

INTERDISCOURSE AND MEMORY: THE METAPHOR AND THE METONYMY IN PÊCHEUX/HERBERT

João Carlos CATTELAN*

- **ABSTRACT:** Since the concepts of interdiscourse and memory are sometimes overlapped and become almost equivalent and cover different discursive functions, I intend to examine the issue by using the concepts of metaphor, metonymy, and transversal discourse, as theorized mainly by Michel Pêcheux (2011 [1984]) in *Metaphor and interdiscourse* and Thomas Herbert in *Remarks for a General Theory of Ideologies* (PÊCHEUX, 1995a). The hypothesis is that interdiscourse refers to metaphor as displacement of the pre-constructed from one discursive region to another. Meanwhile, as metonymy is the imposition of another effect from a “part” of the discursive object, metonymy organizes another meaning-relation network through transversal discourse and, therefore, another axis of memory. I will take the cases of ‘mole’ and ‘fire’ (from Michel Pêcheux) as a basis for argumentation and discuss the case of ‘God’.
- **KEYWORDS:** Metaphor; interdiscourse; metonymy; memory; transverse-discourse.

Introduction

Following the problematization presented by graduate students in a Discourse Theory course, I was led to seek a deeper understanding of the concepts of *interdiscourse* and *memory* and, by doing that, I could see that I often had the same difficulty that they reported, which was related to not being able to discern a more objective trait that would allow them to see the division between the notions, given the entanglement between both, making them not rarely indiscernible.

Seeking to understand the threads that intertwine the two concepts, I came to the essays “*Metáfora e discurso*”, by Michel Pêcheux (2011), “*Observações para uma teoria geral das ideologias*”, by Thomas Herbert (Michel Pêcheux, 1995a), “*A língua inatingível*”, by Françoise Gadet and Michel Pêcheux (2004), and “*Papel da Memória*”, by Michel Pêcheux (1999). Based on these works, it seemed to me possible to suggest a way out of the problem raised.

The interlinking of these studies led to the deepening of the concept of metaphor, conceived by Pêcheux as a first symbolic short-circuit, due to the import of a pre-constructed from one discursive region to another through interdiscourse. On the

* Universidade Estadual do Oeste do Paraná (Unioeste). Cascavel - PR - Brazil. ORCID: 0000-0002-7838-5284.

other hand, given the fragmentation that operates on the discursive object as a second symbolic short-circuit, metonymy would impose the justification and explanation for the import and for the cleavage, generating another series of discursive sequences, in “contradiction” with the one on which it constitutes itself, a series that is guided by the transverse-discourse towards the production of another axis of memory. That is what this essay is about.

The metaphor of *Mole* and of *Fire*

In “*Metáfora e interdiscurso*”, published in 1984, Pêcheux (2011) brings these two concepts together, making them circumscribe a movement of reciprocal dependence. Based on the “emphasis given to discursive processes” (PÊCHEUX, 2011, p.151),¹ he postulates that his project consists of “taking seriously the notion of *discursive materiality* as a level of socio-historical existence [...] that refers to the verbal conditions of objects existence [...] in a given conjuncture” (PÊCHEUX, 2011, p.151-152, emphasis added).² Pêcheux claims that meaning is produced via discourse and not through determinations that transcend historicity.

The project proposed by Pêcheux (2011, p.152) avoided the assumption “of the evident existence of the objects of knowledge, ‘passing through’ the discursive processes, in which they are constructed, without paying particular attention to the latter”.³ The theorization should prevent “a ‘sociology of knowledge’ (based on evidence), a ‘poetological’ position that would locate [...] processes or a theory of genres in the poetic space” (PÊCHEUX, 2011, p.152).⁴ An object is signified by being placed in discursive processes and that an effect, in the face of temporal precedence or accentuated repetition, stipulates what it is, not necessarily being it.

For Pêcheux (2011, p.153, emphasis added), “it is necessary to go back to the question of *the discursive production of the meaning of an utterance* (expression, phrase or textual sequence)”,⁵ which conditions the meaning by the discourse and the discourse by the meaning, concluding that the latter cannot be done without the former and the former submits to the latter. Therefore, the meaning depends on what is said about something. Against a transparent literalness or a specular naturalness, the thickness of the discursive “objects” comes from what submits them to an effect, cleaved by the discursive process that constrains them.

¹ Original: “*realce dado aos processos discursivos*” (PÊCHEUX, 2011, p.151).

² Original: “*levar a sério a noção de materialidade discursiva enquanto nível de existência sócio-histórica [...] que remete às condições verbais de existência dos objetos [...] em uma conjuntura dada*” (PÊCHEUX, 2011, p. 151-152, emphasis added).

³ Original: “*da existência evidente dos objetos de saber, ‘passando através’ dos processos discursivos, nos quais eles se constroem, sem prestar a estes últimos uma atenção particular*” (PÊCHEUX, 2011, p.152).

⁴ Original: “*uma ‘sociologia do saber’ (pautada na evidência), uma posição ‘poetológica’ que localizaria [...] no espaço poético os processos [...] ou uma teoria dos gêneros*” (PÊCHEUX, 2011, p.152).

⁵ Original: “*é preciso retroceder até a questão da produção discursiva do sentido de um enunciado (expressão, frase ou sequência textual)*” (PÊCHEUX, 2011, p.153, emphasis added).

A term would not have *one* meaning, as it is “cyclically determined as an ideological object”;⁶ terms like “the free balloon, the railroad and the mole”,⁷ which refer to spatial displacement, are “metaphors in which it represents itself” (PÊCHEUX, 2011, p.157);⁸ ‘mole’ wouldn’t have a “zoological naturalness”,⁹ since the discursive production of objects “would circulate among different discursive regions, none of which can be considered original” (PÊCHEUX, 2011, p.158)¹⁰ because they are what is said about them. Although the term is retained, the meaning changes according to the discursive region. There would not be “a semic structure of the object and, then, varied applications of this structure in this or that situation, but the discursive reference of the object is already constructed in discursive formations (technical, moral, political...)” (PÊCHEUX, 2011, p.158)¹¹

To get to the point: ‘mole’ would be a metaphor not by reference to a natural meaning, but because the meaning is cleaved by discursive regions and takes on an effect in each, although the linguistic form remains: “neither historical nor pure universals ideological effects of class, these objects would have the possibility of being at the same time identical to themselves and different from themselves, that is, of existing as a divided unit, susceptible to being inscribed in one or another cyclical effect” (PÊCHEUX, 2011, p.157); “It is because the elements of the textual sequence, functioning in a given discursive formation, can be imported (metaphorized) from a sequence belonging to another discursive formation that references can build and move historically” (PÊCHEUX, 2011, p.158).¹² Here is the metaphor as an import, cleavage, construction and displacement of the discursive reference through the relationship between discursive regions that speak about the same “things”, but do not say the same things about them.

In the text “*Observações para uma teoria geral das ideologias*” [Pour une théorie générale des idéologies], written as Thomas Herbert, Pêcheux (1995a) also refers to metaphor by approaching what he calls Empirical Ideology, “above which a local resistance is exercised (an ideology tries to pass as a science, producing its

⁶ Original: “conjunturalmente determinado enquanto objeto ideológico” (PÊCHEUX, 2011, p.157).

⁷ Original: “o balão livre, a estrada de ferro e a toupeira” (PÊCHEUX, 2011, p.157).

⁸ Original: “metáforas nas quais ele se representa” (PÊCHEUX, 2011, p.157).

⁹ Original: “naturalidade zoológica” (PÊCHEUX, 2011, p.158).

¹⁰ Original: “circularia entre diferentes regiões discursivas, das quais nenhuma pode ser considerada originária” (PÊCHEUX, 2011, p.158).

¹¹ Original: “uma estrutura sêmica do objeto, e em seguida aplicações variadas desta estrutura nesta ou naquela situação, mas a referência discursiva do objeto já é construída em formações discursivas (técnicas, morais, políticas...)” (PÊCHEUX, 2011, p.158).

¹² Original: “nem universais históricos, nem puros efeitos ideológicos de classe, esses objetos teriam a possibilidade de ser ao mesmo tempo idênticos a eles mesmos e diferentes deles mesmos, isto é, de existir como uma unidade dividida, suscetível de se inscrever em um ou outro efeito conjuntural” (PÊCHEUX, 2011, p.157); é porque os elementos da sequência textual, funcionando em uma formação discursiva dada, podem ser importados (metaforizados) de uma sequência pertencente a uma outra formação discursiva que as referências podem se construir e se deslocar historicamente (PÊCHEUX, 2011, p.158).

effects and reaping its benefits” (PÊCHEUX, 1995a, p. 65),¹³ since it “puts into play a semantic function [which postulates] the coincidence of the signifier with the signified” (PÊCHEUX, 1995a, p. 71).¹⁴ That obliterates the displacement of meaning through metaphorical import and presupposes a biunivocal relationship of adequacy and co-naturality between them.

But the claim of co-naturality between the signifier and the signified erases, for example, the metaphorical displacement and creates a resistance that obliterates the “symbolic specificity of the human animal, [with] the pseudo-genesis of the order of the symbolic” (PÊCHEUX, 1995a, p. 72-73)¹⁵. For the author, based on Freud,

[...] there is no genesis of the signifier (which nullifies the idea of the production-distribution of signifiers typical of the empiricist ideology): the signifier-signified relationship results from a property of the chain of signifiers that allows the correct placement of the problem of external reality and proof of this reality (PÊCHEUX, 1995a, p. 73, emphasis added).¹⁶

It is not reality that allows “from an original and non-metaphorical connection with the ‘real object’, to build metaphors *a posteriori*” (PÊCHEUX, 1995a, p. 73, emphasis added).¹⁷ This is why Gadet and Pêcheux (2004, p. 27) defend that the “metaphor also deserves to be fought for”¹⁸, in *A língua inatingível*.

To illustrate how he conceives metaphor (and metonymy), Pêcheux (2011, p.158, emphasis added) resorts to the case of the “classic interpretation between anarchist and Marxist representations of the destruction of the State [through] the figure of fire”).¹⁹ He states that, based on the “notion of interdiscourse and imported pre-constructed sequence” (PÊCHEUX, 2011, p.158),²⁰ he aims to show how the interpretation is metaphorical in the case of anarchists and, in the case of Marxists, it is metonymic, the opposite of what was defended.

¹³ Original: “*a propósito da qual se exerce uma resistência local (uma ideologia tenta se passar por uma ciência, produzir os efeitos dela e recolher seus benefícios)*” (PÊCHEUX, 1995a, p.65).

¹⁴ Original: “*coloca em jogo uma função semântica [que postula] a coincidência do significante com o significado*” (PÊCHEUX, 1995a, p.71).

¹⁵ Original: “*especificidade simbólica do animal humano, [com a] pseudo-gênese da ordem do simbólico*” (PÊCHEUX, 1995a, p.72-73).

¹⁶ Original: “*não há gênese do significante (o que anula a ideia da produção-distribuição de significantes própria da ideologia empirista): a relação significante-significado resulta de uma propriedade da cadeia de significantes que permite colocar corretamente o problema da realidade exterior e da prova dessa realidade*” (PÊCHEUX, 1995a, p. 73, emphasis added).

¹⁷ Original: “*a partir de uma ligação originária e não metafórica com o ‘objeto real’, edificar a posteriori as metáforas*” (PÊCHEUX, 1995a, p. 73, emphasis added).

¹⁸ Original: “*metáfora também merece que se lute por ela*” (GADET; PÊCHEUX, 2004, p. 27).

¹⁹ Original: “*clássica entre as representações anarquistas e marxistas da destruição do Estado [por meio da] figura do incêndio*” (PÊCHEUX, 2011, p.158, emphasis added).

²⁰ Original: “*noção de interdiscurso e de sequência pré-construída importada*” (PÊCHEUX, 2011, p.158).

For him, given a sequence S1: “‘The stores X/bank Y/administrative building Z... were destroyed by fire’”;²¹ from the “everyday discourse of the 19th century” (PÊCHEUX, 2011, p.159),²² given the approximation with an S2 sequence: “‘It is necessary to destroy the bourgeois state by Revolution’, from the classic revolutionary political discourse” (PÊCHEUX, 2011, p.159),²³ and because they have destruction in common, fire and revolution can be paired in sequences as “the fire of the revolution will destroy the bourgeois state” or “Long live the fire of the bourgeois state” (PÊCHEUX, 2011, p.159).²⁴ For Pêcheux (2011, p.159), the import links fire and revolution through a symbolic short-circuit “without any justifying discourse implying it: explanations and justifications will come later”.²⁵ In this case, there would be the import, via interdiscourse, of the pre-constructed, the destruction by fire or the fire destroys, which produces a metaphorical displacement and a symbolic cut.

One can replicate the reflection in cases relating to spatial displacement; be the *mole*. As this animal moves underground, digs tunnels, lives in caves and is blind, it is possible to refer to underground (or subway) tunnel excavation workers with the term: “subway workers live like moles” (a zoological metaphor) or attributing the term to little insight into a situation: “ideologically, your friend is a mole” (a political metaphor): short circuits occur, then, moving the term between distinct discursive regions, with different effects: behold interdiscourse as division, cleavage and dispersion.

In short: from Pêcheux’s (2011) perspective, a linguistic materiality does not have a natural meaning and, thus, contrary to the empirical ideology and the imaginary of the literal and univocal meaning, the metaphor cleaves the signifiers and places them on axes of equivocality and polysemy via import and displacement, through of interdiscursive relations. It generates multiple effects, such as fire and mole. A diagram can create an effect of greater objectivity to what was said above. Since the fire case will be better presented in the reflections, in the diagram, I will work only with the mole case (case given by me).

Chart 1 – Mole 1

Discursive Region A	Discursive Region B	Discursive Region C
<i>Mole</i> tunnel digging animal (zoological metaphor)	<i>Mole</i> subway workers (technical metaphor)	<i>Mole</i> lack of critical sense (political metaphor)

Source: Author’s elaboration.

²¹ Original: “As lojas X/o banco Y/o prédio administrativo Z... foram destruídos pelo incêndio” (PÊCHEUX, 2011, p.159).

²² Original: “discurso cotidiano do século XIX” (PÊCHEUX, 2011, p.159).

²³ Original: “É preciso destruir o Estado burguês pela Revolução”, do discurso político revolucionário clássico” (PÊCHEUX, 2011, p.159).

²⁴ Original: ‘o incêndio da revolução destruirá o Estado burguês’ ou ‘Viva o incêndio do Estado burguês’ (PÊCHEUX, 2011, p.159).

²⁵ Original: “sem que nenhum discurso justificativo o subentenda: as explicações e as justificações virão após” (PÊCHEUX, 2011, p.159).

Metaphor and Interdiscourse

In this section, considering the text “*Metáfora e Interdiscurso*”, I seek a conception of interdiscourse, in the light of excerpts from Pêcheux’s (2011) article, considering the definition of metaphor and the case of fire. I understand that interdiscourse is intrinsically linked to metaphor, because, given the import and displacement it causes, it has in it the “functioning principle” (PÊCHEUX, 2011, p. 158).²⁶ In view of the cleavage of meaning, other discourses are made and, against integration, it refers to dispersion and difference, since, according to Pêcheux (2011, p. 157), “the effects of interdiscourse do not resolve themselves at a point of integration, but develop in contradictions”.²⁷

Pêcheux (2011) states that the elements that refer to spatial displacement (mole, railroad, free balloon) are metaphorical, since they do not come from an original region that expands via connotation. They are cleaved objects, identical to and different from themselves: they are the diversity that sustains itself in the apparent unity caused by the use of a signifier. But, given the possibility of being inscribed “in one or another cyclical effect” (PÊCHEUX, 2011, p. 157),²⁸ the meaning depends on the region that mobilizes them. It is interdiscourse because of import, displacement and “contradiction”; and it is metaphor because the investment result makes sense to be different.

Against the supposed collage of a signifier to a signified, with the meaning coming from outside discursive processes, the signifiers transit through discursive regions and receive an effect from each one, given the displacement caused by the interdiscourse and its functioning, when placing discourses in perspective, allowing other discourses to be produced. There is, therefore, no meaning, but an effect produced in a situation. Thus, everything is decided upon the meeting of the conjuncture that encompasses the signifier and defines its contours.

For Pêcheux (2011, p. 158), “the object’s discursive reference is constructed in discursive formations [...] that combine their effects in interdiscourse effects”,²⁹ which means that there is no single or literal sense. The import of an object, via interdiscourse, due to the disjunctive relations that metaphor produces, makes the effect to be what it establishes. Consequently, for him, “the discursive production [of] objects would ‘circulate’ between discursive regions, none of which could be considered as originating” (PÊCHEUX, 2011, p. 158).³⁰ There is not, first, the mole from the animal world, then the mole related to displacement under the earth, and, finally, the mole related to political alienation. The term ‘mole’ would belong to all of them, with dispersion and cleavage

²⁶ Original: “*princípio de funcionamento*” (PÊCHEUX, 2011, p.158).

²⁷ Original: “*Os efeitos de interdiscurso não se resolvem em um ponto de integração, mas se desenvolvem em contradições*” (PÊCHEUX, 2011, p.157).

²⁸ Original: “*em um ou outro efeito conjuntural*” (PÊCHEUX, 2011, p.157).

²⁹ Original: “*a referência discursiva do objeto é construída em formações discursivas [...] que combinam seus efeitos em efeitos de interdiscurso*” (PÊCHEUX, 2011, p.158).

³⁰ Original: “*a produção discursiva [dos] objetos ‘circularia’ entre regiões discursivas, das quais nenhuma por ser considerada originária*” (PÊCHEUX, 2011, p.158).

effects; they make it belong to conjunctures that construct it as a discursive object in their own way through a relation of discursive contradiction.

Interdiscourse, therefore, refers to the relationship between discourses with relatively delimitable boundaries (technical, political, religious, sanitary, moral, medical, pedagogical discursive formations...), whose import of pre-construct discourses allow a metaphor to place the discursive object under other lights and provide another network of senses. If the everyday fire is a reason for the existence of a fire brigade, when it comes to the fire of the revolution, it is appropriate to argue that it is not necessary that fire and flames carry out the fight, although this may happen.

In light of these reflections, it is possible to affirm that metaphor and interdiscourse maintain a constitutive and inextricable relationship, the latter being the way in which a pre-construct from a discursive region is led to produce another effect from the former. If interdiscourse is the displacement mechanism and metaphor is the imposition of another effect, the former refers to the relationship between discourses that can generate confrontation or alliance, in general, with the denial of debt. One discourse is indebted to another, there is the circulation of discursive objects in different non-preferred regions and, sometimes, a scathing and polemic clash.

It is from this restrictive point of view that Pêcheux's (1995b, p. 162) claim seems to apply: "the characteristic of every discursive formation is to conceal, in the transparency of the meaning that is formed in it, the contradictory material objectivity of the interdiscourse"³¹, since it is not born from itself, giving itself an origin in relation to another one from which it distances itself, even if under the effect of an alliance. A discourse lacks another that precedes it and provides the humus for the metaphorization of pre-constructions that will produce other effects on the signifiers. However, the dependence concealed by the appearance of evidence is nothing more than an effect of the imaginary.

It is under this constraint that the formula taken up by Pêcheux (1995b, p. 162) seems to be considered as a definition: "the contradictory material objectivity of the interdiscourse refers [to] the fact that 'something speaks' (*ça parle*) always before, elsewhere and independently"³². In it, each term used seems to determine a reading path. In the case of the mole, it is necessary for the term, as an interdiscourse datum, to belong to another independent place (zoology, technical world, political standpoint) and that it sustains itself without the necessary existence of its other. The reflection can be reapplied to fire: it denounces an interdiscursive relationship, because, from the everyday discourse, previous (not the origin), from another place and independent, it was displaced to the revolutionary discourse through a metaphorization, producing another effect.

³¹ Original: "o próprio de toda formação discursiva é dissimular, na transparência do sentido que nela se forma, a objetividade material contraditória do interdiscurso." (PÊCHEUX, 1995b, p. 162).

³² Original: "a objetividade material contraditória do interdiscurso remete [ao] fato de que 'algo fala' (*ça parle*) sempre antes, em outro lugar e independentemente". (PÊCHEUX, 1995b, p. 162).

It seems, therefore, that the interdiscourse relates discourses and allows metaphors to be constructed and become the pendulum for the weaving of networks of meaning that deal with the “same” discursive objects, but do not say the same about them, constituting other effects, other shades of meaning and other axes of memory through other syntactic chains that metonymically take up another part of the whole.

The previous diagram has the inconvenience of sectioning the discursive regions into strictly circumscribed areas, with clear boundaries, as if there were no drift and mutual dependence among them. Separation with solid lines can produce the effect of radical separation, isolation and no debit from one to the other. In other words, the isolation designed can erase the interdiscourse and the dispersion that constitutes interdiscursivity, an axis on which one can, hypothetically, gather the discourses that relate to preferential discursive objects. This is why the initial diagram appears redone below. In it, there are no isolated regions without multidirectional circulation that allow dispersion among A, B and C, with an always imprecise number of dispersions that can occur horizontally.

Chart 2 – Mole 2

Discursive Region A	Discursive Region B	Discursive Region C
<i>Mole</i> tunnel digging animal (zoological metaphor)	<i>Mole</i> subway workers (technical metaphor)	<i>Mole</i> lack of critical sense (political metaphor)

Source: Author’s elaboration.

The Metonymy of Fire and the Mole

Metonymy is considered as the resumption of one term for another, which represents it as part of the whole. The substitution is not based on similarity as in metaphor, but on the use of a part of the whole that takes it back, given the contiguity between them. Pêcheux (2011, p. 160) makes use of the case of the ‘sail’ that takes up ‘boat’, wherewith “it is articulated through the technical description of the constituent parts of the boat (and the sail is precisely one of its constituent parts: the main, essential or constitutive”.³³ The author replicates the reflection on ‘fire’ as a “classical metonymy”, a restriction that produces a cleavage between the current definition and the one that the concept will have in its formulations. In it, metonymy sometimes coincides with the canon, but sometimes the “part” is the result of a metaphorical displacement conceived by syntactic chains that restrict it and not by the resumption of a part that constitutes the whole.

³³ Original: “se articula através da descrição técnica das partes constituintes do barco (e a vela é justamente uma de suas partes constituintes: a principal, essencial ou constitutiva)” (PÊCHEUX, 2011, p.160).

Considering the repression of the symbolic order by empirical ideology, which denies the fact that the signifier of a signified is not born from the relationship with the real object, but from the discursive chain that generates the anchorage, it is worth returning to a second repression generated on metonymy. by the erasure of the “connection of signifiers among themselves” generated by the “speculative” ideology” (PÊCHEUX, 1995a, p.71, emphasis added),³⁴ which also simulates itself as a science by placing objects in discourse, based on the thesis of communication and control of the human beings about themselves by language.

Should the first repression assume that the signifier adheres to the signified through a relationship of co-naturality, the second one postulates the stable by conceiving “‘man’ (as) a social animal” (PÊCHEUX, 1995a, p.72, emphasis added),³⁵ whose relations with others would be natural, since a “nature would be precisely *the linguistic nature of the human animal as a social animal* able to exchange codified meanings” (PÊCHEUX, 1995a, p. 72, emphasis added).³⁶ Denying that the signifier socially adheres to the signified, which is produced by syntactic chains that fix its contours, here, language is a set of signs that have a univocal meaning and allow communication through messages, which justifies the designation of this ideology as speculative-phraseological, since, based on the speculation of meaning, it creates an effect of evidence, although it is anchored in identification and recognition.

In the case of ‘fire’, for Pêcheux (2011), a first metaphorical short-circuit occurs because of the similarity between everyday life and anarchism, which considers it a possible substitute or determinant of ‘revolution’. This brake on the homogeneous sense postulated by an empirical ideology poses a challenge, if the repression of the symbolic order is maintained, which involves immersion in syntactic-metonymic chains, as in ‘fire’, in a second short-circuit, this time, by the crossing of “a transversal textual sequence” (PÊCHEUX, 2011, p.159).³⁷

For Pêcheux (2011, p. 159), on S1, “fire - destroy - buildings/banks/shops” and on S2: “revolution - destroy - bourgeois state”, in which the metaphor via interdiscourse produces a displacement, a sequence S3 that connects “shops/banks”/administration” and “bourgeois state”, generating “The bourgeois state protects the shops, banks, administrations” or “It is organically linked to these institutions” (PÊCHEUX, 2011, p.160).³⁸ The second short-circuit would not be “a disturbance that can take the form of a lapse, a mistake, a poetic effect, the Witz or the enigma [or negation]”³⁹ as in the

³⁴ Original: “*conexão de significantes entre si*” gerado pela ideologia “*especulativa*” (PÊCHEUX, 1995a, p.71, emphasis added).

³⁵ Original: “*o homem (como) animal social*” (PÊCHEUX, 1995a, p.72, emphasis added).

³⁶ Original: “*natureza seria precisamente a natureza linguística do animal humano como animal social apto para intercambiar significações codificadas*” (PÊCHEUX, 1995a, p.72, emphasis added).

³⁷ Original: “*uma sequência textual transversal*” (PÊCHEUX, 2011, p.159).³⁷

³⁸ Original: “*O Estado burguês protege as lojas, os bancos, as administrações*” ou “*Ele está organicamente ligado a estas instituições*” (PÊCHEUX, 2011, p.160).

³⁹ Original: “*uma perturbação que pode tomar a forma do lapso, do ato falho, do efeito poético, do Witz ou do enigma [ou da negação]*” (PÊCHEUX, 2011, p.160, emphasis added).

metaphor, but “an attempt to ‘treat’ this disturbance, to *reconstruct* its appearance conditions, a bit like a biologist reconstructs [...] the process of a disease in order to intervene in it” (PÊCHEUX, 2011, p. 160, emphasis added).⁴⁰ Given the disturbance caused by ‘fire’ and the questioning about the approximation with ‘revolution’, the metaphorical short-circuit must be justified and explained with a metonymic short-circuit chained by a network of signifiers guided by a transverse-discourse that determines the relationship between ‘a’ and ‘b’ by contiguity.

Thus, it is possible to state that a metaphor happens through an interdiscursive relationship and produces a fracture in the sense. If displacement was not aimed at cleavage, it would not be necessary. However, the metaphor, since it fragments the reference, lacks explanations and justifications for the dispersion, and it is up to metonymy to partialize the discursive object, explaining what it is from now on in a discourse. In the case of ‘fire’, everything revolves around the justification of the first short circuit through a second one that, metonymically, translates and locates the fissure produced through discursive sequences. The same reasoning applies to ‘mole’ (and to other cases), because, given the strangeness of import (what does a subway worker or a politically alienated person have to do with the animal?), a justification is imposed, owing to be constructed through syntactic chains that intertwine the part with the whole.

It is a function of metonymy, therefore, to reveal the repression of the order of the symbolic produced by an empirical ideology, bypassing the signified of a signifier with syntactic chains based on a phraseological-speculative ideology. If metaphor, via interdiscourse, disturbs the sense, metonymy, via transverse-discourse through discursive sequences, constrains reading, at the limit, with the risk of “evolving into a construction-preservation of the existing”, fixing it “in an administrative eternity”, through the “concern to heal the wound in question, or to nullify its effects”, with the resulting difficulty in supporting the category of contradiction (PÊCHEUX, 2011, p.161).⁴¹ The working hypothesis here is that this is how the memory is reached.

Enlarging the diagram above because of the metonymic impact on the alteration of discursive references and on the crack generated in the sense, it is a question of justifying and explaining why ‘mole’ and ‘fire’ could be metaphorized for regions B and C by through the fragmentation of the discursive object, forcing it, given the partial similarity, to displace a part to another place, with the production of a set of discursive sequences that justify and clarify the “incongruent” approximations.

⁴⁰ Original: “uma tentativa de ‘tratar’ esta perturbação, de *reconstruir* suas condições de aparecimento, um pouco como um biólogo reconstrói [...] o processo de uma doença para intervir sobre ela” (PÊCHEUX, 2011, p.160, emphasis added).

⁴¹ Original: “evoluir para uma construção-preservação do existente”, fixando-o “em uma eternidade administrativa”, por meio da “preocupação de curar a ferida em questão, ou de anular os seus efeitos”, com a dificuldade decorrente de suportar a categoria de contradição.” (PÊCHEUX, 2011, p.161).

Chart 3 – Mole 3

Discursive Region A	Discursive Region B	Discursive Region C
<p><i>Mole</i> Animal (zoological metaphor) 1) Lives under the ground 2) Dig tunnels 3) It is blind</p>	<p><i>Mole</i> subway workers (technical metaphor) 1) Yes (metaphorically) 2) Yes 3) No</p>	<p><i>Mole</i> lack of critical sense (political metaphor) 1) Yes (metaphorically) 2) No 3) Yes (metaphorically)</p>

Source: Author's elaboration.

In order to justify and explain the use of ‘mole’ by three different regions, which, from a logical point of view, may seem irrational, statements like the ones below can be produced, affected by the intervention of the transverse-discourse that puts the discourses A, B and C in relation to the dispersion of constituent parts of discursive objects.

- 1) The mole is a small insectivorous mammal, which has an elongated, cylindrical body adjusted for digging tunnels, a long tubular snout for searching for food, tiny eyes, is practically blind as it lives almost entirely in darkness and has its forelegs adapted to dig or swim.
- 2) The subway workers are called moles, because they work in tunnels under the ground, have not so much contact with those who live in sunlight and act like blind people, if it was not the artificial light that helps them. Just like the pet, in these tunnels they seek their survival.
- 3) As the animal that lives underground digging tunnels in search of food and is practically blind, the political alienated, unable to critically analyze the political situation that captures him/her, can be referred to as a mole, as he/she acts as if he/she lives in absence of light and did not perceive the knots that surround him/her.

Metonymy and Memory

I return to *fire* to clarify how I perceive the link between memory and the framework of concepts about metaphor; the author does not make this relationship, which is my responsibility. I recall the conclusions reached up to this point: working on a pre-constructed from another place and independently, through interdiscourse, a metaphorical short-circuit takes place. If the enterprise has any relevance, an explanation or justification may be necessary for the cleavage that cuts the meaning, demanding a reflection on the meaning effect that is now another and that anchors itself on a part of the whole.

In everyday discourse, *fire* refers to the combustion process, which produces flames and turns things to ashes if not fought. On the other hand, in revolutionary discourse,

it refers to the corrosion of institutions that sustain a state model. In both cases, it is about destruction, but not based on the same means. While the first has to do with this unwanted fatality and does not select the victim, the second has an application focus, given a political-ideological economic position. A firefighter who is required to address fire prevention will speak interchangeably to means of production owners or workers; a Marxist will do it differently, warning those who are disadvantaged and advocating collective management. These are discourses that deal with fire, but if on one hand they fight it there, on the other hand they preach its spread here (with the effect saved); if one aims at safeguarding, the other is guided by disappearance.

It is through the second short circuit, as the metaphor's justification and explanatory discourse, that the pre-constructed interpretive key is generated and that memory takes shape, determining the reading thread of the nascent discourse. Under the injunction to specify the effect of the cleavage, it takes shape and can become a theorization similar to the Marxist discourse. The cleavage caused by metaphor via interdiscourse, due to the transverse-discourse that crosses the metonymic process, thus constitutes a set of materialities that can crystallize an understanding and, to the limit, create an effect of stability. Metonymy, in the section it generates through the chain guided by the transversal discourse that constitutes it, in the eagerness to justify the metaphor, elaborates memory, which is discursive and paraphrastic and may, for some time, become immune to contradiction.

To cure the disturbance produced by metaphor, metonymy, via transverse-discourse, is meant to translate the effect of meaning and bring back the repression of the symbolic order to deny the wound, and should, through discursive sequences, make the recognition explicit and identification based on axiological dictates. The metaphorical displacement, when producing a dispersion, must become understandable and go through the discourse that reveals it and that, when revealing it, constitutes a network that fixes contours and allows the resumption, expansion and speculation, through unfolded paraphrases in implications, inferences and slips.

Given the constitution through syntactic chains that produce the metonymic ties guided by the transverse-discourse, memory "should not be understood [...] in the directly psychological sense of 'individual memory'" (PÊCHEUX, 1999, p.50)⁴² and imposes that "let us move away from psychological interpretations in terms of 'really-already-heard'" (ACHARD, 1999, p.50).⁴³ When the signifier is cleaved by a discursive region that displaces it, it is with another phraseology that the "new" meaning is managed, which means that memory is discursive, since "the structuring of the discursive will constitute the materiality of a certain social memory" (ACHARD, 1999, p.11).⁴⁴ Memory, in this sense, is woven by the need to justify and explain the

⁴² Original: "*deve ser entendida [...] no sentido diretamente psicologista da 'memória individual'*" (PÊCHEUX, 1999, p.50)

⁴³ Original: "*afastemos interpretações psicológicas em termos de 'realmente-já-ouvido'*" (ACHARD, 1999, p.50).

⁴⁴ Original: "*A estruturação do discursivo vai constituir a materialidade de uma certa memória social*" (ACHARD, 1999, p.11).

dispersion of the pre-constructed discourse, which, identical to itself, migrating, or being forced to migrate, inhabits other discursive materialities with another effect.

As transverse-discourse, based on the part of the discursive object it highlights, guides the occurrence of discursive sequences, it acquires a productive force of paraphrases, “as derivations of possibilities in relation to the given, (whose) regularization structures the occurrence and its segments, placing them within series” (ACHARD, 1999, p.16).⁴⁵ The dispersion of the pre-constructed discourse and the migration to another region make it a discursive reference crafted in materialities that stabilize the meaning and retain a preferential effect, establishing what can and should be said and constituting a memory and the implicit ones that constrain it.

It should be noted that ‘implicit’ here is conceived as an element that needs to be recovered from the discursive formation that establishes it, through the relationship with memory established by a transverse-discourse that acts on the discursive sequence. This sense is the one that seems to be given to the fragment by Pêcheux (1999, p.52): “the discursive memory would be what, in the face of a text that is given to read, comes to re-establish the ‘implicit’ (that is, more technically, pre-constructed elements, cited and reported elements, transversal discourses, etc.) that a reading needs”⁴⁶, who, although not only repeating the same, considers it as a reference thread. The metaphor, by splitting the pre-constructed discourse, establishes a set of explanations and justifications that, as a memory, implies that they must be summarized, even if by reference to the other discourse from which it separated itself. As a discursive region has its own axis of reference, it takes up, above all, the ‘implicits’ constructed in it so that materialities are subject to a pattern of intelligibility.

I must remind that, sometimes, interdiscourse and memory arise entangled or under the attempt to make one fit within the other. I understand that, in light of the discussions, both refer to distinct, albeit intertwined, phenomena, one referring to a genetic rite that refers to metaphorical displacement, and the other to the constitution of a discursive region around the pre-constructed of another independent place. It also does not seem relevant to make one the continent and the other, since they are constitutively dependent, as they are not quasi-synonymous, given the discrepancy and the heuristic power of each. I emphasize that I do not conceive memory as a capsule that freezes meaning due to its constitution and that I consider Pêcheux’s claim that “there is always a game of force in memory, under the shock of the event [which can provoke] a ‘deregulation’ that disturbs the network of ‘implicit’”⁴⁷ (PÊCHEUX, 1999, p.53) with the generation of another effect via metaphorical displacement and metonymic treatment.

⁴⁵ Original: “*como derivações de possíveis em relação ao dado, (cuja) regularização estrutura a ocorrência e seus segmentos, situando-os dentro de séries*” (ACHARD, 1999, p.16).

⁴⁶ Original: “*a memória discursiva seria aquilo que, face a um texto que é dado a ler, vem restabelecer os ‘implicitos’ (quer dizer, mais tecnicamente, os pré-construídos, elementos citados e relatados, discursos transversos, etc.) de que uma leitura necessita*” (PÊCHEUX, 1999, p.52).

⁴⁷ Original: “*Há sempre um jogo de força na memória, sob o choque do acontecimento [que pode provocar] uma ‘desregulação’ que vem perturbar a rede de ‘implicitos’*” (PÊCHEUX, 1999, p.53).

Chart 4 – Mole 4

Discursive Region A	Discursive Region B	Discursive Region C
<p><i>Mole</i> Animal</p> <p>(zoological metaphor)</p> <p>The mole is a small insectivorous mammal, which has an elongated, cylindrical body adjusted for digging tunnels, a long, tubular snout for searching for food, tiny eyes, is almost blind for living almost entirely in darkness and has its forelegs adapted for digging or swim.</p>	<p><i>Mole</i> subway workers</p> <p>(technical metaphor)</p> <p>The subway workers are called moles, because they work in underground tunnels, they have little contact with those who live in sunlight and act like blind people, were it not for the artificial light that helps them. Just like the animal, in these tunnels, they seek their survival.</p>	<p><i>Mole</i> Lack of critical sense</p> <p>(political metaphor)</p> <p>Like the animal that lives underground, digs tunnels in search of food and is almost blind, the political alienated, unable to critically analyze the political situation that captures him/her, is a mole, since he/she acts as if he/she lives in the absence of light and did not notice the knots that surround their daily lives.</p>

Source: Author's elaboration.

Being affected by the interdiscourse that leads to metaphorical displacements of the pre-constructed ones that constitute them, the discursive regions, guided by the transverse discourse that crosses them, needing to justify and explain the meaning effects derived from the part of a whole coming from another independent place, they generate ideological nuclei (like those in the diagram) that determine and define the parameter for the production of discursive sequences that take them as a source of ideological affiliation. Unlike a horizontal axis, such as the interdiscourse that disperses meaning, memory is articulated on verticality that, under the injunction of a non-subjective productivity, prevents the future, until the interdiscourse comes to haunt it with another. metaphorization.

The case of “God”: one more piece of information given

I seek to systematize the results achieved by applying it to a discursive sequence, in order to make the abstract reflections concrete and present an understanding of the framework of mobilized concepts. Illustration always has some explanatory power and somehow shows the rationality of theorizing. Without claiming that the following analysis is the best solution, it seems pertinent, since it does not apply canonically to the cases used by Pêcheux and contemplates a mode of metaphorization not mentioned by the author: negation, in which the metaphor occurs by unguided displacement in similarity/identity, but by contradiction.

The novel *O crime do Padre Amaro* (*The crime of Father Amaro*, 2000) was written by Eça de Queirós and had as its setting the abbey of Leiria, where Cônego Dias, mistress

of the landlady, Dona Joaneira, plots that Amaro, his protégé, is the substitute of the late vicar of the Sé. Amélia, Joaneira's beautiful and seductive daughter, with the arrival of Amaro, makes up the quartet of forbidden relationships, living in conjugality with the new parish priest. Pregnant and unassisted, in the end, she dies along with her child.

Not resisting the attraction to Amaro and giving herself to him, she suffers scathing dramas of conscience and even hallucinates of being needled by Nossa Senhora (the catholic Our Lady), spending her days between surrender to desire and subsequent recrimination, which makes her life pass in a tortured, restless, and depressing way. However, Ferrão, a new abbot, arrives at the parish and becomes her confessor, bringing her to know another religious perspective and bringing some calm to her problematic existence. This excerpt from this work has already been used in another 2017 study (CATTELAN, 2017), but I use it because it allows me to give an overview of what I developed in this essay. It is a passage in indirect discourse freed from the flow of consciousness of the abbot Ferrão, who also became confessor of Dona Josefa, a blessed of the Cathedral.

He tried then to shed a broader, brighter light on that nocturnal, fanatical mind inhabited by phantasmagoria. He told her that all her anxieties came from an imagination tormented by a fear of offending God. That God was not a fierce, angry master, but an indulgent, caring father. That one must serve him with love not fear. That all these scruples – Our Lady sticking pins in her legs, God's name slipping down into her stomach – were the product of a sick mind. He advised her to trust in God and to eat well in order to recover her strength. And not to wear herself out by praying too much⁴⁸ (QUEIRÓS, 2000, p.295).⁴⁹

To a categorical question that intended to place 'God' in a univocal sense, there would be no answer to be given, as the effect attributed to Him transits between two discursive regions, which resume in their own way what appears as a discursive object of dispute. Against the supposed designation that discerns the world, naming it and establishing the best adequate meaning for each ingredient, God is one as a "label", but cleaved as a conception. This means that God is a metaphor that moves between discourses characterized by dispersion and that print divided and dispersed meanings on the world. In the excerpt, there are, so to speak, two gods: an "indulgent, caring father" and a "fierce, angry master" and it is not possible to define (in this case, above all)

⁴⁸ English version translated by Margaret Jull Costa. Cambridge: New Directions, 2003. Available at: <https://booksbooks.com/the-crime-of-father-amaro-pdf-eca-de-queiros.html>. Access on: Jun. 09, 2022.

⁴⁹ Original: "*Quis então levar àquele noturno cérebro de devota, povoado de fantasmagorias, uma luz mais alta e mais larga. Disse-lhe que todas as suas inquietações vinham da imaginação torturada pelo terror de ofender a Deus... Que o Senhor não era um amo feroz e furioso, mas um pai indulgente e amigo... Que é por amor que é necessário servi-lo, não por medo... Que todos esses escrípulos, Nossa Senhora a enterrar alfinetes, o nome de Deus a cair no estômago, eram perturbações da razão doente. Aconselhou-lhe confiança em Deus, bom regime para ganhar forças. Que não se cansasse em orações exageradas*" (QUEIRÓS, 2000, p. 295).

which is the best meaning, but only bear the further questioning effectively. Metaphor thus appears (in Pêcheux, it is necessary to take into account) as the basic data, and not literality, which refers to the displacement between discursive regions that are defined by difference and not by identity: this is interdiscourse as a genetic rite.

The term ‘god’, metaphorical as it is, does not manage to specify the effect of meaning, and not the meaning, which it must have, as it needs to be immersed in chains of signifiers that retake it, that transform it into a discursive object and circumscribe an apprehension that differentiate it from that of another discursive region. ‘God’ needs to be put into discursive sequences for the effect to be established, not by integration, but by cleavage and division. Then, there is God and He is not the same: there He is “fierce, angry”, must be served “with love not fear”, He is a terrifying being, He is a source of phantasmagoria, He is a producer of a “nocturnal mind”, of “an imagination tormented” and “a sick mind” and demands “too much” praying; here, it is an “indulgent, caring father”, it must be served “with love”, it does not ask for endless prayers, it does not torture, it does not generate disturbances, it does not terrify, it does not produce hallucinations and it desires enlightened and confident people; there, given fury and ferocity, he is punishing and vengeful; here, given the indulgence and friendship, he is kind and understanding. The metaphor *God* moves, interdiscursively, between a discourse A and a discourse B, metonymically receiving the effect of meaning that must be reproduced from the injunction of an axis of memory in the discursive sequences.

This overview takes up the reflection developed in this essay and advances the following considerations. While metaphor and interdiscourse refer to the horizontal axis of cleavage and dispersion, as meaning effects that transit through discursive regions, metonymy and memory point to the vertical axis of repeatability of an effect sedimented by discursive chains that reiterate and stabilize (relatively) a management matrix.

As stated below, there is, on the one hand, a discourse A that represents God as “a fierce, angry master”. If we imagine a S1 such as “Men desire eternal life” and a S2 such as “The church desires the salvation of humanity”, this institution would be able to fulfill people’s will for perpetuity, as it would be the representative in the world of an omnipotent *Being*, omniscient and omnipresent that, therefore, has, above all, the power to satisfy the human desire for eternity, being, therefore, by virtue of knowledge and ubiquitous presence, someone who can punish men if they do not satisfy His will, as well as conceived by a type A church. Standing at the service of the salvation of men, this institution is thus placed, by consequence, in the obligation to build a discourse around the attainment of eternal life, weaving conceptions about the nature of God, His designs, His requirements, His way of acting and, above all, of what men must do to meet Him.

In an attempt to give a signified to a signifier and due to the obligation to place, in this particular case, God in speculative syntactic and/or phraseological chains that translate the collage, discourses are produced and weave a network of meanings about Him, which is the church and what is expected of men, since, if they want eternity and He can grant it, it would be up to church to define how to obtain it, by reference to the

constitution of a grid of meanings that establish a memory of the whole. As in A, for B, the ideological core is a controlling, angry and punitive lord, a set of consequences is tied to this principle, establishing a low and narrow light of understanding, a tortured imagination, the terror of offending God, the deference out of fear, exaggerated fasts and endless prayers. This “logic” is based on a church model that, with a “knowledge”, defines a lifestyle determined by the concern to sin and by the thesis that one always sins; given this vicious circle, the precautions listed would be commendable. Strictly speaking, nothing is known about God, an imaginary entity that, put into chains of signifiers, through the displacement of other stops (God is a long-lasting construct) and by the constriction of the isolation of a part of the whole (it is unknown which is not even if there is a part - we are dealing with faith), receives a memory that defines what He is, as well as church, man, sin and salvation.

It can be concluded that, given the metaphorical displacement of a pre-constructed, via interdiscourse with pagan-polytheism (hypothetically), another effect was imposed on God, which, above all, because, in the face of the imaginary linked to faith, produced, through the transversality related to God, the church, man and salvation, a discourse around punishment and led to the unfolding of discursive sequences, such as “If men want salvation, they can look for it in the church, which, being an instance of mediation between them and God, can guide them, because it knows Him and knows, therefore, how to obtain it”; in this case, for example, with fasting, prayer, restlessness, fear and dread.

In contrast, there is a discourse B that conceives of God as “an indulgent, caring father”, through denial as an ingredient that is the protagonist in a polemical relationship, in which the terms of A are transformed into opposites. Maintaining the hypothesis of S1 and S2, above, the church is still presented as being able to meet people’s desire for eternity, but, based on another ideological conception, it would have another set of guidelines: still serving God, having sobriety in food and reciting prayers, but in a different light. Denying the ideological core of A and the entire network of derived constructions, B positions itself as a church that also deals with the sinful man, that provides salvation, that allows the attainment of eternal life and that is the secular institution that allows the attainment of perennality, but sustaining itself in a more human and compassionate tuning fork.

In this case, without a word like fire that is moved to another discourse with another effect, there is an identical term (God) which, given the controversy, is, in the face of negation via interdiscourse, metaphorically displaced from A to B, abandoning the traces of ferocity and fury and harboring indulgence and friendship, the ideological core guiding the unfolding in another set of predictions, since, metonymically, the part removed from the imaginary whole is redemption and not punishment. In B, unlike A, through the injunction of another relationship between men, God, church salvation, another network of discourses is woven, leading to the constitution of a memory that produces a different way of conceiving the relationship between salvation and desire for eternity, constituting another imaginary of religious interaction.

As in A, the church would be the institution indicated to guide men in dealing with the divine in the face of the desire for eternal life, as it would hold the “knowing” about Him and His purposes, this time, desirous of loving servanthood, sober food and moderate prayers. In B, the brain would no longer be obtuse and possessed of phantasmagoria, there would be no tortured imagination, no terror, no fear, and discernment would be more adequate and more comprehensive. Insofar as B also needs to explain, speculatively, the collage effect that it seeks to produce between the signifier ‘God’ and its effect, it is from another S3 that, transversally, it ties the constituted framework with a view to salvation. If, in A, it is obtained in one way, with the constitution of a discursive affiliation and a set of resulting meanings (a memory), in B, it is achieved in another way, since B supports it in another ideological nucleus and another parameter network (another memory).

Both A and B deal with God, but they metaphorize Him in a different way, producing effects from the interdiscursive confrontation that intertwines them. Faced with a dominant ideology like A, Ferrão is the resistance that, through denial and as a representative for another gaze, seeks to ground another religious behavior. Supported by another transversality that reorients the relationship between men, God, church and salvation, the established metonymic cut selects a dissimilar trait to be put into practice, transforming it into a set of discursive sequences and shaping another discursive process and another memory.

It is in this sense that God is not indivisible. In the materiality of discourse and in the struggle for meaning, there are two gods: *a fierce and angry master and an indulgent and caring father*. There are, therefore, two religious discursive regions whose performance parameters are different. If A is guided by rigor, censorship and punishment, in B, forgiveness, complacency and understanding are worth it. That is: God is what discourse conceives, with as many discursive formations as possible, irrespective of what He is or is not. This is the reason for Pêcheux’s emphasis on a materialist position of discourse, since it is in the different discursive regions that objects receive meaning.

Final considerations: attempt at synthesis

This seems to be the time to revisit the hypothesis developed in this study. A discursive region, determined by the injunction to assign meaning to the discursive objects that constitute it, produces a set of discursive sequences about them. However, against all sorts of precautions, due to the conflict it may have with another region, which conceives the world in a different way, the discursive references that constitute it may change into others, as they are subject to migrating to other places.

The controversy between regions, due to the interdiscourse, can lead, in this way, a pre-constructed that, in A, means X, to mean Y, in B, producing another effect from the metaphorical displacement, which means that another proximity is formed, since the

discursive object needs another place to receive existence. In this way, interdiscourse, via controversy, and metaphor, via displacement, produce a fissure in the field of meaning that needs to be addressed in the face of the horizontal dispersion caused.

For displacement to be acceptable, there must be common ground between A and B, that is, A's pre-construct must have some ingredient that allows for import into B, whose meaning part was just one more. The discursive region that produces the metonymy that cleaves meaning will be faced with the need to explain and justify dispersion (as Marxism did in relation to fire), making the relationship between B and A visible through the transversal discourse to explain the connection and the disconnect between them and to produce a series of sequences that establish the effect of the discursive object.

I argue that it is through this movement of production of discursive sequences that constitute a discursive process and constrain meaning in a perspective that a preventive verticality is regularized, establishing a series for the future, even if it expands to the limit of not making the ideological core that underpins it. Memory, in this way, defines what is utterable and what must be kept at a distance, given the risk of borders collapsing under the weight of discursive confrontation. I tried to support these and other reflections with the cases of fire and the mole and God; however, I am tempted to assume that the postulate is repeatable, if not always, almost always, given the data supporting the hypothesis.

CATELLAN, J. Interdiscurso e memória: a metáfora e a metonímia em Pêcheux/Herbert. *Alfa*, São Paulo, v.66, 2022.

- *RESUMO: Partindo da constatação de que, às vezes, os conceitos de interdiscurso e de memória são emaranhados tornando-se quase equivalentes e entendendo que recobrem funcionamentos discursivos distintos, pretendo refletir sobre a problemática, recorrendo aos conceitos de metáfora, de metonímia e de discurso transversal, como teorizados, sobretudo, por Michel Pêcheux (2011 [1984]), em Metáfora e Interdiscurso, e Thomas Herbert (PÊCHEUX, 1995a), em Observações para uma Teoria Geral das Ideologias. Tentarei sustentar a hipótese de que o interdiscurso se refere à metáfora, como deslocamento do pré-construído de uma região discursiva para outra, ao passo que a metonímia, como imposição de outro efeito a partir de uma "parte" do objeto discursivo, organiza, por meio do discurso transversal, outra rede de sentido e, por isso, outro eixo de memória. Para a construção do percurso, amparo-me nos casos de 'toupeira' e de 'incêndio' (retirados de Michel Pêcheux) e trago para a discussão o caso de 'Deus'.*
- *PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Metáfora; interdiscurso; metonímia; memória; discurso transversal.*

REFERENCES

ACHARD, P. *et al.* Memória e produção discursiva do sentido. In: ACHARD, P. *et al.* **Papel da memória**. Trad. José Horta Nunes. Campinas: Pontes, 1999. p. 11-22.

CATTELAN, J. C. O interdiscurso entre discursos. **Trama**, Marechal Cândido Rondon, v.13, n.30, p.168-190, 2017.

GADET, F.; PÊCHEUX, M. **A língua inatingível**. Trad. Bethânia Mariani e Maria Elizabeth Chaves de Mello. Campinas, SP: Pontes, 2004.

PÊCHEUX, M. Metáfora e interdiscurso. Trad. Eni Puccinelli Orlandi. *In*: ORLANDI, E. P. **Análise de Discurso**: Michel Pêcheux. 2.ed. Campinas, SP: Pontes, 2011. p.151-161. Original de 1984.

PÊCHEUX, M. Papel da memória. Trad. José Horta Nunes. *In*: ACHARD, P. *et al.* **Papel da memória**. Campinas: Pontes, 1999. p. 49-58.

PÊCHEUX, M. Observações para uma teoria geral das ideologias. **Rua**, Campinas, v.1, n. 1, p.63-89, 1995a. Escrito como Thomas Herbert.

PÊCHEUX, M. **Semântica e discurso**: uma crítica à afirmação do óbvio. Trad. Eni Puccinelli Orlandi *et al.* 2.ed. Campinas, SP: Ed. da Unicamp, 1995b.

QUEIRÓS, E. de. **O crime do padre amaro**. São Paulo: Ática, 2000.

Received on October 30, 2020

Approved on June 23, 2021