

## Call for Presentations

### *A theoretical theater.*

In 1979, in an emblematic text ("*There is only cause for what fails...*"), Michel Pêcheux argues that throughout the 1960s in France, a theoretical "Triple Alliance" was forged between Linguistics, Marxism and Psychoanalysis (Saussure, Althusser and Lacan) which "intended to 'articulate' these three disciplines among themselves and control the transit between the continents of History, the Unconscious and Language". Pêcheux makes a prognosis: the "critical work (...) will most likely end up destroying the citadel of the 'Triple Alliance'"; then, it is necessary to discern the positions that "more than ever it is important to occupy and defend", but "under the condition that they are occupied and defended in a different way". Four years later, in "*Discours: Structure or event?*" (1983), Pêcheux points to the "crisis of Marxism", referring to the "Marxist denial of interpretation" and calling to recognize that history is a "discipline of interpretation", and not a "new kind of physics". "Let's stop protecting Marx and ourselves through him." Marx was not the Galileo of history... because the real socio-historical does not form a "structural system, analogous to a Galilean conceptual-experimental coherence". Thus, within a triple alliance in trouble, a great blockage or impasse was situated at the vertex of History. As if subject and language, the two other components of the equation, were struggling and reacting against such an overwhelming historical object. As if discourse analysis, in order to become a truly historical discipline, must first undertake the painful and uncertain task of breaking and rethinking its historical vertex.

Saussure, Althusser and Lacan... If today, in an imaginary theater, we were to represent, half a century later, the "politics of alliances" of discourse analysis, how to figurate such a new scene? Where are language, subject and history located today? How does one position itself in relation to the other? What displacements, what rearrangements? What happened with history? For the time being, its objectifying burden would have been mitigated. The historian's task is once again more like a philologist's reconstructions than a physiologist's dissections. Today we conceive - or, at least, we intend to recognize - a more subtle and lighter historical materiality, imbued and infiltrated by the properties of subject and language. A fine fabric of language, time, facticity and event, which is usually called "historicity".

### *The symposium*

The objective of the **RESEARCH SYMPOSIUM: "DISCOURSE AND PSYCHOANALYSIS: ANOTHER ENUNCIATIVE SCENE" / VI Research Symposium: Formation of the psychoanalytic clinic in Uruguay**, is to work and discuss the relationship between Discourse Analysis and Psychoanalysis, from the different directions and developments arising fundamentally from the works of Michel Pêcheux, Michel Foucault and Jacques Lacan.

Creators of very heterogeneous experiences, concepts and styles, these three authors have stood the test of time. And yet, how are your alliances composed today? How are discourse analysis alliances formed today? In what terms does the debate take place? Are we still looking for the "articulation" and/or the way to "control the transit" between history, language and the unconscious? Have we learned to occupy and defend positions "in a different way", as Pêcheux demanded?

Many figurations of the structure-history dichotomy, of 'structural history' and of 'science of history' have given way to 'historicity', a term much freer of compromises. Objects and concepts, methods and techniques are radically historicized, until they reveal the contingency of their points of emergence. How did the subject of the historical structure receive and/or recognize its own historicization? The subject-form (Althusser); the subject of discourse (Pêcheux); the child of the castration complex and the Oedipus complex (Freud); the subject of the signifier and the theory of the four discourses (Lacan); without forgetting the naturalization of objects and concepts in the early Foucault, with his "illusion of autonomous discourse"; all of them, once subjected to the test of "historical ontology" (Hacking), how would they be affected? How do they relate to the archeology of subjectivation practices (Foucault), to gender theory (Butler) and to the new social identity

transformations? How do they keep on going? In a nod to historicity, Lacan complements the theory of the four discourses with a fifth discourse, the "capitalist discourse". More recently, Lacanian psychoanalysis regains theoretical strength through reflecting on its own historicity, the production of its archeology and the redescription of its categories in a situated way and under a discursive key.

Impact of the contemporary experience of historicity, the (speaking) subject is produced as a historical object (practices and techniques of subjectivation; hermeneutics of the subject), allowing himself to be questioned and showing the formation and sediments that we commonly attribute to objects. At the same time, the object subjectifies itself and exhibits its division – an attribute much more commonly associated with the subject. The historical object (and the archive) is divided into enunciate and enunciation.

Language also receives the current impulse of historicization. But language is an absolute condition of historicization, so turning language into a historical object is a much more elusive and difficult task. The new and true "re-entry into the being" of performativity, which, in recent decades, has dramatically renewed and transformed several fields of experience, including the philosophical-epistemological (Butler, Agamben, Hacking, Mbembe), is a reason and an example of this. Likewise, the most recent and impressive emergence of inclusive or neutral language, attributing and/or making visible aspects of the patriarchal *ethos* in linguistic and discursive traits, categories and/or meanings, are also an example of this. How is the socio-historical real encoded, imprinted and/or impregnated in linguistic materiality? To answer this question, discourse analysis uses the hypothesis of the "relative autonomy of language" (Pêcheux).

In a more or less visible or latent way, with more or less emphasis on one or the other, Pêcheux, Foucault and Lacan appear today in the practice of the discourse analyst, in their readings, criticisms and practices. Gaining perspective and, perhaps, with less urgency than before, they became shared references. How is the scene of discourse analysis and psychoanalysis composed today? How do we circulate and traverse the spaces of history, the unconscious and language? How do we capture and relate the different materialities? What place does the redescription of concepts and the analogy of objects occupy, from one field to another, as Freud did with history in "*Moses and Monotheism*" (1938), or Lacan, in "*Function and field of speech and language in psychoanalysis*" (1953)? What is the potency and limit of this redescription work? The historicization of practices will have had its effects, transforming critical and analytical work, and today we can reap new results. Each new investigation is a chance to recreate and reinvent the methodology and references, making the analyst's experience and position count.