

THE BODY THAT WE (DO NOT) SEE SEES US¹

O CORPO QUE (NÃO) VEMOS NOS VÊ

EL CUERPO QUE (NO) VEMOS NOS VE

Maria Thereza Veloso*

Universidade Regional Integrada do Alto Uruguai e das Missões

ABSTRACT: Having as theoretical foundation Pêcheux's Discourse Analysis, and aiming to establish a dialogue between two different expressions – the literary and the filmic ones – in the perspective of the body as channel and expression of the psychoanalytic constitution of language, this article presents some considerations on Discursive Scraps (DSs) interpretative analysis. The analysis relies on Raduan Nassar's novel *Lavoura Arcaica* and on its adaptation/translation into other language and code – image in motion – from which resulted the homonymous film by Luis Fernando Carvalho. For the purposes intended in this study, language is seen in the prediscursive stage in the center of the Borromean knot, the interstitial space of representative circles of the Lacanian triad – the Real, the Symbolic and the Imaginary. Language is also seen as having a borderline nature between the psychic and the somatic, the starting point for two other drives observed by J. Lacan – the invocatory and the scopic ones.

KEYWORDS: Literary language. Filmic language. Body. Senses. Discourse analysis.

RESUMO: Sob a perspectiva da Análise do Discurso pècheuxtiana e pretendendo-se um diálogo entre duas expressões distintas – a literária e a fílmica – na perspectiva do corpo como conduto e expressão da constituição psicanalítica da linguagem, apresentam-se aqui considerações acerca da análise interpretativa de Recortes Discursivos (RDs), retirados do romance *Lavoura Arcaica*, de Raduan Nassar, e sua adaptação/tradução para outra linguagem, mediante outro código, o imagético em movimento, de que resultou o filme homônimo, de Luis Fernando Carvalho. Para tanto, vê-se a linguagem como em estágio pré-discursivo, no centro do Nó Borromeano, no espaço intersticial dos círculos representativos da tríade lacaniana - do Real, do Simbólico e do Imaginário. Vê-se a linguagem igualmente como portadora de um caráter limítrofe entre o psíquico e o somático, ponto de partida para duas outras pulsões observadas por J. Lacan – a invocante e a escópica.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Linguagem literária. Linguagem fílmica. Corpo. Sentidos. Análise do discurso.

RESUMEN: Bajo la teoría del Análisis del Discurso pècheuxtiano e intentando un diálogo entre dos expresiones distintas – la literaria y la fílmica – en la perspectiva del cuerpo como conductor y expresión de la construcción psicoanalítica del lenguaje, se

¹ Tradução/versão livre realizada por Ana Lucia Gutkoski.

* Professora de Comparatismo e Tradução no Mestrado em Letras-Literatura Comparada, na Universidade Regional Integrada do Alto Uruguai e das Missões-URI, e de Análise de Discurso, na Licenciatura em Letras, na mesma Universidade. Doutora em Letras pela Universidade Católica de Pelotas. E-mail: theve47@gmail.com.

presentan aquí aportes acerca de un análisis interpretativo de Recortes discursivos (RDs) – sacados de la novela *Lavoura arcaica*, de Raduan Nassar, y su adaptación/traducción a otro lenguaje y otro código, el de la imagen en movimiento, de que resultó la película homónima, de Luis Fernando Carvalho. Para eso, se ve el lenguaje como en un estadio prediscursivo, al centro del Nudo Borromeo, en el espacio intersticial formado por los tres anillos representativos de lo Real, de lo Imaginario y de lo Simbólico. Se presenta el lenguaje también como portador de un rasgo fronterizo entre lo psíquico y lo somático, punto de arranque para dos otras pulsiones observadas por Lacan – la invocadora y la escópica.

PALABRAS CLAVE: Lenguaje literario. Lenguaje fílmico. Cuerpo. Sentidos. Análisis del discurso.

[...] still confused, stunned, I showed him the chair at the corner, but he did not move and taking the handkerchief off the pocket he said: "Button up your shirt, Andre". (Raduan Nassar, by the voice of Andre, the discursive subject-narrator – DNS, *Lavoura Arcaica*, p. 11-12).

1 INTRODUCTION

The house of the intangible, unreachable Real, – that is the body where we do exist, the universe where we move on and express ourselves. Like a mirror, he reflects our inner (body); he gives us visibility (shape) before the eye of the other and at the same time, he inhabits within the other one that lives in us.

In the psychoanalytic constitution of the language, where the body is a way and an expression, where the Real, the Symbolic, and the Imaginary meet, that triad which, in the Lacanian theory demonstrates the functioning of the significant link, as it has been exemplified by the Borromean knot, a topological picture where those three registers are represented by three intertwined circles, demonstrating the interdependent relation that links them.

In this article, the image-perception of the body is seen as a language in a pre-discursive state, in the center of the Borromean Knot. Being at the empty space that Lacan calls "object a", situated in the interstitial space of the three representative circles of the aforementioned registers, that image/language is recovered by the symbolic and the imaginary. At the same time, it is equally endued by the drive in the same perspective as it was remembered by Freud, a borderline nature between the psychic and the somatic whose condition makes the flow of the two other drives, both the invocative and the scopic one, as it will be demonstrated later on.

As a starting point, here it is, as significant objects under analytical considerations, two distinct languages, which complement one another. They are both the literary and filmic narratives, the later one as a version from the first one translates into another language code, the imaginary in motion.

2 A BODY (IN) DISCOURSE, WORD AND IMAGES IN MOTION

The first version of *Lavoura Arcaica*- which, from now on will only be designated by L.A. -, in a literary narrative condition, begins full of meanings. Andre, the narrator-character - who will presented to the reader a discursive narrator subject (DNS) -, perceives himself as inhabitant of a throbbing body, in a physical, psychic and sensorial nude condition that renders himself to a kind of ascesis, of consecration, or even translation, from the human to the divine, as it is possible to be understood in the reading of the Discursive Clipping (DC) that follows. In this fragment of the text, the central spot is the room, an individual and particular world that receives the body, but it is also the body, an inviolated cathedral which welcomes the senses waiting for the supreme celebration.

DC 1

The eyes at the roof, the nude inside the bedroom, rosy, blue or purple colored, the bedroom is inviolable; the bedroom is unique, it is a world, a cathedral bedroom, where, in the intermissions of anguish, one gathers, from a rough trunk, in the palm of his hand, the white rose of despair, for between the objects

that the bedroom consecrates it is first the objects of the body; I was laid out on the ground in my bedroom, in an old countryside boarding-house.[...] (NASSAR, 1989, p. 9.)

His gaze upwards, towards the bedroom's roof, leads the reader to assume that the DNS is lying on his back. His own perception of the surroundings, by the supine position in which he is in, makes him (DNS) experience the feeling that everything around him becomes fluid, mixing up to explode right afterwards, in a symbiotic confluence between both a pulsating and an accomplished desire. Both the pink and the blue colors, which he, by the senses, notices mixing up in a whole violet tone, are symbols of the desire that, like a spark, expands itself in search of satisfaction and also the feeling of stillness felt after the fulfillment of the senses at the same time.

By the way, it comes from Psychoanalysis the notion that a sensorial occurrence cannot be explained without registering it in a representative form. That representativeness, whether psychic or not, is identified by Nasio (2009) as *a mental image of the body*. As Nasio says, "[...] every single noticed sensation inevitably impresses its form; every single real sensation is, necessarily, duplicated by a virtuality [...]" . The body is also a "*cosa mentale*", he affirms, when remembering Da Vinci, who qualified painting as *cosa mentale*, "because painting – he thought, is not in the picture, but in the mind of the one who paints it or in the mind of the spectator who contemplates it", completes Nasio (NASIO, 2009, p. 8).

In which condition, though, are these reflections on the image of the body as the house of the Real, of the Symbolic and of the Imaginary, and, at the same time all these ones being the way and the expression of that one brought up here? The answer is that, as this article is being based in a comparative discursive analysis and having as a first basis a literary work, it is necessary to outlook the image shaped as the result of a literary creation, yes, but also as socialization. There is no socialization when it is dissociated from ideology even of the imaginary one. On that perspective, as it is pointed by Pageaux (2011, p. 110-111), it is possible to affirm that:

Both the ideology and the imaginary constitute, meaningfully, the two antagonistic and complementary sides of an imagery study. According to the addressed issue, sometimes it will be given preference to the ideology (and the image's approach will come as a contribution to what we can still call of idea's history), sometimes it will be directed to poetic (mainly when the focus of the analysis is the style and the literary practice of a writer or of a group of texts), but also into the imaginary (that one of the writer, the time, place, and the literary school). It is a sort of balance to be constructed or to find, considering the chosen theme [...] Image is a kind of language or a second language to express the Other, but also, and consequently, a language to talk about oneself and his/her culture

Therefore, it's comprehensible the linguistically possible similarity between the suggested mental image to the reader by a reading dialogical interaction, which is sustained by the written literary discourse, in this case the LA novel, and the image that reaches him as a filmic discursive narrative which is clear in the homonym film to Nassar's novel. In the filmic discursive narrative, the images come to the spectator-reader's eyes filtered by the analytical interpretative eye of the film director.

The relation between both the written/read word and the seen/listened image keeps, however, a word/image that, even if it is read in a written or in the filmic imagery code, it does not exist. Unsaid, not even listened or seen, it inhabits what comes before of the beginning. Yet with no name in a state before itself, it is a part of the subject-narrator-reader or a spectator in the form of a silence that identifies it as still being at the condition of "object a". There is a silence that goes beyond words, as it is pointed out by Carnevale (2015, p. 68): "The constitution-formation of the subjects does not occur only via signifiers offered by the Other one, but also, via silence [...] We are constituted by the silence that is beyond every word [...]". One can infer by that reality that there is another one – there are interstices when that silence leaks to become into words, either spoken or written words, a word blending with the image, but it is always an incomplete word, an opaque word, a gap from where the unconscious flow.

At DC2, ahead, it is presented some clues on that primitive silence, the origin of every single human being language. There is also a movement of alternation of both time and senses in the two brothers' speeches, as one can observe:

It was my eldest brother who was at the door; as soon as he entered, we stayed before each other, our eyes fixed, it was a piece of dried earth that was separating us, there was fright and wonder on that dust, but it was not a discovering, I do not even know what it was, and we did not say anything, till he reached out his arms and silently closed his strong hands on my shoulders and we looked at each other and in a given moment our memories sprang up our eyes suddenly, and I saw in a glimpse his eyes become wet, and it was in that precise moment that I felt my eyes become wet, and then he hugged me, and I felt in his arms the weight of the wet arms of the whole family. We looked at each other again and I said "I was not expecting you" it was what I said with the clumsiness of what I was saying and feeling afraid of letting me go it did not matter what I was going to say, and yet I repeated "I was not expecting you" it was what I said once again and I felt the powerful strength of the family falling down on me like a heavy downpour while he was saying "we love you so much, we love you so much" and it was all that he said while he was embracing me once again [...] (NASSAR, 1989, p.11)

There is, in this DC, some additional clues that lead the reader to the perception of silence as a hole, an inaccessible hole, a well so deep it is impossible for someone in his never-ceasing fight for completeness to get to the bottom. Observe, for instance, the DC2a and DC2b:

DC2a – *It was my eldest brother who was at the door.* (NASSAR, 1989, p.11).

It is noticeable that one is before a proposition entirely placed in a past time, the memory time. The DNS, when opening the door sees who is knocking at, but he cannot perceive that one by name. On the contrary, the explanation he gives, *my eldest brother*, recovers the familiar genesis by a bond of affective belonging translated by the personal pronoun *mine*, on a time scale which, by moving forward, goes back to the beginning, or else, the before the beginning as the object *a*. As stated by (PECHEUX, 2008, p. 23.), the explanation given by the DNS brings out "[...] that statement in a network of implicit associative relations – paraphrases, implications, comments, allusions, and so on – that is, in heterogeneous series of statements, acting under different discursive systems, and with a varied mobile stability".

This way, by affirming that it was *his elder brother*, the DNS retrieves a discourse of self-resistance, for he inserts not only one, but various discursive generations that produce a speech that refers to his discursive formation of belonging. The following sequences – *it was a piece of dried ground that was separating us, there was fright and wonder in that dust, but it was not a discovering, I even do not know what it was, and we did not say a single word* – reiterative of the discourse of resistance of that same self. It has to do with both the inter-discourse, "at the order of out of center, that is, that thing that is *outside* of what is being said, but it is mirrored in the significant chain, thus pointing out a *disorder* in the statement", as Ernst (2009, p. 5) says, referring to the *weirdness* as a discourse strategy "that exposes the conflict in discourse constructions [...]", that weirdness, whose clues appear on the discursive surface, as it is in "[...] there was fright and wonder in that dust, but it was not a discovering, I even know what it was [...]" (NASSAR, 1989, p.11).

At that highlighted DC, there is, again, a silence in which it is made an unsaid word up that recovers the unreachable – the lack, the indelible mark, lasting, of the human. There is an excess of signifiers of a plain silence, such as the dryness of the earth and its veil effect, an isolation curtain among multiple meanings of a same discourse, or else, the weirdness which is caused by a *return* that frightens, for it is similar to the unusual that, however, it is already known from before – the already there – already said, already lived, and that looks like getting back, or that frightens by the new that it brings on, or at least that it seems new without being it. It is a voice that speaks by the body's gesture, it is the unconscious that takes the word and presents itself, it is itself that speaks and it speaks about itself and, by saying it, makes itself a subject, it gives and it makes sense.

DC2b – [...] till the moment he reached out the arms and silently closed his strong hands and at my shoulder and we looked at each other and in a precise moment our memories came out all of a sudden, and in a glimpse I saw his eyes become wet (NASSAR, 1989, p.11)

In this DC the DNS overcomes his own barriers through the other's eyes and, by doing that, it overflows. It is in that overflowing that his brother's eyes, in LA, make sense for him, the discursive – narrator- subject. *His eyes got wet*, says the DNS, beholding to cluster at his brother's wet face not only an image, but also many different images that substantiated on it and now they pour in, overflowing. They are afloat in the embrace that connects the two brothers, as much for the excess contained in the speech, reiterated and repeated use of the additive conjunction 'and' (...**and** he closed in silence...**and** we looked at each other...**and** in a precise moment...**and** I saw all of a sudden...), as examples.

In other words, when it comes to words that become images, the word could not only be the same while also bringing forth another meaningful image, as well as the image is never one image only. Resembling to an enclosed photograph in a frame from which the side leftovers had been discarded, such it has already been explained by Castillo (2015), every single image is also the other ones that it does not show, those (images) that sustain them and the following ones that guarantee them a semantic-timing continuity in a discursive context.

Therefore, there is not only one (possible) meaning in an image. It being manifold, it is also spare time; yet it can be an instant out of the time in which the very image is created, a piece of time that is apart from a fixed previous time at the time-space line of DNS himself, such as described in the remembrance discourse [...] *in a precise moment our memories overtook us* [...]. Thus, the image is unreal time kept back and retained in a given place in DNS's memory, but it is also time passing by, so far as, led by the exteriority that constitutes and questions it, it is also a time in a constant flux and flow.

The aforementioned passing of time is more evident when the pendulum-like movement is observed in the inculcated notations in DNS' speech by the use of pronouns, as it can be understood by the alternate use of *me* and *us*, perceptible at DC2. It is clearly noticeable the presence of a semantic space belonging to the DNS Andre and another one belonging to Pedro, the brother who had arrived bringing inside him a kind of remembrance that the one is only one by the bond with the others' one changed into one us.

Pedro's arrival puts in contrast the individual that had torn apart with the collective one, which derives from his single presence in the discursive context. That unexpected presence places at that present moment a feeling of belonging symbolically irrevocable, that is, the presence of his own voice as an affirmation of identity, linking it to the collective family voice, revealing itself manifold – *we love you, we love you*. Thus it is reaffirmed the permanence of the union between the one (DNS) and the others (the brother, Pedro, and the other members of the family), by the use of the verb to love, with full meaning, changed into an action that does not need a time/place definition, just because it has transcended the semantic markers, as it will be shown below.

In that reunion speech between the two brothers one can read three other speeches - the speech of the *lack*, underlying in the expression "I was not expecting you" and that surfaces from the presence of an unexpected visitor, meaning either surprise, or a wish to remain as a deprived being; the discourse of the *excess*, which is emphasised by the repetition of the appealing speech "we love you, we love you", and the *weirdness* discourse, which surfaces before the unexpected that happens to the DNS and in which he is engaged against his will, as if he had been put in a cage, a jail from where he could never escape once again: "*what I said with the misspelling of what I said and full of fear of letting me run away it did not mind anything what I would even say, and yet I repeated "I was not expecting you"*". In that sequence, three key-concepts can be pointed, - which are the lack, the excess and the weirdness-, that, as a condition for general concepts and not as technical devices (ERNST, 2009, p. 2) points out the analyst's task when he considers the discursive corpus. It can be made a discursive contextualization with the three expressions that are present at the discursive materiality analysis. The first one is the acknowledgement of *awkwardness*, of not being at will to live that discursive reality that suddenly his brother's presence made him feel (*what I said with the awkwardness of what I was saying*), especially while he was experiencing the fulfilling completeness of a fully enjoyed sex.. The second expression not only reaffirms the semantic value of the first one but it also re-feeds it slightly (*feeling afraid of letting me go, it did not matter what I would eventually say*), while the third one reinforces the semantic opacity in "*not expecting you*". Would that semantic opacity be an enigmatic reality that cannot be translated clearly because it is in a middle way, in an hiatus between the discursive materiality (of the intradiscourse), and the discursive memory (the interdiscourse), in a reaffirmation of surprise or of almost rejection to the unexpected presence that had obscured the desire almost therapeutic for a macerated body by desire?

3 A BODY IN DISCOURSE: MOVEMENT 1 – GETTING BACK TO THE BEGINNING

The introductory scene of Luís Fernando Carvalho, the film director of *Lavoura Arcaica*'s (2001) production from the written literary language to the filmic literary language, introduces, for only a few seconds, a boy running, who will later be revealed to be Andre, the DNS in the Nassar's novel. The character runs flanked, on his right, by the hillside of a valley and, on his left, by a line of trees near a wired fence. From right to left, in the scene, the boy runs, open arms, a happy face and untidy hair, touched by wind.

Suddenly the eye of the camera expands. The boy is now only a few steps from the end of the way that is limited by the wired fence. The spectator is led, by the child's eyes, to the end of the valley. Down the valley, on the left, what the spectator glimpses is like a flash about a house fenced by green clumps, trees that in the distance look like shrubs.

Cut.

In the sequence, as foreground, the boy is seen backwards, still running, but going towards a frameless door, a hole in the wall, with the top part dome-shaped, which overlooks to an inside yard, translucent by the clear light picture of a day dressed in blue in perfect harmony with the golden sun. Then, all of a sudden, the running stops. The boy opens up his arms, bends his body and throws himself from the threshold of the door.

The director's human view goes beyond the camera displays, artificial eye, partaker of another eye, attentive and curious, the one of the spectator before what is suggested by the character's gesture. What or who was the child going to meet? Or whom did the child run from? And where did he throw himself on? Those are questions apparently as logical as the answers would be predictable. Did little Andre dive into the empty space looking for finding himself, or (finding) the Other one, maybe?

Time/instant passed by. Nothing of what had been presumed happened. Before the voyeuristic eye of the audience, the revelation opens up. A spontaneous childish laughter is heard. Along with it there is the sound of something heavy on a surface that muffles the sound of the fall. The character had flown to meet nothing less than a pack of straws – dry grass – just waiting to satiate the hunger of some cattle, or to pad the night of some stubborn night-hawk, that is what the camera, by the director's point of view, shows to the audience.

The transition has been done. The landing of the young and fast body on the soft and dry grass happens at the same time the character openly laughs, a kind of hymn to the freedom of falling down, getting up and moving forward.

4 A BODY IN DISCOURSE: FINAL MOVEMENT, THE USUFRUCT OF PLEASURE...

Lavoura Arcaica (2001) the movie itself, begins with the opening credits springing up on the picture of a platan tree leaf, its life already dried by the autumn climate. As it is taken in a foreground picture, the image of the leaf resembles a very old skin, of brown shades, where some well defined features can be seen, outstanding ribbings on an earthly made face. Here it is time, here it is the face, here it is the earth, from and to that earth, that face and that body were made for.

Moving forward. Time here is the memory time subscribed into practices such as Pêcheux (1999, p. 50) says [A time[that translates history into another language, the filmic one. This kind of language comes to the spectator through the character's childhood, regaining life by the image of a happy boy, running free, living a time of his own, with no fixed schedules. Later on, it is signaled by the gradual breakdown between a past time, a time in memory – symbolically recovered by the picture of the platan leaf that is already dry with no life in it – and another one, expanding in a present, enduring time. This (time) will be unraveled little by little, from the initial thrill encapsulated between walls, in the silent accomplice of the bedroom almost dreary, silent and drowsy partner of a sexual drive that takes the character from the abyss to the Paradise of the satisfied libido.

Time now is a different one. It is now the time of the picture – of the unsaid picture-word, although it is really present, making itself a discourse in movement, a body movement, the supporter of the characters' emotions of a verbal narrative translated into the filmic language.

Now, the scene chosen by Luis Fernando Carvalho to begin the LA narrative in the point of view of the filmic narrative brings back an ancient notion - that the orgasm taken to its peak leads the individual to feel such enjoyment that he would achieve the sensation of absolute and unspeakable pleasure, perhaps similar to a near death.

It is something akin that is suggested by the director's camera in the filmic transposition of Nassar's novel opening scene. The scenography that was designed by Carvalho is faithful to the novelist's proposition. The bedroom is nearly Franciscan. The floor is made of wood, the bed is simple, the bedroom's walls are bare. Apart from that, there is only the flying shadow of a curtain veils, laced cloth through which the light of the day seeps in and makes arabesque drawings on the wall. Besides the curtain, there is only a turned off lamp, hung from the roof by a support that resembles a wheel of a wagon, the whole picture looking more like a dark spider dangling in the air.

That is the cocoon-like bedroom where Andre is a physical presence, but he is still an absent presence to the spectator. To shelter in that bedroom is to run away from the social interaction that, in Nassar's narrative is represented by the character's family. It is in that discursive spot that the opening scene of the filmic narrative is established. In a half-light setting, the spectator glimpses an image that may suggest moving waves under the moonlight. The light surface alternating with the dark waving in synchronicity with the sound of a locomotive that is coming near.

As the outside sound increases, the camera moves forward, near the moving surface. Little by little, the spectator can notice that the coming and going of light and shadow is a blanket or a sheet, perhaps. The sound of the locomotive gets closer as it gets closer the eye of the camera to the moving structure.

Before the spectator's eyes, there is a male body that gets excited, in the eagerness of getting the most joy that "it can be seen as circulating "outside" the subject, in the Other one", as it is explained by Fink (1998, p.123). That body as described at the language filmic scene is, simultaneously, an object of desire and an object that *arouses* desire, as it is pointed out by the same author above.

It is important to note that the same author, Fink, points out the comparison between the Marxist concept of added value – the taxes, the profits that the capitalist takes for himself instead of sharing them with his employees – and the concept of object "a". "leftover made by the disruption of the hypothetical mother-child oneness due to the real nature of the desire (FINK, 1998, p. 82-83), which is revealed as the reason for the Other's desire, in a Lacanian perspective. By a psychoanalytical point of view, the capitalist would represent the Other One, whom the subject would work for and who would sacrifice himself for his own pleasure.

Therefore, at the scene as it is shown in the picture, there is a split subject, cleaved from that *leftover*, looking for his own oneness, maybe figuring out he has already got it by his own illusion of totality, as it is explained by Fink (1988, p.83):

By being clashed out that leftover, the divided subject, though having been separated from the Other one, it can support the oneness' illusion; by holding on to the object a, the subject is able to ignore his own rupture. [...] It is in the complex relationship between the subject with the object a [...] that the subject gets a ghostly relationship of completeness, fulfilling, satisfaction and well-being.

The ongoing knocks at the door, interrupts that *ghostly relationship of completeness, fulfilling, satisfaction and well-being*, that the DNS was searching for. The scene is interrupted. The body undoes a unity that had been achieved only for a few minutes – that one of the gesture becoming a word/discourse of the body, for – as Iannini (2016, p. 35) reminds us – *a body really expresses himself, only when something conks out*. At that very moment, when a hand knocks heavily and hurriedly on the cocoon-like bedroom door, what conks out – because it has started to decompose – is the fantasy of the fulfilling, of the empty hole, the house of a desire always incomplete, of the interstice where the object a dwells, between the Real, the Symbolic, and the Imaginary.

5 ... AND THERE COMES THE CONCLUSION – THE (DE)COMPOSITION OF FANTASY

Andre stands up. The camera unravels the illusion. The bed where the pleasure had been reached, was perhaps not the one the viewer expected, but instead, the wooden floor, the material that since ancient times has been used by some civilizations to devote to some deities, thus also symbolizing the House of God.

The DNS dresses the pants first, then he dresses the shirt and heads towards the door. When he opens it, he realizes he has been uncovered in his volunteered exile. At the other side of the threshold, a male character stares at him. It is Pedro, the brother. There is a moment of silence and immobility between the two brothers. Their eyes meet and become one. Andre breaks the silence. *I was not expecting you...* Pedro does not answer. *I was not expecting you...* Andre's voice repeats a second time what is almost like a mantra. Peter's answer is also reiterative of the already known familiar feeling that he says he is the translator and the owner, that one of the discursive identity that unites them: *We love you so much...* *We love you so much...* An embrace brings the two brothers closer, untill the visitor definitely breaks the almost lethargic feeling of delight and enjoyment, which had kept Andre immersed in the fantasy of manipulating his relationship with object *a*, fulfilling the Other's desire. *Button up your shirt, Andre.*

Willing it or not, the assembling of the DNS to his familiar discursive formation is reaffirmed by that voice. The DNS Andre is submitted to the order of the ideology and of the unconscious, having been, once again, restructured, in Peter's imperative, coercive discourse, the brother, the structured memory of his speech, becomes what it has always been – a clashed, divided subject –, in an endless struggle with his own substance, the inside and the outside of his own body, the fantasy of enjoyment and utmost pleasure.

Therefore, when doing a discourse analysis that is manifested into two different languages, though both being complementary, the literary and the filmic language, like in LA, we have tried to demonstrate that the different ways of saying something or not saying it, in the perspective of the three key concepts already mentioned by Ernst-Pereira (2009), of lack, of weirdness and of excess - are essential devices to the interpretative practice, because the intention is not that of analyzing what was said or what was shown as a reference, but it is also to reveal the mechanism of representation itself, in the interaction of both languages as discursive materiality, carrier and creator of meanings that make evident the relevance of the existing intertexture between them.

REFERÊNCIAS

LAVOURA ARCAICA. Dir. Luís Fernando Carvalho. [Filme, baseado na obra homônima de Raduan Nassar]. 172 min. Colorido. NTSC. Dolby Digital 2.0 e 5.1. Distribuição: Europa Filmes, 2001.

CASTILLO, Alejandra. *Imagen, cuerpo*. Adroque - Buenos Aires, RA: La cebra, 2015.

ERNST, A. G. A falta, o excesso e o estranhamento na constituição/interpretação do *corpus* discursivo. In: SEMINÁRIO DE ESTUDOS EM ANÁLISE DO DISCURSO, 4., 2009, Porto Alegre, RS. *Anais...* Porto Alegre: UFRGS, 2009. Disponível em: <<http://anaisdosead.com.br/4SEAD/SIMPOSIOS/AracyErnstPereira.pdf>>. Acesso em 10 mai. 2016.

FINK, Bruce. *O sujeito lacaniano; entre a linguagem e o gozo*. Trad. de Maria de Lourdes Duarte Sette. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar, 1998.

IANNINI, Gilson. Prelúdio. In: *Revista Cult*, n. 211, p. 35, abr. 2016.

NASIO, J-D. *Meu corpo e suas imagens*. Trad. André Telles. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar, 2009.

NASSAR, Raduan. *Lavoura arcaica*. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 1989.

PAGEAUX, Daniel-Henri. *Musas na encruzilhada*: ensaios de literatura comparada. In: MARINHO, Marcelo; SILVA, Denise Almeida; UMBACH, Rosani Ketcher (Org.). Frederico Westphalen/RS: URI; São Paulo, SP: Hucitec; Santa Maria, RS: UFSM, 2011. p. 109-127.

PÊCHEUX, Michel. *O discurso: estrutura ou acontecimento*. Trad. Eni P. Orlandi. Campinas, SP: Pontes, 2008.

_____. Papel da memória. In: ACHARD et al. *Papel da memória*. Trad. e Intr. de José Horta Nunes. Campinas, SP: Pontes, 1999. p. 49-56.

SOUSA, Celeste H. M. de R. *Literatura e imagologia: uma interação produtiva. A contribuição comparatística da Universidade de Aachen. Pandemonium*. São Paulo, n. 17, 2011. Disponível em: <<http://www.fllch.usp.br/dlm/alemao/pandemoniumgermanicum>> Acesso em: 24 jul. 2016.

Recebido em 28/10/2016. Aceito em 14/12/2016