In Michel Foucault’s *The Archeology of Knowledge* he takes up issue with the approach to history, and in addressing his concerns about the history he segues into what makes up a statement, and ultimately how statements of discourse form objects and knowledge. His final observation is that it is important to conduct an analysis from the archeological lens.

The issue with history is that the approach in which it is analyzed forms “a single pattern” (p. 5), and as a result the history of thought, knowledge, literature, and philosophy are “seeking” and “discovering” more than history. History, according to Foucault, is content in “abandoning the irruption of events in favour of stable structures” (p. 6). As a result, he argues for an archeological approach to knowledge, because it accounts for analyzing history as it is. So, if this is applied to knowledge, then it’s analyzing it, as it exists in an attempt to remove what systemic knowledge is applied to it.

If I understand it correctly this is explained in the second chapter “Discursive Formations” when Foucault explains the different ways in which statements form objects. Statements can form an object if they refer to the same object, and they can be formed/defined in their differences, but Foucault calls these the “individualities” of statements (p. 33). Statements can define a group in “form and connexion” based on their relations. The relations, measures, and repression of objects are what shapes them. He goes on to write that language and grammar “rest on a definite number of concepts whose content and usage has been established once and for all” (p. 34), which I think is Foucault accounting for the systems that create statements, regardless of what it is the statement makes of an object.

He establishes these points to set the foundation for the ways in which an object is formed by way of discourse in third chapter, “The Formation of Objects.” He attempts to explain what makes something an object of discourse, and discourse makes/shapes the object. There is the formation of an object by limiting it through defining what the object is talking about, authorities of delimitation, and finally the systems that classify or otherwise specify an object. Due to the preconceived notions and understandings of objects applied to them through discourse Foucault advocates for knowledge to not be obtained from these types of discursive objects and statements.

Foucault, as always is difficult, and if I understand it correctly we are to be aware of the systems within statements. The reason to do this that influence the type of discourse that ultimately leads to the creation, or formation of an object, because to do so is to not question the knowledge, and to analyze it under preexisting or already established knowledge.

I see this as similar to the Bakhtin in that statements and the formation of objects through discourse don’t account for the context in which an object was formed in history, because history doesn’t always take an archeological approach. If it did, it would view the discourse as it is, in its own time, as opposed to being a foundation for future knowledge.