Forense.
- Foucault, M. 1999. *As Palavras e as Coisas: uma Arqueologia das Ciências Humanas*. São Paulo: Martins Fontes.
- Frohmann, B. 1992. “The Power of Images: a Discourse Analysis of the Cognitive Viewpoint.” *Journal of Documentation* 48: 365-86.
- Frohmann, B. 1994. “Discourse Analysis as a Research Method in Library and Information Science.” *Library and Information Science Research* 16: 119-38.

- Frohmann, B. 2001. "Discourse and Documentation: Some Implications for Pedagogy and Research." *Journal of Education for Library & Information Science* 42: 13-26.
- Frohmann, B. 2004. *Deflating Information: From Science Studies to Documentation*. University of Toronto Press. <https://doi.org/10.3138/9781442673779>
- Garcia, V. C., F. M. Redigolo, T. H. B. Barros and J. B. E. Moraes. 2019. "Política de Indexação e Seus Sentidos: Um Estudo a Partir da Análise do Discurso." *Informação & Informação (Online)* 24: 169-89. <https://doi.org/10.5433/1981-8920.2019v24n1p169>
- Hjørland, B. 1994. "Nine Principles of Knowledge Organization." In *Knowledge Organization and Quality Management: Proceedings of the Third International ISKO Conference 20-24 June 1994 Copenhagen, Denmark*, edited by H. Albrechtsen and S. Ørnager. *Advances in Knowledge Organization* 4: 91-100.
- Hjørland, B. 2002 "Domain Analysis in Information Science. Eleven Approaches - Traditional as Well as Innovative." *Journal of Documentation* 58: 422-62.
- Hjørland, B. 2008. "What is Knowledge Organization (KO)?" *Knowledge Organization* 35: 86-101.
- Hjørland, B. 2006 "Knowledge Organization." *Knowledge Organization* 43: 475-84. Also available in *ISKO Encyclopedia of Knowledge Organization*, edited by B. Hjørland and Claudio Gnoli. http://www.isko.org/cyclo/knowledge_organization
- Hodge, Gail. 2000. *Systems of Knowledge Organization for Digital Libraries: Beyond Traditional Authority Files*. Washington, D.C.: Digital Library Federation Council on Library and Information Resources. <https://www.clir.org/pubs/reports/pub91/contents/>
- Martins, W. R., T. H. B. Barros and J. B. E. Moraes. 2019. "Perspectivas Discursivas na Formação do Conceito de Descrição da Informação em Arquivística." *ÁGORA* 29:1-13.
- Mazière, F. 2005. *L'Analyse du Discours*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France
- Mazzocchi, Fulvio. 2018. "Knowledge Organization System (KOS): an Introductory Critical Account". *Knowledge Organization* 45: 54-78. Also available in *ISKO Encyclopedia of Knowledge Organization*, edited by Birger Hjørland and Claudio Gnoli. <http://www.isko.org/cyclo/kos>
- Nesmith, T. 2002. "Seeing Archives: Postmodernism and the Changing Intellectual Place of Archives American Archivist." *Archivaria* 50: 90-132.
- Nesmith, T. 2004. "What's History Got to do With It?: Reconsidering the Place of Historical Knowledge in Archival Work." *Archivaria* 57: 200-40.
- Orlandi, E. P. 1999. *Discurso e Lettura*. 5th ed. São Paulo: Editora da Unicamp.
- Orlandi, E. P. 2005. "A Análise do Discurso em Suas Diferentes Tradições Intelectuais: o Brasil." In *Michel Pêcheux E Análise Do Discurso: Uma Relação De Nunca Acabar*. 2nd ed., edited by M.C.L. Ferreira and F. Indursky. São Carlos: Claraluz, 75-88.
- Orlandi, E. P. 2007. *Análise de Discurso: Princípios e Procedimentos*. 2nd ed. Campinas: Pontes.
- Pêcheux, M. and C. A. Fuchs. 1975. "A Propósito da Análise Automática do Discurso: Atualização e Perspectivas." In *Por uma Análise Automática do Discurso: Uma Introdução à Obra de Michel Pêcheux*, edited by F. Gadet and T. Hak. Campinas: Editora da Unicamp, 163-252.
- Silva, A. P., T. H. B. Barros and J. B. E. Moraes. 2018. "O Discurso da Imparcialidade em Códigos de Ética do Arquivista." *Ágora* 2: 213-26.
- Smiraglia, R. P. 2015. *Domain Analysis for Knowledge Organization: Tools for Ontology Extraction*. Oxford: Chandos.
- Souza. Renato Rocha, Douglas Tudhope and Mauricio Barcellos Almeida. 2012. "Towards a Taxonomy of KOS." *Knowledge Organization* 39: 179-92.
- Tognoli, N. T. and J. A.C. Guimarães. 2015. "Provenance as a Domain Analysis Approach in Archival Knowledge Organization." *Knowledge Organization* 42: 562-9.