SILENCE AND THE REVERSE OF DISCOURSE: FROM WRITING TO SPEECH?

Daniela Moura Queiroz[1] and Nadia Pereira da Silva Gonçalves de Azevedo[2].

ABSTRACT

French materialist Discourse Analysis, according to Michel Pêcheux (AD), is of great importance, because it goes beyond the mere interpretation of words or phrases, that is, it is a theoretical and methodological approach that examines language and discourses in their social, political and cultural contexts. It is known that speaking and writing in the classroom are two essential forms of communication and expression that play complementary roles in the teaching-learning process. Thus, in the educational dynamics, this work aims to analyze the silence and the reverse of discourse in speech and writing. The type of research is analytical, with a qualitative methodology, with the DA method and the corpus selected was "a case report", which is based on the understanding that discourse is a social and ideological practice, immersed in historical contexts and power relations, where silencing and the effect of meanings are intrinsically linked to power and ideology. In this sense, one comes to the conclusion that, while silencing limits the possible meanings that circulate socially, the effect of meanings shapes how these meanings are perceived, interpreted and reproduced by the subjects. These discursive strategies reveal the power that language has to sustain or challenge ideological structures, evidencing the complexity of discourse as a space for struggle and negotiation of meanings.

Keywords: Discourse Analysis. Silence. Speech. Writing. Classroom.

---

[1] Master
Academic institution: Catholic University of Pernambuco
[2] Doctor
Academic institution: Catholic University of Pernambuco

INTRODUCTION

The materialist Discourse Analysis of the French Pecheutian line (DA) is of great importance because it goes beyond the mere interpretation of words or phrases. He introduces an approach that considers discourse as a social, historical, and ideological practice.

The importance of analyzing discourse in the light of DA involves the relationship between language and ideology: Pêcheux (2014a) states that discourse is always immersed in ideologies. That is, the words we choose, the grammatical structures we use, and even what we don't say, all carry underlying ideologies. This means that, when analyzing discourse, we are not only dealing with the linguistic structure, but also with the political, social, and cultural context in which it is inserted.

> In fact, it is more convenient to conceive of language (object of linguistics) as the basis on which processes are built; The linguistic basis characterizes, in this perspective, the functioning of language in relation to itself, as a relatively autonomous reality, and it is necessary, therefore, to reserve the expression "discursive process" (the production of discourse) to the functioning of the linguistic base in relation to representations (cf. above) put into play in social relations. This allows us to understand why very diverse ideological formations can be constituted on a single basis (answer to the problem: a single language/several (process cultures) (Pêcheux, 2014a, p.128).

In this context, for Pêcheux, the subject is not an autonomous being who fully controls what he says. On the contrary, it is crossed by discursive formations, which are structures that determine what can be said in different contexts. By analyzing the discourse, it is investigated how the subject is constituted by what he says and how this reflects the ideological and social formations that surround him.

One of the most significant contributions of AD is the deconstruction of the idea that what we say has a "natural" or "evident" meaning.

> Memory considered as a body/corpus of traces inscribed in this space, under extremely variable forms, thus leads to the notion of collective memory, as it was developed in particular by historians of mentalities; collective bodies (cities, regions, institutions, associations, nations, states, etc.) are the bodies of traces (Pêcheux, 2014a, p. 142).

He states that meaning is always constructed from different conditions of production and that it must be critically analyzed to understand the power relations and the underlying ideological tensions.

Therefore, this theory allows us to go beyond the surface of language and explore how discourse shapes and is shaped by social and ideological forces, revealing hidden aspects of power relations.

In this reflection, it is known that in a Portuguese language class, speech and writing play complementary and equally important roles in the teaching-learning process. The distinction between these two modalities of the language is fundamental to develop in students both oral and written competence, which become essential for their effective communication in different contexts.

Orality is one of the most natural forms of interaction, especially in the school environment. In Portuguese language classes, working on speech allows students to develop the ability to express themselves clearly and articulately, adjusting their speech according to the audience and context. In addition, practices such as debates, group discussions, and oral presentations promote verbal fluency and argumentation skills. The analysis of speech characteristics, such as intonation, pauses, gestures and informality, is also essential for students to perceive the particularities of this modality, which often differs from writing.

Writing, on the other hand, requires greater planning and organization. It is characterized by being more formal, structured and lasting in relation to speech. In Portuguese classes, the teaching of writing involves not only grammatical and spelling aspects, but also the development of skills of cohesion and textual coherence, argumentation and creativity. Working with different textual genres, such as essays, articles, narratives, and letters, provides students with the opportunity to explore the versatility of writing. Writing is also a means of reflection, as it allows the student to better organize their ideas before expressing them.

In Portuguese language classes, it is essential that speaking and writing are not seen as separate skills, but rather as complementary. For example, oral practice can be a preliminary step to the act of writing, such as in debates or discussions that precede the production of an argumentative text. Likewise, the study of orality can benefit from the analysis of written texts that exemplify formal structures and are appropriate to the communicative context.

> Speech (as a manifestation of oral practice) is acquired naturally in informal contexts of everyday life and in the social and dialogical relationships that are established from the moment the mother gives her first smile to the baby. More than the result of a biogenetic disposition, the learning and use of a natural language is a form of cultural insertion and socialization (Marcuschi, 2010, p.18).

In this way, working with speech and writing in the classroom offers a more complete linguistic training, preparing students to express themselves appropriately both in formal and informal situations, oral or written. In this context, the research problem is: would writing be the solution to the reverse of discourse? Consequently, the general

objective of the study would be to analyze silence and the reverse of speech in speech and writing.

Specifically, it is intended to investigate how meanings are constructed and shaped by discursive formations, ideologies and interactions between different discourses.

The French materialist Discourse Analysis itself presents a theoretical-methodological proposal, which is based on the understanding that discourse is a social and ideological practice, immersed in historical contexts and power relations. Thus, after the selection of the corpus, the methodological path will be: the historical and social contextualization, where the discourse is always understood by its historical and social context, and it is necessary to consider the moment, the political conditions and the events that influence it. Then, the analysis of discursive formations, where the sets of rules and ideas that define what can be said in a given context. Next, there is a study of interdiscourse and intradiscourse, the analysis of the interactions between the discourse under analysis and other discourses (interdiscourse), in addition to the internal analysis of the utterance (intradiscourse). After that, the subject's position is studied, marking that the subject is not autonomous, but; crossed by ideologies and discursive formations.

From this perspective, the analysis seeks to understand where the subject speaks from and the power relations that shape his discourse. No less interesting, the contradictions and silencing, where the discourse can present contradictions and omissions, which reveal ideological tensions. Identifying these elements is crucial to understanding how discourse operates. Finally, discursive materiality is analyzed, that is, discourse has concrete effects on social reality, shaping behaviors and perceptions, and must be analyzed in relation to its impacts.

This methodology aims to deconstruct the apparent transparency of meaning in discourse, revealing the underlying ideologies and power relations.

The stages of this article are language in the classroom, power and discursive functioning; the analysis of the corpus and the social historical contextualization; the interdiscourse and the subject's positioning; silencing and the effects of meaning.

Regarding the discursive *corpus* of this study, it will be based on the testimony of a teacher of Basic Education, on a question of Sociolinguistics, in which this dialogue will be described and analyzed with a student, in the final years of elementary school.

PORTUGUESE LANGUAGE AND DISCURSIVE FUNCTIONING

The Portuguese language in the classroom plays a fundamental role in the formation of students, as it is through it that essential communication, critical thinking,

expression and interpretation skills are developed. The teaching of Portuguese goes beyond grammar and spelling, also covering literature, textual production, the understanding of different discursive genres and the ability to argue.

Studying the Portuguese language helps students express themselves clearly and effectively, whether in oral or written form. This is essential not only for academic success but also for professional and social life. Language provides access to a wide range of knowledge and cultures and is a crucial tool for active and conscious citizenship.

> Schooling, in turn, is a formal and institutional teaching practice that aims at an integral formation of the individual, and literacy is only one of the attributions/activities of the school. The school has broad educational projects, while literacy is a restricted skill (Marcuschi, 2010, p. 22).

Teaching Portuguese in the classroom involves challenges, such as the linguistic diversity of students and the lack of interest in reading and writing. It is important for teachers to promote practices that make learning meaningful, valuing linguistic and cultural variations and addressing topics that arouse students' interest.

The Portuguese language is a pillar of education, promoting the intellectual, cultural and social development of students. Dynamic and inclusive education helps to prepare critical citizens, capable of acting and communicating effectively in society.

> In an extensive critical analysis of the culturalist perspective of the aggrandizement of writing, Gnerre (1985) detects in the authors linked to these currents of thought some problems that can be summarized basically in three points: ethnocentrism; overvaluation of writing; globalizing treatment (Marcuschi, 2010, p. 30).

Discursive functioning in language involves the study of how meanings are constructed in linguistic interactions, considering social, historical, and cultural contexts. Unlike the isolated study of words or grammatical structures, the discursive focus is on the use of language to convey and interpret meanings, depending on the intentions and relationships between the interlocutors.

THE ANALYSIS OF THE CORPUS AND THE SOCIAL HISTORICAL CONTEXTUALIZATION

In this section, the discursive corpus to be analyzed in this work will be presented. It is part of a case report, presented at a seminar, described below.

CASE REPORT:

In a seminar on Sociolinguistics and its interfaces, which began on 08/19/2024 and ended on 08/23/2024, held at the Catholic University of Pernambuco (UNICAP), with

Professor Dermeval da Hora, on 08/21/2024, a student from the Graduate Program in Language Sciences shared the following dialogue that took place in a public school in the State of Pernambuco:

In a Portuguese language class, in a class in the final years of elementary school, when I went to correct a student by saying CHICRETE, instead of CHICLETE, she answered me: teacher, I know how to write CHICRETE, I know that after the second 'C' there is an 'L'. However, where I live we don't say CHICLETE, but CHICRETE. I can even write it right, but I say it as I want, there in the community we say CHICRETE, it won't be different.

INTERDISCOURSE AND THE SUBJECT'S POSITIONING

According to Eni Orlandi (2022), discourse is always crossed by voices, memories, and meanings that go beyond the individual. Language is marked by these "voices" of other discourses, and the subject is positioned in the discourse as a function of these elements that precede and constitute it.

> There is no meaning without interpretation; interpretation is present at two levels: that of the speaker and that of the analyser; And the purpose of the discourse analyst is not to interpret, but to understand how a text works, that is, how a text produces meanings. It is necessary to remember that in this theoretical affiliation there is no meaning in itself, the meaning being defined as "relation to" (Canguilhem, 1976 apud Orlandi, 2022, p. 23).

Interdiscourse refers to the set of discourses already said that crosses and grounds what is being said in the present. It connects with the "discursive memory", that is, with the discursive formations that preexist the subject and that enable or limit the meanings that can be constructed in speech.

The teacher, in her training, learned to speak and writes according to the written norm. When she says: "a class in the final years of elementary school, when I went to correct a student by saying CHICRETE, instead of CHICLETE", the interdiscourse works as a "memory" that the current discourse activates, revealing, at the same time, the continuity and rupture with previous discourses. "Memory, in this domain of knowledge, is social" (Indursky; Mittmann; Ferreira, 2011, p. 71).

Through interdiscourse, the subject mobilizes and (re)interprets meanings that already circulate in society.

> The fact that there is an already-said that sustains the very possibility of all saying is fundamental to understanding the functioning of discourse, its relationship with subjects and with ideology. The observation of the interdiscourse allows us, in the example, to refer the saying of the banner to an entire affiliation of sayings, to a

memory, and to identify it in its historicity, in its significance, showing its political and ideological commitments (Orlandi, 2015, p.30).

The production of meaning is not an individual process, as the subject does not create meanings from a blank sheet. Instead, he appropriates already existing meanings, reformulating them, but always within the limits that discursive formations allow.

In the teacher's statement, when trying to silence the student, "this aspect reminds us of the psychic mechanism of repression: repression is an absence that leaves marks. In both cases, what has been repressed and what has been repressed from memory can resurface unexpectedly" (Courtine, 2023, p. 82). As happened in the student's answer.

The subject of discourse is not a totally autonomous and conscious being, but is always inserted in certain discursive formations that determine how he can position himself. Thus, the subject's position is always a consequence of the discursive and ideological context in which he is inserted. "Language itself in the historical-social process and I place the subject and the meaning as parts of this process" (Orlandi, 2017, p.72).

Thus, the subject is "subjected" by the discourses and ideologies that circulate socially, that is, he is constituted from these voices, meanings and knowledge. Even if the subject positions himself in the discourse, he does so within the limitations imposed by the discursive memory. Although the subject is subjected, he still has some margin to resignify the senses and build positions of resistance. Orlandi emphasizes that language is a space of struggles and tensions, where the subject can appropriate dominant discourses, subvert them or create meanings from them.

The interdiscourse, therefore, determines the possibilities of positioning the subject, as it organizes the field of meanings and the memories that the subject mobilizes when speaking. The subject, at the same time that he is conditioned by this discursive field, also updates and transforms it, albeit on a small scale. "All the senses already produced are present there, and not only the meanings that are authorized by the Subject-Form. And if this is so, nothing that has already been said can be absent from it" (Indursky; Mittmann; Ferreira, 2011, p. 86).

In the dialogue with the student, she replied to the teacher: "she answered me: teacher, I know how to write CHICRETE, I know that there is 'L' after the second 'C'. However, where I live we don't say CHICLETE, but CHICRETE. I can even write it right, but I say it as I want, there in the community we say CHICRETE, it won't be different". In this way, discourse is a social phenomenon, marked by memory and interdiscourse, and the subject is positioned in this network of pre-existing discourses. "Identity itself is a movement in history. And to privilege the processes of signification, in which the subject

and meaning are constituted at the same time. Ideology and Unconscious, materially linked" (Orlandi, 2017, p. 74-75).

Thus, the meanings are never stable and that the subject, although marked by subjection, has a limited agency to reposition himself and negotiate meanings. In this way, the interdiscourse and the positioning of the subject are fundamental to understand how the discourse is, simultaneously, a space of reproduction and ideological transformation.

SILENCING AND THE EFFECTS OF MEANING

Discourse is not only what is said, but also what is left aside or hidden. Silencing, therefore, becomes an important discursive strategy, as it directly impacts the meanings produced and interpreted by the subjects.

Silencing occurs when certain meanings or discourses are omitted, suppressed or devalued in a given discursive situation. This can happen in different ways, such as by not speaking, by erasing voices, or by excluding certain themes and points of view.

> When man, in his history, perceived silence as a signification, he created language to retain it. The act of speaking is to separate, distinguish and, paradoxically, glimpse silence and avoid it. This gesture disciplines signifying, as it is already a project of sedentarization of meaning. Language stabilizes the movement of the senses. In silence, on the contrary, meaning and subject move widely (Orlandi, 2018, p.27).

Thus, silencing as a form of ideological control, as it regulates what can or cannot be said in a given context. "From the perspective we assume, silence does not speak. Silence is. It means. Or rather: in silence, the meaning is" (Orlandi, 2018, p.31).

When the teacher tells the student: "a class in the final years of elementary school, when I went to correct a student by saying CHICRETE, instead of CHICLETE", by silencing certain discourses, society or the dominant group imposes certain meanings and marginalizes others, thus strengthening the power over socially accepted meanings. "There are multiple silences: the silence of emotions, the mystical, the silence of contemplation, the silence of introspection, the silence of revolt, the silence of resistance, the silence of discipline, the exercise of power, the silence of the will, etc." (Orlandi, 2018, p.42).

In this context, silencing can be explicit (when something is purposely omitted) or implicit (when certain discourses do not appear because they do not have space in a certain discursive formation). In both cases, what is not said can be as significant as what is said, as it also guides the interpretation of the senses.

In this path, the effect of meanings, which is the perception of meaning generated in the interlocutors throughout a discursive interaction. This effect is not only in the isolated

words, but in the relationships between what is said and what is silenced, in the intentionalities, in the interpretations of the context and in the discursive formations at stake.

"In effect, the politics of silence is defined by the fact that by saying something we necessarily erase other possible, but undesirable, meanings in a given discursive situation" (Orlandi, 2018, p.73). Thus, the senses are not fixed or unique; they arise from the intertwining between discourse, context, subject and ideology.

In the answer obtained by the teacher "she answered me: teacher I know how to write CHICRETE, I know that after the second 'C' the 'L'. However, where I live we don't say CHICLETE, but CHICRETE. I can even write it right, but I say it as I want, there in the community we say CHICRETE, I won't be different", the effect of meanings is produced by the combination of what is enunciated and what is omitted, shaped by historical, cultural and social aspects.

The effect of meanings is also a matter of subjective positioning. Different subjects may interpret the same discourse in different ways, depending on their experiences, ideological positions, and relationships with discursive formations. The subject's discourse is 'an effect of the interdiscourse on oneself, an interiority' entirely determined from the outside (Pêcheux, 2014a) that is, the meaning is not in the discourse itself, but in the interaction between discourse, subject and context.

> There is ideology in full operation: in what is necessarily silenced. We would say, therefore, that "reading", in discourse analysis, cannot do without a theoretical place for the functioning of silence. This place, in turn, implies recognizing the status of what we call "materiality" (of the senses) in the analysis we propose (whether of language or of silence). For it is through the notion of materiality that we can intervene in the illusion of transparency (literalness effect), thus thinking of language as a system not of abstract forms, but of material, that is, a space for the manifestation of relations of force and meanings that reflect confrontations of an ideological nature (Orlandi, 2018, p.174).

Silencing is one of the factors that shapes the effect of meanings. By silencing or omitting certain discourses, a limited interpretative field is created, in which the subject is led to attribute meanings based on an incomplete or biased set of information. This process impacts how meanings are produced and received, generating a specific view of reality that can reinforce or contest certain ideologies.

Thus, in the dialogue between the teacher and the student, while silencing limits the possible meanings that circulate socially, the effect of meanings shapes how these meanings are perceived, interpreted and reproduced by the subjects. These discursive strategies reveal the power that language has to sustain or challenge ideological structures,

evidencing the complexity of discourse as a space for struggle and negotiation of meanings.

Therefore, silence and ideology are deeply intertwined, pointing out that silence is not just an absence of speech, but an active form of construction of meanings. Silence can operate both as an absence of discourse and as a way of expressing oneself, even if indirectly, influenced by ideological factors. Ideology shapes discourses and how, through silence, certain meanings are marginalized or suppressed, while others are highlighted.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

Silence is a strategic tool of ideology to shape the senses and knowledge that circulate in society. It works as a mechanism that imposes limits on what can or cannot be said in certain contexts and social situations. This process of exclusion or concealment of meanings is a form of maintaining power, as it controls access to interpretations and information.

The teacher tried to silence the "wrong" speech according to the written norm, however, without success. The student said that she would follow the norm of writing in the activities, but the teacher would not control what she says and how she speaks, because she wants to speak according to her community, she does not want to be different. "As history and subject, when it comes to language, are always in motion, resistance appears, as we have said, exactly where there is censorship" (Orlandi, 2018, p.129).

Therefore, silencing and the effect of meanings are intrinsically linked to power and ideology. While silencing limits the possible meanings that circulate socially, the effect of meanings shapes how these meanings are perceived, interpreted, and reproduced by the subjects. These discursive strategies reveal the power that language has to sustain or challenge ideological structures, evidencing the complexity of discourse as a space for struggle and negotiation of meanings.

REFERENCES

1. Courtine, J.-J. (2013). Decifrar o corpo: pensar com Foucault. Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes.

2. Courtine, J.-J. (2023). Corpo e discurso: uma história de práticas de linguagem. Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes.

3. Foucault, M. (2014). A ordem do discurso: aula inaugural no Collège de France pronunciada em 2 de dezembro de 1970 (L. F. de A. Sampaio, Trad., 24ª ed.). São Paulo: Edições Loyola.

4. Indursky, F. (2011). A memória na cena do discurso. In F. Indursky, S. Mittmann, & M. C. L. Ferreira (Orgs.), Memória e história na/da análise do discurso (pp. xx-xx). Campinas, SP: Mercado de Letras.

5. Leandro-Ferreira, M. C. (2020). Glossário de termos do discurso – edição ampliada. Campinas, SP: Pontes Editores.

6. Marcuschi, L. A. (2010). Da fala para a escrita: atividades de retextualização (10ª ed.). São Paulo: Cortez.

7. Orlandi, E. P. (2014). Gestos de leitura: da história no discurso (4ª ed.). Campinas, SP: Editora Unicamp.

8. Orlandi, E. P. (2015). Análise de discurso: princípios e procedimentos (12ª ed.). Campinas, SP: Pontes Editores.

9. Orlandi, E. P. (2017). Discurso em análise: sujeito, sentido e ideologia (3ª ed.). Campinas, SP: Pontes Editores.

10. Orlandi, E. P. (2018). As formas do silêncio: no movimento dos sentidos (5ª ed.). Campinas, SP: Editora da Unicamp.

11. Orlandi, E. P. (2020). Interpretação: autoria, leitura e efeitos do trabalho simbólico (5ª ed.). Campinas, SP: Pontes Editores.

12. Orlandi, E. P. (2022). Discurso e texto: formulação e circulação dos sentidos (5ª ed.). Campinas, SP: Pontes Editores.

13. Oliveira, M. L. S. (2001). Charge: imagem e palavra numa leitura burlesca do mundo. In J. C. de Azeredo (Org.), Letras e comunicação: uma parceria no ensino de língua portuguesa (pp. 265-275). Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes.

14. Pêcheux, M. (2014a). Análise do discurso (4ª ed., E. P. Orlandi, Org.). Campinas, SP: Pontes Editores.

15. Pêcheux, M. (2014b). Semântica e discurso: uma crítica à afirmação do óbvio (5ª ed.). Campinas, SP: Editora da Unicamp.

16. Pêcheux, M. (2015). O discurso: estrutura ou acontecimento (7ª ed.). São Paulo: Pontes Editores.

17. Pêcheux, M. (2023). Legados de Michel Pêcheux: inéditos em análise do discurso (C. Piovezani & V. Sargentini, Orgs.). São Paulo: Contexto.

18. Rabaça, C., & Barbosa, G. G. (1987). Dicionário de comunicação. São Paulo: Ática.

19. Silva, C. L. M. e. (2004). O trabalho com charges na sala de aula. Pelotas, RS: UFRGS.