

**RDBCI**

Revista Digital Biblioteconomia e Ciência da Informação

RDBCI

Digital Journal of Library and Information Science

ARTICLE

doi: 10.20396/rdbci.v17i0.8652798/pdf_1

FRENCH DISCOURSE ANALYSIS IN THE ORGANIZATION OF INFORMATION AND KNOWLEDGE IN BRAZIL: EPISTEMOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS TO DOCUMENTARY ANALYSIS

ANÁLISE DO DISCURSO FRANCESA NA ORGANIZAÇÃO DA INFORMAÇÃO E DO CONHECIMENTO NO BRASIL: CONSIDERAÇÕES EPISTEMOLÓGICAS À ANÁLISE DOCUMENTÁRIA

¹ Marcos Vinícius Santos Carvalho Terra 

Universidade Estadual Paulista
Marília, SP - Brasil

² Carlos Cândido de Almeida 

Universidade Estadual Paulista
Marília, SP - Brasil

³ Deise Maria Antonia Sabbag 

Universidade Estadual Paulista
Marília, SP - Brasil

Correspondence

¹ E-mail: marcos_vsct@hotmail.com

Submitted: 26/06/2018

Accepted: 12/11/2018

Published: 17/12/2018

Checagem antiplágio
 



JITA: AC. Relationship of LIS with other fields .

e-Location ID: 019011

ABSTRACT

It investigates how the Information Science in Brazil establishes its interdisciplinary dynamics with the French Discourse Analysis, which has unfolded in different theoretical and methodological orders. In addition, it analyzes, from a diachronic perspective, the epistemological interactions between the French aspect of Discourse Analysis and Information Science, especially with regard to the Organization of Information and Knowledge. Through a literature review, it shows the main historical contributions of discourse theory to the informational field in the Brazilian context. Among the theoretical contributions of Discourse Analysis is the The article explores the dialogical relationship that can be established between the French theory of discourse analysis in the Information and Knowledge Organization in the Brazilian context. In the broad sense, the reflective path comprises a possible gnosiology present in the Science of Information and the discursive studies. The focus of this analytical study is on the interdisciplinary issues, as well as on the epistemological relationships, that this dialogue presents for Documentary Analysis. The objective is to establish the interdisciplinary relations of the two areas of study in the Brazilian context, having as a methodological path for the understanding of this diachronic perspective the critical epistemology. Three lines of discourse analysis were chosen for the purpose of the dialogical relationship: the line of Michel Pêcheux, the line of Sociolinguistics and the line of Michel Foucault. The first and third are present in works carried out in the field of Information Science, especially in the convergences with Documentary Analysis, having as confluence information as discourse, subject, language and pragmatics. Possible paths point to a scenario affected by power disputes. Thus, this scenario produces meaning effects and needs to be analyzed by a reading gesture, taking into account the historical issues of time and space, because depending on the cultural and temporal moment, information and discourse can produce different effects of meaning.

KEYWORDS

Interdisciplinarity. Information Science. Organization of Knowledge. Epistemology.

RESUMO

O artigo explora a relação dialógica que pode ser estabelecida entre a teoria francesa de análise do discurso na Organização da Informação e Conhecimento no âmbito brasileiro. Em sentido amplo o percurso reflexivo compreende uma possível gnosiologia presente na Ciência da Informação e os estudos discursivos. O foco deste estudo analítico está nas questões interdisciplinares, bem como nas relações epistemológicas, que esse diálogo apresenta para Análise Documentária. O objetivo é o estabelecimento das relações interdisciplinares das duas áreas de estudo no contexto brasileiro, tendo como caminho metodológico para o entendimento desta perspectiva diacrônica a epistemologia crítica. Três linhas de análise do discurso foram eleitas para efeitos da relação dialógica: a linha de Michel Pêcheux, a linha da Sociolinguística e a linha de Michel Foucault. A primeira e a terceira estão presentes em trabalhos realizados no âmbito da Ciência da Informação, notadamente nas convergências com a Análise Documentária, tendo como confluência a informação como discurso, o sujeito, a linguagem e a pragmática. Os caminhos possíveis apontam para um cenário afetado por disputas de poder. Assim, tal cenário produz efeitos de sentido e precisa ser analisado por um gesto de leitura, levando em consideração as questões históricas de tempo e espaço, pois dependendo do momento cultural e temporal, a informação e o discurso podem produzir diferentes efeitos de sentido.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE

Interdisciplinaridade. Ciência da Informação. Organização do Conhecimento. Epistemologia.

1 INTRODUCTION

The guiding thread of the reflection proposed in this article rests on the epistemological interactions between the French Discourse Analysis and the Information Science in Brazil, especially regarding the Organization of Information and Knowledge. The different perspectives of discourse studies, present in research on information and knowledge, can reveal that the theoretical affiliations interfere, producing different meanings on the political position of agents and research institutions. It wouldn't be precise to define the limits of a block of theories called French Discourse Analysis, but the common ideology consists in questioning the presuppositions of Saussurean linguistics.

For this reflective study, we considered the studies that explore the theoretical relations between French Discourse Analysis and the Organization of Information and Knowledge. By Organization of Information and Knowledge it is generally meant a search field, and an activity center, where the focus are actions of mediation between documents and information users through the process of analysis and representation. Among the lines of research of the Information Organization, one can cite the Documentary Analysis, of French origin, which contributes to the processes of mediation of the discourses for the purpose of information retrieval. This process, as it is evaluated, is the main point of interest when the subject is the interdisciplinarity between Information Science and Discourse Analysis, having as its common object the scientific discourse itself.

For this, a disciplinary cut must be analyzed from the perspective of a social production field. Bourdieu (2004) points out that the scientific field is the universe, in which are inserted agents and institutions that produce, reproduce and diffuse science. It is a field of forces, a field of struggles, a social world that involves relations of domination. The points of view, the scientific interventions, the places of publication, the chosen themes and the objects of research are commanded by the structure of the objective relations between the different agents. The position in this structure determines what can and cannot be done.

Thus, the presence of the French Discourse Analysis in the Organization of Information and Knowledge in Brazil allows reflections on the different forms of epistemological involvement between the two fields of knowledge over the last years. Such reflections help to think the theory, in order to find ways for the maturation of the scientific interactions.

Having in mind the scientific point of view, we enter the realm of a critical-social epistemology. Entering the epistemology, in the view of Japiassu (1977), is to engage in a controversial space and conflicts. Although it seems an old term, it emerged from the nineteenth century in philosophical vocabulary. Its etymological meaning is to speak (logos) about science (episteme). It is a discipline whose construction is slow and recent. Epistemology is understood in the broad sense of the term as the methodical and also reflective study of

knowledge, in which its organization, its formation, its development, its functioning and its intellectual products are considered.

It is important to consider that scientific knowledge is inserted in certain sociocultural contexts. It is, therefore, tributary of factors linked to religion, politics, ideology, philosophy and economics. Science has its goals, its agents and its ways of operation conditioned to a determined society. Therefore, scientific knowledge is also a form of power (JAPIASSU, 1977).

In this sense, it should not be forgotten that intellectual conflicts, as Bourdieu (2004) points out, are also conflicts of power. Similar to the economic world, the scientific world knows relations of strength, phenomena of concentration of capital and power, even of monopoly, as well as social relations of domination, which imply an appropriation of the means of production and reproduction, in addition it knows struggles that reflect the control of specific means of production and reproduction. When examining epistemologically the meshing of two disciplines, one cannot lose sight of the sociological, of field operations and epistemological categories, of the history of their own disciplines.

Given this, it is opportune to know the French aspects of Discourse Analysis that emerged in the 1960s and which brought contributions to information science in Brazil, in general, through a specific disciplinary core, that is, the Documentary Analysis brought to the country by members of the group TEMMA of the University of São Paulo, which collaborated in the interpretation of ideological, linguistic and political processes, that manifest themselves in the ways of ordering and representing information and knowledge. It should be emphasized that it is not part of the objectives of this work to deepen the exegesis of the foundations of Discourse Analysis, as well as in the conceptual framework of Documentary Analysis. It is, however, intended to reflect on the interdisciplinary relations between the two areas considering the Brazilian context. It would also not be possible to address other lines of the Information and Knowledge Organization, in particular the approaches linked to the International Society for Knowledge Organization, founded in 1989.

Thus, the interdisciplinary study and the points of interdisciplinarity helps in the understanding of complex phenomena that only one discipline would not be able to clarify. In this perspective, the continuous cooperation between methodological theories and options becomes essential, because there are lapses in the historical course of the disciplines, in particular, the trajectory of Documentary Analysis in contact with discourse theories, which need to be investigated under this view.

In order to proceed with the exposition, one must deal first with the French currents of the Discourse Analysis. Secondly, the general conception of the Information and Knowledge Organization will be addressed, with special attention to Documentary Analysis, which is

considered more favorable to receive contributions from Discourse Analysis. Third, the interdisciplinary aspects of Discourse Analysis of French Matrix and Documentary Analysis will be related as one of the main currents of the Information and Knowledge Organization. Finally, some conclusions about the meshing between the areas are highlighted.

2 FRENCH SCHOOLS OF THOUGHT ON DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

In France, amid the heated political clashes, effect of the 1960s, various movements and groups were organized historically with different tendencies. The political positions, as well as the controversies related to the role of Linguistics in these relations, have increased tensions, since from the Althusserian position, language is no longer merely an accessory to politics and science (ORLANDI, 2003). This section aims to relate the main lines of Discourse Analysis of French origin.

The studies on discourse have unfolded in different theoretical and methodological orders. It is also important to consider that there is, in the scientific field, relations of strength and power, which cross the classifications, differences and considerations of these developments. Science is built in different places with the strength and particularities of each tradition (ORLANDI, 2003).

Harris, an American linguist, is believed to have been the first to use the term "discourse analysis" in the 1950s. Thus, it is important to point out that the French lines of discourse theory, with a materialist tendency, would be the counterpoint of the Anglo-Saxon studies on discourse that are interested in propositions. It is emphasized that the Anglo-Saxon side was influenced by interactionist currents. In addition, it has a linguistic-pragmatic foundation (MAINGUENEAU, 1997; ORLANDI, 2003).

According to Maingueneau (1997, p.15),

In order to evaluate the specificity of the "French school of discourse analysis", it is enough to confront it with what is genetically understood in the United States as "discourse analysis": a discipline dominated by the interactionist and ethnomethodological currents that it takes as its essential object to study ordinary conversation.

Therefore, it is a heterogeneous field. There are many aspects of Discourse Analysis, among them the enunciative discourse analysis, whose main theoretical is the French Dominique Maingueneau, and the dialogical analysis of the discourse, linked to the Circle of Bakhtin. It is also important to map out the Charaudeau line, termed by some as a semi-linguistic analysis of discourse. In addition to these aspects, there is also the critical analysis of discourse, the so-called discourse analysis, and the sociointeractional discourse analysis (MACHADO TEIXEIRA, 2014).

It is emphasized that this is a very broad area of study, so in this paper we chose three French lines emerging in the sixties (the same time that studies on Discourse Analysis gained strength in the French scenario), namely: the line of Michel Pêcheux; line represented by Jean Dubois, Jean Baptiste Marcellesi, Bernard Gardin and Louis Guespin, among others; and Michel Foucault's line. Only the epistemological criticism will make it possible to reveal the ins and outs of Discourse Analysis as it moves toward a given field of knowledge. Each line presents its specificity, with points of approach and points of departure (GADET, 2015; NARZETTI, 2010). These authors are linked to the emergence of Discourse Analysis in the French context and are the main representatives of each strand.

The first part related to Michel Pêcheux is based on three disciplinary domains, namely Saussure's Linguistics; the Historical Materialism of Marx; and Freud's Psychoanalysis. Pêcheux, in his theory, refers to Lacan and Althusser, especially regarding the unconscious and the ideology in the constitution of the subject (ORLANDI, 2003, 2007).

The first part related to Michel Pêcheux is based on three disciplinary domains, namely Saussure's Linguistics; the Historical Materialism of Marx; and Freud's Psychoanalysis. Pêcheux, in his theory, makes several references to Lacan and Althusser, especially regarding the unconscious and the ideology in the constitution of the subject. It should be noted that, in this perspective, language is a social fact, and it is not a closed structure in itself. It is a place of tensions. It is subject to misunderstandings, that is, failures, lapses, slips, misunderstandings, and ambiguities. Speech is understood, in Pêcheux's view, as an effect of meaning among speakers (ORLANDI, 2007).

The language system is the same for the materialist and for the idealist, for the revolutionary and also for the reactionary, for the one who has certain knowledge and for the one who does not have such knowledge. However, it is important to emphasize that even though the language system is the same for these characters, the discourses are different. Language is presented as the common basis of differentiated discursive processes, which are understood in it as the ideological processes simulate the scientific processes (PÊCHEUX, 1995).

The conception of ideology, developed by Althusser, influences Pêcheux's theory. For the theorist, ideology challenges individuals as subjects. In the Althusserian perspective, "there is only ideology for the subject and for subjects. It is understood: there is only ideology for concrete subjects, and this destination of ideology is possible only by the subject: it is extended by the category of subject and by its functioning" (Althusser, 1980, p.93). In retaking the Marxist philosopher, Pêcheux argues that taking ideologies as ideas rather than as material forces and considering them to have their origin in subjects, when in fact they constitute individuals in subjects is a double-faced error (Pocheche 1995).

Althusser, in his book *Ideology and Ideological State Apparatus*, discusses the real foundations of a non-subjectivist theory of the subject, as a theory of the ideological conditions of reproduction/transformation of production relations: the relation between unconscious and ideology (PÊCHEUX, 1995).

From the point of view of Pêcheux's theory (1995, p.159 -160),

is ideology which, through 'habit' and 'use', is at the same time designating what is and what should be, and sometimes through linguistically marked 'deviations' between the confirmation and the norm and that work as a device of "resumption of play". It is ideology that provides the evidence by which everyone knows what a soldier, a laborer, a boss, a factory, a strike, etc., is, evidence that makes a word or a statement mean what they really say and thus mask, under the transparency of language, what we will call the material character of the meaning of words and statements.

There is no discursive neutrality, even in the face of "the most seemingly daily use of the signs" (ORLANDI, 2007, p.9). In *Speech Analysis*, linguistic, ideological, and historical aspects are linked. According to Orlandi (1994, 54), "it is in discourse that one can grasp the relation between language and ideology, having the notion of subject as mediator: there is no discourse without subject or subject without ideology. The elemental ideological effect is what institutes the subject (always already there)".

All discursive processes, according to Pêcheux (1995, p. 92), are inscribed into an ideological relation of the dispute between classes. Consequently, "the relation with language is never innocent, it is not a relation with the evidence and it can stand in the face of the articulation of the symbolic with the political" (ORLANDI, 2007 p.95). The class struggle is one of the threads that will lead to Analysis and the Discourse linked to Pêcheux. The French philosopher never separated theory from politics. The theory, for him, must intervene in the political struggle, to think about the functioning and the role of ideologies and resistance (GREGOLIN, 2004).

The second slope, called the sociolinguistics of Discourse Analysis, in turn, has Linguistics as its epistemological ground, however an expanded Linguistics, renewed, which does not leave out of its analyzes the social aspects, which were not problematized by structuralist linguistics. From the perspective of Marcellesi and his team, Discourse Analysis is part of the particular domain of Sociolinguistics (NARZETTI, 2010; ORLANDI, 2003). It is important to emphasize that the sociolinguistic analyzes of discourse are marked by contrastive and comparative exams that value political discourse (MARCELLESI, 1971).

Sociolinguistics is characterized by an interdisciplinary dialogue between Linguistics and other social sciences, especially Marxism (NARZETTI, 2010). The French sociolinguistic aspect contributes to the reappearance of discussions on the relations between the language and

the social. To understand this theoretical line, it becomes relevant, therefore, to consider the debates around Marxism and politics (GADET, 2015).

From the perspective of sociolinguistics, the words *enunciation* and *discourse*, according to Guespin (1971, p.10), tend to organize in opposition. For the theoretician, the enunciation, or statement, is the succession of sentences issued between two semantic whites spaces, two pauses of communication. Discourse, in turn, is the enunciation thought from the perspective of the discursive mechanism that conditions it. Thus, a look at a text from the point of its structuring in language makes it a statement; a linguistic study of the production conditions of this text will make it a speech.

For its part, the third strand, the Foucaultian, is not situated in Linguistics. Although it deals with speech, it does not perform an analysis of meaning. Archaeological analysis seeks the fact of the historical appearance of a discourse. It is noteworthy that the study of knowledge in Foucault, is not limited to the Discourse Analysis or articulation regimes (NARZETTI, 2010). For him, "discourse is something entirely different from the place where it comes to be superposed or deposited, as in a simple surface of inscription, objects that would have been established previously" (FOUCAULT, 2008, p.48).

From Foucault's point of view (2008, p.31),

The analysis of the discursive field is oriented in an entirely different way; to understand the statement in the narrowness and singularity of its situation; to determine the conditions of its existence, to fix its limits in the most just way, to establish its correlations with the other statements to which it may be connected, to show that other forms of enunciation exclude. The semi-silent conversation of another discourse is not sought: it must be shown why it could not be another, as it excludes any other, how it occupies, among others and related to them, a place which no other could occupy. The question pertaining to such an analysis could thus be formulated: what singular existence is this that comes to the surface in what is said and nowhere else?

The discourses, for Foucault (2008, p.55), are formed by signs; but what they do is more than using those signs to indicate things. Here, there is no definite semiotic reading on the concept of sign, what comes closest is the Saussurian definition. It is this *more*, therefore, which places them as irreducible to the language and to the act of speech. It is this *more*, moreover, that must appear and need to be described.

In the Foucaultian perspective, to make appear the space in which discursive events unfold is not to try to restore it in an isolation that nothing could surpass; it is not to shut it in oneself; is to become free, in order to describe, in and out of it, games of relations (FOUCAULT, 2008, p.32). According to the theorist (2008, p. 55), "one cannot speak of anything at any time; it is not easy to say something new; it is not enough to open our eyes, to pay attention, or to be aware, so that new objects will soon light up and, on the surface of the ground, throw their first clarity." Therefore the speech, argues Foucault (2008, 61),

[...] it is not the majestically developed manifestation of a subject who thinks, who knows, and who says it: it is, on the contrary, a set in which the dispersion of the subject and its discontinuity in relation to itself can be determined. It is a space of exteriority in which a network of different places develops.

Foucault seeks an understanding of archaeogenealogy and the way in which historical relations between knowledge and power are constructed from diverse themes (madness, prison system, sexuality). He works in a vast field; inserts the discourse within an order, but avoids the term ideology (SARGENTINI, 2006).

For Foucault (2008, p.43),

in the case in which it is possible to describe a similar system of dispersion among a number of utterances, and in the case that between the objects, types of enunciation, concepts, thematic choices, if one can define a regularity (an order, correlations, positions and workings, transformations), we say by convention, it is a *discourse formation* - thereby avoiding words overcharged with conditions and consequences, moreover, inadequate to denote similar dispersion such as "science", or "ideology," or "theory," or "domain of objectivity."

Although in Foucault the Althusserian notion of ideological apparatuses does not exist, the theoretician does not deny the existence of a power of State. It deals with the relations between the discourse and its powers. In fact, it shows that there are, in addition to the power of the state, other powers which have varied nature and mechanisms (GREGOLIN, 2006).

For the theorist, subject and society are crossed by discursive practices that become the continuity of each other, that is, the "in" as the constituent of the subject is the fold of the "out". There is a movement between "in" and "out" differing only by temporal and geographical spaces. Man is the subject of the statement, the "in" that produces modes of subjectivation that cross and actualize knowledge and power relations. In genealogy, Foucault finds the perspective that makes possible the comprehension of these statements.

In the view of the theorist, the analysis of power relations should not be restricted to the study of a set of institutions, even those that are classified as political. The relations of power are inscribed in the social network as a whole. It is important to point out that, according to the Foucaultian line, it is impossible to have a relation of power without points of insubmission, since the subjects fight. Thus, no power is complete (GREGOLIN, 2006).

In the three strands mentioned above, discourse is not confused with language and speech. Given the plurality of studies, it is important to mark the similarities and dissimilarities of each strand (NARZETTI, 2010). The theoretical differences between Pocheche and Foucault involve the way to stand before Althusser's proposals. In Foucault, the classic categories of Marxism, especially ideology and class struggle, are lacking; there is, therefore, between them, differences in the reading of Marx (GREGOLIN, 2006).

Pêcheux and the sociolinguistic strand approach through the Marxist referential. The two strands address issues of class struggle and ideology (NARZETTI, 2010). Foucault does not worry too much about marking a position as a Marxist. It is worth noting that Foucault and Pêcheux are not opponents of a discourse theory, since their theoretical proposals are not in opposition but in complementarity (GREGOLIN, 2006).

The meaning of words, in Pêcheux's perspective, changes and shapes the position in the class struggle of those who use them. As for Foucault, the meaning of the enunciation changes as the relations with other enunciations are established. The author of *The Archeology of Knowledge* does not work with the relation between language, ideology and the unconscious, in the figure of the symbolic. He is not concerned about theorizing the mechanisms of language. Pêcheux, for his part, was more connected to the problems of Linguistics (GREGOLIN, 2006).

Thus, the difference between the concept of discourse of the Foucaultian strand in relation to the other two strands lies in the fact that the discourse is not related to the ideological formations. Foucault, therefore, rejects the concept of ideology as relevant to the analysis of knowledge.

Although the Pêcheux strand and the sociolinguistic strand approach the presence of the class struggle in their theories, they support different views on Linguistics. For Marcellesi and his group, Discourse Analysis is inserted in Linguistics; for Pêcheux, is articulated between Linguistics, Historical Materialism and Psychoanalysis.

Next, we will consider the field of Information and Knowledge Organization, in particular, the Documentary Analysis in order to, in a second moment, think about the epistemological articulations with the strands of speech analysis.

3 ORGANIZATION OF INFORMATION AND KNOWLEDGE

In order to reflect on the interactions between Discourse Analysis and the Organization of Information and Knowledge, it is important to point out that information studies emerge with an interdisciplinary proposal. The Information Science, which, in the US historical perspective, according to Borko (1968), is an interdisciplinary science that investigates the properties and behavior of information, the forces governing information flows and information the processing means for its usability and recovery. In addition, it aims to offer a theoretical corpus, which is linked to origin, collection, organization, storage, retrieval, interpretation, transmission and use of information. It is known, however, that the prospects of Information Science are many, among them the Russian, the German and the French perspectives. This last perspective had special contribution in Brazil and Spain. In this section

we shall briefly define Information Science, to contextualize the Organization of Information and Knowledge as a warm framework of the theories of language and speech, in particular, the French theoretical strand known as Documentary Analysis.

For Saracevic (1996), Information Science is interdisciplinary, as well as being determined by the technological imperative and also an active participant in the evolution of the Information Society. For the author, understanding the phenomena associated with information is a hermetic task. Thus, a single discipline is not enough to investigate human information behavior and ways to facilitate access to knowledge from technological tools.

Information Science, from Mostafa's (1996) perspective, is a new thematic configuration born in the contradictory intersection of social and technological disciplines and in the space left by clippings, which were instituted by Librarianship and other social sciences. To the author, moreover, it is born alongside other configurations such as automatic data processing, systems analysis, cybernetics, artificial intelligence, operational research, cognitive psychology, and all new sciences that emerge from 1950.

For González Gómez (2000, p.2), the Information Science "appears on the horizon of transformations of contemporary societies that have come to regard knowledge, communication, meaning systems and uses of language as scientific research objects and fields of technological intervention".

Galvão and Borges (2000) point out that Information Science is characterized by the study of information, its relationship with various sciences, because it is inserted in the context of postmodern society and science. So it is not a classical science, nor a basic science. It is relevant to point out that, according to Santos (2008), postmodern science does not follow a one-dimensional line. Its style, therefore, is not easily identifiable, because it adopts a configuration of styles, from the criterion and the imagination of the researcher.

In view of the above, Information Science is known as an interdisciplinary science, that is, it is open to scientific cooperation and dialogue with other areas of knowledge. Moreover, because it is a science whose information is its object; for being able to dialogue with other social disciplines; and because it is inserted in the context of new information and communication technologies.

Although Information Science, in theory, is considered interdisciplinary, in practice, perhaps, it is not hollow in an effective and clear way. There is a lot of resistance in the construction of truly interdisciplinary dialogues, especially as regards the confrontation between the more objective view of information, on the one hand, and a more subjective view, on the other. It is necessary to underline that although there are theoreticians within the Science of Information with a more positivist and objective view of information, one cannot neglect its subjective and social side, since these perspectives are not excluded..

The Organization of Information and Knowledge is one of the basic cores of Information Science. It is an area of research, teaching and professional activity. It is an intermediate process, that is, it is between the production stage and the information utilization stage. So, the success of the recovery depends on the organization made in advance. The Organization of Knowledge corresponds to the process of building representations models of knowledge with the purpose of elaborating world models through the representation of the knowledge of a group (BRASCHER; CAFÉ, 2008). It is also linked to beliefs about science, basic ontological assumptions, and the importance of such knowledge to society. The Organization of Information and Knowledge believes that knowledge has different goals and values in particular cultures and institutions. It needs, in addition, to reflect theoretically in a broad way (HJØRLAND, 2003).

Thus, sociocultural, linguistic and semiotic processes, that is, cultural identity in the Organization of Information and Knowledge cannot be neglected. In this sense, according to Brascher and Café (2008), information and knowledge are concepts that are interrelated, even if they deal with distinct tasks, so they need to be thought within a larger field of articulations.

Therefore, the activities of elaboration of abstracts, cataloging, classification, indexing, establishment of links, description of documents and their attributes, characteristics and objectives are part of the Information Organization. The Knowledge Organization, in turn, aims at the conceptual structure and the construction of world models (BRASCHER; CAFÉ, 2008). The Organization of Information and Knowledge therefore involves the physical description of informational objects and the creation of conceptual models of various areas of knowledge. To understand an essential set of theories and approaches

Within the field of the Organization of Information and Knowledge one can cite the active participation of a theoretical approach founded in France in the 1960s, Documentary Analysis. Jean-Claude Gardin (1925-2013) was the main exponent of this theory investigating documentary languages (VOGEL, 2009, 81). In Brazil, the Temma Group, founded in 1986, sought to follow the line of research created by Gardin and to analyze the linguistic and logical foundations of documentary languages. The area establishes contact with the disciplines Linguistics, Logic, Philosophy, Computing, Semiotics and Discourse Analysis.

The documentary languages in the French perspective, according to the Vogel summary (2009, p.84) are artificial languages, constituted by a lexicon, have combination rules, promote the representation of information and communication between system and users. It is a restricted form of language, since the mechanism of execution or speech - as opposed to system or language - in the theory of structural linguistics is not present in documentary languages. Another aspect of documentary language is its character of semantic reduction promoted to the technical terms organized by it, that is, the natural evolution of the meanings of the words needs to be interrupted, in order to reach a good conclusion, in relation to the objective of

documentary language. Communication or mediation of information is another fundamental aspect of documentary language, its purpose is to promote the relationship between the information system and users.

It is important to separate the Documentary Analysis that turns to the content and meanings of documents and speeches and what is called Documentary Analysis of form (cataloging, physical description of documents) and content (indexation, classification) in the Spanish context. The first presents a theoretical section based on the French studies that have the understanding of Documentary Analysis the indexing itself; the second has as its understanding the descriptive and thematic dimensions.

Therefore, it is considered that Documentary Analysis refers to the core of the Information Organization practices and with contributions also to the field of Knowledge Organization, for this reason, the French strand couldn't fail to be conceptualized when the intention is to explain activities, and technical methods related to such area. In a very objective way, Information Science, given its configuration in Brazil, could not be explained without the use of the Organization of Information and Knowledge, and this is not made explicit without the mention of Documentary Analysis.

Nonetheless, epistemological interactions within the Organization of Information and Knowledge should be of interest to the expert, since the most recent advances of a field start from the periphery.

4 ANALYSIS OF FRENCH SPEECH AND ORGANIZATION OF INFORMATION AND KNOWLEDGE IN THE BRAZILIAN CONTEXT: A READING OF CONVERGENCES WITH DOCUMENTARY ANALYSIS

Through interdisciplinarity, an exchange of knowledge is possible. The disciplines involved in this process have their own identities and different perspectives, however, given the complexity in the information field, the need for scientific collaboration for the analysis of a common object emerges. In a horizon full of challenges, we seek to understand the links between the French Discourse Analysis and the Organization of Information and Knowledge, that is, what exists in-between theories, how they intersect, how the interdisciplinary movements work. The goal of this section is to outline the conceptual interactions between French Discourse Analysis and Documentary Analysis as the representative nucleus of the Information and Knowledge Organization.

Therefore, the word complexity is linked to the nuisance, the inability to define easily, to name clearly, to sort ideas. The complex cannot be condensed into a keyword. It cannot, moreover, be limited to a simple law or idea. It requires skills in order to deal, dialogue and

negotiate with the real. It seeks, in addition, articulations between disciplines that are dismembered due to the disjunctive thinking. In complexity, the deep, antagonistic, truths are complementary, while remaining antagonistic. In it, multidimensional thinking is sought (MORIN, 2005).

A more in-depth knowledge of the objects of study requires an interdisciplinary understanding that accounts for the configurations, the historical arrangements, the multiple perspectives present in science. Interdisciplinarity is sensitive to complexity, articulation, a taste for collaboration, cooperation, and common work (POMBO, 2005). Moreover, the interaction of knowledge does not lead to simple contact between disciplines. It is fundamental to recognize the theoretical and conceptual foundations of the areas involved. The interaction between disciplines helps in explaining phenomena that only one discipline could not explain. It also aims at the continuous cooperation of arguments, methodologies, contents, problems, results, examples and applications. Investing in interdisciplinary studies is necessary, because there are gaps in the production of knowledge. Thus, it is important that there is communication, confrontation and discussion of perspectives between disciplines.

The interdisciplinarity, for Pombo (2005), requires interest for what the other has to say, besides sharing the domain of knowledge, in which it is inserted. It also proposes abandoning the comfort of technical language in order to enter a domain that belongs to everyone without exclusive owners.

The hypothesis that Information Science is considered a field of knowledge in search of its own epistemology is shared by Cordeiro (2004). This enables the aggregation and scientific assertion of disciplines that go towards the same point. The researcher explains that from the post-War period, Discourse Analysis and Information Science travels similar paths, presents similar crises and transits through various epistemological spaces.

Thus, the interdisciplinary relations between the French Discourse Analysis and the Organization of Information and Knowledge, especially the Documentary Analysis, involve theoretical tensions and conflicts. Therefore, the ideological sphere is present in the construction of these relations. Thus, discourse theory, a scenario full of challenges, brings important contributions to the informational field, but should be considered that such a relationship was not built in a clear way and without conflicts.

From a diachronic look, the epistemological relationship between the French theory of Discourse Analysis and the Organization of Information and Knowledge in Brazil, specifically, the Documentary Analysis. For this, we shall highlight the following junctions: information and speech, subject, language, pragmatics and, finally, the history of the Documentary Analysis.

4.1 Information as speech

It should be noted that there are strong interests behind research linked to information and discourse. It is known that the representation, classification and description of information do not occur in a neutral way. At the moment information and knowledge are ordered, there is always something left out, so that the goals of certain organizations are fulfilled. In each chosen term, in each classified object, in each descriptor selected, in each concept created, there are others that are silenced. The choices made are not unbiased; on the contrary, they serve interests.

Information as discourse, moreover, is a plural and complex phenomenon. It is not bare of intentionalities. It is embedded in an ideological dimension. It is dependent on context, skills, and also the interpretative needs of the people involved in informational processes. Ideology and power relations cannot be ruled out as determining factors in the Organization of Information and Knowledge, since it depends on the subjects that relate to it. Around the information, there are conflicts, economic interests, inequalities, political conflicts. In the light of the French Discourse Analysis, it is important to consider such aspects.

It should also be noted that Information Science, like other sciences, has its origin in specific social demands, which determine and legitimize its existence. Therefore, it has an inseparable relationship with society. The information and social mechanisms of its production and use are objects of its interest. Research related to the Organization of Information today no longer focuses solely on the techniques of organization and begins to consider the subjects that define the mechanisms of organization, their language and their view of the world and of organizing knowledge. In the last few decades, in the information field, the search for an understanding of the social context regarding information actions (ALMEIDA; BASTOS; BITTENCOURT, 2007) could be seen. To conceive the information with discursive discourse or movement tends to value the ideologies present in the systematization of information, from the creation processes, through registration to its organization and dissemination.

4.2 Subject

It is well known that, over the years, different studies have been carried out, based on scientific cooperation between French studies on discourse and Information Science. Faced with this reality, the following question was raised: how does the interdisciplinary dialogue between the French lines of Discourse Analysis and the Organization of Information and Knowledge work?

There is a gap that needs to be rescued in the interactions between the Organization of Information and Knowledge and the French aspects of discourse analysis, in particular the fact that the analysis of the content of the documents, taking into account their representation, assume a type of scan of the author's speech. In this way, it is relevant to rescue works carried out on the subject. Moreover, it is necessary to identify the researchers who have developed research linked to interdisciplinary relations between the two fields of knowledge, so that other researchers have a panoramic view of what has been produced over the years.

In the Analysis of the French Discourse, especially in the studies of Pêcheux, the subject is not intentional. Ideology makes the word/thing relationship possible. For this there are the basic conditions, language and the process, which is discursive, in which ideology makes possible the relation between thought, language and the world, that is, it brings together subject and meaning. The subject, therefore, is constituted and the world is signified by ideology (ORLANDI, 2007, p.95-96).

The subject is incomplete, affected by the unconscious and by ideology (ORLANDI, 2003). The effects of meaning are dependent on the enunciator and its interlocutor. Due to the ideological effect, it is conditioned to not be able to say anything, from anywhere, because the socio-historical context determines it. The subject, Pêcheux adds (1995, p.163), is constituted by forgetting what determines it.

For the French philosopher,

unconscious repression and ideological subjection are inextricably linked within what could be called the process of the Significant in interpellation and identification, the process by which what we call the ideological conditions of reproduction/transformation of production relations (PÊCHEUX, 1995, p.133).

The common character of the structures-functions denominated as ideology and unconscious is to conceal its own existence within the very interior of its functioning, to the point of producing a fabric of subjective evidences, the latter adjective is not understood as affecting the subject, but in which the subject is constituted (PÊCHEUX, 1995 p.152-153).

The condition of language, says Orlandi (2007, p.52), is incompleteness. The subjects and the senses, in synthesis, are not complete, already made, constituted in a definitive way. They conform and function from the way of intermingling, from relation, from lack, from movement. This incompleteness proves the opening of the symbolic, because the lack is the place of the possible.

The reintroduction of the subject and its context of discourse production proves to be fundamental in the field of Information Organization, especially since the documents are not seen under the eyes of neutrality and the same applies to the instruments of organization of knowledge and different forms of classification. Naming, classifying and organizing is

configured as the action of a subject. In this sense, the documents are products of a real author, a social subject, immersed in the contradictions present in the daily struggle. It is no longer the rationalistic cognitive subject that is autonomous and independent of its fellow citizens, which takes actions and expresses itself only based on its convictions. In fact, this neutral and free of ideologies subject would not exist.

4.3. Language

Linguistics has its own object, that is, the language, which has its own order. In the structuralist proposal, language is defined as the composition formed by tongue and speech. It is emphasized that, in Discourse Analysis, the language is not transparent. From Marxism, it is considered that man makes history, yet it is not transparent to him either. Psychoanalysis contributes to the displacement of the notion of man to that of subject, constituted in relation to the symbolic, namely, in history (ORLANDI, 2007).

In Discourse Theory, although the language has its own order, it is relatively autonomous. Unlike Linguistics, it reintroduces the notion of subject and situation in the analysis of language. History has its real affected by the symbolic, that is, facts claim senses. The subject of language is decentered, because it is affected by the real of language and also by the real of history; you do not have control over how they affect you. Therefore, the discursive subject functions by the unconscious and the ideology (ORLANDI, 2007).

Like the notion of subject, the idea of language leaves the linguistic matrix to assume a Marxist line that seeks to reveal the contradictions and struggles between the discourse-producing classes and how language is configured politically to produce prejudices, reify social hierarchies sub-represent minorities in Knowledge Organization systems. The concept theory itself must take the perspective of Discourse Analysis to understand the role of language in the representation of reality, even in the context of scientific knowledge.

There is no way to specify the origin of the new conceptions of information, subject and language, but it is true that Information Science has shown the same tendency to incorporate new meanings closer to what has been proposed by Discourse Analysis.

4.4. Pragmatics

The term pragmatics, according to Charles Morris (1985), was coined in reference to the term pragmatism. It is plausible to assume the permanent meaning of pragmatism lies in the fact that it has given more direct attention to the relationship between

signs and their users, as well as having appreciated more deeply than in previous moments the relevance of this relation to the understanding of intellectual activities. The term pragmatics, in the author's view, serves to underline the importance of Peirce, James, Dewey and Mead's achievements in the field of semiotics. At the same time, pragmatic, a specifically semiotic term, requires its own formulation.

Pragmatics, therefore, is the branch of semiotics that studies the origin, uses, and effects of signs (NÖTH, 1996). It is important to consider that Morris was strongly influenced by classical Pragmatism, since its main theses follow the theoretical expectations of its founders, including Peirce. Pragmatic, from the perspective of the American theorist, brought several contributions that raised the problem of language from the point of view of the subject. It was a test of the insertion of the subject in linguistic theory (ALMEIDA, 2009).

Members of a social group use a linguistic sign, in pragmatic terms, in combination with other signs; a language is a social system of signs that mediates the responses of members of a community to each other and to their environment. To understand a language, according to the theorist, is to employ only those combinations and transformations of signs that are not prohibited by the uses of the social group in question. It is also to denote objects and situations as the members of this group do, it is also to have the expectations that others have at the moment when certain sign vehicles are employed, and is to express their own states as well as the others they do. In summary, understanding the language or use it correctly is to follow the rules of its use (syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic) in the social community (MORRIS, 1985).

Although the divergences between Discourse Analysis and Pragmatics are concentrated in the definitions of subject and context (POSSENTI, 2003a), it is well known that the introduction of the subject into the field of language is a point that unites them. In Pragmatics, the subject knows what happens when he participates in the discursive event. It presents intentions that want to make them known and seeks to achieve goals. It has knowledge of the language and the circumstances surrounding its use. It is also capable of performing sophisticated and relatively conscious calculations. It also has the ability to choose the most appropriate forms, so that the effects you want are obtained in the best possible way. The subject is able to select relevant context factors in order to interpret linguistic sequences (POSSENTI, 1996).

In the perspective of Possenti (1995, 2003b), a Brazilian researcher influenced by the works of Dominique Maingueneau, although it is not only the unconscious that works, it can not be dispensed with. It is therefore necessary to separate what the subject knows from what he does not know. The presence of the other, for the author, does not erase the self altogether, however shows that the self is not alone.

Discourse Analysis does not associate text and context in the manner of some theories of coherence, just as it does not associate utterances with contexts. In order to overcome the

notions of context of the pragmaticist view, the concept of circumstances is replaced by the concept of conditions of production in the discursive perspective (POSSENTI, 2003a).

The concept of context is linked to elements external to the texts. It involves the communicative situation in which the text is produced. The concept is revised, because for the theory of discourse the externality is not outside the discourse, but is constitutive of it. The context is encompassed by the notion of production conditions (FERREIRA, 2001).

Although one of the main differences between the areas is in the form of understanding the subject, according to Possenti (1996, p.75),

if we define pragmatics by its more classical route, recalling Morris, to speak of the relevance of pragmatic factors will be to postulate the need to take into account the role of the speaker himself in the analysis of facts of language. In a way, it could be said that DA does the same thing, and therefore it should not even distinguish itself from pragmatics.

This approach between Discourse and Pragmatic Analysis must be examined in more detail, because it is possible that the introduction of discourse analysis themes have reached the Organization of Information and Knowledge by the bias of Pragmatics, that is to say, by the summary valuation of the subject against the production of language. Pragmatics, because of the themes it addresses and theoretical similarities, can be a gateway to the concepts of French Discourse Analysis in the Organization of Information and Knowledge. There is a pragmatic shift in the Organization of Information and Knowledge that will necessarily seek in Discourse Analysis ways of renewing its perspectives in order to understand its object and to better understand the limits of its practices and processes.

4.5 Documentary Analysis

Throughout the years, several researchers have been approaching the studies on discourse to Information Science, especially in aspects related to Documentary Analysis in Brazil, of French view and linked to the works of Gardin. The documentary process can be considered as a restricted type of discourse analysis, whose goal is practical and applied to the representation of information and retrieval of its content. Cunha, Kobashi and Amaro (1987), in Brazil propose the application of a discourse analysis methodology, aiming at information retrieval. They also believe that discourse theory can provide support for the application of methodologies that allow to advance in the automation of Documentary Analysis.

Nair Yumiko Kobashi (1996), in a paper dealing with aspects related to the organization and representation of documentary information, explains that Documentary Analysis is a field of knowledge that works with texts and, therefore, with language. In this way, it approaches

theories such as Discourse Analysis. The researcher emphasizes the peculiarities of Documentary Analysis in relation to discourse studies, as well as of other disciplines that work with analysis of texts. For her, concepts should not be transferred between the two theories mechanically.

According to Kobashi (1996), several attempts to introduce Discourse Analysis procedures in Documentary Analysis were frustrated. It is important to mention that for the researcher, Documentary Analysis aims to identify the thematic basis of the text. In this way, he does not worry about the socio-historical conditions of discursive production. From practical experiences, she points out that the misappropriation of concepts from other areas makes it possible to create inconsistent models.

Lucas (1997), in turn, points out that language materiality is often underestimated by indexation theorists. Information professionals, in the view of the author, have the goal of organizing information and knowledge, using techniques and methods that aim at terminological control. It is worth mentioning, however, that in this process the production conditions and the polysemy tensions are present. In this way, the process of interpretation is not neutral. In addition, the indexation is done within an institutional reference. It therefore serves interests. Luke, in the light of Discourse Analysis, explains that the same document can be indexed in different ways, according to his groups. When the conditions of production are not considered, the contradiction between the various discursive formations, which intersect there, is erased.

Therefore, Kobashi (1996) and Lucas (1997), in a scenario of epistemological tension, see the interactions between Discourse Analysis and Documentary Analysis differently. Unlike Kobashi, Lucas argues that in documentary matters the movement of interpretation cannot be erased, since the subject is affected by its socio-historical context. In addition, the researcher questions the perspective of Kobashi, who according to her, limits the reading of the information professional to methods of word processing.

In his work, Alvarenga (1998) emphasizes the relations between the archeology of knowledge and bibliometry. In the view of the author, the two disciplines present a common object, that is, the speeches forming a field of knowledge. The literature that formulates an area of knowledge, in this way, is polyphonic, dispersed, discontinuous, intertextual and dependent on persuasive and pragmatic strategies, which depend on the positions of power occupied by those who produce them.

Válio (2003), in his research, seeks to analyze the discursive formations that are inserted in the scientific productions of Information Science. In addition, it describes speeches about terminology. Oliveira (2003) however, brings, from the Analysis of the French Discourse, the problematization of the relations between memory, identity and document.

Pereira (2007) aims to approach some concepts of Documentary Analysis with Discourse Analysis, giving emphasis to ideological aspects in analyzing texts for documentary purposes. The researcher's focus is on the description of the discourses on Terminologies in Information Science, especially in Information Management.

Ferrarezi and Romão (2007, p.154) point out that "the documents materialize one or more speeches, carrying in their lines an entire network of memory that raises much more than a literal reading of the text." From the perspective of discourse theory, according to researchers,

[...] we may think that documents, besides being an ideological choice - in some senses are naturalized as dominant and should be remembered and institutionalized, and others are censored and must be forgotten and erased - they are also, as monuments, bearers of a heritage: the discursive memory of which they are constituted and that sustains them, allowing their signification (FERRAREZI; ROMÃO, 2007, p.156).

Gaspar and Reis (2010) affirm that there is no escape from subjectivity when subjects and themes are indexed. In doing its work, the information professional produces meaning, so his reading is not neutral. For the researchers, based on interactions between the discursive field and the informational field, it is possible to think of new ways of reading, naming, classifying, organizing and making information available. The theoretical foundations of Discourse Analysis, especially the notions of "enunciation" and "discursive materialities", would help in the process of analyzing texts in the organization of information.

In this way, it is evident, according to the studies made by Freitas (2010), the increasing use of French Discourse Analysis in information research. According to the author, the studies on discourse, through memory and archive conceptualizations, touches on many objects of Information Science. In addition, Lima, Moreira and Moraes (2016) argue that it is possible to affirm that there are theoretical-conceptual relations between Documentary Linguistics and French Discourse Analysis.

5 FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

The epistemological aspects that permeate the history of Discourse Theory in the Organization of Information and Knowledge are thus affected by power disputes. Therefore, the interdisciplinary works carried out point to this. In view of this cipher, it is emphasized that they require reading gestures, since the positions taken regarding information and discourse can produce different effects of meanings, depending on the place in which the subject is inserted. In this way, the interactions between the French currents of Discourse Analysis and the Organization of Information and Knowledge were constructed from different perspectives and theoretical affiliations.

Therefore, the Information and Knowledge Organization is entangled in political conflicts, which are manifested in the bonds that can and must be made, which must represent and circulate the expression of a certain power. Given the above, it is relevant to think about the theoretical contributions, often strategic, between the slopes of Discourse Analysis and the informational field.

In this sense, it should not be forgotten that Discourse Analysis and Documentary Analysis appear in the French text in the sixties. In this course, in dialogue with Information Science, experiments were carried out in order to apply a Discourse Analysis methodology, aiming at information retrieval. In addition, research was carried out that marked the particularities of Documentary Analysis in relation to Discourse Analysis, even though language is a point of convergence between them.

It is emphasized that moments of epistemological tension also marked the interactions between the two disciplines. In the light of the French studies on discourse, the researches that limit the work of information professionals to methods of word processing were questioned.

Another perspective that deserves attention are the studies that approach the bibliometric researches to the archaeological Foucaultian studies, under the argument that the speeches forming a field of knowledge are a common object between the two disciplines.

Among the great contributions of discourse analysis, is the assumption that there is no neutrality in the information field, since the information as a scientific object involves linguistic, semiotic, cultural, ideological, economic, political, technological, social and historical aspects, which cannot be neglected.

In addition, the Discourse Analysis dialogues with the Information Science, bringing contributions about the notion of subject. In this way, the discursive studies, in the Organization of Information and Knowledge, help in the reflection of this subject, affected by the ideology, that classifies, indexes, organizes and disseminates the information.

Finally, it is worth emphasizing that the linguistic issues approach both areas, since the way in which language is configured politically to represent in systems of Knowledge Organization aspects related to social classes is of interest to contemporary studies in Information Science. Therefore, it is important to retake the concept of ideology, in order to adapt it to the informational field, and to point out that the representations are not the real, and therefore, can manifest forms of prejudice and discrimination.

REFERENCES

ALMEIDA, Carlos Cândido de; BASTOS, Flavia Maria; BITTENCOURT, Fernando. Uma leitura dos fundamentos histórico-sociais da Ciência da Informação. *Revista Eletrônica Informação e Cognição*, Marília, v. 6, n. 1, p. 68-89, 2007. Disponível em: < <http://200.145.171.5/revistas/index.php/reic/article/view/749/651> >: Acesso em: 9 jul.2016.

ALMEIDA, Carlos Cândido de. Peirce e a organização da informação: contribuições teóricas da semiótica e do pragmatismo. 2009. 416 f. Tese (doutorado) - Universidade Estadual Paulista, Faculdade de Filosofia e Ciências de Marília, 2009.

ALTHUSSER, Louis. Ideologia e aparelhos ideológicos de Estado. 3. ed. Lisboa: Editorial Presença, 1980.

ALVARENGA, Lídia, Bibliometria e arqueologia do saber de Michel Foucault – traços de identidade teórico-metodológica. *Ciência da Informação*, Brasília, v. 27, n. 3, p. 253-261, 1998.

BOURDIEU, Pierre. Os usos sociais da ciência: por uma sociologia clínica do campo científico. São Paulo: Editora Unesp, 2004.

BORKO, Harold. Information science: what is it?. *American documentation*, v. 19, n. 1, p. 3-5, 1968.

BRASCHER, Marisa.; CAFÉ, Lígia. Organização da informação ou organização do conhecimento? In: ENCONTRO NACIONAL DE PESQUISA EM CIÊNCIA DA INFORMAÇÃO, 9., 2008, São Paulo. Anais... São Paulo: USP, 2008.

CAPURRO, Rafael. Epistemologia e Ciência da informação. Encontro Nacional de Pesquisa em Ciência da Informação, 5., Belo Horizonte, 2003. Anais... Belo Horizonte: UFMG, 2003.

CORDEIRO, Pedro Aurélio Cerveira . Análise do discurso e Ciência da Informação: ensaio sobre uma possibilidade metodológica. 2004. 93f. Dissertação (Mestrado em Ciência da Informação)- Escola de Comunicação, Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, 2004.

CUNHA, Isabel Maria Ribeiro Ferin; KOBASHI, Nair Yumiko ;AMARO, Regina Keiko Obata Ferreira. Revisão Bibliográfica. In: SMIT, Johanna Wilhelmina. Análise documentária: a análise da síntese. Brasília : IBICT, 1987.

FERRAREZI, Ludmila; ROMÃO, Lucília Maria Sousa. Arquivo, documento e memória na concepção discursiva. *Encontros Bibli: revista eletrônica de Biblioteconomia e Ciência da Informação*, Florianópolis, n. 24, p. 152-171, 2007.

FERREIRA, Maria Cristina Leandro. Os desafios de fazer avançar a análise do discurso no Brasil com singularidade e liberdade. *Revista Desenredo*, v. 4, n. 2, 2009.

FERREIRA, Maria Cristina Leandro. Glossário de termos de Análise do Discurso. Porto Alegre: Instituto de Letras, UFRGS, 2001.

FOUCAULT, Michel. A arqueologia do saber. Rio de Janeiro: Forense Universitária, 2008.

FREITAS, Lídia Silva de. A análise do discurso e o campo informacional: usos atuais e alcance epistemológico: uma atualização. InCID: Revista de Ciência da Informação e Documentação, v. 1, n. 1, p. 32-55, 2010.

GADET, Françoise. 1977: em torno de um momento-chave do surgimento da Sociolinguística na França. Organon, Porto Alegre, v. 30, n. 59, p. 41, 2015.

GALVÃO, Maria Cristiane Barbosa; BORGES, Paulo César Rodrigues. Ciência da Informação: ciência recursiva no contexto da sociedade da informação. Ciência da informação, v. 29, n. 3, 2000.

GASPAR, Nádea. Regina.; REIS, Lívia Lima. Um olhar da análise do discurso para a representação temática na Ciência da Informação. DataGramaZero, 2010, dez, v. 11, n. 6.

GREGOLIN, Maria do Rosário Valencise. Os vértices (as) simétricos de um triângulo Pêcheux, Althusser, Foucault. In: _____(Org.). Foucault e Pêcheux na construção da análise do discurso: diálogos e duelos. São Carlos: Claraluz, 2004. p. 111-150.

GUESPIN, Louis. Problématique des travaux sur le discours politique. Langages, 23. Paris, 1971. p. 3-24.

HJØRLAND, Birger. Fundamentals of knowledge organization. Knowledge organization, v. 30, n. 2, p. 87-111, 2003.

JAPIASSU, Hilton. Introdução ao pensamento epistemológico. Rio de Janeiro: Livraria F. Alves Editora, 2. ed., 1977.

KOBASHI, Nair Yumiko. Análise documentária e representação da informação. INFORMARE - Cad. Prog. Pós-Grad. Ci. Inf., Rio de Janeiro, v.2, n. 2 p. 5-27, jul./dez. 1996.

LIMA, Larissa Mello; MOREIRA, Walter; MORAES, João Batista Ernesto. Linguística Documentária e Análise do Discurso: um mapeamento entre conceitos. 2016. In: VI Seminário em Ciência da Informação (SECIN). Anais...Londrina. 2016.

LUCAS, Clarinda Rodrigues Lucas. Biblioteconomia: produção e administração da interpretação. Ciência da Informação, Brasília, v. 26, n. 1, p. 46-53, jan./abr. 1997.

MACHADO TEIXEIRA, Maria Eunice de Godoy. Sentidos do percurso da análise de discurso no Brasil na voz de pesquisadores da área. 2014. tese (doutorado). Universidade Estadual de Campinas, Campinas, Instituto de Estudos da Linguagem, 2014. Available at: <

http://taurus.unicamp.br/bitstream/REPOSIP/270862/1/MachadoTeixeira_MariaEunicedeGodoy_D.pdf >. Access in: 1º mai. 2018.

MAINGUENEAU, Dominique. Novas tendências em análise do discurso. Campinas: Pontes, 1997.

MARCELLESI, Jean-Baptiste. Éléments pour une analyse contrastive du discours politique. Langages, n° 23. 1971. p. 25-56.

MORIN, Edgar. Introdução ao pensamento complexo. Porto Alegre: Sulina, 2005.

MORRIS, Charles William. Fundamentos de la teoría de los signos. Barcelona : Paidós, 1985.

MOSTAFA, Solange Puntel .Ciência da informação: uma ciência, uma revista. Ciência da informação, v. 25, n. 3, p.1-5, 1996.

NARZETTI, Claudiana. As linhas de análise do discurso na França nos anos 60-70. RevLet–Revista Virtual de Letras, v. 2, n. 02, 2010.

NÖTH, Winfried. A semiótica no século XX. São Paulo: Annablume, 1996.

OLIVEIRA, Cármen Irene Correia de. Memória e discurso institucionais: o caso de uma instituição de ensino superior. In: ENANCIB, 5., 2003, Belo Horizonte. Anais... Belo Horizonte, 2003.

ORLANDI, Eni Puccinelli. Discurso, imaginário social e conhecimento. Em Aberto, Brasília, v. 14, n.61, p.53-59, jan./mar. 1994.

ORLANDI, Eni Puccinelli. A análise de discurso em suas diferentes tradições intelectuais: o Brasil. In: SEMINÁRIO DE ESTUDOS EM ANÁLISE DE DISCURSO, 1., 2003, Porto Alegre. Anais... Porto Alegre, RS: UFRGS, 2003. 18 f. Available at: <http://www.ufrgs.br/analisedodiscurso/anaisdosead/1SEAD/Conferencias/EniOrlandi.pdf>. Access in: 19 jun. 2017.

ORLANDI, Eni Puccinelli . Análise de Discurso: princípios e procedimentos. 7. ed. Campinas : Pontes, 2007.

PÊCHEUX, Michel. Semântica e discurso: uma crítica à afirmação do óbvio. 2. ed. Campinas: Ed. Unicamp, 1995.

PEREIRA, Edmeire Cristina.O “Cavalo de Tróia” de Michel Pêcheux: uma breve reflexão sobre a análise automática do discurso. TransInformação, Campinas, 19(3): 207-218, set./dez., 2007.

POMBO, Olga. Interdisciplinaridade e integração dos saberes. *Liinc em revista*, v. 1, n. 1, p. 4-16, 2005.

POSSENTI, Sírio. O " eu" no discurso do " outro" ou a subjetividade mostrada. *ALFA*, São Paulo, v. 39, 1995.

POSSENTI, Sírio. Teoria do discurso : um caso de múltiplas rupturas. In. MUSSALIM, F. & BENTES, A C. (Orgs.). *Introdução à lingUística : fundamentos epistemológicos*. São Paulo : Cortez, 2003a.

POSSENTI, Sírio. Dez observações sobre a questão do sujeito. *Linguagem em (Dis) curso*, Tubarão, v. 3, Número Especial, p. 27-35, 2003b.

SANTOS, Boaventura de Sousa.S. *Um discurso sobre as ciências*. 5. ed. São Paulo : Cortez, 2008.

SARACEVIC, Tefko. *Ciência da Informação: origem, evolução e relações*. *Perspectivas em ciência da Informação*, Belo Horizonte, v. 1, n. 1, p.41-62, jan./jun.1996.

VÁLIO, Else Benetti Marques. Terminologia da ciência da informação: abordagem da análise do discurso. *Perspectivas. ciência informação.*, Belo Horizonte, v. 8, n. 2, p. 114-133, jul./dez. 2003.

VOGEL, Michely Jabala Mamede. A influência da Jean-Claude Gardin e a linha francesa na evolução do conceito de linguagem documentária. *Perspectivas em Ciência da Informação*, v. 14, n. 3, p. 80-92, 2009. Available at:

<http://portaldeperiodicos.eci.ufmg.br/index.php/pci/article/view/920/629>. Access in: 07 dez. 2018.