

**Analytical Speech: Epistemological Essay in Discourse Theory / O**  
***Discurso da Análise: Ensaio Epistemológico sobre as Doutrinas do***  
***Discurso***

Rodrigo Marcelino<sup>1</sup>

**Received:** July 29<sup>th</sup>, 2019. **Approved:** September 28<sup>th</sup>, 2019.

**How to cite this article:**

MARCELINO, Rodrigo. O Discurso da Análise: Ensaio Epistemológico sobre as Doutrinas do Discurso. *Revista Letras Raras*. Campina Grande, v. 8, n. 3, set. 2019. ISSN 2317-2347. Disponível em: <<http://revistas.ufcg.edu.br/ch/index.php/RLR/article/view/1355>>. Acesso em: 30 set. 2019.

**DOI:** <http://dx.doi.org/10.35572/rlr.v8i3.1355>.

**ABSTRACT**

This paper exposes a technique of interpretation used in the French, Anglo-Saxon and Brazilian traditions of discourse theory. This problem arises from a more general study that investigates the history of the relationships between language knowledge and interpretive practice in Brazil. Analytical speech is a technique of interpretation which articulates the statements of the knowledge of language with those of history and subject. This technique differs in its interpretation according to the culture considered, and it is inappropriate to measure its presence as a foreign influence among *l'analyse du discours*, discourse analysis and doctrines of discourse. Thus, this paper points out some singular statements of analytical speech in different cultures and suggests the task of researching its formation in Brazil. The doctrines of discourse in Brazil are not a foreign influence, but they have a formation which can be sought through the old relationships of the knowledge of language and interpretation as indicated in analytical speech.

**KEYWORDS:** *l'analyse du discours; discourse analysis; doctrines of discourse; epistemology; technique of interpretation.*

**RESUMO**

*O presente texto isola uma técnica de interpretação utilizada nas culturas francesa, anglo-saxã e brasileira de teoria do discurso. O problema é motivado por uma pesquisa de tese que investiga a história mais geral da relação entre o saber da linguagem e a prática de interpretar em nossa cultura. O discurso da análise ou fala analítica é uma técnica que consiste na articulação dos enunciados do saber da linguagem com os enunciados do saber da história e com os enunciados do saber do sujeito para efetivar sua interpretação. Portanto, as diferenças do discurso da análise serão pontuadas para cada um dos seus enunciados em três culturas distintas, deixando em aberto a tarefa de pesquisar sua formação entre nós. Porque o discurso da análise difere sua interpretação de acordo com a cultura considerada, sendo inadequado avaliar sua presença em l'analyse du discours, discourse analysis e nas doutrinas do discurso como uma influência que aparece em cada cultura. As doutrinas do discurso no Brasil não são uma influência estrangeira, mas possuem uma formação que pode ser buscada através do discurso da análise que se funda na relação mais abrangente do saber da linguagem com a interpretação.*

**PALAVRAS-CHAVE:** *L'analyse du discours; Discourse analysis; Doutrinas do discurso; Epistemologia; Técnica de interpretação.*

---

<sup>1</sup>Ph.D. candidate, Applied Linguistics, Federal University of Rio de Janeiro (UFRJ-2016). Professor, City of Rio de Janeiro Department of Education, SME-RJ, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. [r.marcelino@rioeduca.net](mailto:r.marcelino@rioeduca.net)

So you'll learn, in many days, what you used to do,  
untaught, as in a haze, like eating now, and drinking,  
you'll see the necessity of One! Two! Three! Truly  
the intricacy of logic is like a master-weaver's  
fabric, where the loom holds a thousand threads,  
here and there the shuttles go and the threads,  
invisibly, flow, one pass serves for a thousand  
instead.

Goethe - *Faust*

## **1 Introduction**

This paper intends to conceptualise a technique of interpretation that belongs to the doctrines of discourse in order to assess them according to the way they bring themselves forward in our culture. To do so, we will investigate part of the history of the relationships between interpretation and language, represented by the doctrines of discourse. The relationship between the practice of interpreting and the knowledge of language has been expressed in many ways over time. This naturally leads us to observe that there are several historical experiences of the present and of the past with which we could shape our investigation, such as biblical exegesis, legal hermeneutics, etc. However, our main concern is the doctrines of discourse formed in Brazil in the 1970s, '80s and '90s, although the French and the Anglo-Saxon traditions of discourse theories are inevitable paths. They are so recent that the generation that has seen the doctrines of discourse happening coexists with other generations for whom the doctrines had already existed when they were born.

We prefer, on the one hand, to recognise the doctrines of discourse in plural form, as to reveal their diversity, which stems from the practice of different interpretive cultures, from different postures in the face of them or from the many stories about their formation. Because they are an active and contemporary experience, we respect the conflicts and contests that exist under each of their perspectives. On the other hand, we have chosen to identify them as doctrines in order to avoid the denomination of theory, which is usually opposed to practice, although this does not always occur. Characterising different theories of discourse as a doctrine has the advantage of highlighting that they are not only related to an epistemological scheme organised through an intricate network of statements, but also to a set of duties established in a

specific professional ethic. Both the epistemological scheme and the code of conduct are responsible for the power of the interpretation of the doctrines of discourse.

The doctrines of discourse are an interpretive tradition that makes use of the knowledge of language. In fact, the doctrines of discourse are a knowledge that began in an indefinite point in the past and continues until the present day. This frees us from holding chronology as the most important element in the study of the relation of the interpretation practice with language knowledge as it is manifested in the doctrines of discourse at the end of the last century.

In the practice of interpretation, the doctrines of discourse are not differentiated by making use of the knowledge of language, since this also happens with other techniques of interpretation. What distinguishes the interpreting art of the doctrines of discourse is an articulation among statements—the knowledge of language is articulated to knowledge of history and of the subject. The doctrines of discourse are very complex and hard to define, because they are a contemporary cultural experience, so close that no one can exhaust them. Exhaust is not our claim. Even if we should consider such articulation among statements as an outcome of the doctrines of discourse, it is not the whole event, for there must be something outside these borders: there are middle terms whose values are not determined, and the known factors do not exhaust the series, which work only as part of its triggering. Highlighting in the knowledge of language articulated with the knowledge of history and with the knowledge of the subject, in the doctrines of discourse, means dealing with a minor literature of an interpretive culture. The present essay<sup>2</sup> introduces the expressions ‘analytical speech’ or ‘analysis discourse’, which is the focus of our study, to show the articulation of the knowledge of language with the knowledge of history and the knowledge of the subject.

Analytical speech is a technique of interpretation that consists in capturing an experience analysed through an uninterrupted and limited succession of three statements that refer to one another. In a finite sequence of statements, each statement depends on a previous one or is explained by the following one. Thus, a first present and immediate statement comes into relation with a second one that differs from the previous, but can be thought, explained or affirmed by it, resulting in a chain in which the second statement would be clarified by a third one that would, in turn, be dependent on the first

---

<sup>2</sup> This essay is part of an ongoing thesis.

statement in the series. For example, we might expect that the concept of language would be explained by the concept of history which would be clarified by the concept of subject.<sup>3</sup> This would happen in an ideal game sample, since there are several possible variations. In fact, the filling of the first position is free, as are the other positions. It would be possible to begin with another sample, in which the subject would fill the first position and would be succeeded by any other knowledge or by one of its own derivations, indistinctly. It could even happen that knowledge would be articulated to the derivations of its own semantic range before any other knowledge. Derivations mean that the history could be replaced by archive, narrative, etc., language could be replaced by idiom, dialect, etc., and the subject could be changed by agent, person, etc. There is a lack of both order and a clearly indicated path among the statements in the sequences of analytical speech. These sequences enable a different interpretation according to the cultural repertory and to the experience considered. What remains from the movement and the dynamics of the analytical speech is that one statement is articulated in a more explicit one. Analytical speech does not indicate anything; its statements refer only to another statement.

That is all we can show, for what can be shown cannot be said. Analytical speech is not susceptible to having its traces followed, apart from the experience in which it is employed and from which it is realised. It constitutes an articulation of statements whose instances do not exhaust their combinatory possibilities. Now we understand our feelings as we are in possession of a logically correct conception, as long as everything is in accordance in our culture.

Analytical speech is a technique of interpretation that emerges from the French culture as *l'analyse du discours*,<sup>4</sup> from the Anglo-Saxon culture as discourse analysis and from the Brazilian culture as the doctrines of discourse. Discourse theories have different formation in each culture. We introduce and show the techniques of interpretation that have been designated as 'analytical speech' or 'analysis discourse' as it has manifested in different cultures. Therefore, the text will be presented according to each culture in which analytical speech can be observed. In the first section, we will

---

<sup>3</sup> It must be clear we have no compromise with the samples. They are just a way of emulating, so to speak, the analysis discourse or analytical speech.

<sup>4</sup> Whenever any territory of knowledge is mentioned, such as discourse analysis, anthropophagy, Marxism, etc. one should consider, as reference, the quoted authors related to the phrase throughout the text.

discuss the French culture, in the second section, the Anglo-Saxon culture, and, in the last section, the Brazilian culture. The objective of conceptualising a technique of interpretation in the core of the doctrines of discourse will be accomplished as analytical speech takes shape according to the description of each cultural experience, taking into account their particularities whenever necessary.

## ***2 L'analyse du discours***

In France, analytical speech is called *l'analyse du discours*. Its origins can be noted in the colloquium *Matérialités Discursives* that took place at Paris X Nanterre University in April, 1980. The interpretive question was raised as an outcome of an irreducible heterogeneity among history, language and the unconscious (PÊCHEUX, 1980, p. 15). A few years earlier, the articulation among history, language and unconscious was named by Michel Pêcheux (1978) as the Triple Entente. Thus, this combination was considered a new theoretical basis involving Marx, Saussure and Freud, passing through the structuralist cultural reading of Althusser and Lacan. The basis of this combination had existed since 1975, in the text Pêcheux wrote with Catherine Fuchs. The colloquium was directed by the question: “where is *l'analyse du discours* going?” which considered discourse in an articulation among linguistics, history and psychoanalysis, and each participant of the colloquium had a particular way to contribute to it.

However, analytical speech has not only been a part of an interpretive basis attached to Pêcheux's group, but it has also been present in the French culture as a whole. In 1964, the French Communist Party magazine, *La Nouvelle Critique*, published an article by Louis Althusser containing an analytical speech. The motivation of the text was, above all, to express the theoretical importance of returning to Freud, namely, ‘to instil the members of the FCP to recognise the scientificity of psychoanalysis and the importance of the Lacanian interpretation of it’ (ALTHUSSER, 1969, p. 103). Lacan's theory was usually understood as something impossible without the emergence of a new science: ‘the acquisitions of Saussure and Linguistics’. If in the history of Western reason, sciences have been born with great care, have been planned with proper precautions, ‘two or three children have been born without being expected:

Marx, Nietzsche, Freud’. Althusser spoke about them ‘because they were the birth of science and criticism’ in the nineteenth century (ALTHUSSER, 1964, p. 32, 63).

In the same year, Michel Foucault, who took part in the development of *l’analyse du discours* (MARCELINO, 2013), suggested that Marx, Nietzsche and Freud ‘founded again the possibility of a new hermeneutics’ (FOUCAULT, 1964, p. 42). According to *The Order of Things* (1966), in the nineteenth century, the arising of these techniques of interpretation is due to the fact that language returned to the enigmatic density it had in the Renaissance: ‘The first book of *Das Kapital* is an exegesis of “value”; all Nietzsche is an exegesis of a few Greek words; Freud, the exegesis of all those unspoken phrases that support and at the same time undermine our apparent discourse, our fantasies, our dreams, our bodies’. The technique of interpretation all each of the three manifests the return of language as an object of knowledge, free from representation that was the heart of the episteme of the Classical Age (FOUCAULT, 1966, p. 412). But in contrast to the sixteenth-century interpretation, which was defined as a infinite task judged by the limits of similarity and dispersed in a homogeneous space always equal in all directions, the new hermeneutics of the nineteenth century would plunge into the depths of the exteriority of language, in an endless work bordered by man’s natural finitude.

If ‘Nietzsche, Marx, and Freud’ have been ‘great investigators who opened new paths’ (HYPOLLITE, 1966, p. 170), Jean Hypollite, in his last work, raised the fundamental question of whether they ‘continued philosophical and metaphysical thought, or criticised it. What is the meaning of a thought that belongs neither to positive science nor to the classic anthology? What is the place of this thought and its language?’ (1966, p. 170).

The reply of the Foucault states that these men have marked some crucial points for the interpretation which, in its modern status, gives primacy to signs. Therefore, interpretation becomes an infinite task, the interpreter himself disappears and there would be nothing to interpret; the sign becomes malicious, it is masquerade. Every interpretation must be bent upon itself by the question of who interprets and by the circular obligation to pass unceasingly through where it had already passed (FOUCAULT, 1964, pp. 45–49). For Paul Ricoeur, on the contrary, ‘All three—Nietzsche, Freud, Marx—free our horizon for a more authentic speaking, a new reign of

truth, not only by means of “destructive” critique but by the invention of an art of interpreting’ (1965, p. 149).

Apart from proper names, *Difference and Repetition* (1968) gives us a sample of analytical speech. Gilles Deleuze tries to show that ‘it is a question of simulacra, and simulacra alone. The power of simulacra is such that they essentially implicate at once the object = x in the unconscious, the word = x in language, and the action = x in history’ (1968, p. 299). We cannot situate the simulacra in Deleuze’s philosophical drama to show the reversal of Platonism by Plato.<sup>5</sup> It is enough to point out that simulacrum is a contestation of the world of representation, which is based either on the notion of model and on the notion of copy, on the notion of identity and on the notion of similar, both on the notion of the One and on the notion of negative (DELEUZE, 1968, p. 59). Analytical speech is like the simulacrum, triggered as a power of divergence and decentring, functioning as a differential system. The simulacrum ‘is the system in which different relates to different through difference itself’, its unit is disparate and ‘the convergence of all the series, is an informal chaos in which they are all included’. There is no privilege of a series over others in the system (1968, pp. 128, 277–278). Everything is difference in the elements and difference of difference in their communication. ‘What moves and disguises itself in the communicating elements cannot and should not be identified, but exists, acts as the differentiator of difference’. Analytical speech is haunted by the dark precursor: its simulacrum system ‘interiorised the dissimilitude of its constituent series and the divergence of its points of view to the point where it shows several things or tells several stories at once’ (1968, pp. 128, 277–278).

Despite these assessments, it seems that, in the French culture, analytical speech has significant differences. Was the Triple Entente, Marx, Saussure, and Freud, comparable to Marx, Nietzsche, and Freud in the articulation of history, language and subject, such as the technique of interpretation of analytical speech?

In fact, the dissymmetry of forms that can be seen in the knowledge of language is raised between Saussure and Nietzsche, but not in the same way that philology is opposed to linguistics, or the historical and comparative method is opposed to the functional and structural one. Linguistics has had a good reputation throughout France.

---

<sup>5</sup>Cf. *Logic of Sense* (1968), especially the appendices on Plato and Lucretius.

Although *On the Genealogy of Morality* (1887) asks how the science of language can aid in the history of morality, the presence of Nietzsche does not increase the value of philology as a science of language, but because of the importance of language for the history of philosophy—that is, at least, the perception of *l'analyse du discours*. According to Foucault, ‘Language did not return into the field of thought directly and in its own right until the end of the nineteenth century. We might even have said until the twentieth, had not Nietzsche, the philologist, been the first to connect the philosophical task with a radical reflection upon language’ (1966, p. 332). There is no exclusion of Saussure or Nietzsche in the French culture, as far as language is concerned. On the contrary, both of them overlap, in a scientific and philosophical complementation of language knowledge.

Regarding the role of the unconscious, highlighted as a series of simulacra, between Freud and Lacan, it is possible to clarify, from the point of view of the subject, another particularity of the discourse of analysis in the way in which it manifests itself in the French culture. The subject in analytical speech is under the auspicious of the unconscious in France. The dispute, in analytical speech, consists of defining what kind of unconscious the knowledge of the subject will be related to, since the conscious acts of the subject have been left aside as an outcome of a naive psychology. We should point out that, in France, analytical speech emerges from the context of anti-academic revolt against canonised subjects, such as psychology, history and philosophy (DOSSE, 1991, pp. 424–425).

The presence of analytical speech, brought by some authors, in the meditation on the interpretation and the prestige that linguistics had in France are aspects that must be acclimated in a non-institutional experience. ‘This was the context in which references to Nietzsche, Marx, and Saussure became operational, true arms of an antiacademic criticism against proponents of university and mandarin orthodoxy’ (DOSSE, 1991, p. 426). The *Collège de France* and the *École Pratique des Hautes Études* have been marginal institutions. Considering the courses given at the Sorbonne in 1967, linguistics professors, ‘with the exception of André Martinet, were entirely different from those who are well known today. In 1967, there was not even any linguistics department at the Sorbonne, but only a simple *Institut de Linguistique*’ (DOSSE, 1991, pp. 425–426). Although today linguistics does not have an entire course



in Paris XVII, the department offers linguistics lessons, which are taught to different teaching courses. Whatever may be the case, in France, the idea is that analytical speech has been far from the institutional curriculum.

### **3 Discourse analysis**

Discourse analysis has different historical meanings in the Anglo-Saxon culture. For some (COULTHARD, 1975), the variety of meanings, interests and models of discourse analysis applied by each person are so broad that any generalisation about what they have in common would be excluded. However, analytical speech is a technique of interpretation present on the horizon of discourse analysis. Although analytical speech cannot exhaust all the extension of this cultural experience, this is the water which bathes the two great critical and noncritical margins of the discourse analysis tradition. In fact, unlike in the French culture, analytical speech is not so explicitly a part of discourse analysis. This articulation is much more subtle; a certain change of viewpoint and of attitude is necessary so we can recognise and consider analytical speech itself.

The critical and non-critical sides of discourse analysis would articulate analytical speech if, and only if, it were possible to accept that the situation, spoken functional properties and world knowledge (SINCLAIR, 1975; COLTHARD, 1992) would take the place of the social, textual functional properties and communicative competence (FOWLER et al., 1979). Both British classroom discourse analysis and critical linguistics use the interpretation that ‘the particular form taken by the grammatical system of language is closely related to the social and personal need that language is required to serve’ (HALLIDAY, 1970, p. 142). The two traditions point out that ‘just as in sociolinguistics, the emphasis thus shifted from abstract, formal and invented sentences to real language use in the social context’ (VAN DIJK, 1988, p. 21). However, the critical version of discourse analysis is a sample of the analytical speech best suited to a technique of interpretation, since the non-critical side focuses on the construction of grammar, language textbooks, methodology for foreign language teaching, etc. The limitations of British classroom discourse analysis ‘are the absence of

a developed social orientation to discourse, and insufficient attention to interpretation’ (FAIRCLOUGH, 1992, p. 15). *Language as Ideology* (1979) argues that theorising has a social effect. The legacy of this book is the problematic that linguistics needs to be ‘socially responsive’. This approach ‘draws on the work of Marcuse (and through him on the Marxist and Hegelian tradition) and on that of Freud. Underlying our approach to language is the assumption that linguistic items and processes are parts of ordered systems’ (HODGE; KRESS, 1979, p. 151). Gunther Kress and Bob Hodge taught as professors of linguistics and literature with an ‘overarching theoretical frame of Marx and Freud and Whorf and Halliday’ (KRESS, 2008, apud LINDSTRAND, 2008, p. 61).

In *Prejudice and Discourse* (1984), the focus has been on the characteristics of prejudice talk. Social and psychological aspects would be less evident, but Teun van Dijk’s project was ‘primarily interested in the relationships between discourse, on the one hand, and the cognitive and social context of language use, on the other hand’ (1984, p. ix). The three functions of Halliday (1970) have been related to the structure of the English phrase or even to a speech act or text. In Van Dijk (1984), they are related to the ways in which ordinary talk and other types of discourse express ‘prejudice talk’, also considered a type of text. Despite this, analytical speech had the connotation that ‘both fundamental research and sociopolitical action may provide insights into, and changes of, the racist nature of our societies’ (1984, p. 154).

In *News as Discourse* (1988), the emphasis is on the cognitive processes: ‘various structures of the news are systematically related to the cognitive and social conditions of news production. [...] Their theoretical basis derives from current advances in text processing within cognitive psychology and Artificial Intelligence’ (VAN DIJK, 1988, pp. vii–viii). Cognition, however, as it is linked to ideology, is not restricted to the psychology of the individual; it repeats social structures. Analytical speech in Van Dijk’s book is presented as a ‘description of cognitive, social, and cultural dimensions of language use and discourse’ (1988, p. 23). Historical knowledge is divided into two important sides, a micro social context and a macro cultural context. ‘It is also intended to bridge the gap between the microlevels and macrolevels of news analysis and between media texts and contexts’ (1988, p. 181). Thus, the knowledge of history in analytical speech is carried out in discourse analysis with social and cultural dimensions, examining ‘what ideological membership, groups, group relations,

interests, power or dominance mean’ (VAN DIJK, 1988, p. 136). Social is another dimension of the knowledge of the subject, next to cognitive psychology.

Certainly, analytical speech is formed by distinct emphases in the statements of its articulation, despite the acceptability of the whole. The functional grammar of language and the cognitive psychology of the subject are important elements for the technique of interpretation of discourse analysis, but social is the most important knowledge in *Language and Power* (1988). Norman Fairclough has distinguished three dimensions of discourse analysis in a critical way. First, there is the formal description of the text, in which reference is made to the functional properties of language, just as in Halliday. Then, there is the phase of interpretation that focuses on the ‘relationships between transitory social events and more durable social structures which shape and are shaped by these events’ (FAIRCLOUGH, 1988, p. 27). However, it seems that in the third dimension, even the presence of psychology, as a valuation of the consciousness in the subject’s knowledge, is justified only in order to be the first step towards the emancipation of the state of domination of some people over others supported by ‘social struggle’: ‘The individual is able to act only insofar as there are social conventions to act within [...] being socially constrained does not preclude being creative’ (FAIRCLOUGH, 1988, p. 28).

Analytical speech is present in the three language functions considered in *Discourse and Social Change* (1992), which are dimensions of meaning that coexist and interact in every discourse. First, ‘the identity function is related to the ways in which social identities are set up in discourse’. Identities are ‘subject positions’ and ‘types of self’. Second, the relational function works to construct ‘social relationships among discourse participants’. Relationships are dramatised and negotiated. Finally, in the third dimension, ‘the ideational function relates to ways in which texts signify’, as they contribute to the ‘construction of systems of knowledge and belief’ (FAIRCLOUGH, 1992, pp. 91–92).

Analytical speech appears as a technique of interpretation and as a constitutive characteristic of the object which works to reproduce and to transform society. ‘In focusing upon social change, this version of CDA is historical. [...] To pursue this objective, it needs to focus upon social change which is grounded in the crises and

transformations of capitalism in our own times, the present and the recent past' (FAIRCLOUGH, 2014, p. 32).

It is a habit to relate discourse analysis to analytic philosophy, critical linguistics and cultural studies. However, the relation to the latter movement is not only due to the concern with social change and the emphasis on media as an object of study and criticism, but also to analytical speech itself. The link between cultural studies and discourse analysis is also supported by analytical speech. In the short essay *The Question of Cultural Identity* (1992), the presence of analytical speech is noted as part of the great developments in social theory and human sciences. According to Stuart Hall, analytical speech has been responsible for the last decentring of modern identity, that is, the displacement of the Cartesian subject. The first displacement refers to the Marxist thought, especially as interpreted by Louis Althusser. The second major decentralisation is the discovery of the unconscious by Freud, with emphasis on the Lacanian renewal. The third displacement is associated with Saussure (1992, pp. 35–40).

In a general evaluation of the presence of analytical speech in Anglo-Saxon culture, we can see that discourse analysis, unlike critical linguistics and cultural studies, does not use psychoanalysis in its interpretive technique. The technique for interpreting the knowledge of the subject in analytical speech is consciousness, a statement of cognitive psychology. Discourse analysis ascribes to the psychoanalytic view 'a position of the subject as an effect', and as a result, 'the ability of subjects to act as agents' is neglected (FAIRCLOUGH, 1992, pp. 55–56). In terms of analytical speech, this point differs from discourse analysis and *l'analyse du discours* as well, since consciousness loses ground to the unconscious in the French version. Another aspect of divergence refers to the dimension of language. If *l'analyse du discours* has set up a language project based on the Saussurian concept of *langue* and on questioning Nietzsche about the genesis of the truth, discourse analysis has complemented its language models with the concept of *parole* and with the speech act of analytical philosophy, with the cultural functions of Malinowski and with the linguistic functions of the Prague Circle contained in Halliday. In terms of knowledge of history, in discourse analysis, historical materialism refers more to Antonio Gramsci than to Althusser. This is because the actions that will transform society from capitalism to

socialism should not be undertaken directly by the state, nor against it. The actions must be indirect, as in the case of the interpretation in which no one should turn it away from the view of a politically-oriented practice.

#### **4 Doctrines of discourse**

In Brazil, analytical speech has been present in the doctrines of discourse, in some papers published and in some theses and dissertations. There were several attempts to develop a technique of interpretation for the issue of discourse throughout the 1970s, '80s and '90s in Brazil. Not all doctrines had analytical speech as a technique for the practice of interpretation, but the following examples do.

In the Brazilian culture, a sample of analytical speech can be seen in the work of Oswald de Andrade (ca. 1952–1953). But the primitivist triad, Marx, Freud and Nietzsche, has not been articulated in terms of a doctrine of discourse; it has been bound up with an interpretation of the history of ideas. Oswald de Andrade, throughout his historical exegeses, shows ruptures in different cycles and affirms that each one of them conducts itself to its own subversion. The historical cycles operate by ruptures that are processed by contradictions and do not advance in an ascending line. It is impossible to complete a picture of the evolution of ideas without paying attention to all the transformations that separate one cycle from the other. Historical cycles alternate with one another with characteristics that clearly distinguish them, and it is this contradiction that exists at the root of the movement. A strong and decisive break would be the sign of a previous demand imposed by negation. This is a cyclical sense of history, which passes through states that appear and disappear in a movement through which any phase could reappear once again. There has been a thesis that humanity has passed through a primitive general phase and that analytical speech would be the responsible for decreasing the world of patriarchy, opening the possibility of a return to primitive habits: a matriarchy based on the economy of being, on the law of war and on the moral of freedom. Therefore, for the philosophy of anthropophagic history (MARCELINO, 2013), analytical speech has been responsible for the cyclical return of the beginnings.

In the early 1970s, Carlos Henrique Escobar (1970) sought to set up a Science of Ideological Discourses by the reading of the cut produced by the 'Marx/Freud/Saussure

triad'. In the transition from the 1960s to the 1970s, in essays published as book chapters and in the journals *Tempo Brasileiro* and *Revista de Cultura Vozes*<sup>6</sup>, there is a radical transformation of psychoanalysis and linguistics in the theoretical production of the region of ideological discourses in the historic continent: 'All this happens institutionally in Rio de Janeiro, in the chair of Semiology and Epistemology of Communication, in the School of Communication of UFRJ, and in the chair of Scientific Foundations of Social Communication of the Institute of Art and Social Communication of UFF' (KOGAWA, 2012, pp. 49, 197). The formation of Escobar's works, in a doctrine of discourse, is marked by the presence of analytic speech at a 'militant' moment 'as a form of theoretical and political intervention', not only as a scheme of statements on a technique of interpretation: 'The problematic revolves around the existence, in Saussure, of a Semiology that enables the construction of a larger and interdisciplinary field (Psychoanalysis, Linguistics and History) for the understanding of the production/circulation of discourses' (KOGAWA, 2012, pp. 49, 197).

The book *A Metamorfose do Silêncio: Análise do Discurso Literário* (1974) is an important contribution to the doctrines of discourse. Luiz Costa Lima stands out for using analytical speech in the field of analysts, critics and historians of literature. For him, analytical speech seemed decisive for aesthetics in the analysis of literary discourse. To Costa Lima, analytical speech was the only way to 'dethrone the anthropocentric conception' in which aesthetics participates, by 'encouraging systemic analysis': 'Since Marx, Freud and Saussure, founders of the theory of social systems, man no longer appears as the master of his own creations. He is rather an efficient mailman, who delivers correspondence whose contents he does not know' (COSTA LIMA, 1974, p. 40). As Costa Lima argues, analytical speech belongs to the field of humanities, and the idea of a system would do for the social sciences what Galileo's conception has done for natural sciences (COSTA LIMA, 1974, p. 40).

In the technique of interpretation of Costa Lima, the systemic idea of analytical speech did not appear, however, with the name of Marx. Rather, he derives his possibility of setting up a doctrine of discourse from the 'first confluence between the establishment of Linguistics and Psychoanalysis, mediated by the work of Levi-Strauss'

---

<sup>6</sup> For a complete reference of the works and an analysis of the forgotten role of Escobar in the reception of Pêcheux, see Motta (2011), Kogawa (2012).

(COSTA LIMA, 1974, p. 17). But how can we not consider the absence of Marx a destabilising factor in the argument? Marx loses ground to Lévi-Strauss in *A Metamorfose do Silêncio* within the framework of history which, as in Costa Lima's doctoral thesis, *Estruturalismo e Teoria da Literatura* (1973), 'determines an anthropological situation' that 'is not confused with the field occupied by the science of anthropology' (1973, p. 217). In order to check this, it would be necessary to go back to the essay *Pressupostos do Pensamento Estruturalista* (1971). Costa Lima shows how the concept of Lévi-Strauss about cumulative history, in *Race et Histoire* (1952), differs from the concept Auguste Comte about linear and evolutionary history. He does not, however, disregard the fact that the problem of nature and culture has been much more important than the concept of history, which is discussed in terms of method. Within the concept of cumulative history we could observe what Lévi-Strauss had said about the relationships between nature and culture. The myth was 'identified with the reflection about social representations': 'History, therefore, does not give us structures, it is given in structures' (COSTA LIMA, 1971, pp. 77, 98). Costa Lima would rather Lévi-Strauss than Marx because he was neither Communist nor Marxist. It explains all his dissatisfaction with Lukacs's treatment of realism, as Lukacs found Tolstoy superior to Zola because the Russian had been able to defy the nausea brought by the curve of history, which is as narrow as the socialist realism Lukacs had fought.

We also find analytical speech in a doctoral thesis, on a different subject, in the department of Sociology of USP. In *A Ideologia Curupira: Análise do Discurso Integralista* (1977), by Gilberto Vasconcellos, history and the unconscious are bound up with each other to interpret what he called integralist discourse. Historical materialism and psychoanalysis are clear references, and Freud and Marx are nominated, unlike Saussure—although there are different linguistic references, such as interpretations of utterance, semantic deviation, lexicon, the intrinsic relation between signifier and signified in literary discourse, a rhetorical-linguistic ornamentation and significant propositions. The technique of interpretation of the thesis presupposes, even though it is not always expressly stated, that 'the ideological reading of a text must be more aware with its latent surface than with its manifest one', as, for example, the lack of evidence of working class in reality, although there was a working class in the integralist discourse (VASCONCELLOS, 1977, p. 197). The most special aspect of this

interpretation is the linguistic configuration of ideology, which is the cause of the affirmation of the affinity between language and ideology; discourse is identified with a theory that precedes a political practice.

The contribution of Vasconcellos' thesis is less historical than theoretical and integrates the *corpus* of dependency theory in sociology, according to Florestan Fernandes (1978). But what does it have to do with dependency theory? The dependency theory, recurrent in authors such as Fernandes, Fernando Henrique Cardoso and Roberto Schwarz, replaces the biological cause of dependence or imitation, as stated by the tradition of some members of the School of Recife, with an economic cause. Vasconcellos brings dependence theory out of its original economic field to 'understand and unravel the cultural processes', so far unexplored, of Brazilian modernity. The 'purpose has been to study Integralist discourse as a fascist ideology from the point of view of its mimetic and caricature reception in colonial or peripheral countries'. But the thesis 'has been less interested in fascism itself than in the pathology of cultural imitation in a country that is a satellite of the imperialist metropolis' (VASCONCELLOS, 2010, p. 13).

In the journal *Série-Estudos*, published by the language department of the Human Sciences and Language Center of Uberaba University, Eni Orlandi has presented the articulation of three regions of scientific knowledge: historical materialism, linguistics and a psychoanalytic theory of subjectivity. This is an epistemological framework of a discourse doctrine also called "análise do discurso". In her interpretation, 'Marx, Nietzsche and Freud are founders of discourses, not just authors' (ORLANDI, 1993, p. 24). She assumes this perspective to interpret pedagogical discourse, historical discourse, discourse of indigenous education, argumentation, religious discourse, etc., as temporary objects for the reflection of language experience. Starting from a territory that has language as an object of study, her purpose has been 'to incorporate the notions of social and history' and the 'question of the consciousness' in the language field. *Análise do discurso* has been considered a region of linguistics that is privileged to study the historical-social processes which constitute language. And from it 'derives the possibility of perceiving the subjective illusion that is often unthought, and not criticised, in linguistic theories' (ORLANDI, 1983, pp. 18–19).



Throughout the 1980s, analytical speech was triggered in language departments, above all, for the interpretation of the pedagogical discourse, in language teaching in school, especially in the practice of reading. Analytical speech would focus attention on education by the way of this issue and would help to analyse another aspect of pedagogical discourse, the authoritarian discourse. At this stage, the notion of reading gained meaning in the doctrines of discourse because of the great implications for language teaching and literacy. Teaching reading experience has created the conditions to form the concepts of interpretation and understanding in the future developments of doctrines of discourse. Another example of doctrines of discourse, in which teaching and reading are bound up with analytical speech, can be found in the thesis *Discourse Analysis and Syllabus Design: An Approach to the Teaching of Reading* (1986). The thesis of Moita Lopes uses a doctrine of discourse to endow teachers with a curriculum constructed for reading practice. The concept of language is interactional; it takes place between the participants, reader and writer, in the discourse, through its triple sociolinguistic and sociopsychological aspect. Language is negotiation of meaning in a communicative interaction: ‘The reader in this process is interacting with the writer, so to speak, in order to negotiate the meaning of the text’ (MOITA LOPES, 1986, p. 109). The thesis makes use of the philosophy of education as a resource for the knowledge of history, conceived in an imperialist system which controls power in society by means of intellectual and technical colonisation. The subject of this historical system acts consciously, choosing the alternatives the world offers. He is the agent, not the object, of history, possessing an ontological mission in which, as an individual, he takes part critically in the transformation of social space, where the psychology of dependence comes to an end (1986, pp. 22, 49, 74).

Milton José Pinto (1937–2011), coming from the tradition of semantic analysis of the 1960s, adds a social doctrine of discourses to semiology, since he merged linguistic structuralism, Marxism and psychoanalysis (PINTO, 1999). During his intellectual life, analytical speech has been responsible for replacing semiology in his doctrine of discourse or, as he used to call it, semiology of social discourses (1995). The doctrines of discourse are, according to Pinto (1999), one of the most important areas of research that has been developed in the field of communication since the 1980s. Because he taught in the Department of Language of PUC-Rio between 1971 and 1988,

and in the School of Communication of UFRJ from 1970 to 2009, there is no distance between linguistics and communication in his methodology. Although he dealt with a semantic theory of literary discourse and natural languages at the beginning of the 1960s, he did not do so from a linguistic point of view, but from a semiologist point of view, concerned with a wide variety of meanings. His project of doctrine of discourse leads to an interpretation of any semiotic system that is empirically attested in natural language or by the image of different media (PINTO, 1971, p. 10).

In this case, analytical speech has been manifested in a doctrine of discourse which has contributed to the interpretation of images. Although Milton José Pinto was trained in the semantic tradition of language studies, he has not used linguistics as an instrument to work with the analysis of texts and semiology and semiotics in the study of images. He has been interested in the study of the image—more precisely, in the relationships between text and image. This explains the name ‘semiology of social discourses’ in the plural form. Analytical speech has been established under three postulates in order to interpret the relationships among different semiotic systems (PINTO, 1988), and each postulate derived from a region of knowledge and based on a theory of social communication. The first postulate, infinite semiosis, deals with the knowledge of language. Any object, verbal or nonverbal, has meaning based on culture; its triggering occurs according to its crossing point quality, that is, a place of transition composed by a series of significant objects in a process of meaning production, where a discourse is related to another one, which in turn, is referred to others *ad infinitum*. The second postulate is the political economy of the signifier, and it is bound up with history. As stated by the postulate, any object goes through a process of communication/exchange produced by a historical context in order to signify. The process of communication passes through the production, circulation and consumption of meaning, setting up the determinations responsible for meaning choice and those responsible for meaning restriction. The relationships of the discourse responsible for the meaning choice shape ideology; the determinations responsible for meaning restriction configure power. Finally, the last postulate refers to the enunciative heterogeneity of the subject. This postulate questions the unicity of the subject based on the anonymous subject, the plural subject and the strategic evidence of showing the other in the empirical cultural manifestations. Real receivers and emitters may assume

idealised places as the subject of the enunciation, the subject of the statement and the spoken subject, all modulated by ritualised communicative intentions, when they are conscious and/or not.

Before concluding, we should mention that cultural journals were publications that played a fundamental role in the formation of analytical speech in the twentieth century. These journals have circulated in the context of a press that no longer exercised its practice through criticism. They have competed with a press based on the practice of reporting, aided by the dissemination of illustrated magazines and especially by television. Actually, no one can speak about unfair competition, since there has been no real competition between cultural journals and mass media products from the illustrated press, radio and television. Nevertheless, cultural journals not related to the universities—*Revista de Cultura Vozes*<sup>7</sup> (1907), *Revista Tempo Brasileiro*<sup>8</sup> (1963), *Revista Civilização Brasileira*<sup>9</sup> (1965–1968), etc.—have created a space that would only be fulfilled with the consolidation of graduate programs, with their own press that, in addition to conferences, seminars, etc., would be the main means of publication. Almost entire books have resulted from the collection of papers from this graduate environment, such as the early works of Eni Orlandi and Moita Lopes.

Analytical speech has been created by a specific code of conduct which stems from the press and is very close to pedagogical practice at universities. This outcome resulted from professors that have been practicing analytical speech, and inevitably, they have introduced the interpretive technique from their writings into their teaching. In the 1970s and 1980s, there were undergraduate and graduate courses with subjects that used analytical speech as an interpretive resource of a doctrine of discourse, such as those taught by Pinto and Escobar. There is evidence in communication conferences of exclusive working groups for doctrines of discourse, some of which dealt with analytical speech, such as COMPÓS, in the 1990s.

## Conclusion

---

<sup>7</sup> The journal is maintained by a Catholic publisher connected to liberation theology, but it does not publish only texts of a religious nature or committed to the Church (SPRICO, 1998).

<sup>8</sup> The journal belongs to the publishing house created by Gustavo Barroso, *Civilização Brasileira*, and was directed by Ênio Silveira. In the first issue, it indicates its concerns with the 'field of political, sociological, economic and cultural studies' (CAMARGO, 2010).

<sup>9</sup> *Tempo Brasileiro* is a journal and a publishing house founded by Eduardo Portela, literary critic and professor of Brazilian Culture at UFRJ (CAMARGO, 1997).

The presence of analytical speech, as seen above, was verified in different fields in Brazil from the 1950s to the 1990s: in Anthropophagy, with its interpretation of the philosophy of history; in Marxism, with its political interpretation; in sociology, with its ideological interpretation; in literature, with its aesthetic interpretation; in linguistics and applied linguistics, with pedagogical interpretation, and in communication, with the interpretation of semiology and semiotics. Apart from the Oswaldian primitivism, analytical speech has been activated as part of a doctrine of discourse in all these territories.

The main objective of this text was to conceptualise analytical speech in the cultures investigated, by the articulation of three statements: language, history and subject. This interpretive technique was manifested throughout the doctrines of discourse around the world in the second half of the twentieth century, but there is evidence that it was a part of the Brazilian culture before that. We have seen throughout the text that the recent formation of analytical speech in Brazil shows that the knowledge of the subject accepts a wider range of statements, encompassing psychological and psychoanalytical aspects, which is a turning point for foreign techniques of interpretation. We have also noticed that the Marxism present in discourse analysis and *l'analyse du discours* does not completely overshadow the doctrines of discourse in its knowledge of history. The knowledge of language, when assuming semiotic and semiological approaches, as in some French traditions, lacks analytical speech, for not investing in a historical interpretation, as in Patrick Charaudeau. This does not occur with Milton José Pinto that always bound up the knowledge of language with the statements of the knowledge of history and of the subject. We must bear in mind that in the 1970s, '80s and '90s there were several attempts to formulate a doctrine of discourse in Brazil as well, many of which did not include analytical speech as a technique of interpretation. Even in the formation of each of the samples mentioned, analytical speech comes about in different degrees of articulation, sometimes present but not well fitted, or with a disproportionate emphasis that would only be clarified with the ongoing publication of theses and journals.

Quite different from what any undergraduate student can spontaneously identify today, the doctrines of discourse have been related to the names of Derrida, Foucault,

Althusser, Barthes, Lévi-Strauss, Greimas, Pêcheux, Harris, Halliday, Veron, Widdowson, etc. All of them, in some way, are part of the doctrines of discourse abroad. However, the necessary conditions for analytical speech to become a technique of interpretation of the doctrines of discourse in the Brazilian culture should not be entirely followed in a foreign culture. Analytical speech can be easily identified as an interpretive technique of the doctrines of discourse, and the doctrines of discourse are considered heirs of discourse analysis and of *l'analyse du discours*. This results in the deduction that analytical speech is a foreign influence. Starting from the hypothesis that, at the end of the twentieth century, analytical speech was not a foreign influence manifested in the doctrines of discourse, but on the contrary reinforces an old tendency and a consummate articulation, we would ask whether the doctrines of discourse would mark an autonomous epistemological phase or would collapse under a retrospective. We suggest investigating under what conditions analytical speech has become an object of knowledge and under which limits its epistemological domain in the Brazilian culture unfolds. The research problem created by the conceptualisation of analytical speech cannot show its repetition in all the past epochs of the Brazilian culture, nor accept that analytical speech is a foreign influence of the late twentieth century. Future studies must characterise the conditions of possibility that assured the repetition of the analytical speech in different ways, through some of the epistemological displacements that this technique of interpretation has suffered in the past, until it acquired the attributes it has today in Brazil.

The merit of this study is not in retelling the history of analytical speech step by step, but to elicit it and to point out some remarkable features of the conditions in which it is possible. The usefulness of it is to raise the research question and to provide notes for other inquiries in the general theme of analytical speech, which is no more than the product of historical formation that relates interpretation to the knowledge of language. History “circumscribes us and set limits, it doesn't determine what we are, but what we are in the process of differing from”. History makes “possible to experiment with something beyond history” (DELEUZE, 1995, p.95, 170). Evaluating the last attempt of doctrines of discourse to update an old technique of interpretation opens up the investigation of an experience from which the present inevitably distances itself. This fate is before us.

REFERENCES

- ALTHUSSER, L. [1964] *Freud e Lacan. Marx e Freud: introdução crítica-histórica*. Rio de Janeiro, Graal, 1985.
- \_\_\_\_\_. [1969] Nota ao editor a “Freud e Lacan”. In. *Posições-2*. Rio de Janeiro, Graal, 1980.
- CAMARGO, M. Resistência e crítica: Revistas Culturais Brasileiras nos tempos da Ditadura. In. *Boletim de Pesquisa NELIC*, v. 10 n. 15, Florianópolis, 2010.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Tempo Brasileiro e Novos Estudos nos anos 80. In. *Boletim de Pesquisa NELIC*, v. 1 n. 1, Florianópolis, 1997.
- COSTA LIMA, L. *Estruturalismo e teoria da literatura*. Petrópolis; Vozes, 1973.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *As metamorfoses do silêncio: análise do discurso literário*. Rio de Janeiro; Eldorado, 1974.
- \_\_\_\_\_. [1971] Pressupostos do Pensamento Estruturalista. In. FOUCAULT, M. et al. *Estruturalismo e Teoria da Linguagem*. Petrópolis, Vozes, 1974.
- COULTHARD, M. *Introduction to Discourse Analysis*. University of Michigan, 1975.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Towards an analysis of discourse. In. COULTHARD, M. *Advances in Spoken Discourse Analysis*. London, Routledge, 1992.
- DELEUZE, G. [1968] *Difference and Repetition*. New York, Columbia University Press, 1994.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Negotiations, 1972-1990*. New York, Columbia University Press, 1995.
- DOSSE, F. [1991] *História do Estruturalismo, V. I. O campo do signo 1945-1966*. São Paulo, Editora da UNICAMP, 1993.
- ESCOBAR et al. *Epistemologia e Teoria da Ciências*. Petrópolis; Vozes, 1971.
- FAIRCLOUGH, N. [1992] *Discurso e mudança social*. Brasília, Editora da UNB, 2001.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Language and Power*. New York, Longman, 1984.
- \_\_\_\_\_. [2014] What is CDA? Language and Power Twenty-Five Years On. Disponível em:  
[http://www.academia.edu/8429277/What\\_is\\_CDA\\_Language\\_and\\_Power\\_twenty\\_five\\_years\\_on](http://www.academia.edu/8429277/What_is_CDA_Language_and_Power_twenty_five_years_on). Acesso em 16/04/ 2016.
- FERNANDES, F. [1978] Prefácio. In. VASCONCELOS, G. *Ideologia Curupira. Análise do discurso Integralista*. São Paulo; Editora Brasiliense, 1979.
- FOWLER, R et al. *Language and Control*. London: Routledge, 1979.
- FOUCAULT, M. [1966] *The Order of the Things*. New York, Routledge, 2005.
- \_\_\_\_\_. [1964] Nietzsche, Freud e Marx. In Ditos e Escritos II. Rio de Janeiro, Martins Fontes, 2008.
- \_\_\_\_\_. [1977] Verité et pouvoir. In. *Microfísica do poder*. Rio de Janeiro; Graal, 2010.

HALL, S. The Question of Cultural Identity. In. HALL, S et al., (eds.) *Modernity and its Futures*. Cambridge: Polity, 1992.

HALLIDAY, M. Languages Structure and Language Function. In. LYONS, J. *New horizons in linguistics*. Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1970.

HYPOLLITE, J. [1966] A estrutura da linguagem filosófica no “prefácio” da fenomenologia do espírito, de Hegel. In. MACKSEY, R. DONTÓ, E. *A controvérsia estruturalista*. São Paulo, Cultrix, 1976.

KOGAWA, A. [2012] *Linguística e Marxismo. Condições de Emergência para um Análise do Discurso Francês no Brasil*. São Paulo, FAP-UNIFESP, 2015.

KRESS, G. HODGE, B. *Language as Ideology*. London, Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd. 1979.

LINDSTRAND, F. Interview with Gunther Kress. *Designs for Learning*, Burlington, Volume 1 / Number 2 / Dec, 2008.

MARCELINO, R. *Estudos de poder da imprensa. A prática de reportar como componente do dispositivo disciplinar*. Dissertação apresentada à Pós-graduação em Comunicação da UFF, 2013.

MOITA LOPES, L. *Discourse Analysis and Syllabus Design: An Approach to the Teaching of Reading*. Doctoral thesis, Institute of Education, University of London, 1986.

MOTTA, L. E. Sobre “Quem Tem Medo de Alhusser?” de Carlos Henrique Escobar. *Achegas.net*, Rio de Janeiro, n. 44 jan/Dez 2011.

ORLANDI, E. A sociolinguística, a teoria da enunciação e a análise do discurso. Sobre o discurso. In. *Série-Estudos*, Uberaba, v. 6, 1981.

\_\_\_\_\_. (org.) *Discurso fundador*. Campinas; Pontes, 1993.

\_\_\_\_\_. *A linguagem e seu funcionamento*. São Pulo; Brasiliense 1983.

PINTO, M. J. *Comunicação e discurso. Introdução à análise de discursos*. São Paulo; Hacker editores, 1999, 2002. 1ª e 2ª edições.

\_\_\_\_\_. *As marcas linguísticas da enunciação. Esboço de uma gramática enunciativa do português*. Tese de doutorado apresentada à coordenação dos cursos de pós-graduação da Escola de Comunicação da UFRJ. 1988.

\_\_\_\_\_. [1971] A Mensagem Narrativa. In. BARTHES, R. et al. *Análise estrutural da narrativa*. Petrópolis; Vozes, 2008.

PÊCHEUX, M. [1978] *Semântica e Discurso: Uma Crítica a Afirmação do Obvio*. Campinas, Ed. da Unicamp, 1997.

\_\_\_\_\_. [1980] Overture du Colloque. In. CONEIN, B et al. *Colloque Matérialités Discursives*. Lille: Presses Universitaires de Lille, 1981.

PÊCHEUX, M.; FUCHS, C. Mises au point et perspectives à propos de l'analyse automatique du discours. *Langages*, 37, 1975, p.7-80.

RICOUER, P. [1965] *The Conflict of Interpretations*. Evanston; Northwestern University Press, 1974.

SPRÍCIGO, S. Uma apresentação da Revista de Cultura Vozes. In. *Boletim de Pesquisa NELIC* v. 2, n. 3 - Leituras do periodismo cultural. Florianópolis, 1998.

VAN DIJK, T. *News as discourse*. London; Routledge, 1988.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Prejudice in Discourse. An analysis of ethnic prejudiced in cognition and conversation*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1984.

VASCONCELOS, G. [1977] *Ideologia Curupira. Análise do discurso Integralista*. São Paulo; Editora Brasiliense, 1979.

\_\_\_\_\_. Trinta anos depois: ideologia curupira. *Locus: Revista de História*, Juiz de Fora, v. 30, n.1 p. 11-15, 2010.