

Archaeology of Knowledge: Outline

Outline by John Protevi / Permission to reproduce granted for academic use
protevi@lsu.edu / <http://www.protevi.com/john/Foucault/AK.pdf>

I. Introduction

- A. Two trends in writing history
 - 1. History proper: The Annales School: *la longue durée*, material civilization
 - 2. History of ideas: rupture, discontinuity
- B. Same problem for 1) and 2): questioning of the document
 - 1. Previous historiography: turning monuments into documents (of a subject)
 - 2. Contemporary historiography:
 - a. Works on documents to define unities, totalities, series, relations
 - b. Turns documents into monuments so history becomes archaeology, the "intrinsic description of monuments"
 - 3. Four consequences of new history
 - a. [the series] current history seeks to constitute the series itself
 - b. Discontinuity now both an instrument and an object of research
 - c. Move from total history to general history
 - (1) total history: principle of society, form of civilization; centralize
 - (2) general history: discover relations btw series: draw "tables"; disperse
 - d. Methodological problems
 - 4. Interest in historiographic methodology
 - a. New history vs. "philosophy of history" [=Kant/Hegel/Marx]
 - b. Intersects w/ other "structuralist" fields, BUT
 - (1) structuralism covers only part of new history
 - (2) "structuralist" problematics in history not imported
 - (3) no "structure" in history opposed to development [*devenir*]
- C. Origin of this epistemological mutation in historiography
 - 1. Probably begins with Marx, but delayed registration and reflection;
 - a. continuity in history is shelter for consciousness, subjectivity
 - b. promise of [re-]appropriation of historical difference [Hegel, "humanist" Marx, "nostalgic" Heidegger, Gadamer]
 - 2. Effects of this desire: reactions to, misreadings of Marx/Nietzsche/Freud
 - 3. These reactions are a "conservative function"
 - a. Cry of "murdering history" goes up when "threshold" is mention
 - b. but this is just bewailing death of historiography tied to subject
- D. Situating Foucault's project re: the new historiography
 - 1. Previous works were an "imperfect sketch" of mutations in historiography
 - 2. Thus it is not a question of structure vs genesis, but of the subject
 - 3. Difference btw AK and MC, BC, OT
 - 4. Self-reflection on AK
- E. Concluding dialogue

II. The Discursive Regularities

- A. The unities of discourse
 - 1. Unquestioned unities to be suspended
 - 2. Two linked but opposite themes (ensuring continuity) to be suspended
 - 3. Positive statement of goals of AK
 - a. must receive discourse in its sudden irruption, its dispersion
 - b. Suspending unities frees 'field of totality of all effective statements ... as events'
 - (1) 'a population of events in space of discourse in general'
 - (2) 'project of a pure description of discursive events ... as horizon of search for unities that form w/in it'

4. F's project vs. other analyses
 - a. Linguistic analysis
 - b. History of thought
 5. Goal of analysis
 - a. Restore to statement specificity of its occurrence as discontinuity, as event
 - b. Prevent link to psychological synthesis, so other relations are grasped
 - c. Describe other unities on basis of statements' coexistence, succession, etc.
 6. Provisional division as an initial approximation
 - a. Criteria: density, spread, etc
 - b. Target: sciences of man (where subject of discourse is the object of discourse)
 7. Two provisos: analysis not limited to target; assumed limits provisional
- B. Discursive formations
1. Defer question of terms 'statement' 'event' 'discourse' (Part 3)
 2. Question of the relations of statements: what are their unities?
 - a. Objects as unities vs. rules of dispersion/transformation of objects
 - b. Enunciative style (form of statements) vs. rules of dispersion of different types
 - c. Concepts as unities vs. rules of dispersion of their appearance
 - d. Themes as unities vs. rules of dispersion of points of choice
 3. Definition of terms
 - a. Discursive formation = system of dispersion of objects, types, concepts, choices
 - b. Rules of formation = conditions of existence of statements in a given field
 4. Ironic warning of 'danger' of losing subject and finding 'blank, indifferent space'
- C. The formation of objects
1. Three sets of factors
 - a. Surfaces of emergence
 - b. Authorities of delimitation
 - c. Grids of specification
 2. Inadequacies of this simple listing
 3. Formation of new objects as neither discoveries nor effects of institutional change
 4. Must pursue problem of new formation of objects in discursive relations among 1a-c
 5. Remarks and consequences
 - a. Historical conditions of new objects are positive, not just limiting
 - b. Discursive relations are established in field of non-discursive relations
 - c. Discursive relations must be distinguished from
 - (1) primary relations (btw non-discursive factors); establish relations of dependence for discursive relations
 - (2) secondary relations in discourse: what psychiatry says re: family/criminality
 - d. Discursive relations are at the limit of discourse
 6. Summary
 - a. Discursive relations form set of immanent and defining rules
 - b. This is not a history of the referent (MC): anti-phenomenology
 - c. Nor an analysis of meaning: anti-analytic philosophy
 - d. Thus not a question of 'words and things'
- D. The formation of enunciative modalities
1. Three sets of factors
 - a. Who speaks
 - b. Institutional site
 - c. Subject-position
 2. Relations among these are the key
 3. 'Further remark': non-reduction to subject
 4. Rather, to space of exteriority, to dispersion of subjectivity-positions
- E. The formation of concepts
1. Three sets of factors

- a. Forms of succession
- b. Forms of coexistence
- c. Procedures of intervention
- 2. Again, relations are the key
- 3. Preconceptual field is not
 - a. horizon of ideality (a science of logic)
 - b. or a genesis of abstractions (history of ideas as facts)
 - c. Rules of formation in this field 'operate in discourse itself ... uniform anonymity'
 - d. But they are not valid for all domains; they are specific to fields
- F. The formation of strategies
 - 1. Factors:
 - a. Points of diffraction of discourse
 - b. Economy of discursive constellation (choices related to other discourses)
 - c. 'Another authority' (including non-discursive practices)
 - 2. Relations as key to individualizing a discursive formation on basis of strategies
 - a. These are neither subjective choices nor ideological translations of interest
 - b. But systematically different ways of treating objects, forms, and concepts
- G. Remarks and consequences (What is gained by this new analysis?)
 - 1. Interrelations among the four sets of rules
 - 2. 'at limit of discourse'; 'schema of correspondence btw several temporal series'
 - 3. Systems of formation do not determine micro-level of texts

III. The Statement and the Archive

- A. Defining the statement
 - 1. Statement is not
 - a. Proposition (logic)
 - b. Sentence (grammar)
 - c. Speech act (Austin: NB: F later recants on this point)
 - 2. Statement does not exist on same level
 - a. as *la langue* (although it is made up of signs)
 - b. Nor is it like perceptual objects (although it does have a certain materiality)
 - 3. Statement is not a structure, but a 'function of existence' of signs
- B. The enunciative function
 - 1. Relation of statement to correlate is not that of
 - a. signifier to signified
 - b. proposition to referent
 - c. Sentence to meaning
 - 2. Re: object/referent/meaning
 - a. 'correlate' of statement is 'group of domains in which objects may appear or relations be assigned'
 - b. Via correlate statement is 'linked to "referential" ... laws of possibility, rules of existence'
 - 3. Re: subject-positions
 - a. Not grammatical subject, nor author of the formulation
 - b. But a 'particular' vacant place that may in fact be filled by different individuals'
 - 4. Re: associated field
 - a. Statement CANNOT operate w/o field of other statements
 - b. Elements of the associated field
 - 5. Re: material existence: 'repeatable materiality'
 - a. 'institution': possibilities of reinscription and transcription
 - b. Conditions imposed by its associated field: 'field of stabilization'
- C. The description of statements
 - 1. What is task of describing statements?

- a. First task: fix vocabulary
 - (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
- b. [second task: defining the statement]: not isolating an elementary unit, but defining conditions
- 2. Theory of statement related to previous analysis of discursive formations
- D. Rarity, exteriority, accumulation: F as 'happy positivist'
 - 1. Rarity: 'everything is never said'; discourse as asset; question of power
 - 2. Exteriority: not the retracing of expression; 'an anonymous field'
 - 3. Accumulation: *rémanence*; materiality; additivity; recurrence; no search for origin
- E. The historical a priori and the archive
 - 1. Historical a priori = positivity of discourse defining limited space of communication
 - 2. Archive = general system of formation and transformation of statements
 - 3. 'We are difference'; analysis of archive 'bursts open the other and the outside'

IV. Archaeological Description

- A. Archaeology and the history of ideas
 - 1. Characterization of history of ideas: genesis, continuity, totalization
 - 2. Principles of archaeology
- B. The original and the regular
 - 1. History of ideas deals with the new and the old
 - 2. Archaeology: regularity of statements; set of conditions for enunciative function
 - 3. Future projects of archaeology
 - a. Different homogeneous fields of enunciative regularities
 - b. Interior hierarchies w/in enunciative regularities: tree of enunciative derivation
- C. Contradictions
 - 1. History of ideas: contradiction as residual mistake or fundamental motor of history
 - 2. Archaeology: contradictions to be described for themselves; spaces of dissension
 - a. Different types
 - b. Different levels
 - c. [Different] functions
- D. The comparative facts
 - 1. Limited and regional comparison
 - a. Each investigation yields a region of interpositivity (not a worldview)
 - b. Horizon for archaeology = 'tangle of interpositivities'; multiple analyses needed
 - 2. Play of analogies and differences at level of rules of formation; five tasks:
 - 3. Relation btw discursive formations and non-discursive domains
 - a. Arch is not symbolic or causal analysis
 - b. But how political practice takes part in conditions of discourse
- E. Change and transformation
 - 1. Apparent synchrony of discursive formations: suspension of 'calendar of formulations' reveals relations characterizing temporality of discursive formations
 - 2. Rupture; the differentiation of differences
 - a. Distinguishes levels of events:
 - b. Substitute analysis of transformations for mere reference to 'change'
 - c. Transformation of relations does not change all elements (analysis of continuity)
 - d. Heterogeneity of ruptures; dispersion of discontinuities
- F. Science and knowledge

1. 'Positivities' disciplines, sciences'
2. *Savoir*: rules of discursive practice for formation of a science: 'that of which one can speak in a discursive practice'
3. *Savoir* and ideology
4. Different thresholds and their specificity
 - a. Positivity
 - b. Epistemologization
 - c. Scientificity
 - d. Formalization
5. Different types of histories of sciences
 - a. Level of formalization
 - b. Threshold of Scientificity
 - c. Threshold of epistemologization: archaeological history; analysis of episteme

V. Conclusion

- A. Structuralism
- B. Phenomenology
- C. Status of 'archaeology':
 1. History or philosophy?
 2. Scientificity
 3. Rule-bound nature of F's own discourse