

POLEMIC PEDAGOGICAL DISCOURSE AND POLYSEMY IN THE FORMATION OF THE SUBJECT-AUTHOR

DISCURSO PEDAGÓGICO POLÊMICO E POLISSEMIA NA FORMAÇÃO DO SUJEITO-AUTOR

DISCURSO PEDAGÓGICO POLÊMICO Y LA POLISSEMIA EN LA FORMACIÓN DEL SUJETO-AUTOR

Carolina Fernandes^{*}

Aline Alves Portella^{**}

Universidade Federal do Pampa

ABSTRACT: In this work, it was proposed, through the Materialist Discourse Analysis, a study of the authorship of an argumentative-dissertative text worked from the polysemy with the objective of understanding the functioning of the Polemic Pedagogical Discourse in the writing process. The analysis sought to observe the production of the authorship effect in the texts of technical high school students on Human Rights. Through writing and speeches in the classroom, it was possible to identify the students' discourse on the topic and the way in which they placed themselves in different subject-positions, in the texts produced. The analyzes pointed to the existence of ideological antagonism, and allowed us to identify different degrees of authorship and the way in which the pedagogical discourse can intervene in the student's authorship even when in its controversial functioning.

KEYWORDS: Discourse Analysis. Authorship. Controversial pedagogical discourse. Polysemy. Human rights.

RESUMO: Neste trabalho, foi proposto, pelo viés da Análise do Discurso Materialista, um estudo da autoria de texto argumentativo-dissertativo trabalhado a partir da polissemia, com o objetivo de compreender o funcionamento do Discurso Pedagógico Polêmico no processo de escrita. A análise buscou observar a produção do efeito de autoria nos textos de alunos do Ensino Médio Técnico

^{*} Professora Associada na Universidade Federal do Pampa, campus Bagé, onde atua no curso de Licenciatura em Letras e no Programa de Pós-Graduação do Mestrado Profissional em Ensino de Línguas. É líder do grupo de pesquisa Estudos Pêcheuxianos e tutora no Programa de Educação Tutorial, o PET-Letras, com bolsa FNDE. E-mail: carolinafernandes@unipampa.edu.br.

^{**} Licenciada em Letras-Português e Literaturas de Língua Portuguesa pela Universidade Federal do Pampa, campus Bagé. E-mail: alinealvesportella@gmail.com.

sobre os Direitos Humanos. Através da escrita e das falas em sala de aula, foi possível identificar o discurso dos alunos sobre o tema e a forma como eles se colocaram em distintas posições-sujeito nos textos produzidos. As análises apontaram a existência de antagonismo ideológico, e nos possibilitaram identificar diferentes graus de autoria e a forma como o discurso pedagógico pode intervir na autoria do aluno mesmo quando em seu funcionamento polêmico.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Análise do Discurso. Autoria. Discurso pedagógico polêmico. Polissemia. Direitos Humanos.

RESUMEN: En este trabajo se propuso, a través del Análisis Materialista del Discurso, un estudio de la autoría de un texto argumentativo-disertante trabajado desde la polissemia con el objetivo de comprender el funcionamiento del Discurso Pedagógico Polémico en el proceso de escritura. El análisis buscó observar la producción del efecto autoría en los textos de estudiantes de secundaria técnica sobre Derechos Humanos. A través de escritos y discursos en el aula, fue posible identificar el discurso de los estudiantes sobre el tema y la forma en que se ubicaron en diferentes posiciones de sujeto, en los textos producidos. Los análisis apuntaron para la existencia de antagonismo ideológico, y permitieron identificar diferentes grados de autoría y la forma en que el discurso pedagógico puede intervenir en la autoría del estudiante aun cuando en su funcionamiento controvertido.

PALABRAS CLAVE: Análisis del Discurso. Autoría. Discurso pedagógico polémico. Polissemia. Derechos humanos.

1 INTRODUCTION

In this work, we proposed the analysis of the production of the authorship effect in argumentative-dissertative text through the operation of polysemy and pedagogical discourse in order to understand how these pedagogical strategies interfere in the positioning of the subject-author. The objective of this work is to identify what is the role of polysemy in the process of authorship, since according to Fernandes (2017), students usually reproduce the Traditional School Pedagogical Discourse (PD), placing themselves in the position of student-writer, repeating what he believes is expected by the teacher. Our hypothesis is based on the assumption that polysemy, undertaken by the polemical discourse, allows the takeover of the author-position by the subject-author.

This research was conducted based on the curricular internship developed in a Technical High School, where the project aimed to discuss and reflect on the Human Rights theme that was addressed through the Polemical Pedagogical Discourse. The reading and discussion activities resulted in the students' text production about the subject: Human Rights for what and for whom? The texts that compose the corpus of analysis of this research were selected based on the different discourses produced on the subject. When discussing Human Rights in class, we observed that there was the production of a common sense effect that associated human rights with privileges that certain "humans" could have guaranteed or not. As a pedagogical objective of the practice, we tried to move the meanings of the statements used by the respective subject-students, confronting them with the knowledge about the importance of laws that protect them, regardless of their ideological positions and their beliefs.

In the Polemic DP, polysemy is controlled, but allows each subject-enunciator to direct his saying according to his ideological constitution, resulting in the production of possible effects of meaning, because it is through it that these subjects will mobilize pre-constructed of the interdiscourse, taking a position concerning the dominant ideology. Our analyses were based on the studies of Materialist Discourse Analysis (DA), one affiliated with Michel Pêcheux's theory, which by considering discourse as a theoretical object, proposes language as its specific materiality. Developing this theory in the Brazilian context, Eni Orlandi (2011) analyzes the pedagogical discourse in the production conditions of the dictatorial period, understanding that its predominantly authoritarian operation causes the student to be placed in a position of information receiver, instead of producing meanings. Thus, based on this theoretical perspective, we assume that starting from a Polemic operation of PD in the classroom, it is possible to stimulate dialogue, developing criticality, and helping students in the construction of their argumentation, which, in our hypothesis, may favor the process of authorship.

From the observation of the conditions of production and the analysis of the texts produced by the students, we seek to understand the Discursive Formations (DF) that determine their positions, and how these contribute or not to the production of an author effect. For this, three texts were chosen, being these: two in ideological antagonism, and one of them that presents a change of position-subject during the rewriting process, which leads us to think about the need of this subject to position himself as an author.

After this brief introduction, we will proceed to the organization of this work. In the second section, some considerations regarding the theory that guides our analysis will be presented. In the next section, the methodology will be presented, followed by the analysis of the results and the final considerations.

2 THEORETICAL-ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK

This work is based on the studies of Discourse Analysis (DA) of Materialist affiliation, which analyzes the texts considering the ideological constitution of the subject and the meanings. For DA, discourse is an effect of meaning, and is produced from formulations that already exist in the interdiscourse and are mobilized by the subject from the discursive formation (DF) with which he identifies, and with these being components of ideological formations that represent them in the language (Pêcheux; Fuchs, 1997). According to Orlandi (2005), the discourse materializes the way in which the subject sees the world based on the social and historical context in which he or she is inserted and the conditions in which it produces it. Thus, every subject is inscribed in at least one DF, associated with an ideological formation that interpellates it.

The writing process is one of the forms of materialization of the discourse, and it is through it that the discursive practice of the subject-student will be analyzed in this article, because, according to Indursky (2016, p. 34), "[...] writing promotes the textualization of different discursivities, that is, through its bias, the materialization of the interdiscourse takes place". This means that the saying does not belong to the subject-speaker, it is not his "idea", or "opinion", exposed in those words, as believed in the idealism of a rational subject, but he identifies with senses and sayings already produced, which are in circulation in society, and remain in the interdiscourse waiting for its re-updating in the intradiscourse.

The practice of writing promotes the materialization of discourse, therefore, bringing through this symbolic space different voices that can unite or even oppose each other. Writing is constituted, as Indursky (2016) explains to us, from discursive threads recovered from the interdiscourse, that is, which come from the exteriority and from this subject determined by ideology and the unconscious, in addition to the conditions of production that interfere in the discursive process.

To understand the complex process of writing, some concepts that will constitute the theoretical-analytical device of this work will be presented. They are discourse and text (for being objects of study and analysis respectively); subject and author (for being the object of discussion of our work); polysemy and paraphrase (for being useful notions for this approach); polemical pedagogical discourse (for being the instrument used to mobilize the process of authorship).

2.1 DISCOURSE AND TEXT

According to Orlandi (2011, p. 40), "discourse is the necessary conjunction of language with history, producing the impression of reality". Through the effects of meaning, it is possible to observe the functioning of paraphrase and/or polysemy in the process of textual formulation, because the discourse is constantly reformulated in an attempt to mobilize new meanings from the different gestures of interpretation in order to produce the effect of authenticity and originality.

Language is observed in DA, therefore, as symbolic material, because, according to Orlandi (2007), it is through its opacity and its equivocal character that its materiality makes sense. This process allows us to observe the different ways the subject puts discourse in verbal text, considering the conditions of production that involve them and the ideological formation that constitutes it. In this way, symbolically, the subject has the illusion of being the source of the saying, because everything that is being said by him has already been said before and in another place. To recover the previous sayings, the discursive memory is moved, mobilizing meanings that already circulate in society.

Through this rescue, we can make other voices resonate in the statements because the saying is possible only if it is within the order of the repeatable (Orlandi, 2012). We demonstrate this with the example of our practice, when some students, when faced with the theme that would be addressed in the Human Rights classroom, uttered statements such as "bros rights", "good citizens", "a good

criminal is a dead criminal", thus bringing to the debate statements already uttered before, in another place, and regardless of their new enunciators, who return as pre-constructed in their statements.

This process is materialized through the textual body, therefore its relation with the production of meanings is equivocal and incomplete, and its unity is only an effect, because, according to Orlandi (2017, p. 57): "[...] the text, seen from the discourse perspective, is not a closed unit - although, as a unit of analysis, it can be considered a whole unit - because it is related to other texts (existing, possible or imaginary), to its conditions of production (the subjects and the situation), to what we call its constitutive exteriority (the interdiscourse: the memory of saying)".

When circulating in society, the text, therefore, will always be related to others that already exist, about which the author produces an effect of unity and homogeneity, providing effects of beginning, middle, and end. Meaning is given from the crossing of other discourses, which establishes a relationship with the subject. these are the relations of memory and exteriority that allow the subject, through the interdiscourse, to produce singular gestures of interpretation, mobilizing, via discursive memory, different discourses that circulate in society.

In the midst of the theoretical reflection on discourse and text, we also consider it important to mobilize the concept of the unsaid. It consists of that statement that is implicit in the discourse of this subject even if it has not been pronounced, but that is being implied through incompleteness, silencing, and the possibility of the gesture of interpretation. However, the silencing of the implicit does not compromise what the subject is saying, because, according to Orlandi (2005, p. 82), "It is known that, along the speech, there is a whole margin of non-sayings that also mean something. In the analysis of discourse, there are notions that accompany the not saying: the notion of interdiscourse, ideology, and discursive formation. We consider that there is always a necessary non-saying in the saying".

For Orlandi, silence is an object of reflection, and is related to the sayable and the unsayable as the very condition of saying, since to say x, it is necessary to silence y. Thus, besides the implicit and the implied, the unsaid, referring to what was left out of the discourse thread, also constitute the meanings of a text and will be implicated in the analyses developed in this article.

2.2 SUBJECT AND AUTHOR

Categorically, we have already stated that, in DA, the subject of discourse is not an empirical individual and is not the owner or source of his saying, he is constituted in the discourse, which is ideological materiality, and, as a result of the interconnection between language and history, he is constituted from the relationship with other subjects: "He is subject to language and history, because to constitute himself, to (if) produce meanings he is affected by them. He is thus determined, because if he does not suffer the effects of the symbolic, that is, if he does not submit to language and history, he is not constituted, he does not speak, he does not make sense" (Orlandi, 2005, p. 50).

This subject is the one who appropriates the word, and his words acquire a meaning according to the position he occupies socially and ideologically, directing his statement so that it produces an effect of meaning. By being interpellated by ideology, the subject believes that he is in charge of his discourse, so when he says "in my opinion", "that's what I think", "that's what I believe", he places himself in a subject-position based on an ideological position that he believes to be formed by his reason, and not by an external constitution. As Pêcheux and Fuchs (1997) explain when referring forgetfulness #1, the role of the unconscious is to repress the ideological subjection. The repression is necessary, considering the need for the subject to act in society, producing statements of his own authorship even if this is only an effect.

As for the textual production, this subject-position will inscribe itself in the text somehow, giving rise to the author-position, which, according to Fernandes (2017, p. 145), "can reflect both in writing and in reading through singular interpretative gestures". This author position assumed by the subject-enunciator differs from its author function, because, as defined by Orlandi (2005, p. 86) the author function "is a function of the subject, responsible for the organization of meaning and the unity of the text, producing an effect of continuity of the subject". Thus, while the author-function acts in the production of the effect of unity, already sufficient to

confer the effect of authorship to the text, the author-position gives the effect of authenticity and originality through unique interpretation gestures, that is, that displace the meanings of a same chain of repetition, escaping from common sense and the sentences that are already prepared.

The existence of the author-function is conditioned to the discursive memory and the interdiscourse that produces the update of the discourse in the intra-discourse. This function can be only of repetition (paraphrase) or it can produce displacements (polysemy) in the networks of interpretation and in the DFs, producing an effect of new, of original. One can thus say that the subject becomes an author if what he produces is interpretable and repeatable, inscribing the sayings in the historicity of language. And one can say, along with Fernandes (2017), that the subject only places himself in the author's position if what he writes produces the effect of originality, not reproducing such statements already formulated.

According to Fernandes (2017, p. 252), the teacher's evaluation of the student's adoption of an authorial position should not be based on a question of all or nothing, or whether one is an author or not, but rather "to indicate different degrees of authorship", evaluating the interpretative gesture of the subject-student considering the processes of paraphrase and polysemy that produce singularity effects in different degrees, therefore not existing a zero degree of authorship.

In the school environment, there is usually no concern about the degree of authorship of the texts, limiting itself only to expecting the student to be productive and meet the proposed task, making him just a reproducer of sayings, without being able to put himself in a new subject-position (SP) to, thus, assume the position of the author.

2.3 PARAPHRASE AND POLYSEMY

The processes of production of meaning unfold, according to Orlandi (1984), in two ways: by paraphrase and by polysemy. Paraphrasing is the process of production of meaning effects that makes it possible to recover from the interdiscourse what has already been said through discursive memory and its maintenance reiterates a discourse coming from the same discursive formation (DF). While polysemy is the rupture with the chain of repetition of the meanings, thus, there is the possibility of movement of the meanings in an attempt to formulate new effects of meaning, opening for the identification with other discursive formations. According to Orlandi (2012, p. 38):

Paraphrasing is the matrix of meaning, because there is no meaning without repetition, without support in discursive knowledge, and polysemy is the source of language since it is the very condition of existence of discourses, because if the meanings - and the subjects - were not multiple there would be no need to say. Polysemy is precisely the simultaneity of distinct movements in the same symbolic object.

In this way, the paraphrase is the condition for the saying, since the subject needs to retake what has been said to produce his text, but the problem is in being restricted to this process, without giving space for the movement of meanings that polysemy allows, which occurs very often in school as Marinheiro and Borges state (2011, p.138): "[...] when the student writes a text not based on his reading histories, this text remains on the predictable axis, some reasons for this is because the subject shares a dominant ideology that writes according to common sense".

This fixity of meaning in the axis of common sense leads us to believe that the subject seeks to position himself as an author by adopting the discourse that "would be for everyone", when, in fact, he is being a mere reproducer of a dominant discourse. This subject-author repeats what he has as a notion of common sense, without considering the specific conditions of production and its ideological constitution, which could favor the production of new meanings, thus he is limited to paraphrasing what does not move the meanings. Moreover, according to Fernandes (2016, p. 223): "These stagnant forms of mobilizing discourses do not stimulate the taking of the position-author, only the writing-position of the subject that does not question, only reproduces the meanings that are imposed on him." Thus, the taking of the author's position would only be effective in the passage from paraphrase to polysemy, because at the same time that it restates what has already been said, there is an attempt to break with this repetition to establish the difference.

There is between paraphrase and polysemy a relation with productivity and creativity, being paraphrase the process of the repeatable that is very appropriate for productivity; and polysemy, as it displaces the meanings, is the process favorable to creativity, because there is the possibility of the originality effect. These processes are explained by Orlandi as follows (1984, p. 11):

On one side, we have the reiteration of processes already crystallized by the institutions, in which language becomes a product and the sayable is maintained in the space of what has already been established: the paraphrase. This is what I call productivity. Man's relationship with the institution, with the law, with the system. But next to paraphrase there is another process: polysemy. Polysemy is the process that, in language, allows creativity. It is the attestation of the relationship between man and the world.

This relationship between productivity and creativity occurs in a conflicting way, because while one is legitimate since it is institutionalized by repeated sayings, the other seeks to legitimize itself and, for this, through creativity, the subject establishes the difference in order to break with the dominant DFs and with the repeated meaning. According to Orlandi (2011), through the process of polysemy, there is an attempt to establish the multiplicity of meanings, avoiding summarizing them to the "it is because it is" of the traditional pedagogical discourse that, according to the author (2011), is predominantly authoritarian.

Thus, we believe that polysemy in the functioning of argumentation, understood as a political practice of saying, assumes a key role in establishing authorship in the text of the subject-student, since this, by seeking to support his discourse, it can break with the dominant DF, mobilizing other possible meanings in his textual production. As we can have a gradation of authorship between the mere execution of the author function until the assumption of the subject to the author position, we understand together with Fernandes (2017) that authorship should be evaluated as a matter of "degrees", thus one can observe the authorship of a text giving itself from a higher to a lower degree as the processes of paraphrase and polysemy are established.

2.4 POLEMICAL PEDAGOGICAL DISCOURSE

The pedagogical discourse presents three discursive typologies - as proposed by Orlandi - being distinct according to the object of discourse and the interlocutor: ludic pedagogical discourse, polemical pedagogical discourse, and authoritarian pedagogical discourse. In ludic pedagogical discourse, polysemy is open and exaggeration is the non-sense. In authoritarian pedagogical discourse, the referent is hidden by the saying, and polysemy is controlled, trying to privilege a certain discourse in order to make it unique. The subject is the instrument of command, and he orders which sense should be maintained. In the polemical pedagogical discourse, the gestures of interpretation are directed through controlled polysemy so that there is no privilege for one discourse or another, always trying to avoid insult: "[...] the polemic discourse maintains the presence of its object, and the participants do not expose themselves, but on the contrary, they try to dominate its referent, giving it a direction, indicating particularizing perspectives through which it is looked at and said, which results in controlled polysemy (the exaggeration is the insult)" (Orlandi, 2011, p. 15)

The Polemic PD is a mode of discourse operation that exposes the subject to the opacity of the text, thus allowing the polysemy to be established, and different meaning effects can be admitted as possibilities of interpretation. Orlandi (2011, p. 33) says that, on the student's part, the Polemic DP is what allows the student to manifest his disagreement with the text, "not to accept what the text proposes and what guarantees its social value." This movement of giving space for the subject to position himself according to the DF to which he is affiliated makes an attempt to break with the tradition that the subject-student should write what he believes is expected by the teacher.

We consider, then, that the object of analysis of this work was developed in conditions of functioning of the PD of polemical type since the practice performed sought to provide the subject-student a space of open debate for the most diverse positions. In this way, the subject-student could position himself about the Human Rights theme according to that DF with which he most identifies, thus making possible the polysemy in the classroom. It is up to us, in this article, to observe whether these conditions of production favored the production of authorship in argumentative texts.

3.3 METHODOLOGICAL PROCEDURES

The DA methodology considers the text as the unit of analysis for perceiving it as discursive materiality, i.e., the materialization of the discourse that is its theoretical object (Orlandi, 2012). The analysis of the research corpus is done alternating between description and interpretation as proposed by Pêcheux (1990), always considering the conditions of production of the discourse in its broad and narrow sense (Orlandi, 2012). Therefore, this paper proposes the creation of a theoretical-analytical mechanism according to the specificity of its theoretical-methodological support. With that, as stated by Fernandes and Vinhas (2019, p. 145):

“It is important to emphasize the material character that constitutes the Analysis of Discourse, which, in a nutshell, means that the whole analytical process does not start from theory, but from praxis. So, our theoretical-analytical mechanism is placed in the reverse of idealism, finding the ideological functioning from what is materially placed”.

Therefore, it is based on these conditions that we determine the theoretical and methodological development of the analysis of texts produced in the classroom from a pedagogical practice carried out under specific conditions that we will present later. These texts are taken as an object of investigation not only because they come from students, but also because it is possible to observe in them how the discourse is produced through operations of argumentation and authorship's construction.

The immediate conditions of production of the texts comprised reading and text interpretation activities on Human Rights, including the Universal Declaration of Human Rights itself, through the polemical pedagogical discourse that enabled the production of polysemy in the classroom, giving voice to different subject-positions on the theme as observed in Fernandes (2022, p. 88): “[...] the pedagogical discourse in its polemical operation, in general, positively affected the students' authorial gestures, as they could produce meanings with singularity, being in favor or even against Human Rights, thus reaching the pedagogical objective as to the development of authorship”.

The pedagogical conduction to other possibilities of interpretation that would go beyond the common sense already mentioned happened because of the work with the pedagogical archive as it is defined by Indursky (2019), as being the classroom archive, including the teacher's material and the students' productions. This archive gives the subject-student the opportunity to construct a history of readings, through which he appropriates enunciates that are used to produce his texts. Thus, the pedagogical archive refers to the interdiscourse and discursive memory, and it is from its reading that the subject-student can identify with a particular discourse and reproduce it. The archive of this research is formed, then, from clippings from the pedagogical archive and notes in the class diary of the trainee and the internship supervisor, both authors of this article.

After selecting the texts to be analyzed, we defined the discursive clippings for the analyses, that is, the fragments of language and situation that represent a “discursive unit” (Orlandi, 1984, p. 14). As Fernandes and Vinhas (2019, p. 146) explain: “the ‘cut’ of the discursive corpus depends on a way of interpretation of the analyst”. Thus, by previously interpreting the subject-position constituted in the texts that materialize the students' discourses on Human Rights (HR), we defined three discursive clippings to be analyzed: 1. The authorship from the pro-HD discourse, 2. The authorship from the anti-HD discourse and 3. Authorship in the contradiction of the pro- and anti-HD discourses. From this delimitation, it was observed, in the discursive sequences (DS), the FDs and the SP in which the subject-speakers insert themselves to build argumentatives, attending to the production of the authorship effect.

By evaluating the degrees of authorship of the texts, we sought to understand how the polysemy, developed through a pedagogical discourse that was intended to be polemical, was able to contribute or not to the taking of the authorial position.

4 THE ANALYSES

The texts that compose our corpus of analysis were produced from the polysemic reading of pedagogical files, which provided the most varied discourses on the theme addressed in class: Human Rights. We present, therefore, the elements that will constitute the analysis process of this work: speeches about Human Rights (because it is the theme that drives the clippings selected for analysis); students' speeches on Human Rights (because it is the element that served as a basis for analysis) and authorship in the students'

texts (because it is the object of investigation of this article).

4.1 HUMAN RIGHTS DISCOURSES

Human Rights represent the recognition of basic rights that are inherent to all human beings. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights was adopted by the United Nations Organization, in 1948, as a reaction to the effects suffered by the impact of the Second World War, having as motivating episodes the holocaust and the launching of atomic bombs. The possibility of guaranteeing rights to any citizen started to be debated by Brazilian society during the Military Dictatorship, the period when the population became aware of the attacks on the humanity of political prisoners. Thanks to international pressure, the regime proceeded to a political opening, and society was able to have its rights guaranteed in law through a new Federal Constitution, called the Citizen Constitution, in 1988.

The universality of human rights continued to be debated during the 1980s and 1990s, as Caldeira (1991) tells us, especially with regard to the violent and arbitrary ways of combating common crimes. In Brazilian society, antagonistic discourses on human rights began to circulate, about their importance and effectiveness in the face of the conditions in which prisoners were subjected.

Through popular movements in the 1970s and 1980s, minorities legitimized the notion that they had about rights that should be claimed and fulfilled, seeking ways to qualify and specify them. The search and legitimation of these rights have always occurred through popular organization, through social movements, because it was believed that only through social mobilization, it is possible to guarantee rights to others, since this guarantee of rights only became feasible thanks to the guidelines of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights considered inalienable and irreducible. However, as Arendt (1991, p. 396) considers, this relationship between man and his rights becomes paradoxical, since such rights are inalienable and inherent to every human being, yet: "If a tribal community or 'backward' group did not enjoy human rights, it was obviously because it had not yet reached that stage of civilization, the stage of popular and national sovereignty, and was oppressed by foreign or native despots" (Arendt, 1991, p. 396).

This leads us to reflect on the conditions of humanity that are denied to certain social groups because they are believed to be less deserving of rights. The human rights emerge as a way to guarantee the life and physical integrity of human beings because if a person does not have the right to be treated as a citizen, he or she should at least be treated as a human being.

The meaning effect of rejection regarding the HR was produced, in the social context of big capitals, from the disagreement with humanitarian movements about the conditions of Brazilian prisoners, since, according to Caldeira (1991), it was more difficult to convince the population that those who were serving time for crimes they had actually committed deserved better treatment. In the Brazilian socio-historical context, we notice that a large part of the prison population is composed of black and marginalized individuals who, in the great majority, are victims of the most varied prejudices and discriminations. According to Fiocruz data, in the year 2019, black people represented 66.7% of the prison population in Brazil, the survey also shows that for every non-Black person imprisoned, there are two Blacks deprived of their liberty. This number becomes even higher when white people are counted since there is not even one white subject for every black one. Therefore, the fight for HR is directly related to the class struggle in its racial intersection, and such minorities are associated with all the stereotypes conceived by the population of criminals, such as the profile or so-called "appearance" or "face" of a criminal.

According to Caldeira (1991), once this struggle for HR is associated with the privilege of thugs, it produces the meanings of "protector of thugs," "defender of the bros' rights," and other terms used pejoratively to define the person who dares to defend the right of all. During the 2018 elections, this debate was recurrent on the national scene, especially from reactionary politicians who advocated arming the population and fighting crime. In this political discourse, the term "good citizen" often appears, indicating the citizen who would have his property and, sometimes, his physical integrity, attacked by "bandits". The "good citizens", usually with a privileged social status, are considered victims because their freedom is compromised since they have to protect themselves from robberies by barricading their residences, etc., while the subjects labeled as "bandits", along with other more pejorative terms such as "bums", would have their rights defended by the "human rights people".

The discourse in defense of human rights is seen by this Discursive Formation (DF) under the effect of social injustice by considering that the "good citizen" was at a disadvantage in relation to the criminals who attacked his freedom. Within this DF, a discourse of hate is produced about these subjects, which causes the statement: "a good criminal is a dead criminal" to be repeated in a mnemonic way, reaffirming how criminals should be treated: with death. That is why the defense of arming the population is so that they can defend themselves by killing the bandits. This anti-HR DF puts the progressive political discourse on the side of criminals and against the good citizen, indicating that anyone who defends that everyone should have a fair trial and decent conditions to serve their sentences is considered an "enemy of the country". It is in this context, more specifically after the victory of the candidate who adopted this hate speech as a campaign strategy, that our internship activity was developed dealing with Human Rights in a class in which this discourse was very present.

4.2 STUDENT DISCOURSES ON HUMAN RIGHTS

Through the observations and dialogues held in class, we noticed that part of the students disregarded the condition of human for certain members of society, and that, depending on the subjective constitution of that individual, he would be deserving or not of the conditions in which he lived. This distinction between "human" and "non-human" has its origin in the context of the Military Dictatorship, in which a sense of security was produced by removing from circulation what were called "vagabonds and criminals".

We noticed that many of the statements uttered by the students came from a reactionary discourse, often defended by the family, and materialized through social networks through memes, tweets, or even false information, such as Fake News. We understand that the identification with an anti-Human Rights Discursive Formation (anti-HR DF) is favored by the immediate context of the internship activity when hate speech received legitimization with the election of a candidate openly anti-Human Rights and defender of dictatorship.

In class observation, we saw that students used the argument in defense of freedom of expression, whatever it may be, to express their disagreement with the criteria of the ENEM essay about receiving a zero score if it disrespected Human Rights. On several occasions, the students expressed their discomfort with the mediatic interference on Human Rights, because "how can people, or a TV station manipulate us to fight for a belief we don't believe in?", reproducing a discourse that attacks public personalities and broadcasters who take a stand against the hate speech against "criminals". Still with regard to what they defined as "interference from third parties," some statements gave the family a sovereign power over the individual, as shown in the speech of one of the students: "who should teach us what is right or wrong, and what to believe, are our parents, education comes from home, and the school cannot change and interfere in this. This argument reflects a discourse of the subject as the private property of the family, seen under the Christian imaginary as "sacred".

The anti-HR DF proved to be the predominant one in this class even after the beginning of the polemical reading practice, since the most uttered statements were that "human rights are beautiful only in theory", "Human rights are contradictory, because they do not benefit the population, only the criminals". The logic that sustains such arguments comes from a reactionary ideological formation that does not legitimize human rights because they cover the part of society that is stigmatized as "non-human". Thus, a fascist discourse is propagated that, according to the imaginaries produced by it, there are superior beings, those who deserve rights, and inferior beings, who deserve to die, translating in the terms addressed: there is a difference between good citizens versus criminals.

4.3 AUTHORSHIP IN STUDENT TEXTS

As an object of analysis for this paper, three texts were selected in ideological antagonism and which we suspected to present different degrees of authorship. These texts were analyzed by means of clippings in order to observe the movement of meanings in the construction of the argumentation. Considering the conditions of production, we sought to understand the functioning of polysemy, developed in the reading activities by the polemic PD, in the process of authorship of this subject and to point out if there was or not the taking of the subject-author position. According to Orlandi (2007), the authorial gesture is the attempt to mobilize new meanings, for this, through the polemical PD, dialogues that mobilize the discursive memory and the different social voices were provided, so that students could identify with a discursive formation to take a position on the subject of Human Rights.

Some students even agreed that prisoners should not live in inhumane conditions, others considered that they should "rot in jail and should not live at the government's expense, using the money of good citizens", justifying that the unhealthy or inappropriate conditions to accommodate a human being were considered a deserved punishment due to the crimes committed. Thus, the inhumane treatment of the inmate subject is seen as a just lesson so that he will not commit crimes again.

We also observed reference to more exalted political speeches delivered by certain candidates with whom these students identified that: "it was necessary to kill all criminals, that only by exterminating them could we live in peace". On the other hand, some defended the State's duty to give criminals the opportunity to regenerate. The corpus of analysis of this work was composed of this ideological antagonism, and for this article, we selected three texts written by students in class on the theme: "Human Rights for what and for whom?". We defined the first section of analysis with a text that materializes the pro-HR discourse, another section with an anti-HR text, and a third section in which the chosen text produces a contradictory meaning effect on the subject, and their respective rewritings. We seek, in each clipping, to understand the operation of authorship by identifying the DF in which the subject-author is inserted to build his argumentation, observing the unsaid and the effects of meaning that his ideological position produces.

4.3.1 Authorship from the Pro-Human Rights discourse

Already in the title of the text produced by A1: *Human Rights are not for protecting the wrong!*, we perceive an attempt to defend Human Rights by claiming that their function is not to protect those who commit infractions. The implicit "The HR protects the wrong", resonates with the discourse that the HR protects criminals, it is for this imaginary reader that the subject-author writes, with the aim of "convincing" him otherwise. The defense of human rights begins to be constructed in the argumentative-dissertative text as follows:

DS 1: *Nowadays people think that human rights are for "defending vagabonds", and I say that it is not quite like that. The wickedness of people tells them that even if a thief is already in jail paying for what he did, he has to stay there, thrown, in precarious conditions, like an abandoned animal.*

One of the possible interpretative gestures for this discursive sequence (DS) is that Human Rights should guarantee any person decent living conditions and that people want revenge for seeing criminals suffer. According to the notes made in the class diary, some students produced statements claiming that bandits should be deprived of any and all rights, so the student brings this discourse as pre-constructed in his text to deconstruct it defending a "real" function of Human Rights. We observe the term that the subject-author takes from this discourse of hate to which he seeks to oppose: "bums". And he puts it in quotation marks, showing that this saying comes from another place, and is not enunciated by him.

When A1 formulates the statement "and I say that it is not quite like that", he calls himself a commitment to defend such rights through his text and, when he refers to the behavior of others regarding those who are serving time, he comments on the non-human condition to which these people are submitted: "thrown there, in precarious conditions, like an abandoned animal". The effect of meaning is that of compassion for the prisoners who do not have their dignity recognized.

In the last DS that we highlight from this text, A1 exposes her feelings regarding the lack of security in prisons, but, even so, defends that prisoners should live with, at least, the minimum of adequate conditions, as follows:

DS 2: *I am in favor of increasing security in prisons to prevent the entry of materials or drugs, because there are imprisoned who even inside continue "bossing" outside. This would already be a good step for the prisoners to pay for what they have done, but leaving them in precarious conditions is inhumane because no one deserves to be treated as "anything". Paying for what you did wrong is different from being tortured.*

It can be observed that A1 considers the condition of the prisoners inhumane and calls them "imprisoned", a term that produces a

different meaning from "vagabonds" as we have already discussed. One of the possible interpretative gestures to this DS is that, although he recognizes that some prisoners continue to practice crimes inside prison, A1 places himself in a SP favorable to the intervention of Human Rights in the conditions of common prisoners inside prisons, considering that "paying for what you did wrong is different from being tortured", which resonates the unspoken that "one crime does not justify the other".

With respect to authorship, we note that the text presents a high degree of authorship attitude, considering that the subject-author places himself in the authorial position when he retrieves from the interdiscourse discourses opposed to his own to build his opposing arguments and deconstructs them by producing meanings that displace the sayings of that DF that is contested by him. The argumentation is, therefore, built from the opposition of discourses, one overlapping the other to refute it.

4.3.2 Authorship from the anti-Human Rights discourse

Let's begin the analysis of the clipping with the title "Human rights for whom?". A2 questions to whom human rights are destined, suggesting the production of meanings of contestation of the usefulness of HR as materializes the anti-HR discourse. In DS 1:

DS 1: *In our country, most people who defend human rights only think about the rights of prisoners, criminals, drug dealers, among others. If someone takes the lives of others in a robbery or something like that, nobody speaks up, but if they want to kill someone who took the lives of many, they make a big fuss".*

We observe that A2 argues against Human Rights (HR) based on the discourse about a certain "injustice" produced by those who defend them, saying that the lives of criminals would be protected instead of the lives of victims. In "the rights of prisoners, bandits and drug dealers" he takes from the interdiscourse the statements that human rights are "rights of the bros". One can also identify, through the unsaid, that the subject to whom the statement refers is not just any criminal, since it does not include politicians arrested for corruption, but that individual to whom one can associate the stereotype of a criminal according to the social imaginary of a subject-bandit.

"If someone takes the lives of others in a robbery or something like that, no one protests, but if they want to kill who took the lives of many, they make a big fuss" materializes the discourse about the privileges of criminals as exposed by Caldeira (1991), in which the HR would benefit only the "criminals", not serving the good citizens. However, it can be observed that implicit in this statement is the desire for justice by one's own hands when A2 says "but if they want to kill those who have taken the lives of many," that resonates as an unspoken right that one believes to take lives in defense of his property or his family (argument generally used in the pro-armament discourse). The reaction of "people who defend human rights" to the death of a criminal described as a "great scene" reveals a disproportion between the commotion for the death of the victim of a crime and the commotion for the death of the criminal, placing human rights defenders on the side of criminals and against good citizens, as if these were their enemies.

In the following DS, A2 ends her writing by justifying her identification with anti-HR discourse.

DS 2: *We should apply the laws for everyone, not only for the "victims of society". Human rights should be followed, but not strictly, some things are exaggerated and only serve to protect criminals.*

According to Caldeira (1991), because there is a mobilization for the rights of minorities (precisely because they are already socially vulnerable), there is a feeling that the laws are not applied to everyone. A2 reproduces the effect of common sense when she says that "we should apply the laws to everyone, not only to the 'victims of society'". This term in quotes resumes the discourse to what the subject-author opposes, that there are subjects victimized by their own living conditions in the capitalist system. *Victims* in quotation marks also produces an effect of irony by resonating the discourse on victimhood, usually attributed to the minority when they claim their rights.

The anti-Human Rights DF still produces the effect of meaning that human rights would be laws applied to "get criminals out of jail", and relativizes the strength of this "law" by stating that "human rights must be followed, but not strictly". The opposition brought

by the connector "but" shows, through the unsaid, the discourse that, depending on which human is involved or what he has done, one can punish more severely, even using torture, a discourse that justifies the genocidal practice of black youths by the police.

It is clear that A2's PS is affiliated with an anti-HR DF and remains coherent with it throughout the text. However, we observe that there was no development of a consistent argumentation that would support this ideological position beyond the arguments already brought in class by common sense. Thus, there is the effect of authorship and the taking of authorial position, but in an intermediate degree which maintains the saying within the same chain of repetition, not allowing other relations of meaning to be established even if they maintained the meanings in the anti-HR DF.

4.3.3 Authorship in the contradiction of pro- and anti-HR discourses

This last clipping becomes relevant to discuss the role of polysemy and pedagogical discourse in the development of authorship by the subject-student. In A3's text, we observe an oscillation between pro and anti-HR discourses, making it difficult for the argumentation to be consistent. Let's see the first DS:

DS 1: *Human rights are a set of laws that serve every good citizen, although sometimes it may not seem like it. Many of us have it in our minds that it is only for criminals, murderers, etc, and maybe they are right, because that is exactly what we see and what is proven to us around.*

In the first paragraph of the text, A3 uses the expression "good citizen" which had been widely used by most of the students during the class discussion. The expression appears without quotation marks as being proper of the author of the text's discourse, so it is part of his ideological constitution the discourse about the "attack" on the freedom of citizens considered to be "good", who have their right to justice by their own hands limited, among other rights as it is "seen and proven around". There is relativization in the pro-HR discourse because, although it affirms that the good citizen is supported by human rights, the connector "despite" introduces an opposition that this support does not seem to be effective. However, the argument used to explain that it is only an impression that human rights are not useful to good citizens produces the effect of proving that they are indeed useless: "Many of us have it in our minds that it is only useful for thugs, murderers, etc, and, perhaps, they are right, for that is exactly what we see and what is proven to us out there." The subject-author marks his inclusion in the group that contests the usefulness of HR in "many of us" and "our thinking", and reaffirms this position by saying "maybe, they are right", justifying the reason given with what is "proven around", revealing that the discourse is produced within an anti-HR DF. These gestures of interpretation can be seen in the attempts to justify the assumed subject-position as we see in

DS 2: *One thing that I think is wrong is those who defend murderers, rapists, and people like that, and human rights are there, to defend those kinds of people. Why have compassion for these people who always commit the same mistake? In a situation like this (and in some others) we should even give them a chance. But if the person repeats the mistake, he should be considered a psychopath or something like that.*

We notice that the subject-student marks himself again in the text: "I think it's wrong who defends murderers [...]", taking up again the discourse that there are defenders of criminals who get them off their sentences, this being a difficult problem to be solved, since "the laws serve to punish criminals, but they are released by Human Rights" as can be observed in the following DS:

DS 2: *A solution to the problem? Hard to say, because the laws are there to punish those who commit crimes, and that is when human rights do not step in and make their defense and prove the innocence of someone who is not so innocent. But it is always good to go after any and all information for or against someone in trial processes".*

The subject-student bases himself on the common sense notion that Human Rights is an institution that "gets criminals out of jail", regardless of their innocence as can be seen in the comment: "someone who is not that innocent", that is, the proof of innocence is relativized: he may have a share of guilt even if it is not possible to prove it. It is interesting to note that his writing mobilizes a discursive memory that circulates in society, evidencing the anti-HR DF while saying that "they prove innocence" and that "it is

always good" to hear both sides, for or against, in trial processes.

A3's positioning becomes controversial in the writing process, due to the attempt to fit what he believed to be adequate to the pedagogical discourse: to say that HR is meant for all citizens, including the good citizen; that everyone, even if a criminal, has the right to a fair trial. These meanings more aligned to a pro-HR DF confront a PS linked to the anti-HR DF that seems to be the predominant one in the text despite not making it explicit. In this way, the effect of unity is compromised by the inconsistency in the defense of his arguments, showing that the authorship occurs to a lesser degree than the previous ones for not supporting a predominant position, thus undermining the effect of singularity and the consistency of the argumentation.

5 CLOSING REMARKS

It can be seen that the polysemy developed through the polemic PD promoted reflection on Human Rights (HR) in which the subject-student could freely manifest the subject-position to which he belongs, so we have the production of texts both for and against the HR. The debate on the theme opened several possibilities of interpretation, however, with the direction given by the pedagogical file, texts that indicated the importance of the HR, some students began to understand the meaning of social rights and that this guarantee of rights is for everyone in the same way, and not only for criminals.

Through the Polemic PD in the classroom, we sought to move the meanings and make the students take a position, first, from what they "knew previously", and then with an update of their reading histories on the theme. Thus, in writing, they were able to produce authorial gestures in different degrees, from the reproduction of ready-phrases of the reactionary discourse to the construction of new sayings that point to reflection on the theme and the production of the effect of originality and singularity. During the process of authorship, it is expected that the subject-student reflects and occupies a position of a critical subject, producing an effect of originality even to what is repeated from common sense. However, as we saw in text 3, the reproduction of the PD produces a gap between the student-subject and his own text that, in an attempt to reproduce the discourse that he imagines to be that of the teacher-subject, failed in the articulation of arguments, leaving the consistency of the argumentative-dissertative text fragile. Therefore, even if it is not the intention of the subject-teacher to produce an authoritarian pedagogical discourse, that dictates the directions that the interpretations can take, the subject-student, by the historicity of the school discursive production, understands that he "should repeat" what is said in the pedagogical discourse even if it does not impose it, because, only this way, his task will be well evaluated.

Even with this reproduction of the PD in the text of A3, we realize that its polemical functioning facilitated the development of polysemy and authorship in class since each text reached a degree of authorship according to the take of SP and the arguments raised. We believe, finally, that polysemy contributed to the formation of the subject-author who placed himself in a certain subject-position according to the DF to which he is affiliated.

REFERENCES

- ARENDT, H. *As origens do totalitarismo*. Anti-semitismo, imperialismo, totalitarismo. São Paulo: Cia. das Letras, 1991.
- CALDEIRA, T. P. do R. Direitos Humanos ou "Privilégios dos Bandidos"? *Novos estudos Cebrap*, n. 30, v.1, p. 162 -174, jul. 1991. Disponível em <https://novosestudos.com.br/produto/edicao-30/#58dbd825f3874>. Acesso em: 18 maio 2020.
- FERNANDES, C. O livro didático na constituição da autoria. In: CORACINI, M. J.; CAVALLARI, J. S. (org.). *(Des)construindo verdade(s) no/pelo material didático: discurso identidade, ensino*. Campinas: Pontes Editores, 2016. p. 203-226.
- FERNANDES, C. *O visível e o invisível da imagem*. Mercado de Letras: São Paulo, 2017.

FERNANDES, C.; VINHAS, L. I. Da maquinaria ao dispositivo teórico-analítico: a problemática dos procedimentos metodológicos da análise do discurso. *Linguagem em (dis)curso*, Tubarão, v. 19, n. 1, p. 133-151, jan./abr. 2019. Disponível em https://portaldeperiodicos.animaeducacao.com.br/index.php/Linguagem_Discurso/article/view/6985. Acesso em: 20 março 2020.

FERNANDES, C. Do funcionamento do discurso pedagógico polêmico perante o discurso anti-direitos humanos. In: DALTOÉ, A. da S.; FLORES, G. B.; SILVEIRA, J. da (org.). *Marcas da Memória: o que resta da ditadura na educação brasileira?* Campinas: Pontes Editores, 2022, p. 77-92.

INDURSKY, F. As determinações da prática discursiva da escrita. *Revista do Programa de Pós-Graduação em Letras da Universidade de Passo Fundo*, v. 12, n. 1, p. 30-47, jan./jun. 2016. Disponível em: <https://seer.upf.br/index.php/rd/article/view/5954>. Acesso em: 20 de maio de 2018.

INDURSKY, F. Leitura, escrita e ensino à luz da Análise do Discurso. In: NASCIMENTO, L. (org.). *Presenças de Michel Pêcheux: da análise do discurso ao ensino*. São Paulo: Mercado de Letras, 2019. p. 97-120.

MARINHEIRO, T. S.; BORGES, F. C. V. Paráfrase e Polissemia: Produções Textuais Escritas na Escola. *Nucleus*, v. 8, n. 1, abr. 2011. Disponível em: <https://www.nucleus.feituverava.com.br/index.php/nucleus/article/view/549>. Acesso em: 15 janeiro 2020.

ORLANDI, E. P. “Segmentar ou recortar?”. *Série Estudos. Linguística: questões e controvérsias*, n. 10. Uberaba: Faculdades Integradas de Uberaba, 1984.

ORLANDI, E. P. *Análise do Discurso: Princípios e Procedimentos*. 6. ed. São Paulo: Editora Pontes, 2005.

ORLANDI, E. P. *As Formas do Silêncio*. 6. ed. São Paulo: Editora Unicamp, 2007.

ORLANDI, E. P. *Interpretação: Autoria, leitura e efeitos do trabalho simbólico*. 5. ed. São Paulo: Editora Pontes, 2012.

ORLANDI, E. P. *A linguagem e seu funcionamento. As formas do discurso*. 6. ed. São Paulo: Editora Pontes, 2011.

PÊCHEUX, M.; FUCHS, C. Por uma análise automática do discurso: atualização e perspectivas. In: GADET, F.; HAK, T. (org.). *Por uma Análise Automática do Discurso: Uma introdução à obra de Michel Pêcheux*. 3. ed. Campinas: Editora da Unicamp, 1997. p.163-187.

PÊCHEUX, M. *O discurso: Estrutura ou acontecimento*. Campinas: Pontes, 1990.

VARGAS, Tatiane. Dia da Consciência Negra: Por que os negros são maioria no sistema prisional? *Informe Escola Nacional Pública Sergio Arouca*, Rio de Janeiro, 19 nov. 2020. Disponível em: <https://informe.ensp.fiocruz.br/noticias/50418#>. Acesso em: 10 out. 2021.



Received 24 September, 2022. Accepted 14 December, 2022.