

Maria Emilia Amarante Torres Lima: A Rescue of the Memory of the Discourse Analysis in Brazil / *Maria Emilia Amarante Torres Lima: um resgate da memória da Análise do Discurso no Brasil*

*Mailson Fernandes Cabral de Souza**

ABSTRACT

This paper has the purpose of rescuing the intellectual trajectory of Maria Emilia Amarante Torres Lima. The work of this researcher is an important testimony of the history of the Discourse Analysis of the French line, as well as the initial link of this discipline with Social Psychology. In her doctoral thesis, guided by Michel Pêcheux, Lima developed a pioneering study on the phenomenon of populism in Brazil from the analysis of the construction and operation of the speeches of May the 1st of Getúlio Vargas. However, this author's work is little known both within Discourse Analysis and Psychology. In order to rescue this memory, we take as a theoretical-methodological contribution the studies developed by Jeanne Marie Gagnebin on memory and narration together with the concepts of archiving and reading-writing elaborated by Michel Pêcheux.

KEYWORDS: Memory; Discourse analysis; Social psychology; Populism

RESUMO

Este artigo tem como propósito realizar um resgate da trajetória intelectual de Maria Emilia Amarante Torres Lima. A obra dessa pesquisadora constitui um importante testemunho da história da Análise do Discurso de linha francesa, assim como do vínculo inicial dessa disciplina com a Psicologia Social. Em sua tese de doutoramento, orientada por Michel Pêcheux, Lima desenvolveu um estudo pioneiro sobre o fenômeno do populismo no Brasil a partir da análise da construção e funcionamento dos discursos de 1º de maio de Getúlio Vargas. No entanto, o trabalho dessa autora é pouco conhecido tanto dentro da Análise do Discurso, como da Psicologia. A fim de dar a ler essa memória, tomamos como aporte teórico-metodológico os estudos desenvolvidos por Jeanne Marie Gagnebin sobre memória e narração, em conjunto com os conceitos de arquivo e leitura-escritura elaborados por Michel Pêcheux.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Memória; Análise do discurso; Psicologia social; Populismo

* Universidade Católica do Pernambuco – UNICAP-PE, Programa de Pós-Graduação em Ciências da Religião – PPGCR, Recife, Pernambuco, Brazil; <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-8526-4520>; mailsoncabral@yahoo.com.br

To articulate what is past does not mean to recognize “how it really was.” It means to take control of a memory, as it flashes in a moment of danger.

*Walter Benjamin*¹

Introduction

The view we establish about the memory of the past depends on our relationship with the present moment. In this sense, a question that should not be left out in the process of elaborating a past is: what do we wish to read? Long before what might be possible to know about something, and the respective conditions for that, this questioning is necessary. When we pose this question to the field of Humanities – in particular, to studies that are engaged in some dimension with the work of historical interpretation – it is essential that the researcher ask this very question not only to himself, but also aim it at the narratives that are established in a given area of knowledge.

And once a narrative gains prominence in the history and memory of a discipline, it tends to establish its own cutouts and montages, either through those inserted in the discipline, or through an institutional framework that selects certain names as vectors in the composition of its own history. Some subjects become greater characters and others smaller ones in this process. Some, however, do not even enter the plot: they are forgotten, erased, silenced. This is all done so that the narrative may unfold under an apparent transparency along the discursiveness thread that weaves the order of saying.

But language, like history and memory, is also constituted of ellipses, flaws and lapses that always leave us traces of a discourse-other, a polysemy that escapes the regulation of saying.

The story, which will unfold in the next pages, is located in one of these fissures, in the midst of a discipline, the Discourse Analysis of French line, which has the philosopher Michel Pêcheux as one of its pivotal exponents. To be more precise: the Discourse Analysis that evokes this tradition in Brazil and that takes the studies developed by Eni Orlandi as the starting point, the main name of the field in the country.

¹ BENJAMIN, Walter. On the Concept of History. *Gesammelten Schriften* I:2. Suhrkamp-Verlag. Frankfurt am Main, 1974.

However, Orlandi was not the only one to cross the Atlantic bringing Pêcheux's ideas. Simultaneously, a group of researchers from the Social Psychology Sector at the Federal University of Minas Gerais also had contact with the philosopher's ideas. More than that, they were in direct contact with Pêcheux, in the early 1970s, in the department in which he worked at Paris VII University. There were three travelers who, for more than a decade, kept in contact with the Pecheutian circle. They were: Célio Garcia, Marília Novais Machado and Maria Emilia Amarante Torres Lima. The latter lived eleven years in France, where she became Pêcheux's advisee and had her doctoral thesis defended in 1983. Later, it was published as a book, in Brazil, by the University of Campinas publisher, under the title *A construção discursiva do povo brasileiro: os discursos de 1º de maio de Getúlio Vargas* [*The Discursive Construction of Brazilian People: The Speeches of May the 1st by Getúlio Vargas*], in 1990. Lima's academic production, in this context, marks not only an important moment in the development of the ideas in Discourse Analysis, but also one of the pioneering studies on the phenomenon of populism.

Amidst the forces' interplay of the narratives, however, this path has been forgotten and a memory, as a consequence, has been silenced in the history of Discourse Analysis. The publications that are engaged in retracing the historical steps in Brazil in this area (FERREIRA, 2003; ORLANDI, 2003; MACHADO TEIXEIRA, 2014; BALDINI, ZOPPI-FONTANA, 2015; OLIVEIRA; NOGUEIRA, 2019) simply do not mention or attach little importance to Lima's work and the Social Psychology Sector. In this sense, the present paper intends to fulfill three functions: 1) an error to be corrected: to show that the works around Pêcheux's work do not start in Brazil only from Orlandi; 2) a forgetfulness to be repaired: Lima's memory within Discourse Analysis; 3) to bring a new perspective: the dissociation of Pecheutian Discourse Analysis from a single historical narrative. For that, we will present, next, some of the theoretical-methodological assumptions that will help to intertwine the threads of the weave that will be woven in our study.

1 It Is not Possible to Say Everything. What Do We Wish to Tell, Then?

The writing of memory is linked to the construction of identity and history, since, in the process of producing a narration, memory and identity are imbricated (GAGNEBIN, 1998). When narrating a memory, we have a resemblance as the object. In it, there is a trace² of a presence that no longer exists and that runs the risk of being permanently erased, that is, of not becoming memory. The reconstruction of a past, therefore, is based on the selection of the traces left behind by that.

When narrating a story, we are not only describing a past, but articulating it with the present. Hence, whoever faces the work of writing memory, is faced, according to Gagnebin (1997, p.47), with what for a long time was the prerogative of reason: “a smooth and flawless continuity, which referred to the subject’s full identity and to the indisputable unfolding of a homogeneous time.”³ This understanding did not take into account the nuances that involve the work with memory. In the elaboration of a narrative, there is always a set of other sayings that go through the process of forming what is said, directing the ways in which it can be accessed and apprehended. In other words, when composing the report of a memory, we are working on a process of montage, cropping, and framing about what will be written. We select, therefore, the perspective and the set of things from which we want to present a story.

To the historian – and, why not, also to the discourse analyst – it would be necessary to fight against forgetfulness and denial of memory. In other words, fighting a desire for annulment, for the denial of history – not letting to die away, once again, the voices of the dead, of those vanquished by the oblivion.⁴ (GAGNEBIN, 1997; 1998) From

² “[...] The trace inscribes a remembrance of a presence that is no more and that always runs the risk of being permanently erased. Its essential and intrinsic frailty contradicts in that manner the yearn for plenitude, that of presence and substantiality which marks the classical metaphysics.” “[...] *o rastro inscreve a lembrança de uma presença que não existe mais e que sempre corre o risco de se apagar definitivamente. Sua fragilidade essencial e intrínseca contraria assim o desejo de plenitude, de presença e de substancialidade que caracteriza a metafísica clássica.*” (GAGNEBIN, 1998, p.218). Free translation from the aforementioned quotation in the Portuguese edition.

³ In Portuguese: “Uma continuidade lisa e sem falhas, que remetia à identidade plena do sujeito e o desenrolar inelutável de um tempo homogêneo.”

⁴ “Now, the past is really the past or, as Proust says, it is lost, it does not come back as such, but can only re-emerge, unlike itself and, however, similar, make an unexpected way in the layers of oblivion.” “[*Ora, o passado é realmente passado ou, como diz Proust, perdido, ele não volta enquanto tal, mas só pode ressurgir, diferente de si mesmo e, no entanto, semelhante, abrindo um caminho inesperado nas camadas do esquecimento.*”] (GAGNEBIN, 1997, p.102). Free translation from the aforementioned quotation in the Portuguese edition.

this perspective, the author invites us to take a position: to preserve memory, to rescue the past, to fight forgetfulness.

Although indirectly, this stance leads us to the problem of the truth and memory of a past. Since the author assumes that the relationship between the present and the past is fundamentally a historical one, she argues that the truth of the past refers to an ethics of the present. Gagnebin (1998, p.214) apprehends the concept of truth as an elaboration of meaning, be it invented in the freedom of imagination or a discovery in the ordering of the real: “the truth of the past refers more to an ethics of the present action than to a problematic of adequacy (supposedly scientific) between ‘words’ and ‘facts.’”⁵ She affirms that the historical truth is not in the order of factual, empirical verification, but that the concept of truth is not limited to the meanings that are inscribed in adequacy and verification procedures. The concept of truth must cover the rooting and belonging that precede the relationship of a subject to an object, which, in turn, “is an attitude radically different from complacent, apathetic relativism, said postmodern, which, in fact, is nothing but the inverted and lackluster image of its opposite, the dogmatic positivism” (GAGNEBIN, 1998, p.217).⁶ In short, this argument rescues the ethical dimension of the work with memory, showing us the historical and political content that mark this activity.

Given what has been said so far, it is noticeable that the memory to which we refer is not apprehended in its biological sense, but is the one of the order of saying and of history. For that matter, Pêcheux’s assertion about this concept seems alluding:

[...] memory reports not to the cortical traces *within* an organism, nor to the scarring traces *on* that organism, nor even to the behavioral traces deposited *by* it in the outer world to the organism, but rather to a complex set, pre-existing and external to the organism, consisting of series of *fabrics of readable indexes*, constituting a socio-historical corpus (PÊCHEUX, 2016b [1983], p.142; author’s highlights).^{7, 8}

⁵ In Portuguese: “a verdade do passado remete mais a uma ética da ação presente que a uma problemática da adequação (pretensamente científica) entre ‘palavras’ e ‘fatos’.”

⁶ In Portuguese: “é uma atitude radicalmente diferente do relativismo complacente, apático, dito pós-moderno, que, de fato, nada mais é que a imagem invertida e sem brilho de seu contrário, o positivismo dogmático.”

⁷ Maldidier (2003) tells us that this text, a research project, was written in 1983, but was posthumously published only in 1990. We shall consider 1983 as the date of reference.

⁸ In Portuguese: “[...] a memória se reporta não aos traços corticais *dentro* de um organismo, nem aos traços cicatriciais *sobre* este organismo, nem mesmo aos traços comportamentais depositados *por* ela no mundo exterior ao organismo, mas sim a um conjunto complexo, preexistente e exterior ao organismo, constituído por séries de *tecidos de índices legíveis*, constituindo um corpus sócio-histórico.”

Under this bias, memory would be what establishes the legibility of an event, that is, a condition to make it understandable. Memory is not conceived as a simple accumulative space of historical events, bearing a homogeneous sense, which it would have the function of transmitting, but as “a mobile space of divisions, disjunctions, displacements and retakings, of conflicts of regularization... A space for developments, replicas, controversies and counter-discourses” (PÊCHEUX, 2010 [1983], p.56).⁹ In other words, the ways of saying something are not disconnected from historicity and ideological and discursive positions, marking the meanings that words, expressions and propositions acquire in the reading-writing process of memory.

Thus, as we take the position of someone who narrates a memory, we assume a double condition: that of the person who begins to write a memory of another, in order to give him a voice, and that of the one who prints his own reading gesture in his elaboration of a memory. For Pêcheux (1997 [1982]), this work on memory is understood as the construction of an archive. The concept of archive corresponds to the field of concerning and accessible documents on a given issue that is studied, such as, for example, political, philosophical, aesthetic discourses – or even everyday conversations. In parallel, the concept also designates an investigative procedure composed of a set of strategies for the description of the different sayings inscribed in the field of archives submitted to an analysis.¹⁰

In this sense, the construction of the archive takes place under the work with memory. This movement, for Pêcheux (1997), is characterized as a reading-writing of the archive. Reading and writing, for the author, are processes that are intertwined, juxtaposed, of reciprocal influence. Reading-writing, hyphenated because it is a reading that is immediately scribing itself and, at the same time, it is a scribing that cannot be separated from the reading that contains it. The scribing is an immediate data of the reading and vice versa. Reading-writing: it is not merely the sum of two processes, but an unfolding of the reading gestures that make up an archive, which form its memory. This implies, at the level of concepts and procedures, taking sides “for this work of thought in combat with its own memory, which characterizes the reading-writing of the

⁹ In Portuguese: “um espaço móvel de divisões, de disjunções, de deslocamentos e de retomadas, de conflitos de regularização... Um espaço de desdobramentos, réplicas, polêmicas e contra-discursos.”

¹⁰ We shall not extend ourselves in the exposition of the discursive analysis that is developed by Michel Pêcheux. Taking into account the purpose of this paper, we shall entertain ourselves with the points of contact between the ideas of both Pêcheux and Gagnebin about the issue of memory.

archive, under its different ideological and cultural modalities, against everything that tends today to erase that work” (PÊCHEUX, 1997, pp.63-64).¹¹

Concluding what has been said in this section: in the reading-writing work of building a archive, which forms the set of tracks in which a memory is inscribed, we select and organize a memory in order to make it narratable. Let us now move on to the unfolding of the plot that we wish to provide for reading.

2 First Tracks of a Journey: From the Social Psychology Sector of UFMG to France

In the 1960s, Brazil was going through one of the darkest and most troubled periods in its political history. In 1964, the military dictatorship was installed. The government of that time granted, on its own, the constitutive power through decree-laws, the Institutional Acts (AI). Among several AI's, the Institutional Act Number Five (AI-5), issued in 1968,¹² was to take effect for ten years, marking the time of the greatest political repression and military centralization of the state power. This corroborated, in turn, the regime's repression tactics – torture, kidnapping, prison, murders, hiding of corpses, etc. – in the persecution of dissident groups. The numbers and names of the missing persons were multiplied. The right to memory and truth had been denied, interdicted. In a word, “a wound that does not heal, the trauma is difficult, if not impossible, to narrate” (GAGNEBIN, 2002, p.125).¹³ The difficult production of a scar, of a memory. Let us keep that image.

¹¹ In Portuguese: “por este trabalho do pensamento em combate com sua própria memória, que caracteriza a leitura-escritura do arquivo, sob suas diferentes modalidades ideológicas e culturais, contra tudo o que tende hoje a apagar esse trabalho.”

¹² “As a consequence of AI-5, the President of the Republic acquired powers to: enact the recess of both the National Congress and the Legislative Assemblies and Municipal Councils; suspend the political rights of any citizens; cancel federal, state, and municipal elective mandates; veto constitutional guarantees of vitality, immovability, and stability; suspend the right of habeas corpus for the cases of political crimes against national security, the economic and social order and the popular economy.” [“Como consequência do AI-5, o presidente da República adquiria poderes para: decretar o recesso tanto do Congresso Nacional como das Assembleias Legislativas e Câmaras Municipais; suspender os direitos políticos de quaisquer cidadãos; cassar mandatos eletivos federais, estaduais e municipais; vetar as garantias constitucionais de vitaliciedade, inamovibilidade e estabilidade; suspender o direito de habeas corpus para os casos de crimes políticos contra a segurança nacional, a ordem econômica e social e a economia popular” (CODATO, 2004)].

¹³ In Portuguese: “ferida que não cicatriza, o trauma, difícil, senão impossível narração.”

In the midst of such adverse circumstances, in 1964, the Social Psychology Sector¹⁴ of the Federal University of Minas Gerais emerged, led by Célio Garcia.¹⁵ The group brought together students and professionals from Psychology and Social Sciences. During his stay in Paris, between 1953 and 1960, Garcia specialized in Social Psychology, obtaining the *Licence ès Lettres* from the University of Paris-Sorbonne – that same season, he also had contact with the founders of the *Association pour la Recherche et l'Intervention Psychosociologiques* (CAMPOS, GARCIA, 2011).

In its beginning, the teaching of Social Psychology at UFMG was based on the line of group dynamics and development in human relations. Subsequently, a tendency towards Social Sciences was outlined in the group, as the result of a critical stance towards the Psychology of Human Relations, which came to be understood as “excessively conciliatory” (CAMPOS, GARCIA, 2011, p.406). Given the dictatorial context in which the country found itself, the group had the ideal to use Social Sciences as a vector for political and social transformation.¹⁶

During the first years, the Sector kept its several international partnerships which resulted in exchanges.

Between 1967 and 1975, the sector maintained, under his leadership [Célio Garcia], an academic and scientific cooperation program financed by the Cultural Service of the Embassy of France in Brazil. Through this program, the professors Max Pagès, André Lévy, Roger Lambert, Georges Lapassade, Pierre Fedida and Michel Foucault,

¹⁴ “It is understood by Sector, not the Department of Social Psychology of UFMG, but the group that, during the period that remained at the University, brought as a characteristic, in addition to the academic meeting and theoretical affinities, common objectives, seeking new paths of study and practices of Social Psychology.” [“Entende-se como Setor, não o departamento de Psicologia Social da UFMG, e sim o grupo que, durante o período que permaneceu na Universidade, trouxe como característica, além do encontro acadêmico e afinidades teóricas, objetivos comuns, buscando novos caminhos de estudos e práticas da Psicologia Social”] (ABREU, 2012, p.10).

¹⁵ It was during this period that Garcia became a professor of Social Psychology in the Psychology course at UFMG, created in 1962: “When recalling the Social Psychology Sector at UFMG, the name of Professor Célio Garcia is always referenced. In addition to being the founder of the Sector group, he was ahead of the team 1973, when he was transferred to the Philosophy Department at UFMG.” [“Ao lembrar o Setor de Psicologia Social da UFMG, o nome do Professor Célio Garcia é sempre referenciado. Além de fundador do grupo do Setor, esteve em sua liderança até o ano de 1973, quando se transferiu para o Departamento de Filosofia da UFMG.”] (ABREU, 2012, p.11).

¹⁶ “The members of the sector were divided between the two orientations of Social Psychology at that time: the French school and the North American school. Without making a definitive choice for either, both were critically analyzed. This created conditions for creativity and the invention of original devices” [“Os membros do setor se encontravam divididos entre as duas orientações da Psicologia Social daquele momento: a escola francesa e a escola norteamericana. Sem fazer uma escolha definitiva por nenhuma das duas, ambas eram analisadas criticamente. Isto criava condições para a criatividade e a invenção de dispositivos originais”.] (CAMPOS, GARCIA, 2011, p.406).

visited the UFMG on a cultural mission, the first four specialists in the field of Social Psychology (CAMPOS, GARCIA, 2011, p.406).¹⁷

Given this flow of intellectual exchanges, the Sector started to function as a point of intersection between different areas – Sociology, History, Philosophy and Health –, providing exchanges of knowledge, criticisms and new ways to think about the performance of the social psychologist (ABREU, 2012). This transit of ideas became a two-way road. In May 1968, a scientific and cultural cooperation agreement with France was initiated, made possible by Garcia by means of the contact he established with the group of sociologists and psychologists who founded the *Association pour la Recherche et l'Intervention Psychosociologiques*:

The cooperation was initially funded by the Cultural Service of the Embassy of France, having as beneficiaries the Departments of Psychology and Philosophy of FAFICH / UFMG (1967-1975); in this program, from 1969, members of the sector studied in France: Rosa Maria Ferreira Nehmy, Regina Lúcia Goulart Botelho, Júlio Miranda Mourão, Maria Emilia Amarante Torres Lima, José Renato Campos do Amaral. Each one of these fellows always kept close contact with those who stayed in Brazil, through the exchange of bibliography, information, ideas, and the organization of meetings with French teachers (MACHADO, 2004, p.25).¹⁸

The internationalization was experienced in an intense and pioneering way. On one of these trips, a group from the Sector, formed by Célio Garcia, Marília Novais Machado and Maria Emilia Amarante Torres Lima, had a meeting with Michel Pêcheux.¹⁹

¹⁷ The original excerpt in Portuguese version is: “Entre 1967 e 1975, o setor manteve, ainda sob sua liderança [Célio Garcia], um programa de cooperação acadêmica e científica financiado pelo Serviço Cultural da Embaixada da França no Brasil. Através desse programa, visitaram a UFMG em missão cultural os professores Max Pagès, André Lévy, Roger Lambert, Georges Lapassade, Pierre Fedida e Michel Foucault, os quatro primeiros especialistas na área da Psicologia Social” (CAMPOS, GARCIA, 2011, p.406).

¹⁸ In Portuguese: “A cooperação foi financiada inicialmente pelo Serviço Cultural da Embaixada da França, sendo beneficiários os Departamentos de Psicologia e Filosofia da FAFICH/UFMG (1967-1975); nesse programa, estudaram na França, a partir de 1969, integrantes do setor: Rosa Maria Ferreira Nehmy, Regina Lúcia Goulart Botelho, Júlio Miranda Mourão, Maria Emilia Amarante Torres Lima, José Renato Campos do Amaral. Cada um destes bolsistas manteve sempre contatos estreitos com os que ficaram no Brasil, através de troca de bibliografia, de informações, de idéias, e da organização de encontros com professores franceses.”

¹⁹ According to Machado (2018, p.13), an initial contact with Pêcheux was made about two years earlier: “Every year, Garcia spent a season in France and, on those occasions, kept up with what was happening academically and culturally in Europe. In 1970, he had already contacted the two Michels, Pêcheux and Foucault, who, somewhat without communicating directly, had been former disciples of the same master, were at the birthplace of discourse analysis in 1969” [“A cada ano, Garcia passava uma temporada na

At the time, he was developing an ambitious theoretical-methodological project that would be known as Discourse Analysis.²⁰ In 1972, the year of the meeting, Pêcheux had a link with the Social Psychology of his time, assuming a critical position in relation to the different theoretical lines that constituted it.

In October 1966, Pêcheux joined the *Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique* (CNRS), employed as a researcher at the Social Psychology Laboratory, directed by Robert Pagès (MALDIDIÉ, 2003). Social Psychology functioned as a space for the application of the theorizations that Pêcheux had been working on. Proof of this are two of his first articles: one, with the pseudonym of Thomas Herbert, published in 1966, and another with his own name, in 1969, both raising criticisms of Social Psychology (HERBERT, 2016 [1966]; PÊCHEUX, 1969). Pêcheux (1969) stated that the history of Social Psychology was influenced by institutional and ideological determinations and that the discipline behaved as if it had no memory of these determinations, repeating its beginning indefinitely. This would make Social Psychology become the application of a technique at the service of an ideology of social relations. In summary, the vulnerability of the discipline to the ideologies (political, moral, religious, and biological) of its time has been demonstrated. In these criticisms, according to Machado (2008), many of the elements that would compose Discourse Analysis were already outlined, among them:

- (a) selection of corpora to be analyzed, considering the production of the most respected social psychologists in the field at the time; (b) reading of these writings in models of social listening; (c) theoretical formulation regarding the regions of animality and sociability that maintain dominance relations among themselves, leaving behind theoretical gaps that are ideologically filled; (d) analysis of the discourses present in the texts in the light of these theoretical formulations; (e) demonstration, in language and by language, of the underlying ideologies (MACHADO, 2008, p.34).²¹

França e, nessas ocasiões, se punha a par do que ocorria acadêmica e culturalmente na Europa. Em 1970 ele já havia contatado os dois Michel, Pêcheux e Foucault, que, um tanto sem se comunicarem diretamente, embora ex-discípulos de um mesmo mestre, estiveram no nascedouro da análise do discurso em 1969”].

²⁰ In addition to Michel Pêcheux, two other important names that are also at the heart of the theoretical debates that led to the emergence of Discourse Analysis in France are the linguist Jean Dubois and the philosopher Michel Foucault. Different lines and trends for DA emerged from these authors, generating different approaches to the issue of discourse (MAZIÈRE, 2007).

²¹ In Portuguese: “(a) seleção dos corpora a serem analisados, considerando a produção dos psicólogos sociais mais conceituados da área, na época; (b) leitura desses escritos nos moldes de uma escuta social; (c) formulação teórica relativa às regiões da animalidade e da sociabilidade que mantêm entre si relações de dominação, deixando lacunas teóricas que são preenchidas ideologicamente; (d) análise dos discursos presentes nos textos à luz dessas formulações teóricas; (e) demonstração, na linguagem e pela linguagem, das ideologias subjacentes” (MACHADO, 2008, p.34).

This link between Pêcheux and Social Psychology contributed to the emergence of a device for the analysis of the underlying ideologies, that is, the [Automatic] Discourse Analysis – a relationship often overlooked by discourse analysts, as Machado (2008) points out. Let us also note that these theoretical ventures by Pêcheux occur in parallel to the early years of the Social Psychology Sector at UFMG. It is precisely in this period of intellectual effervescence that the meeting of this UFMG group with Pêcheux will take place, in January 1972, as narrated by Marília Machado herself:

But, as I was already well trained to be an empirical academic, ADA attracted me. This did not prevent me from making a bad impression, in January 1972. Célio Garcia, Maria Emília Amarante Torres Lima and I, in France, had a meeting with Pêcheux, who wanted to know what we were thinking of doing, in Brazil, with DA. I told him about the research we were starting. We called it an experiment. We wanted to apprehend and compare speeches of the mentally ill who, at our request, would complete sentences. We intended to control variables such as sex, age, education and religion, based on the certainty that the diagnoses that labeled our subjects were definitive, correct and evident. For the analysis, we would adopt “part of the method proposed by Michel Pêcheux, in the book *Analyse automatique du discours*” and we would have as a unit of analysis the statement “as defined by Pêcheux” (AMARAL; MACHADO, 1971, p.17). We would compare all the statements obtained two by two.

As can be seen, a proposal permeated by experimental scientific training, already criticized at the time by Pêcheux, for a belief in the diagnosis of psychopathology at the time and for a perspective that closed itself off to the innovation represented by ADA and simplified the analysis, limited by the few resources that we had. In fact, at that time, the only computer we knew was a model 1130 that took up much of a floor at the Faculty of Engineering at UFMG and did much less than the simplest of today’s microcomputers. So, imagining doing a true automatic analysis was a long way off. Pêcheux was delicate, but it allowed me to see the shortsighted and narrow way in which we thought (MACHADO, 2018, pp.14-15).²²

²² In Portuguese: “Mas, como já estava bastante treinada para ser uma acadêmica empírica, a AAD me atraía. Isso não me evitou fazer uma má figura, em janeiro de 1972. Célio Garcia, Maria Emília Amarante Torres Lima e eu, na França, tivemos um encontro com Pêcheux, que quis saber o que pensávamos fazer, no Brasil, com a AD. Falei-lhe a respeito da pesquisa que iniciávamos. Dávamos a ela o nome de experimento. Queríamos apreender e comparar discursos de doentes mentais que, a nosso pedido, completariam sentenças. Pretendíamos controlar variáveis do tipo sexo, idade, escolaridade e religião, partindo da certeza de que os diagnósticos que rotulavam nossos sujeitos eram definitivos, corretos e evidentes. Para a análise, iríamos adotar “parte do método proposto por Michel Pêcheux, no livro *Analyse automatique du discours*” e teríamos como unidade de análise o enunciado “tal como definido por Pêcheux” (AMARAL, MACHADO, 1971, p.17). Compararíamos dois a dois todos os enunciados obtidos. “Como se vê, proposta permeada por uma formação científica experimental, já criticada na ocasião por Pêcheux, por uma crença no diagnóstico da psicopatologia da época e por uma perspectiva que se fechava

Despite the initial mishaps reported by Machado (2018), a partnership between the Psychology Sector at UFMG and the CNRS was established from that meeting. As a result of this collaboration, one of the researchers of the Sector, Maria Emilia Amarante Torres Lima, was sent to France, as a scholarship fellow of an agreement between UFMG and the Cultural Service of the Embassy of France, to develop her doctoral thesis under the guidance of Pêcheux.²³

In 1973, by an international agreement, Célio Garcia brought Foucault to Brazil. On that occasion, the professor at *Collège de France* had already defined discourse analysis as a description that was both critical and genealogical (FOUCAULT, 1971). That same year, thanks to Garcia and the agreement with the French embassy, Maria Emília obtained a scholarship in that country. Between 1973 and 1984, she remained in France, where she had Pêcheux as her thesis advisor (LIMA, 1990) and research director in the CNRS group. During that time, she kept her colleagues from the Social Psychology Sector in Brazil up to date on the development of ADA1, ADA2 and ADA3. As they appeared, she gave us access to texts by Jean-Jacques Courtine, Michel Plon, Paul Henry, Jacqueline Léon, Régine Robin, and several others by Michel Pêcheux (MACHADO, 2018, pp.14-15).²⁴

à inovação representada pela AAD e simplificava a análise, limitando-a aos poucos recursos que tínhamos. De fato, nessa altura, o único computador que conhecíamos era um modelo 1130 que ocupava boa parte de um andar da Faculdade de Engenharia da UFMG e fazia bem menos que o mais simples dos microcomputadores de hoje. Dessa forma, imaginar fazermos uma análise automática verdadeira era algo distante. Pêcheux foi delicado, mas me permitiu ver a forma limitada e estreita segundo a qual pensávamos.”

²³ There are no records that Pêcheux has supervised many doctoral theses. In addition to Lima, we find the case of Simone Bonnafous: “BONNAFOUS, Simone. *Les motions du Congrès de Metz* (1979) du Parti socialiste : processus discursifs et structures lexicales, thèse de 3e cycle, Sciences du langage, Université Paris X-Nanterre, 1980 (directeur : Michel Pêcheux)” (THIEBAULT, 1992 [1982], p.27). The French website *Id Ref – Identifiants et Référentiels pour l’enseignement supérieur et la recherche*, which works as a data collector for French researchers – an approximate version of this in Brazil would be the Escavador website – points out that Pêcheux had three more doctoral students: Sergio Perez Cortes, with the study *Les conflits dans la formalisation en linguistique*, put forward 1981; Rolande Poullet-Hlacia with the study *Politiques d’alphabétisation en Afrique francophone: étude d’un corpus de rapports de l’UNESCO (1974-1978) selon la méthode de l’analyse automatique du discours (A.A.D.)*, put forward 1981; Laura Carrera Lugo with the study *Analyse idéologico-politique de l’institution musée: éléments d’analyse du discours*, put forward 1983. This information can be accessed at: <https://www.idref.fr/027062058>. Paveau (2008) informs us that Jean-Jacques Courtine's doctoral thesis, *Quelques problèmes théoriques et méthodologiques en analyse du discours, à propos du discours communiste adressé aux chrétiens*, put forward in 1980, was also supervised by Pêcheux.

²⁴ In Portuguese: “Em 1973, num convênio internacional, Célio Garcia trouxe Foucault ao Brasil. Nessa ocasião, o professor do *Collège de France* já havia definido a análise do discurso como uma descrição simultaneamente crítica e genealógica (FOUCAULT, 1971). Nesse mesmo ano, graças a Garcia e ao convênio com a embaixada francesa, Maria Emília obteve bolsa de estudo naquele país. Entre 1973 e 1984, ela permaneceu na França, onde teve Pêcheux como orientador de sua tese (LIMA, 1990) e diretor de pesquisa no grupo do CNRS. Durante esse tempo, ela manteve seus colegas do Setor de Psicologia Social, no Brasil, atualizados quanto ao desenvolvimento da AAD1, AAD2 e AAD3. Na medida em que apareciam,

Lima lived for eleven years in France and followed the development of Discourse Analysis from within, participating in the group of researchers who helped build the field. More than that: she not only contributed to the theorization of Discourse Analysis through her research, but she also did a previously unpublished study on populist discourse in Brazil. However, her inscription in the history of that discipline did not happen. Her name is an absent presence. It is as if Lima had left no traces. Traces and scars, as Gagnebin (2002) reminds us, are metaphors for memory. Decipher tracks and collect debris. It is with this operation that we will be deal from now on.

3 Elaborating the Memory of Past: Description of an Intellectual Trajectory

Maria Emilia Amarante Torres Lima was born on March 16, 1949 in Belo Horizonte, Minas Gerais. She died on February 13, 2019 in the same city. She graduated in Social Sciences and obtained her master's degree in Political Science, both from UFMG. During her time in France, she was a professor at UFMG, on a doctorate leave, at the beginning. She spent more time in France than tolerated by UFMG, losing her link with the institution in 1983. Back to Brazil, in 1984, she worked for a few years at the Fundação de Desenvolvimento da Pesquisa [Research Development Foundation] (FUNDEP / UFMG), advising researchers; in 1997, she returned to UFMG as a professor for the Psychology department (LIMA, 2002a). She retired in 2013 because of health issues. Her thesis in Social Psychology submitted at the University of Paris VII in 1983 (*La construction discursive du peuple brésilien dans le discours du Premier Mai de Getúlio Vargas*), guided by Pêcheux, was published in Brazil, in 1990, by Editora da Unicamp [Unicamp Printing Press] – with the translation into Portuguese: *A construção discursiva do povo brasileiro: os discursos de 1º de maio de Getúlio Vargas [The Discursive Construction of Brazilian People: the Speeches of May the 1st by Getúlio Vargas]* made by the author herself (LIMA, 1990).

During her stay in France, Lima worked between 1978 and 1979, at the *Association pour la Recherche et l'Intervention Psychosociologiques*, ARIP, (the organization with which Célio Garcia had established contact years before) as writing

ela nos deu acesso a textos de Jean-Jacques Courtine, Michel Plon, Paul Henry, Jacqueline Léon, Régine Robin e a diversos de Michel Pêcheux.”

secretary. She also worked at *Université de Nancy II*, in 1978, teaching introductory economics. From 1979 to 1980, she worked at *Centre Culturel Latino Américain*, CETECLAM (LIMA, 2002a).

In addition to her thesis, Lima also published an article in which she discusses methodological issues of Discourse Analysis (LÉON, LIMA, 1979), two other texts in which she resumes some of the discussions developed in her PhD (LIMA, 1998; 1999), and an introductory article to Discourse Analysis (LIMA, 2003), in which she addresses the differences between Discourse Analysis and Content Analysis. She published a second book, *As caminhadas de Auguste de Saint-Hilaire pelo Brasil e Paraguai* [*Auguste de Saint-Hilaire's Walks around Brazil and Paraguay*] (LIMA, 2002b), resulting largely from the research she conducted in the years she lived in France.²⁵ She also translated Dominique Maingueneau's book *Termos-chave da análise do discurso* [*Key Terms of Discourse Analysis*] (MAINGUENEAU, 1998).

Although Lima's academic production is not extensive, it is significant to understand the discussions that constituted the field of Discourse Analysis. In her first article, published in partnership with the linguist Jacqueline Léon in 1979 (*Études de certains aspects du fonctionnement de l'Analyse Automatique du Discours: Traitement des syntagmes nominaux en expressions figées et segmentation d'un corpus en séquences discursives autonomes*),²⁶ the issue of corpus segmentation is addressed, a central theme for the Pecheutian project in that period. It is appropriate to make a digression to the methodological discussion in which the article is located.

Automatic Discourse Analysis (hereinafter ADA69) was a methodological device conceived as a set of computerized procedures articulated with a theory of discourse, with the purpose of being a reading machine that would pluck the question of reading from the subjectivity problem. This project, from Pêcheux's doctoral thesis²⁷ was published as a

²⁵ There were some other papers in the academic production, as it can be verified in her *Currículo Lattes*, but those do not directly concern Discourse Analysis.

²⁶ Free translation: "Studies on Certain Aspects of the Functioning of Automatic Discourse Analysis: Treatment of the Nouns in Fixed Expressions and Segmentation in a Corpus in Autonomous Discursive Sequences."

²⁷ There is a certain information gap regarding Pêcheux's formation. Henry (1997) states that Pêcheux's thesis was in Social Psychology – HENRY, P. Theoretical issues in Pêcheux's Automatic discourse analysis. In: GADET, F; HAK, T. (orgs.). *Automatic Discourse Analysis*. Amsterdam/Atlanta: Editions Rodopi, 1995. pp.21-40) –, while Maldidier (2003) only comments that Pêcheux obtained aggregation in Philosophy in 1963 at the *École Normale Supérieure* and that his first book, Automatic Discourse Analysis, published in 1969, would be the result of his doctoral thesis. A list of theses put forward in 1968 in France, presented in the *Revue Française de Sociologie*, published that same year, states that Pêcheux put forward

book in 1969 and marks the beginning of what, after more than a decade, has established itself as an academic subject called Discourse Analysis. The construction of ADA69 is part of the space of structuralism in the 1960s around the question of ideology, in particular, of how ideology crosses and constitutes discourses.²⁸ This initial support in linguistic structuralism aimed to provide “the scientific means to displace the question from domain of the quantitative to that of the qualitative, from a statistical description to a quasi-algebraic theory of structures, and at the same time means to reject the ‘anything goes’ attitude of ‘literary reading’” (PÊCHEUX, *et al*, 1995 [1982], p.190).²⁹

The corpus treatment procedure in the ADA69 had a manual phase, which consisted of dividing it into maximum units of comparison within a corpus, that is, in Autonomous Discursive Sequences (ADS). The ADSs are a set of segmentations extracted from cutouts and frames made on a textual surface in order to identify the semantic domains that are mobilized in the sequences for the production of meaning (PÊCHEUX, *et al*, 1995, p.193). The ADSs have a phrase as a minimum non-segmentable unit. When selecting an ADS, the continuity of the discursive thread to which it was linked was broken, allowing it to be treated by the algorithm as an independent entity – which is why the discursive sequences received the adjective “autonomous.” This segmentation process was carried out according to linguistic criteria: “based on a careful linguistic analysis of inter-sentence links (anaphora, ellipsis, connectors) and questions of mode, aspect, tense and determination.”³⁰ (PÊCHEUX, *et al*, 1995, p.193) The ADSs were defined by their thematic unit, respecting the following criteria for nonsegmentation of a sequence:

Take a sentence i. If the next sentence j begins with connector such as ‘but’, there is no segmentation; there is a thematic continuity between i

his thesis in the Literature course: “Pêcheux, Michel. Vers l’analyse automatique du discours. 3rd cycle, Lettres, Paris, November 13. President du Jury: M. Culioli.” (DU COLOMBIER, 1968, p.563).

²⁸ The political and theoretical horizon implied in this method was twofold: that of historical materialism animated by Louis Althusser from his reinterpretation of Marx and the psychoanalysis of Jacques Lacan. Scientific practice and political activism at that time had blurred borders. Let us remember that France was still agitated by the events of May 1968 and that the Human Sciences were under the influence of structuralism. In the social field, problems related to inequality and discrimination were growing in Western Europe. The Soviet bloc’s bureaucratic conduct by the State no longer supported the idea of a Communist International. For Pêcheux, a Marxist linked to Louis Althusser’s group, the political issue was central. Hence his theorizing about ideology and affiliation with the French Communist Party.

²⁹ PÊCHEUX, M. *et al*. Theory, Procedures, Findings and Perspectives. In: GADET, F; HAK, T. (orgs.). *Automatic Discourse Analysis*. Amsterdam/Atlanta: Editions Rodopi, 1995, pp.189-213.

³⁰ For reference see footnote 29.

and j, and sentences i and j belong to the same autonomous discursive sequence.

If the sentence j contains an anaphora whose referente is presente in sentence i (a simple anaphora such as ‘John ... He’), sentences i and j belong to the same autonomous discursive sequence to the extent that the anaphora establishes a thematic unity between them (PÊCHEUX, *et al*, 1995, p.193).³¹

In this text, signed by Michel Pêcheux, Jacqueline Léon, Simone Bonnafous, and Jean-Marie Marandin, mention is made of the article by Léon and Lima (1979) in relation to the issue of anaphors:

This new condition on discursive non-segmentation in the case of simple anaphora is a rectification of the propositions presented in the article by J. Leon and M.E. Torres-Lima, which did not take into account the definition of ADS as a thematic unit (PÊCHEUX, *et al*, 1995, p.193).³²

According to the authors, Léon and Lima (1979) did not aim at understanding ADS as a thematic unit in which anaphors establish a line of continuity with the aforementioned that would not allow segmentation to be applied.³³ It is also interesting to highlight in this quote the use of the term rectification. The criticism made to Léon and Lima (1979) appears as a kind of complement to what was said by the authors, which is indicative of the collective enterprise that was led by Pêcheux.³⁴ The advances and rectifications in theorizing and in the analytical device were substantially done together.³⁵

³¹ In Portuguese: “Seja uma frase i, se a frase j seguinte começa por um conector de junção (por exemplo “mas”), não se segmenta; há continuidade temática de i a j, e as frases i e j pertencem a mesma SDA. “Se a frase j contém uma anáfora cujo referente está contido na frase i (tipo anáfora simples: João... Ele), as frases i e j pertencem a mesma SDA, na medida em que a anáfora assegura uma unidade temática entre as frases i e j.”

³² The excerpt above has been deleted from the aforementioned English edition; for reference see footnote 29. In Portuguese: “Essa nova condição sobre a não-segmentação discursiva no caso da anáfora simples constitui uma retificação das proposições apresentadas no artigo de J. Leon e M. E. Torres-Lima, que não levavam em conta a definição da SDA enquanto unidade temática.”

³³ This question of whether segmenting anaphoric connections is taken up by Lima (1990) in her thesis. She makes the case that there are situations in which the anaphor allows segmentation – when, for example, the restoration of the anaphor provides autonomy to the sentence without the reference to the aforementioned becoming vague.

³⁴ Let us remember that this text by Pêcheux, jointly signed with his collaborators, marks an important phase of criticism and rectification. The text distinguishes between the device ADA69 and the ADA80, the latter would mark a new phase of the method. We will not delve into the distinctions between the two procedures, we just point out that they have as a continuity line the (re)construction of the discursive trajectories that constitute a corpus.

³⁵ In the summary of the same article, which was deleted in the Portuguese translation, it is pointed out what each of the authors performed in the text: Pêcheux traced the history of the ADA69 method; Léon

In summary, the authors examine, in the article, the binary relations that associate, through enunciative connectors, the elementary statements that make up a set of ADS, as well as also analyze the equivalence classes (semantic domains) present in the sequences belonging to a same corpus. In this way, the morph-syntactic categories of statements are explored and the relations of semantic domains present in them, marking a given discursive path. In addition, the segmentation criteria of a corpus in ADA69 are also presented (LÉON, LIMA, 1979). Pêcheux (1981) also recommends this very text in a bibliography on Discourse Analysis in France.³⁶

After Pêcheux's death in 1983, and the emptying of the group he led, his name and work were progressively left aside, so that today Pêcheux is no longer a central figure in the analytical framework of the researchers who make the Discourse Analysis in France. However, his work is still a strong reference in the studies on discourse in Latin America, especially in Brazil (FERREIRA, 2003).³⁷

The tradition established in our country takes as a starting point the studies developed by Eni Orlandi. She tells us that her first contact with Pêcheux's work took place in the late 1960s, when she was in a study season in France (ORLANDI, 2006). In 1977, her first publication on Discourse Analysis came out and, in 1983, her first book (The language and its functioning: the forms of discourse) that gathers several articles based on Pêcheux's works (ORLANDI, 1983). Orlandi would become, from then on, the initiator and main diffuser of Discourse Analysis in Brazil, being also responsible for the translation, and coordination of the translations, into Portuguese of almost all of Pêcheux's texts. In addition, the author was a central figure in the institutionalization of Discourse Analysis as an academic discipline in the country, forming generations of researchers.

presented the ADA69 method; Bonnafous presented results of a research that she developed on socialist discourse at that moment; Marandin presented some results and deficiencies of ADA69 (PÊCHEUX *et al.*, 1982). The correction about the text by Léon and Lima (1979) is contained in the section written by Léon.

³⁶ The text in question is *Analyse de discours et informatique*. There is a translation into Portuguese (PÊCHEUX, 2016c [1981]), but the section of bibliographic references has been deleted.

³⁷ Discourse analysis inspired by Pêcheux is widespread in Brazil, especially in the courses in Linguistics, Letters and Language Sciences. In spite of this, the methodological discussion of the automatic (computerized) dimension of the analysis did not develop in the country, but took a closer contour to Linguistics. The main centers that bring together researchers, events, and publications related to the discipline are UNESP in Araraquara, UNICAMP (Campinas), and UFRGS in Porto Alegre (MACHADO, 2008).

In this context, the narrative about the history of Discourse Analysis in Brazil is based on the studies developed by Orlandi. In the cutouts and montages that were established in the construction of this discipline, Lima's work and the relationship between the Social Psychology Sector at UFMG and Pêcheux did not enter into this plot. The assessments about the field made by Ferreira (2003) and Orlandi (2003) do not mention the case of Lima. In the PhD thesis by Teixeira Machado (2014) on the route of Discourse Analysis in Brazil, reference to the case is also not made. Not even in the thought-provoking set of interviews organized by Oliveira and Nogueira (2019), which gathers statements from important researchers who worked directly or indirectly with Pêcheux, the story of Lima is not mentioned. We found only in an article by Baldini and Zoppi-Fontana (2015) a brief allusion to Lima, in a footnote:

It is worth remembering, here, the works, in the 70s, of Carlos Henrique Escobar, and Célio Garcia, whose student, Maria Emilia Amarante Torres Lima, went in 1973 to do a doctorate with Michel Pêcheux. For several reasons, these authors, however, did not lead Discourse Analysis to a consistent institutionalization and disciplinarization, nor were they responsible for the formation of researchers who acted in a relevant way in the area of Discourse Analysis (BALDINI, ZOPPI-FONTANA, 2015, p.4).³⁸

As you can see, the reference to Lima is put on a smaller degree.³⁹ It is true that she did not participate in the process of institutionalization of the area in the country –

³⁸ In Portuguese: “Vale lembrar, aqui, os trabalhos, na década de 70, de Carlos Henrique Escobar, e de Célio Garcia, cuja aluna, Maria Emilia Amarante Torres Lima, foi em 1973 fazer um doutorado com Michel Pêcheux. Por diversas razões, tais autores, no entanto, não conduziram a Análise de Discurso a uma institucionalização e a uma disciplinarização consistentes, nem foram responsáveis pela formação de pesquisadores que atuassem de forma relevante na área de Análise de Discurso.”

³⁹ Carlos Henrique Escobar's case is well documented and explored in Kogawa's doctoral thesis (2012). Escobar translated one of Pêcheux's articles in 1972. In addition, he wrote books and articles with themes similar to those of Pêcheux's. Another author who also developed research with Pêcheux's works in his theoretical horizon – which is not mentioned by Baldini and Zoppi-Fontana (2015) – was Haqira Osakabe. In 1975, after a period in France, he defended his doctoral thesis in Linguistics, at UNICAMP, having ADA as one of the underpins. The thesis was published in a book by Kairos, in 1979, under the title *Argumentação e discurso político [Argumentation and Political Discourse]* (OSAKABE, 1979). The author also had as a corpus the speeches of Getúlio Vargas, as in the thesis of Lima (1990). Osakabe (1979) introduces the integrative perspective of politics with argumentation, being one of the first researchers to make use of the works of Perelman and Pêcheux in Brazil. Together with Carlos Vogt, Carlos Franchi, and Rodolfo Ilari, in the early 1970s, Osakabe was part of a group of professors at UNICAMP who spent a season in France for academic training. Upon returning to Campinas, the group established the foundations of the Linguistics Department, which, alongside Economics and Social Sciences, comprised the Humanities area at UNICAMP, located at the Philosophy and Human Sciences Institute, the embryo that would make 1977, the Instituto de Estudos de Linguagem, IEL (Institute of Language Studies). This group was responsible

because she was in France until 1984 and she lost her position as a professor for UFMG. However, it is not possible to understand from this why her work and intellectual trajectory are not presented in the history of the discipline. Moreover, it becomes difficult to understand two other things: the fact that her thesis was published through Eni Orlandi⁴⁰ (LIMA, 1990), in the same year that two of Pêcheux's most important works (*For an Automatic Analysis of the Discourse*;⁴¹ *Discourse: Structure or Event*) were released in Brazil, and Pêcheux's reason for citing it in at least three articles (PÊCHEUX, 1981; 1982; 2016a [1983]).

It is in the critique of populism that Pêcheux mentions Lima's thesis work. In analyzing what he calls the *orthodox Marxist metaphysics of class realism*, which permeated the left of his time, Pêcheux (2016a) shows how the use of populism in political practice proved to be something disastrous and harmful to people's and workers' movements, taking as an example the case of Stalinism, which was a form of state populism. He argues that this metaphysics did not take into account the contradictory and ambiguous character of the struggles for ideological displacement present in the most different popular movements. The objects of these struggles would be paradoxical "under the name of People, law, work, gender, life, science, nature, peace, freedom..."⁴² (PÊCHEUX, 2016a, p.115), functioning "in mobile force relations, in confusing changes, which lead to extremely unstable agreements and oppositions."⁴³ (PÊCHEUX, 2016a, p.116) He will cite as an example of these ambiguous relations the policy developed by Getúlio Vargas in Brazil:

for introducing contemporary Linguistics studies in Brazilian universities, in addition to forming the first Linguistics department created in Brazil (LEVY, 2006).

⁴⁰ In this regard, Lima reports the following: "In a meeting with Eni Orlandi, in August 1989, we talked about Discourse Analysis and, particularly, about the works of Michel Pêcheux. I was then presented with the possibility of my 3rd cycle thesis work, directed by Michel Pêcheux, to be translated for publication." [*Em um encontro com Eni Orlandi, em agosto de 1989, falamos sobre Análise do Discurso e, particularmente, sobre os trabalhos de Michel Pêcheux. Foi-me então apresentada a possibilidade de meu trabalho de tese de 3.º ciclo, dirigido por Michel Pêcheux, ser traduzido para publicação.*] (LIMA, 1990, p.9).

⁴¹ This book and other texts by Pêcheux were collected and published in Brazil under the title *Por uma análise automática do discurso: uma introdução à obra de Michel Pêcheux*. The equivalent in English publication is HENRY, P. Theoretical Issues in Pêcheux's Automatic Discourse Analysis. In: GADET, F; HAK, T. (orgs.). *Automatic Discourse Analysis*. Amsterdam/Atlanta: Editions Rodopi, 1995, pp.21-40.

⁴² In Portuguese: "sob o nome de Povo, direito, trabalho, gênero, vida, ciência, natureza, paz, liberdade..."

⁴³ In Portuguese: "em relações de forças móveis, em mudanças confusas, que levam a concordâncias e oposições extremamente instáveis."

This “Freedom” of leaving the movement of the masses, of the people acting on their own – that is, leaving all attempts to the communities, whose paradoxical mechanisms Faye analyzed – was it not fostered by the historical elimination of certain currents (e.g. anarchism) the strategic orientation of the movement of workers? Later historical gains from Anarchism through the political form of state populism can be well observed in the Vargas period, in Brazil. In this period, the father’s position (Provider and educator) is related to the greatest benefactor of the nation and people (Here I rely on the work of ME Torres-Lima) (PÊCHEUX, 2016a, p.116).⁴⁴

It is in the analysis of the political effects of populism and its discursive functioning that we will find the great point of theoretical and political interlocution between the two researchers: Pêcheux, in his critique of existing socialism, and Lima, in his analysis of the discursive construction of the term ‘people’ in Getúlio Vargas’ speeches. In short, it is in this confluence where the study prepared by Lima in her PhD is located – which we will start presenting in the next section.

4 The Discursive Construction of the Brazilian People: Lines of Continuity and Ruptures in the Discourse Analysis

In her thesis, published in a book in Brazil, Lima (1990) analyzes the functioning of the speeches of May the 1st by Getúlio Vargas and how, through them, Vargas developed a particular notion of people. The work is divided into three chapters, in addition to the introduction, conclusion and annexes: first, a presentation is made of the historical elements referring to the labor movement and Brazilian populism; then the set of speeches of May the 1st by Vargas is presented, divided into his two periods of government; finally, the elements that are implied and constructed when Vargas uses the term people in these speeches are shown.

The discursive material on which the author focused is composed of eleven speeches given by Vargas: seven as a dictator, during the Estado Novo (1938-1944), and

⁴⁴ In Portuguese: “Essa ‘Liberdade’ de deixar a movimentação das massas, do povo agir por conta própria – isto é, deixar todas as tentativas às comunidades, cujos mecanismos paradoxais Faye analisou – não foi fomentada pela eliminação histórica de determinadas correntes (p.ex: o anarquismo) da orientação estratégica da movimentação dos trabalhadores? Ganhos posteriores históricos do Anarquismo por meio da forma política do populismo de estado pode ser bem observado no período de Vargas, no Brasil. Nesse período a posição do pai (Provedor e educador) fica relacionada ao maior benfeitor da nação e povo (Aqui eu me apoio nos trabalhos de M.E. Torres-Lima)” (PÊCHEUX, 2016a, p.116).

four as elected president (1951-1954). These speeches served to compose the corpus of analysis, being segmented into Autonomous Discursive Sequences:

At the beginning, we intended to submit our corpus to the Discourse Analysis device ADA69. [...] the questioning of the ADA69 device resulted in us abandoning a systematic treatment of our discursive material. Since we had already prepared this material in accordance with the requirements of the ADA69 method, we present it in the form of Autonomous Discursive Sequences (ADSs) (LIMA, 1990, p.11).⁴⁵

To better understand this quote, it is necessary to remember that, for the researcher in Discourse Analysis, the analytical work had the following steps: “segmentation into autonomous discursive sequence, manual syntactic analysis and automatic discourse analysis [...] The input for this work consists of the list of domains (and hyperdomains) corresponding to each corpus, and of the relations of dependency which links the various domains”⁴⁶ (PÊCHEUX, *et al*, 1995, p.203).⁴⁷ Lima (1990) breaks up with the traditional approach to the ADA69 method. She keeps the use of segmentations and part of the syntactic analysis (anaphoric relations and interfrastic links), but does not work with the automatic (computerized) dimension of the method.

The problem of interfrastic threads is fundamental in the analysis developed by Lima (1990). They, together with the anaphors, provide the chain of discourses, producing the continuous thread of what is said (the discursive thread) together with other linguistic elements (presupposition, anaphorization, connectors, etc.) and extralinguistic elements (socio-historical conditions of a discourse production). In this sense, the work consists of “pinching the discursive thread and the discursive chaining operators” (LIMA, 1990, p.21).⁴⁸ This method of analysis is anchored in the understanding of the discourse as “a space of reformulations, of chains, of dispersions, of repetitions, of disconnections” (LIMA, 1990, p.21).⁴⁹ As a result, the discursive thread is not seen as something linear,

⁴⁵ In Portuguese: “Tínhamos no início a intenção de submeter nosso corpus ao dispositivo de Análise de Discurso AAD69. [...] o questionamento ao dispositivo AAD69 teve como consequência para nós o abandono de um tratamento sistemático de nosso material discursivo. Dado que já tínhamos preparado este material em conformidade com as exigências do método AAD69, nós o apresentamos sob a forma de Sequências Discursivas Autônomas (SDAs).”

⁴⁶ For reference, see footnote 29.

⁴⁷ For reference, see footnote 29.

⁴⁸ In Portuguese: “pinçar o fio discursivo e os operadores de encadeamento discursivos.”

⁴⁹ In Portuguese: “um espaço de reformulações, de encadeamentos, de dispersões, de repetições, de desconexões.”

but as a result of the intertwining of several pieces of thread, forming a speech. These threads can be introduced at different times – being also interrupted and relaunched – in a statement and “can be ‘pinched’ in the location of anaphors, ellipse, lexical repetition, chaining operators between phrases – connectors and subordinations – of displacements of words and even in the absence of explicit connection marks⁵⁰.”⁵¹ (LIMA, 1990, p.21) The reference points for the discursive analysis of the sequences will be Oswald Ducrot’s studies on presupposition, Pêcheux’s analyzes on appositive and restrictive relative clauses, and Antoine Culioli’s theory of enunciative operations (LIMA, 1990).

If this readjustment removes part of the analytical device of ADA69, on the other hand, it allows the author to undertake a historical analysis of the conditions that made possible the emergence of Vargas’ populist discourse. The other in Vargas’ speech (the workers) is represented in an imaginary relationship. In other words, in the process of elaborating the speech, the image that he attributes to himself and to the other, as well as the image that he makes of his own place and the place of the other, is worked on – but without us ever knowing how this other worked these relationships. Lima (1990) is concerned with understanding how this imaginary relationship works for Vargas himself and produces the meanings of his political practice.

Some words mark an important pole in the Vargasian Discourse: nation / people / workers. They, which were present in the political practice of the anarchist and labor’ movement, are recalled and reworked through populism, intermingling and entangling themselves with such intensity that the notions of nation and people are no longer distinguishable in the words of Vargas. The author analyzes how these (ideological) forces are mobilized in these speeches, seeking “to hear what is openly said and what is not said, within what is said” (LIMA, 1990, p.23).⁵² For this, she studies the historical period that precedes populism in Brazil, placing it in relation to the Brazilian labor movement.

⁵⁰ Given the theoretical linkage of Discourse Analysis to historical materialism, “discourse represents within the functioning of the language effects of ideological struggle and, conversely, it manifests the existence of linguistic materiality within ideology.” [“o discurso representa no interior do funcionamento da língua efeitos da luta ideológica e, inversamente, ele manifesta a existência da materialidade linguística no interior da ideologia.”] (LIMA, 1990, p.22) In other words, every discursive process belongs to the field of ideological and political class struggle.

⁵¹ In Portuguese: “podem ser ‘pinçados’ na localização das anáforas, da elipse, da repetição léxica, dos operadores de encadeamento entre as frases – conectores e subordinações –, dos deslocamentos de palavras e mesmo na ausência de marcas explícitas de conexões.”

⁵² In Portuguese: “ouvir o que é expressamente dito e o que não é dito, no interior do que é dito.”

The labor movement that was formed in Brazil between the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century was anarchist in its origin – the Communist Party would only appear in 1922 –, being “a resistance to capitalist exploitation and to a strongly repressive State for not being a strong state” (LIMA, 1990, p.29).⁵³ However, the models of laborer’s struggles brought by anarchists, immigrants of European origin, were not always understood by the peasants who arrived in the cities: “for them, living in the city was a great achievement and the boss appeared above all as a protector (a new city colonel)”⁵⁴ (LIMA, 1990, p.29), with the dominant ideology of the Brazilian rural environment, *coronelism* and paternalism, rooted in the social formation of the laborer. This became a major barrier to anarchism:

They “dreamed” of destroying the state and “building another world” of a perfect society ... Despite this, or because of this, this refusal of reformism will give way to the “revolutionary” movement of 1930, and will gradually produce the political effect of “populism”: “the good shepherd” that anarchists feared so much within the labor movement will no longer be the “doctor”, but the one who will later present himself as the “father of the poor,” the “father of the people,” GETULIO VARGAS. Vargas will fill the position of “redeemer of the Brazilian people” (LIMA, 1990, p.30; author’s highlights).⁵⁵

For the author, several meanings are intertwined in the term populism: political phenomenon; political action; political regime; party politics; populist leaders – or even the context in which this political effect took place (LIMA, 1990). In the Brazilian case, populism is linked to the urban masses, mobilized by industrialization or expelled by the agrarian sector, with the economic development of the 1930s.⁵⁶ This period will mark the controlled participation of the masses in the political process: controlled urban union structure. In synthesis, Populism expresses the sprouting of the popular classes in the

⁵³ In Portuguese: “uma resistência à exploração capitalista e a um Estado fortemente repressivo por não ser um Estado forte.”

⁵⁴ In Portuguese: “para eles, viver na cidade era uma grande conquista e o patrão aparecia sobretudo como um protetor (um novo coronel da cidade).”

⁵⁵ In Portuguese: “Eles ‘sonhavam’ em destruir o Estado e ‘construir um *outro* mundo’ uma sociedade perfeita [...] Apesar disso, ou por causa disso, esta recusa do reformismo dará lugar ao movimento ‘revolucionário’ de 1930, e produzirá progressivamente o efeito político do ‘populismo’: ‘o bom pastor’ que os anarquistas temiam tanto no seio do movimento operário não será mais o ‘doutor’, mas aquele que se apresentará mais tarde como o ‘pai dos pobres’, o ‘pai do povo’, GETÚLIO VARGAS. Vargas preencherá o lugar de ‘redentor do povo brasileiro’.”

⁵⁶ The author emphasizes, nevertheless, that the material and ideological conditions of populism were already present before this period.

center of the urban and industrial development of the period and the demand of certain political groups to incorporate the masses to the political game.

Lima (1990) will take as the North Star for her analysis the thesis of the political scientist Francisco Weffort, who affirms that the hallmark of Populism is the personalization of power, associating an image, somewhat real and mystical, that the sovereignty of the State takes place in the ruler over society, being the participation of the urban popular masses the only source of legitimacy for the State itself. This ambiguous relationship between love for the people and government functions will find, for the author, its point of paradigmatic manifestation in Vargas.

With the failure of the Aliança Nacional Libertadora [National Liberating Alliance], led by Prestes in 1935, and the fear generated by the Cohen Plan in 1937 – a supposed plan of communist invasion of Brazil, which years later would prove to be false –, Vargas will find the pretext for the *coup d'état*. With the support of the Military Forces, the extreme integralist right-wing and parts of the lieutenants who had supported him in the 1930 revolution, Vargas installed, on November 10, 1937, the dictatorship of the Estado Novo (New State), which would last until 1945, the year in which he would be deposed. Vargas would return in 1951, this time elected by the masses, taking on a new guise:

Vargas will become increasingly progressive and even revolutionary; he wants Brazil's economic independence against foreign capitalism, he opposes the foreign party that constitutes the "non-national" industrial bourgeoisie, directly linked to American imperialism (LIMA, 1990, p.68).⁵⁷

This policy, however, did not last long. At the end of his term, the country's economic and political problems became more acute. Several political forces revolted against Vargas. With the support increasingly reduced, their withdrawal becomes once again eminent: "Vargas will make this a personal matter to the point of putting his life at stake, and of losing it ..." (LIMA, 1990, p.69).⁵⁸

⁵⁷ In Portuguese: "Vargas se tornará cada vez mais progressista e até mesmo revolucionário; ele quer a independência econômica do Brasil contra o capitalismo externo, opõe-se ao partido do estrangeiro que constitui a burguesia industrial 'não-nacional', diretamente ligada ao imperialismo americano."

⁵⁸ In Portuguese: "Vargas fará disso uma questão pessoal a ponto de aí por em jogo a sua vida, e de perdê-la..."

It is precisely in this ambiguous and enigmatic figure of Getúlio Vargas that populism would find its paradigmatic moment in the celebrations of May the 1st. Before the date was transformed by the populist state into a holiday, it marked a day of the struggle of the labor against capital. Vargas, however, would transform this signification. In 1938, he will address the workers for the first time on that date. May the 1st will be retaken as a day to commemorate the cooperation between social classes with the State, in an official celebration of the collaboration between labor and capital. In view of the symbolic value of the date, Vargas introduces a new relationship between the state and good workers. Vargas, pedagogically, teaches how workers should conduct their struggles: within the state apparatus, the revolution being something undesirable. It will also explain what a worker is, what a Brazilian worker is and that they are one. The State exercises a tutelary function over the workers, being it (the State or Vargas?) the one who guarantees the conquests of rights, in a nutshell: “what I gave you, it was you who conquered ...” (LIMA, 1990, p.82).⁵⁹ Here is the ambiguity of the Vargasian Discourse: it does not allow workers to make their own demands or organize outside the State. Vargasian populism, in this context, can be synthesized by the tutelary action of the State and by the collaboration between employees and employers.⁶⁰

Having already traveled the discursive path of Vargas, the author will address the extracts in which the term people appears. It will be the speech of 1938 that will occupy an important position in this analysis, because it is the introductory point of *the mise-en-scène* of Vargas’s meeting (the State) with the workers (the People). Interestingly, this will be the only speech of May the 1st in which the term ‘people’ does not appear explicitly. It is precisely in this speech that there is also the lexicon under which Vargas would elaborate his notion of people. The following terms weave the plot: work; worker; collaboration, laborer; country; Brazil; Minimum wage law; social classes/classes; employees and employers; aspiration; readjustment (LIMA, 1990). An ADS that

⁵⁹ In Portuguese: “o que eu dei a vocês, foram vocês que conquistaram...”

⁶⁰ “And perhaps this is the author’s most lapidary paragraph about how Vargas’ populism has entered our social formation: “Having constituted ‘the Brazilian people’ as ‘a mass’, denying the working class their existence outside of himself or the State, Vargas only made it politically ‘weak’; and this weakness of the working class will be decisive for the sequence of Brazilian history.” [“E talvez este seja o parágrafo mais lapidar da autora sobre como populismo de Vargas se entranhou em nossa formação social: “Tendo constituído ‘o povo brasileiro’ como ‘uma massa’, negando à classe operária sua existência fora dele mesmo ou do Estado, Vargas só a tornou politicamente ‘fraca’; e esta fraqueza da classe operária será decisiva para a sequência da história brasileira.”] (LIMA, 1990, p.114).

functions as a link of the lexical unit that directly and indirectly intersects these terms is as follows: “It is necessary the collaboration of one and the others spontaneous effort and in common work for the sake (of harmony between employees and employers), of the cooperation and of the reconciliation of all social classes” (LIMA, 1990, p.119).⁶¹

In the speeches that correspond to the Estado Novo period, Vargas builds (his) people, while in the speeches of his return from the 1950s he will build the Brazilian People *speaking to the people about the (Brazilian) people* (LIMA, 1990). People that he created and made exist in himself. In other words, the existence of the Brazilian People itself is preceded by the state argumentation, being inconceivable for Vargas a people outside himself: “The idea that there might be another organizer of the Brazilian people was evidently unbearable for Vargas; it is indeed his unthinkable...”⁶² (LIMA, 1990, p.180).

In summary, it will be through the populism developed by Vargas that different lines of continuity in this form of government will be inscribed in Brazilian political history, not only in the two subsequent governments to that of Vargas⁶³ (Juscelino Kubitschek and João Goulart), but it will also find lines of rhetorical continuity in the military dictatorship and lulismo – which does not erase, in turn, the great differences between these political regimes (AVELAR, 2019). In these regimes, says Avelar (2019), the hyperbole of *Brasil Grande* (Great Brazil) was mobilized. In this image, the notions of nation and people are merged, so that it is in the greatness of Brazil that the greatness of its people is expressed. Vargas would, therefore, mark the beginning of a discursive practice that would find the reproduction of its political effects for decades. Lima’s (1990) work, in this sense, helps us to understand some of the lines of continuity and rupture that cross the discursive construction of Brazilian politics.

⁶¹ In Portuguese: “É preciso a colaboração de uns e outros no esforço espontâneo e no trabalho comum em bem (da harmonia entre empregados e empregadores), da cooperação e do conagraçamento de todas as classes sociais.”

⁶² In Portuguese: “A ideia de que possa existir um outro organizador do povo brasileiro era evidentemente insuportável para Vargas; ela é mesmo seu impensável...”

⁶³ “In the extreme case, we could say that populism has structured itself around an ‘imaginary relationship’ between the state and the popular masses (and in particular ‘the workers’, that means, first of all, ‘the laborers’); Vargas I (the ‘nutrient father’), Vargas II (the ‘pedagogue father’); Kubitschek (‘the brother of the workers’) and Goulart (‘the son of Vargas’, and therefore Vargas III).” [“No caso extremo, poderíamos dizer que o populismo se estruturou em torno de uma ‘relação imaginária’ entre o Estado e as massas populares (e em particular ‘os trabalhadores’, que dizer, antes de tudo, ‘os operários’); Vargas I (o ‘pai nutriente’), Vargas II (o ‘pai pedagogo’); Kubitschek (‘o irmão dos trabalhadores’) e Goulart (‘o filho de Vargas’, e por conseguinte Vargas III).”] (LIMA, 1990, p.182).

Final Considerations: A Memory that Gleams in a Moment of Danger

In our research, we promoted a rescue of the intellectual trajectory of Maria Emilia Amarante Torres Lima. As already said at another moment in this text, when narrating a memory, we are not simply describing a past, but articulating it to the present. Our work, therefore, is not simply about returning a memory to Discourse Analysis, but of allowing it to be inscribed and have a meaning in this story.

In 2019, the year in which this text is written, the 50th anniversary of the publication of Michel Pêcheux's Automatic Discourse Analysis is celebrated. Wouldn't it also be time to revisit how the narrative of this discipline was developed in Brazil? Another question that remains to be answered is why Lima's work continues in oblivion in Discourse Analysis. The trace that is inscribed in this memory gleams in an instant of danger: at the moment when the silence of this important academic trajectory is maintained, an indigence of memory is perpetuated.

To say that Discourse Analysis has a history that precedes its institutionalization movement does not consist in breaking down the theoretical building on which it was built, but in showing that it is, in its genesis, a fundamentally undisciplinatory enterprise. Space of theoretical movement. And it is precisely in this sense that Lima's work is a milestone. And not only that. She also invites us to get lost in the waters of discourse, to join the adventure of fishing its meanings and functioning:

This is the discourse: ambiguous, treacherous, faithful, flawed, full of enigmas, we seek in it a coherent sense or not, we want to unravel its secret, "understand it," seize it, make it prey to our intellect. But the discourse fades, takes its course, and it seems that our resources become powerless before their sovereignty. What can we do? How about, instead of mastering it, competing with its grandeur, navigating these meaningful waters, interrupting, breaking its course, following its movement, as researchers always on the move? (LIMA, 2003, p.87).⁶⁴

⁶⁴ In Portuguese: "É assim o discurso: ambíguo, traiçoeiro, fiel, com falhas, cheio de enigmas, procuramos nele um sentido coerente ou não, queremos desvendar seu segredo, 'compreendê-lo', apreendê-lo, torná-lo presa de nosso intelecto. Mas o discurso se esvai, toma seu curso, e parece que nossos recursos se tornam impotentes diante de sua soberania. Fazer o quê? Que tal, ao invés de dominá-lo, competir com sua imponência, navegarmos nessas águas significantes, interromper, romper seu curso, acompanhar seu movimento, como pesquisadores sempre em movimento?" (LIMA, 2003, p.87).

Let oneself dive into the discourse, play with the words and politics that form in the foam of its waters, rescue stories and memories that come in the balance of its waves. Wouldn't that be a metaphor for the speech analyst's reading-writing movement?

REFERENCES

ABREU, M. A. *Uma história do setor de psicologia social da UFMG: invenções, teorias e práticas*, 2012, 139 fl. Dissertação (Mestrado em Linguística) – Instituto de Psicologia da Universidade Estadual do Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, 2012.

AVELAR, I. A hipérbole e o Brasil grande, do varguismo ao lulismo. *Estado de S. Paulo*, Estado da Arte, São Paulo, 07 abr. 2019. Disponível em: <https://cultura.estadao.com.br/blogs/estado-da-arte/a-hiperbole-e-o-brasil-grande-do-varguismo-ao-lulismo/> . Acesso em: 16 jul. 2019.

BALDINI, L. J. S.; ZOPPI-FONTANA, M. G. A Análise do Discurso no Brasil. *Décalages*, v. 1, n. 4, p.1-20, 2015. Disponível: <https://scholar.oxy.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1082&context=decalages> . Acesso em: 15 abr. 2019.

CAMPOS, R. H. F.; GARCIA, C. Setor de Psicologia Social da Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais (UFMG) – 1964. In: JACÓ-VILELA, A. M. (org.). *Dicionário histórico de instituições de psicologia no Brasil*. Rio de Janeiro: Imago; Brasília, DF: CFP, 2011, p.406-408.

CODATO, A. N. O golpe de 1964 e o regime de 1968: aspectos conjunturais e variáveis históricas. *História: Questões & Debates*, Curitiba, n. 40, p.11-36, 2004. Disponível em: <https://revistas.ufpr.br/historia/article/view/2735/2272> . Acesso em: 2 jun. 2019.

DU COLOMBIER, M. Choix de thèses en sciences sociales (1er janvier-30 novembre 1968). *Revue Française de Sociologie*, n. 9-4. p.563, 1968. Disponível em: https://www.persee.fr/doc/rfsoc_0035-2969_1968_num_9_4_1443 . Acesso em: 01 jul. 2019.

FERREIRA, M. C. L. O caráter singular da língua no discurso. *Organon*, Instituto de Letras/UFRGS, v. 17, n. 35, p.189-200, 2003. Disponível em: <https://periodicos.ufsm.br/letras/article/view/11896/7318> . Acesso em: 4 jul. 2019.

GADET, F.; HAK, T. (orgs.). *Por uma análise automática do discurso: uma introdução à obra de Michel Pêcheux*. Campinas: Editora da UNICAMP, 1990.

GAGNEBIN, J. M. *Sete aulas sobre linguagem, memória e história*. Rio de Janeiro: Imago, 1997.

GAGNEBIN, J. M. Verdade e memória do passado. *Projeto História* (PUCSP), São Paulo, v. 17, p.213-222, nov. 1998. Disponível em: <https://revistas.pucsp.br/revph/article/view/11147/8178> . Acesso em: 17 mai. 2019.

GAGNEBIN, J. M. O rastro e a cicatriz: metáforas da memória. *Pro-Posições* (Unicamp), UNICAMP - Campinas, v. 13, n.3 (39), p.125-134, 2002. Disponível em: <https://www.fe.unicamp.br/pf-fe/publicacao/2164/39-dossie-gagnebimjm.pdf> . Acesso em: 15 jun. 2019.

KOGAWA, J. M. M. *Por uma arqueologia da Análise do Discurso no Brasil*, 2012, 209 f. Tese (Doutorado em Linguística) – Faculdade de Ciências e Letras da Universidade Estadual Paulista, Araraquara, 2012. Disponível em: https://repositorio.unesp.br/bitstream/handle/11449/100084/kogawa_jmm_dr_arafcl.pdf?sequence=1 . Acesso em: 03 jul. 2019.

HENRY, P. Os fundamentos teóricos da análise automática do discurso de Michel Pêcheux. In: GADET, F; HAK, T. (orgs.). *Por uma análise automática do discurso: uma introdução à obra de Michel Pêcheux*. Campinas: Editora da UNICAMP, 1997, p.13-38.

HERBERT, T. Reflexões sobre a situação teórica das ciências sociais e, especialmente, da psicologia social. In: ORLANDI, E. P. (org.). *Análise de Discurso: Michel Pêcheux*. Textos escolhidos por Eni Puccinelli Orlandi. Campinas: Pontes Editores, 2016 [1966], p.21-54.

LÉON, J. LIMA, M. E. A. T. Études de certains aspects du fonctionnement de l'Analyse Automatique du Discours: Traitement des syntagmes nominaux en expressions figées et segmentation d'un corpus en séquences discursives autonomes. *T. A. Informations*, revue internationale du traitement automatique du langage, Paris, v. 20, n. 1, p.25-46, 1979. Disponível em: <https://halshs.archives-ouvertes.fr/halshs-01143380> . Acesso em: 16 jun. 2019.

LEVY, C. Onde a linguagem é o eixo da pesquisa. *Jornal da Unicamp*, Universidade Estadual de Campinas, p.5, 8 mai. 2006. Disponível em: https://www.unicamp.br/unicamp/unicamp_hoje/jornalPDF/ju322pg05.pdf . Acesso em: 1 jun. 2020.

LIMA, M. E. A. T. *A construção discursiva do povo brasileiro: os discursos de 1º de maio de Getúlio Vargas*. Campinas: Editora da UNICAMP, 1990.

LIMA, M. E. A. T. A questão do trabalho: do anarquismo ao populismo. In: GOULART, I. B. G.; SAMPAIO, J. R. (org.). *Psicologia do trabalho e gestão: estudos contemporâneos*. São Paulo: Casa do Psicólogo, 1998, p.105-125.

LIMA, M. E. A. T. A nação e a noção de povo nos discursos de Getúlio Vargas. In: MARI, H. (org.). *Fundamentos e dimensões da análise do discurso*. Belo Horizonte: Carol Borges, 1999, p.445-452.

LIMA, M. E. A. T. *Currículo do Sistema Lattes*. [Brasília], 17 dez. 2002. Disponível em: <http://lattes.cnpq.br/8062049942183705>. Acesso em: 21 fev. 2019.

LIMA, M. E. A. T. *As caminhadas de Auguste de Saint-Hilaire pelo Brasil e Paraguai*. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica, 2002.

LIMA, M. E. A. T. Análise do discurso e/ou análise do conteúdo. *Psicologia em Revista*, Belo Horizonte, v. 9, n. 13, p.76-88, jun. 2003. Disponível em: <http://periodicos.pucminas.br/index.php/psicologiaemrevista/article/view> . Acesso em: 25 fev. 2019.

MACHADO, M. N. M. O Setor. In: BOMFIM, E. M. *et al.* (orgs.). *Psicologia Social: memórias, saúde e trabalho*. São João Del Rei: UFSJ: Programa de Pós-graduação da UFMG: ABRAPSO regional Minas, 2004, p.19-31.

MACHADO, M. N. M. Análise do Discurso e Psicologia Social: um vínculo esquecido. *Mnemosine* v. 4, n. 2, p.20-37, 2008. Disponível em:

www.mnemosine.com.br/ojs/index.php/mnemosine/article/view/146 . Acesso em: 15 mar. 2019.

MACHADO, M. N. M. Práticas pedagógicas da psicossociologia nos anos 60 e 70. In: JACÓ-VILELA, A. M.; CERREZZO, A. C.; RODRIGUES, H. B. C. (orgs.). *Clio-Psyché Hoje: Fazeres e dizeres psi na história do Brasil*. Rio de Janeiro: Centro Edelstein de Pesquisas Sociais, 2012, v. 1, p.25-32.

MACHADO, M. N. M. Análise do discurso: vivências, projetos, pesquisas. In: MACHADO, M. N. (org.). *Práticas de análise do discurso*. Belo Horizonte: Editora Artesã, 2018, p.11-37.

MACHADO TEIXEIRA, M. E. G. *Sentidos do percurso da análise de discurso no Brasil na voz de pesquisadores da área*. 2014. 219 fl. Tese (Doutorado em Linguística) – Instituto de Estudos da Linguagem da Universidade Estadual de Campinas, Campinas, 2014. Disponível em: repositorio.unicamp.br/jspui/bitstream/REPOSIP/270862/1/MachadoTeixeira_MariaEunicedeGodoy_D.pdf . Acesso em: 28 fev. 2019.

MAINGUENEAU, D. *Termos-chave da análise do discurso*. Belo Horizonte: UFMG, 1998.

MALDIDIER, D. *A inquietação do discurso: (re)ler Michel Pêcheux hoje*. Campinas: Pontes, 2003.

MAZIÈRE, F. *A análise do discurso: história e práticas*. São Paulo: Parábola Editorial, 2007.

OLIVEIRA, G. A.; NOGUEIRA, L. (orgs.). *Encontros na Análise de Discurso: efeitos de sentidos entre continentes*. Campinas: Editora da UNICAMP, 2019.

ORLANDI, E. *A linguagem e seu funcionamento: as formas do discurso*. Campinas: Pontes, 1983.

ORLANDI, E. A Análise de Discurso em suas diferentes tradições intelectuais: o Brasil. In: *Anais do I SEAD*, 1, 2003, Porto Alegre. Anais... Porto Alegre: Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, 2003. p.1-18. Disponível em: anaisdosead.com.br/1SEAD/Conferencias/EniOrlandi.pdf . Acesso em: 4 jul. 2019.

ORLANDI, E. [entrevista cedida à] SCHERER, A. E. História das ideias x História de vida. Entrevista com Eni Orlandi. *Fragmentum*, Universidade Federal de Santa Maria, v. 7, p.11-51, 2006. Disponível em: <https://periodicos.ufsm.br/fragmentum/article/view/6349/3855> . Acesso em: 5 jun. 2019.

OSAKABE, H. *Argumentação e discurso político*. Kairos: São Paulo, 1979.

PAVEAU, M-A. O redemoinho de palavras. Análise do Discurso, inconsciente, real alteridade. *Matraga*, Rio de Janeiro, v.15, n.22, p.13-p.32, jan./jun. 2008. Disponível em: <https://www.e-publicacoes.uerj.br/index.php/matraga/article/view/27905/19977>. Acesso em: 30 jul. 2020.

PÊCHEUX, M. *et al.* Présentation de l'analyse automatique du discours (AAD69): théories, procédures, résultats, perspectives. *Mots*, n. 4, p.95-129, mar. 1982. Disponível em: https://www.persee.fr/docAsPDF/mots_0243-6450_1982_num_4_1_1053.pdf . Acesso em: 25 jun. 2019.

- PÊCHEUX, M. *et al.* Apresentação da Análise Automática do Discurso (1982). In: GADET, F.; HAK, T. (orgs.). *Por uma análise automática do discurso: uma introdução à obra de Michel Pêcheux*. Campinas: Editora da UNICAMP, 1997 [1982], p.253-282.
- PÊCHEUX, M. Sur la conjoncture théorique de la psychologie sociale. *Bulletin de Psychologie*, v. 23 (4-5), n. 281, p.290-297, 1970.
- PÊCHEUX, M. Analyse de discours et informatique. In: *Actes du Congrès international informatique et sciences humaines*, 1981, Liège. Anais... Liège: L.A.S.L.A. - Université de Liège, 1981, p.699-707. Disponível em: web.philo.ulg.ac.be/lasla/wp-content/uploads/sites/7/2019/02/64.pdf . Acesso em: 25 mar. 2019.
- PÊCHEUX, M. Ler o arquivo hoje. In: ORLANDI, E. P. (org.). *Gestos de leitura: da história no discurso*. Campinas: Editora da UNICAMP, 1997 [1982], p.55-66.
- PÊCHEUX, M. Papel da memória. In: ACHARD, P. *et al.* (orgs.). *Papel da memória*. Campinas: Pontes Editores, 2010, p.49-69. (Publicado originalmente em 1983).
- PÊCHEUX, M. Ideologia – aprisionamento ou campo paradoxal? In: ORLANDI, E. P. (org.). *Análise de Discurso: Michel Pêcheux*. Textos escolhidos por Eni Puccinelli Orlandi. Campinas: Pontes Editores, 2016a [1983], p.107-119.
- PÊCHEUX, M. Leitura e memória: projeto de pesquisa. In: ORLANDI, E. P. (org.). *Análise de Discurso: Michel Pêcheux*. Textos escolhidos por Eni Puccinelli Orlandi. Campinas: Pontes Editores, 2016b [1983], p.141-150.
- PÊCHEUX, M. Análise de Discurso e Informática. In: ORLANDI, E. P. (org.). *Análise de Discurso: Michel Pêcheux*. Campinas: Pontes, 2016c [1981], p.275-282.
- THIEBAULT, C. Ouvrages analysés. *Mots*, n. 30, p.24-38, mar. 1992 [1982]. Disponível em: https://www.persee.fr/doc/mots_0243-6450_1992_ind_30_1_1669 . Acesso em: 1 jul. 2019.

Translated by Túlio Miranda – tuliomiranda7@gmail.com

Received May 05,2020

Accepted April 28,2021