

Foucault - Archaeology of Knowledge

1. Intro

-two approaches to writing history

i) 'proper history' (though later referred to as traditional history... confusing, i know), a deep structure that has been 'covered with a thick layer of events' by traditional history [ie: longue duree, material civilizations, etc]

a) aspects

I) reveal stability

II) indestructible system

III) irreversible processes

IV) accumulation from motionless bases

b) develops a set of tools

I) models of economic growth

II) quantitative analysis of market movement

III) demography, climate, sociology, tech, etc etc

c) tools assume a deep structure

I) linear succession

II) general rhythms despite rapid change (war, famine, sea routes, mining, crop rotation, etc etc)

d) own set of questions

I) link between disparate events

II) causal succession (between the disparate events)

III) totality, reconstruction

e) now shifted to [pg 4]

I) isolating strata

II) constructing series

III) periodization

IV) series of series

V) large-scale chronological table between distinct series

ii) 'history of ideas' also h of sci, h of phil, h of thought, h of lit

a) ID interruptions

I) epistemological acts/thresholds - Bachelard - against origin or base accumulation

II) displacement/transformations of concepts - Canguilhem - against teleology or progressivism

III) microscopic/macroscopic scales of science - Canguilhem - separate of cause/fx or event/fx like Lacan's apres coup

IV) recurrent redistribution - Serres - multiplicity and polyvalence of history [pg 5]

V) architectonic unities - Guérault - "internalism", constructed unities

(in Deleuze' review of Gueroult, attributed him as leading the "structural genetic model" ie: "differential and generative elements of a system")

VI) theoretical transformation - Althusser - 'science' against ideology,

proving the past to be ideological

b) not the prob of continuity, but

I) limits (and division)

II) how a transformation is able to serves as a new foundation "rebuilding of foundations"

c) new questions:

I) diff concepts of discontinuity (threshold, rupture, break, mutation, transformation)

II) criteria for isolating unities (science, oeuvre, theory, concept, text)

III) position and division (level of formalization, interpretation, structural analysis, causality) [pg 6]

iii) documents, monuments, history

a) the problem of history can be summed up in the document

I) traditional history = reconstruction of history based on documents

II) contemporary history = organizing the document

III) restated: [pg7]

A) trad = monument into document (memorialize monument)

B) contemp = document into monument

IV) "There was a time when archaeology, as a discipline devoted to silent monuments, inert traces, objects without context, and things left by the past, aspired to the condition of history, and attained meaning only through the restitution of a historical discourse; it might be said, to play on words a little, that in our time history aspires to the condition of archaeology, to the intrinsic description of the monument."

b) consequences:

I) problem of constituting series

A) trad hist = laws of series

B) contemp hist = break up series (irreducible to a single law) [pg 8]

II) role of continuity in historical disciplines

A) trad hist = primary role of historian is to remove discontinuity explanations given?

i) deliberate action of historian (not a quality of the material) - better methods

ii) result of description (not to be eliminated thru analysis) - clarity of language [pg 9]

iii) specified by the historian (not as a result of a gap between two positivities) - anomalous or comparative

B) contemp = discontinuity is now the "instrument and object of research"

III) move from total history to general history (total = single central principle, general = disperse comparisons and relations) [pg 10]

IV) new methodological problems

A) coherence/homogeneity of documents

B) 'principle of choice' (method of choosing what documents to use)

C) level of analysis (what aspects of documents to be used)

D) specified method of analysis ("method") [pg 11]

- E) delimiting the material (region, period, processes)
- F) relations possible to characterize a group of material
- c) why the 'new' field of history is important
- I) it's a break from the 'history of philosophy'
- II) it intersects with structuralism (though with many caveats about the importance of structuralism for history)

iv) the epistemological mutation in history, and its incompleteness

- I) inaugurated by Marx
 - II) promise of continuous history [pg 12]
 - A) refuge for consciousness/subjectivity
 - B) "this theme has played a constant role since the nineteenth century: to preserve, against all decentrings, the sovereignty of the subject, and the twin figures of anthropology and humanism"
 - III) de-center operations:
 - A) Marx: hist analysis of rx of produ, econ determ, class struggle [pg 13]
 - recoup: total history that reduces diff to single form
 - B) Nietzsche: genealogy
 - recoup: rationality as telos of mankind
 - C) psychoanalysis, linguistics, ethnology: decenter subject to law of desire, form of language, rule of action, games of discourse
 - recoup: history of development (not division), internal dynamic (not interplay of relations). freedom (not system), consciousness (not form)
 - "humanist marx" "transcendental Nietzsche" (search for origins)
 - IV) closed system approach, should be an open system
 - V) 'conservative function' of reactionary approaches [pg 14]
 - A) cry of "murdering history"
 - B) in reality the eclipse of history that had a secretly synthetic connection to the subject
- **great account

v) reflections on work and rx to past work

- I) MC/BC/OT "imperfect sketches" [pg 15]
- II) doesn't want to 'intervene in field of history' but to study the field of historical knowledge where it lies (autochthonous)
- III) non-hylomorphic
- IV) elaborate a non-humanist/non-anthro method from MC/BC/OT [pg 16]
- V) reflecting on failures of MC/BC/OT
 - A) MC: too great of an emphasis on 'experiment' which came to close to an anonymous/general subject of history
 - B) BC: frequent reliance on structural analysis threatened to miss the specificity of the problem and therefore not properly archaeological
 - C) OT: absence of methodological signposting might have given the impression of 'cultural totality'
- VI) careful positivity of the project [pg 17]
- VII) am I shifty? no... "Do not ask who I am and do not ask me to remain

the same: leave it to our bureaucrats and our police to see that our papers are in order. At least spare use their morality when we write."

Part II: The Discursive Regularities [pg 21]

I) First task: negative: "rid ourselves of a whole mass of notions, each of which, in its own way, diversifies the theme of continuity"

A) notions of: tradition, influence, development, evolution, & spirit

B) classification / categories: literature vs politics, etc [pg 22]

C) suspending unities: book / oeuvre [pg 23]

- "node within a network"

- unity of an oeuvre = result of an interpretive operation [pg 24]

D) "impossibility of the real" (F is against) [pg 25]

E) "always already" (F is against)

--D&E both echo of Derrida, but also phenomenology and Lacan

Conclusion: must suspend these "pre-existing continuities" because they assume a self-evidence that requires a non-synthetic purity [pg 26]

II) positive statement: "i shall accept the groupings that history suggests only to subject them at once to interrogation" etc etc

- result: "once these immediate forms of continuity are suspended, an entire field is set free." what is that? 'a field made up of the totality of all effective statements, in their dispersion as events and in the occurrence that is proper to them.' [pg 27]

- project restated: "pure description of discursive events" "as the horizon for the search for the unities that form within it." or "how is it that one particular statement appeared rather than another?" [pg 28]

1)

A) not linguistic analysis or history of thought

B) singularity of statement, 'the specificity of its occurrence' 'historical irruption' "emergence"

C) statement as event

2)

A) eliminate psychologization (intention, rigor of thought, obsession, existenz, etc)

B) establish relationality [pg 29]

3) eliminate naturalness, presentism, or universality

III) provisional description of relations that emerge

A) the constitution of subjects (which is the "object" of F's analysis) [pg 30]

B) qualify his analysis:

i) he privileges human science, but...

a) discursive events is not limited to these fields

b) the division of the 'field' isn't even definitive

Chapter 2 (of Part 2): Discursive Formations [pg 31]

I) two major concerns

1) terms: statement, event, discourse (addressed later)

2) relations of statements (left in their provisional, visible grouping)

A) why are certain fields unities? (ex: political economy, biology, psychopathology) [[ie: autonomous working class discourse...]]

##-1st hypothesis: object as unities : shared object (though statements differ in form and dispersed through time) [pg 32] [K = transformation of objects]

//no good: 1) can't isolate discourse that is part of a 'feedback loop' (using Hackings terminology)

2) not identical objects (madness changed, was different, etc)

-so why not geography? (not the permanence/uniqueness of the object, but the space in which various objects emerge)

"the interplay of the rules that make possible the appearance of objects during a given period of time" [pg 33]

"paradoxically, to define a group of statements in terms of its individuality would be to define the dispersion of these objects, to grasp all the interstices that separate them, to measure the distances that reign between them - in other words, to formulate their law of division."

##-2nd hypothesis: form or style as unities : group rx btwn statements according to form and type of connexion ["series of descriptive statements"] [K = ?]

-ie: a shared style, or same visual modality

-doesn't work b/c

1) description could be abstracted from the hypothesis (description was only one part)

2) description is always being displaced (w/ examples...)

--short suggestion on what would be necessary...

##3rd hypothesis: concepts as unities : system of permanent and coherent concepts [pg 34] [K = generativity]

-ex: language, grammar, etc

-K = "new concepts" prove not perm and coh

##4th hypothesis: theme as unities : regroup to reveal 'identity and interconnexion of themes' [pg 35] [K = ?]

-"suppose that a certain thematic is capable of linking, and animating a group of discourses"

-K = possibility and coherence of theme different at different times (ex: evolutionism & economic value) [pg 36]

-alt = "mark out the dispersion of the points of choice, and define prior to any option, to any thematic preference, a field of strategic possibilities" [pg 37]

B) conclusion on 4 hypotheses: didn't work -- instead, need to study

i) forms of division

ii) systems of dispersion

****Discursive Formation:** "Whenever one can describe, between a number of statements, such a system of dispersion, whenever, between objects, types of statement, concepts, or thematic choices, one can define a regularity (an order, correlations, positions and functionings, transformations), we will say, for the sake of convenience, that we are dealing with a discursive formation." [pg 38]

****Rules of Formation:** "The conditions to which the elements of this division (objects, mode of statement, concepts, thematic choices) are subjected we shall call the rules of formation. The rules of formation are conditions of existence (but also of coexistence, maintenance, modification, and disappearance) in a given discursive division."

--warning that he's not sure about the result of the inquiry, if it will adequately live up to its task, or what will happen if it eclipses all of the touchstones of historical scholarship... "a blank indifferent space, lacking in both interiority and promise"

Chapter 3: The Formation of Objects [pg 40]

I) do 'rules of formation' hold together?
ex: psychopathology and 19C break

Three factors: [pg 41]

(a) Surfaces of emergence

(b) authorities of delimitation

(c) grids of specification

//

(a) surfaces of emergence: the individual differences mapped onto (ie: disease, alienation, anomaly, dementia, neurosis, etc)

(b) authorities of delimitation: "authority in society that delimited, designated, named, and established madness as an object"

(c) grids of specification: "the system according to which the different 'kinds of madness' are divided, contrasted, related, regrouped, classified, derived from one another as objects of psychiatric discourse"

II) not enough by itself: [pg 42]

1) they're not already established objects, handed over for analysis (by other institutions like the family or legal system)

--"it would be quite wrong to see discourse as a plane where previously established objects are laid one after another like words on a page." [pg 43]

2) there are several planes of differentiation

--"a series of different, heterogeneous determinations, lacking attributable links and relations"

3) list of rx in 19C that gave rise to various objects of psychiatric

discourse [pg 44]

****Key method!!!

Let us generalise: in the nineteenth century, psychiatric discourse is characterised not by privileged objects, but by the way in which it forms objects that are in fact highly dispersed. This formation is made possible by a group of relations established between authorities of emergence, delimitation, and specification. One might say, then, that a discursive formation is defined (as far as its objects are concerned, at least) if one can establish such a group; if one can show how any particular object of discourse finds in it its place and law of emergence; if one can show that it may give birth simultaneously or successively to mutually exclusive objects, without having to modify itself. [pg 44]

4) remarks/consequences:

a) historical conditions of new objects are positive, not just limiting (not like there's an obviousness that is being concealed) [pg 45] (**** foucault's positive conception of power is obvious here)

b) objects emerge from a "field of exteriority" which enables them to appear, but does not define its internal composition

c) three types of systems of relations:

i) system of real/primary relations [a positivist base]

-independent of all discourse and indep of objects of discourse

-relations btwn institutions, techniques, social forms, etc (on which the rest depends), [see b)]

-not necessarily expressed in the system of rx that make discursive objects possible

ii) system of reflexive/secondary relations [in discourse]

-what is said by psychiatrists about family/criminality, etc

iii) system of discursive relations - what is 'properly called discursive' is neither i or ii

d) discursive relations = group of rx that discourse must establish for discourse *as a practice*

-not internal to discourse, not exterior to discourse, but at its limits (??)

-presupposed the object is formed independently of discourse

-but is the group of relations necessary "to speak" the object

****"the group of relations that discourse must establish in order to speak of this or that object, in order to deal with them, name them, analyse them, classify them, explain them, etc. These relations characterise not the language (langue) used by discourse, nor the circumstances in which it is deployed, but discourse itself as a practice." [pg 46]

5) summarizing points:

a) discursive relations set up rules, immanent in practice

-it is not the objects that remain constant, nor the domain that they form; it is not even their point of emergence or their mode of characterisation;

but the relation between the surfaces on which they appear, on which they can be delimited, on which they can be analysed and specified. [pg 47]

b) not a history of the referent (though Madness and Civ was)

-resolutely anti-phenomological

-wants to study "the regular formation of objects that emerge only in discourse"

c) not an analysis of meaning

-analysis of meaning are meaningful

-but analysis of meaning can't look to the "discursive practice as a place in which a tangled plurality - at once superposed and incomplete - of objects is formed and deformed, appears and disappears" [pg 48]

-b/c either assumes meanings of a given period (Jameson's reading of mediations) or a semantic structure of a discourse that has already been spoken

d) not about words and things (the Fr. title of OT)

-not structuralist, saussurian, or phenomenological

-quick summary of OT as a project ("the ironic title of a work that modifies its own form, displaces its own data, and reveals, at the end of the day, a quite different task.") [pg 49]

-but a look to discourse "as practices that systematically form the objects of which they speak"

Chapter 4: The Formation of Enunciative Modalities [pg 50]

Three factors:

1) who speaks

-why them out of totality of speaking individuals

-qualified, prestige, value, benefits, etc

2) institutional site [pg 51]

-gives legitimacy to discourse

-point of application of discourse

3)subject-position [pg 52]

-relation to objects

-questioning subject, listening subject, etc etc

Relations are most important! [pg 53]

-relations between distinct elements (repeat of 1-3)

-constructs a unity through series of relations in practice (but not given a priori, not a set of contingencies) [pg 54]

*reminds that he's not suggesting any of the methods he's opposed in the introduction

-not "mediations" (similar to 'bracketing' arg of Coleman, but diff) also not 'conjunctural' in that way

*Discourse is not the result of (thinking, knowing, speaking) subject, but i) space of exteriority

ii) network of distinct sites
('dispersion') [pg 55]

Chapter 5: The Formation of Concepts [pg 56]

"Rather than wishing to replace concepts in a virtual deductive edifice, one would have to describe the organization of the field of statements where they appeared and circulated." [pg 56] like transduction?

Three factors:

- 1) forms of succession // (i) order and (ii) dependence
- 2) forms of coexistence // (i) field of presence (and how its verified, etc), (ii) field of concomitance (AKA co-constitution), (iii) field of memory [pg 58]
- 3) procedures of intervention // used, link, and produce a unity, examples: rewriting, transcribing, translating, approximating, delimiting, transferring, systematizing [pg 59]

*Relations key

-not laws, progression, of consciousness, but dispersion! [pg 60]

-- a preconceptual field!

((ex from OT of how different "opposed" systems are really compatible, and not progressive developments [pg 61]))

Preconceptual field is not: [pg 62]

- 1) horizon of ideality (science of logic)
 - 2) genesis of abstractions (history of ideas as facts)
- not universally valid, but specific to particular discursive fields

-not result of an individual, but the emergence from the preconceptual field [a lot like complexity theory]

Chapter 6: The Formation of Strategies [pg 64]

I) strategies

-going through MC, BC, OT [pg 65]

- 1) points of diffraction
 - i) points of incompatibility
 - ii) points of equivalence
 - iii) points of systemization [pg 66]

"One describes it rather as a unity of distribution that opens a field of possible options, and enables various mutually exclusive architectures to appear side by side or in turn." [pg 66]

2) the economy of the discursive constellation

*not all alternatives 'opened up' are actualized

"This whole group of relations forms a principle of determination that permits or excludes, within a given discourse, a certain number of statements" [pg 67]

"A discursive formation does not occupy therefore all the possible volumes that is opened up to it of right by the systems of formation of its objects, its enunciations, and its concepts; it is essentially incomplete, owing to the system of formation of its strategic choices. Hence the fact that, taken up again, placed, and interpreted in a new constellation, a given discursive formation may reveal new possibilities." *** [pg 67] ** re-appropriation

3) 'another authority'

-authority (who can speak, etc etc) not exterior to discourse, but "its formative elements" [pg 68] **knowledge/power v/v disco formation

II) a discursive formation = "all of the different strategies that are deployed in it" "they all derive from the same set of relations" (in spite of their diversity and dispersion)

-ex: Analysis of Wealth = 6 different strategies (mercantilism, physiocratic, etc)

"Economic discourse, in the Classical period, is defined by a certain constant way of relating possibilities of systematization interior to a discourse, other discourses that are exterior to it, and a whole non-discursive field of practices, appropriation, interests, and desires" [pg 69]

--a short immanent history... (non dialectical) NOT "regarded as the sum of these various options" (and therefore not reductive)

--neither subjectivist or ideological, but actually existing [pg 69] & [pg 70]

Chapter 7: Remarks and Consequences [pg 71]

1) the various levels of discourses are inter-related [pg 72]

-NOT base-superstructure! [pg 73]

2) non-hylomorphic (and not depth but 'at the limit') & 'schema of correspondence between several temporal series' [pg 74]

-ex: inter-rx btwn various 19C disciplines & psychiatry [pg 75]

-"it is no use establishing specific relations that can be analysed only at their own level - the effect of those relations is not confined to another"

3) 'systems of formation' not final stage of discourse

-disco is 'living' and always open

-[even more on that on the next pg, 76]

Part III: The Statement and the Archive

Chapter 1: Defining the Statement [pg 79]

I) what is the statement? (b/c its been used so much...) [pg 80]

-atomistic? reductionist? [cf 106]

II) it's not...

1) logic 'propositional structure'

2) grammar 'the sentence' [pg 81]

3) speech act [pg 83] (apparently MF later changes his mind)

4) la langue (different level, though still made of signs) [pg 85]

5) material objects (different level, though still somewhat material)

III) it is: "not... a structure...it is a function of existence that properly belongs to signs and on the basis of which one may then decide, through analysis or intuition, whether or not they 'make sense', according to what rule they follow on another or are juxtaposed, of what they are the sign, and what sort of act is carried out by their formulation." [pg 86]

- "in its actual practice, in its conditions, the rules that govern it, and the field in which it operates" [pg 87]

Chapter 2: The Enunciative Function [pg 88]

Statements as they exist, enunciation...

I) relation of statement to correlate is not:

1) a subject

2) signifier to signified [pg 89]

3) proposition to referent

4) sentence to meaning [pg 90]

II) some stuff on correlation...

a) correlate of the statement is "a group of domains in which objects may appear and to which such relations may be assigned" [pg 91]

b) correlate is not "things, facts, realities, beings" but "laws of possibility, rules of existence for the objects that are named, designated, or described within it, and for the relations that are affirmed or denied in it"

c) "it is this group that characterizes the enunciative level"

III) subject-positions

a) can't reduce statement to the 1st person of the subject

-ex: saying something about yourself vs. reading it in a play

b) nor author of the formulation

- "it is an empty function, that can be filled by virtually any individual when he formulates the statement" [pg 93]

-ex: math proposition [pg 94]

IV) associated field [pg 96]

a) "the enunciative function... cannot operate on a sentence or proposition in isolation. ... it must be related to a whole adjacent field." [pg 97]

b) description of the elements of the associated field [pg 98 +]

V) material existence

a) repeatable materiality [pg 102]

b) institution defines 'possibilities of reinscription and transcription' [pg 103]

c) field of stabilization

V) Summary

"This repeatable materiality that characterizes the enunciative function reveals the statement as a specific and paradoxical object, but also one of those objects that men produce, manipulate, use, transform, exchange, combine, decompose and recombine, and possibly destroy. Instead of being something said once and for all - and lost in the past like the result of a battle, a geological catastrophe, or the death of a king - the statement, as it emerges in its materiality, appears with a status, enters various networks and various fields of use, is subjected to transferences or modifications, is integrated into operations and strategies in which its identity is maintained or effaced. Thus the statement circulates, is used, disappears, allows or prevents the realization of a desire, serves or resists various interests, participates in challenge and struggle, and becomes a theme of appropriation or rivalry." [pg 105]

Chapter 3: The Description of Statements [pg 106]

Statements again... not atomistic...

I) the project:

a) first task, fix the vocab [pg 107]

-def of some different words..

-analysis of statements = a specific level, distinct and important [pg 108]

b) [second task = defining statement: not an elementary unit, but conditions of existence] not reductionist

"defining the conditions in which the function that gave a series of signs...an existence, and a specific existence, can operate"

-not trying to find a hidden structure, but the statement is 'not immediately visible' "neither visible nor hidden" [pg 109]

*against latency and suppression/repression!

c) ...

new vocab (from Protevi):

(1) Formulation: (psychological) act that reveals linguistic performance as sign

groups

(2) Sentence (grammar); proposition (logic) as units recognized in performances

(3) Statement: modality of existence proper to performances allowing them correlates, subject-positionality, associated fields, repeatable materiality

(4) Discourse: groups of signs qua statements (belonging to single formation)

(5) Discursive formation: law of series, of dispersion, of statements

II) four points on theory [pg 113-7]

1. studying discursive formations...

2. "a statement belongs to a discursive formation as a sentence belongs to a text, and a proposition to a deductive whole"

3. "proper definition of discourse"

- "we shall call discourse a group of statements in so far as they belong to the same discursive formation" [pg 117]

"Discourse in this sense is not an ideal, timeless form that also possesses a history; the problem is not therefore to ask one-self how and why it was able to emerge and become embodied at this point of time; it is, from beginning to end, historical - a fragment of history, a unity and discontinuity in history itself, posing the problem of its own limits, its divisions, its transformations, the specific modes of its temporality rather than its sudden irruption in the midst of complicities of time." [pg 117]

4. 'discursive practice' "is a body of anonymous, historical rules, always determined in the time and space that have defined a given period, and for a given social, economic, geographical, or linguistic area, the conditions of operation of the enunciative function."

***now F explains now that he's gone [discursive formation --> statement]
he now wants to 'invert his analysis' and go [discursive formation --> exterior/ its legitimate use]

Chapter 4: Rarity, Exteriority, Accumulation [pg 118]

I) rarity

1) 'everything is never said'

"there are, in total, relatively few things that are said" [pg 119]

-principle of rarification: a non-filling of the field of possible formulations it is opened up by the language (langue)

2) no deep, hidden structure

3) not repression

"the enunciative domain is identical with its own surface"

4) statements exist in an economy of use [pg 120]

-interp = multiplication of statement... (but also its incarceration)

II) exteriority

-against desire to find "essential nucleus of interiority" [pg 121]

-"an exteriority that may be paradoxical since it refer to no adverse form of interiority"

-the event

1) field of statements: "in its empirical modesty" "the locus of particular events, regularities, relationships, modifications and systemic transformations"

-"treated not as the result or trace of something else, but as a practical domain that is autonomous (although dependent), and which can be described at its own level (although it must be articulated on something other than itself)." [pg 122]

2) anonymous field: "whose configuration defines the possible position of speaking subjects"

-not i) individual subject, ii) collective consciousness or iii) transcendental subjectivity

3) without hope for writing a 'proper' history of things said

*doesn't pose the question of the speaking subject

-not super-ego, Voice, etc

-specific to what was said

III) accumulation

*short explanation of genealogy, then says not this project [pg 123]

-not origins, but how things accumulate and transform

1) rémanence: 'holding charge' "preserved by virtue of a number of supports and material techniques"

-change their mode of existence [pg 124]

2) additivity: don't just pile-up, different rules of combinations

-diff btwn fields

-diff in fields (ie: 19C vs 20C)

3) recurrence: alternative to condensation

*not about origins or giving a second birth [pg 125]

last statement on == "happy positivist"

Chapter 5: The Historical a priori and the Archive [pg 126]

I) positivity of discourse: defines a limited space of communication

-ability to say people were/n't "talking about the same thing"

-not if it was rigorous, or right, etc etc

-statements "communicate by the form of the positivity of their discourse" [pg 127]

II) historical a priori: 'condition of reality of statements'

-not condition for validity of judgments

- "discourse has not only a meaning or a truth, but a history, and a specific history that does not refer it back to the laws of an alien development"

- not a priori + history [pg 128]

*given different image of the surface of discourse "a complex volume"

III) The archive: general system of the formation and transformation of statements [later, pg 130]

- NOT a sum of texts

- statement-event // system of enunciability [pg 129]

- statement-thing // system of functioning

- autonomous level between language (langue) and corpus (collection of words spoken) :: "between tradition and oblivion, it reveals the rules of a practice that enables statements both to survive and to undergo regular modification" [pg 130]

*method stuff -- not possible to describe our own archive

analysis of archive: [pg 131]

- deprives us of our continuities

- dissipates temporal identity

- breaks the thread of transcendental teleologies

- where anthropological thought once questioned man's being or subjectivity, it now bursts open the other, and the outside

- not ID via distinction

- "We are difference, that our reason is the difference of discourses, our history the differences of times, our selves the difference of masks."

"difference... is this dispersion that we are and make."

*archaeology...

Part IV: Archaeological Description

Chapter 1: Archaeology and the History of Ideas [pg 135]

I) consideration of history of ideas

- is MF one? what is HoI? [pg 136]

- MF might have a desire to have HoI pass a "threshold of scientificity" that others have passed...

- marginality disciplines

- inter-disciplinary [pg 137]

II) HoI three "great themes": [pg 138]

- genesis

- continuity

- totality

III) archaeology NOT HoI

four reasons:

1) attribution of innovation

2) analysis of contradictions

3) comparative descriptions

4) mapping transformations

IV) principles:

1) not looking for something concealed/revealed in disco

-not disco as document ('as a sign of something else')

-"not.. as an element that ought to be transparent, but whose unfortunate opacity must often be pierced if one is to reach at last the depth of the essential in the place in which it is held in reserve" [pg 138]

-but disco as monument! [pg 139]

-not interpretive (not seeking another, better-hidden discourse)

-refuses to be allegorical

2) disco in their specificity [pg 139]

-not their moment of construction or destruction

-not a science

-"a differential analysis of the modalities of discourse"

3) not about individual/society opposition

4) not a restoration or return

-not about returning to origins of when something was spoken

Chapter 2: The Original and the Regular [pg 141]

I) HoI: splits valued/rare from ordinary/everday

-puts innovation and importance on the rare

-vs 'old ideas' that are unimportant and mundane

II) HoI requires: resemblance and procession

-procession (on whose shoulders one is standing)

-resemblance (talking about the same thing?)

III) archaeology = "those discursive practices to which the facts of succession must be referred" to be systematic [pg 144]

-not originality/banality opp, but regularity

-regularity: "specifies an effective field of appearance"

-NOT frequency or probability

-NOT the search for inventions or the moment of discovery, "A discovery is no less regular, from the enunciative point of view, than the text that repeats and diffuses it; regularity is no less operant, no less effective and active, in a banal as in a unique formation." [pg 145]

IV) further archaeological study of enunciative regularities

1) homogeneous fields of enunciative regularities

-diff btwn: linguistic analogy (translatability), logical identity (equivalence), and enunciative homogeneity

2) internal hierarchy w/in enunciative regularities

-tree of derivation of a discourse [pg 147]

-what is a base, and what is variable, how much, etc

V) reminder that it's not complete formalization [pg 148]

Chapter 3: Contradictions [pg 149]

I) HoI analyses thru coherence

-resolve contrad through simplest means

-or motor of history [pg 151]

II) arch & contrad: to be discovered, but not dissipated or radicalized

-ex: linnaeus, fixist & 'evolutionist' accounts = share common locus!

-"spaces of dissension" [Bill Reading's University in Ruins? others?]

III)

1) different types of contradiction [pg 153]

2) different levels of contradiction [pg 154]

3) different functions of contradiction

IV) arch's job

-not to resolve or find fundamental underlying contradiction

-map particular discursive practice and describe "a space of multiple dissensions"

Chapter 4: The Comparative Facts [pg 157]

I) arch comparison of positivities always limited and regional

-cannot be generalized

-"The horizon of archaeology, therefore, is not a science, a rationality, a mentality, a culture; it is a tangle of interpositivities whose limits and points of intersection cannot be fixed in a single operation" [pg 159]

II) arch = "the play of analogies and differences as they appear at the level of rules of formation"

-five tasks

1) how different discursive elements may be formed on the basis of similar rules (archaeological isomorphisms)

2) to the extent at those rules work differently (archaeological model)

3) how entirely different concepts occupy a similar position despite their difference (domain of appl, degree of formalization, historical genesis)

[pg 161]

4) how a single notion can cover two distinct elements (archaeological shifts)

5) how relations between elements are established (archaeological correlations)

III) rx btwn disco form & non-disco form

-not symbolic analysis or causality

-not how political practice determined meaning/form of the disco - but how and in what form it takes part in its conditions of emergence/insertion/functioning [pg 163]

IV) not a point for point, but "it seeks to discover that whole domain of institutions, economic processes, and social relations on which a discursive formation can be articulate" [pg 164]

Chapter 5: Change and Transformations [pg 165]

I) synchrony

-suspend temporal succession (the calendar of formulations) [pg 167]

-"to reveal the relations that characterize the temporality of discursive formations and articulate them in a series" - and intersection

a) arch = 'defines the operators by which the events are transcribed into statements'

-ex: not empirical validity between aspects of an event, but what objects of discourse can be articulated from an event

b) not pure synchrony (where diachrony can be suspended) -- maps "temporal vectors of derivation" [pg 169]

-****non-linear

II) difference

-arch is more about dicont, rupture, gap, new forms of positivity, sudden redistributions *****

*NOT ARBITRARY OR RELATIVIST [pg 170]

-different differences:

1) levels of difference [pg 171]

2) transformation (not mere change) [pg 172]

3) transformation of rx doesn't necessarily alter all elements [pg 173]

-continuity despite change

4) rupture isn't total and complete, there is a dispersion of discontinuities themselves [pg 175]

"we must not imagine that rupture is a sort of great drift that carries with it all discursive formations at once"

-each needs to be studied in its specificity

-not just a period, rupture is specific

Chapter 6 and Conclusion -- haven't outlined yet