The system of language, dialogue and discourse

Ana Zandwais[1]

Resumo: O objetivo deste artigo consiste em refletir sobre a concepção de discurso, como um objeto complexo, constituído por opacidade e hibridez. A fim de investigar esta concepção, analisaremos algumas noções importantes introduzidas no contexto soviético por Valentin Voloshinov, Mikhail. M. Bakhtin e Lev Jakubinskij, durante as primeiras décadas do sec. XX, as quais não somente contribuíram para a construção de uma concepção de discurso, mas também influenciaram as bases de estudos importantes sobre as noções de polifonia, heterogeneidade e ideologia, desenvolvidos por semanticistas, linguistas e filósofos franceses como Oswald Ducrot, Jacqueline Authier-Revuz e Michel Pêcheux.
Palavras-Chave: Discurso; sujeito, sentido; ideologia.

Abstract: The objective of this article developed at Post-Graduate studies at Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul State is to reflect on the conception of discourse, as a complex object, constituted by opacity and hybridity. For investigating this conception, we will analyze some important notions introduced in the Soviet context by Valentin N. Volochinov, Mikhail M. Bakhtin and Lev Jakubinskij, during the first decades of the twentieth century, that not only contributed to the construction of the conception of discourse but also influenced the basis of important studies developed about the notions of polyphony, heterogeneity and ideology, in European context, by famous french semanticists, linguists and philosophers as Oswald Ducrot, Jacqueline Authier-Revuz and Michel Pêcheux.
Keywords: Discourse; subject; sense; ideology.

Introduction

Investigating discourse, as a materiality, by analyzing the ways it works, requires reflections beyond the system of language. This purpose implicates to think about the way the senses work in language, considering the fact that they cannot be totally translated by syntactic structures.

On the other hand, this task requires also presupposing that there is, inside the own conception of discourse, a condition of heterogeneity that needs to be described through the functioning of different transversal relationships:

---

a) a relationship between History and event;

b) a relationship between temporality and utterance;

c) a relationship involving language, ideology and meaning.

According to our point of view, one of the most expressive obstacles to understand the way discourse functions can be explained by the fact that even being composed by a linguistic materiality, discourse can not be reduced to this materiality, and for this reason it escapes from the 'eye' of the linguist as an empirical object.

1. Discourse as an Empirical Object

We might say, by beginning this reflection that the composition of discourse can be understood, at the same time, by the symbolic order of language and by ideological values that words assume being considered reflections of contradictions among superstructures and infra-structure (social forces).

By this way, discourse could be described like a process that needs to be explained, as a concrete materiality, according to the interests of social formations and the social practices that reflect such interests through the ways they are produced and inscribed in a symbolic object: that is language.

On the other hand, when we characterize discourse by reflecting social practices and the way social stratifications divide subjects inside a language, following the principles of *raznorechie[2],* proposed by Lev Jakubinsky[3] (2012) and mainly the notion of heteroglossia *(raznoiaziche),* discussed in *The Discourse in the Novel* (1981), by Mikhail Bakhtin, we could say that a national language is a very hybrid composition constituted at the same time by unity and stratification of many languages.

According to discussions of Lätheenmäki (2005) in *Social Stratification of Language in the Discourse on the Novel: the hidden soviet context*, the notions of raznorechie and raznoiaziche explore the relationships between language and society, and give us the possibility of thinking that not only a language is a conjunction of many languages but discourse is also a hybridization among different discourses.

Voloshinov (2010)[4], at the beginning of the twentieth century in his study *Quest ce que la langue et le langage* [*What's language*], trying to analyse facts of language beyond the hegemony of positivism in that century at the 'East', and the influences of Cartesian ideas[5] at the 'West', investigated the most important properties of language, considering that it can be defined as a material body that reflects the social body.

---

2 Mika Lätheenmaki discusses on the ideas of Jakubinskii in 'Estratificação Social da Linguagem no Discurso Sobre o Romance''[Social Stratification of language in Discourse on the Novel] in: 'Mikhail Bakhtin: contribuições para a Filosofia da Linguagem e Estudos Discursivos, 1995, ZANDWAIS, Ana (editor), Porto Alegre: Sagra-Luzzatto Ed., p.41-58 [Contributions to Philosophy of Language and to studies on discourse]

3 We refer to the text 'O dialogicheskoi rechi' published in Moscow by Nauka Editions (1986) and to the text 'Lev Jaubinsky; une linguistique de la parole, published by Lambert-Lucas, Limoges, 2012.

4 We are working here with two translations: the bilingual edition 'Qu'est-ce que la langue et Le langage,' Limoges, Ed.(Lambert-Lucas, 2010, p. 521-566, translated to French by Patrick Sériot and Inna Tylkowsky-Ageeva and with the Brazilian translation from Spanish 'Que é a Linguagem'(2013) produced by João Wanderley Geraldi (São Carlos, Pedro&João Editions) in order to compare the equivalences.

5 It is important to emphasize, according to Sériot (2010:65) that Voloshinov refuses the Cartesian model of language which proposes a previous status of thoughts determining the character of language. He refuses also an idealistic view that the world of ideas determines reality.

According to him (2010:523), 'there's a profound difference between the character of verbal material and any other material exclusively physical'. When, working with language the writer is working, at the same time, with rules and already-given meanings not with standing they can be modified according to social life. Language according to him, 'reflects through all his elements: economical, social and political organization of a society' (op.cit, p.539).

Considering the questions above, we could understand discourse not simply like a verbal material composed by cohesion and coherence.[6] We might understand our object like a more complex unit that must be reflected under historical and social conditions which determine the work of signs in language. This is the principle that can elucidate discourse as an object composed by a special complexity that cannot be situated only in the field of linguistics.

Also, it is important to emphasize that, according Voloshinov (1973:110)[7] in *Marxism and the philosophy of language,* the status of the utterances in the scenery of linguistics studies was always described by uncertain ways. Considering his point of view 'as long as the utterance in its wholeness remains *terra incognita* for the linguist' (op.cit., p.110) it seems to be difficult to understand discourse as a unity of senses.

As closer the linguist is of the borders of utterances more insecure become his positions, considering that syntactic and morphological categories are not sufficient anymore to explain the concrete ways language functions as a material body of a social body.

The conditions that transform linguistic categories into concrete utterances, according to Voloshinov (1973) are placed outside language, if it is taken as a system, by the point of view of an 'abstract objectivism[8]. Therefore, for treating concrete utterances as discourse, it is necessary, first of all, to cross over the fragmentation between language and ideology.

On the other hand, we have to consider also that despite the impossibility to delimitate the borders between linguistic and ideological questions, these relationships are not symmetric. One cannot substitute one by the other.

Discourse, understood by this point of view, therefore, cannot deny its formal content or modalities of social orientation that presuppose different dialogical ways of interaction, representing the tendencies of inscribing signs in social and historical universes that are not only heterogeneous but also complexes.

Voloshinov (1973) affirms that the 'linguistic consciousness of speakers has nothing to do with a simple linguistic form because understanding that consciousness functions in concrete utterances presupposes 'an ideological context that presents the words as being changeable and flexible'. Hence, according to this focus, the words that we understand and make us react are those which arouse ideological resonances.

---

6   We report these comments to the definitions of text found in M.A.K.Halliday & R. Hasan, 'Cohesion in English' (London, Longman Ed., 1976, p.1) where text or discourse can 'refer to any passage spoken or written, or whatever length, that does form a unified whole.'

7   We are working with the English version of 'Marxism and Philosophy of Language (Harvard: Harvard University Press, 1973) translated from Russian language by Ladislav Matejka and I.R. Titunik and also with the Brazilian version from French translated by Iara Frateschi, Michel Lahud et al (São Paulo, Hucitec Editions, 1986). In brazilian version, the authorship appears exactly like in french translation. The translation of Sériot and Ageeva consider the authorship of Volosinov. We try to respect the differences by using the references of each text.

8   It is important to remember that Vološinov in 'Marxism and The philosophy of Language' (1973: 71) emphasizes that language under the point of view of structuralism can be characterized like a ready-make product from generation to generation. According to him, 'in reifying the system of language' the trend of objectivism treats living words as if they were dead.

Mikhail Bakhtin (1990: 85) in 'O discurso na poesia e o discurso no romance[9] [Discourse in poetry and discourse in novel] raises a question that we consider fundamental for exploring discourse as our object of study. He observes that facts of discourse cannot be reduced to the limits of empirical dialogic discourse, like linguists use generally to treat the dialogue, considering that the dialogic *parcours* involves not only relationships between the discourse of the other inside the discourse of each one, but also orientations to multiple social languages inside the limits of a socio-ideological horizon. And these characters of discourse present their own borders as being not delimited; in other words, these borders are neither 'marked', nor transparent.

Hence, considering the features above, we could identify in 'O Discurso na Poesia e o Discurso no Romance' a notion of discourse that characterizes it by its complexity.

According to this perspective, it is important to understand discourse and the conditions in which the concrete utterings are produced, by the substantial way the words of the other resist in the discourse of each one. The words of the other can answer us, by asking, agreeing, arguing, judging or even denying the meanings of our words. This movement, that seems to be invisible, is at the same time founder of discourse and responsible for the way it works.

It is important, observing the object by this perspective but going beyond, for analyzing the ways the utterances and the objects of speech are articulated for understanding the orientation of a theme and the way meanings work. Establishing a complex chain composed of ideological positions that provide identity to discourse as a thematic unity[10].

The words of the others in our words compose our object – discourse - as being hybrid. Discourse under this mixing of words has its proper *parcours* inscribed in certain historical conditions and different forms of concrete interaction. And the ways subjects are interacting in society determine the kinds of practices we have to observe.

According to Volosinov (1973) in'*Marxism and the Philosophy of Language' (MFL),* the center that organizes all our expression is not only interior, but first of all external. Considering this point of view, we could say that meaning is more complex than a simple content produced by verbal signs. Meaning, hence, is potential because it depends at the same time of the system of language and of external references (exotopic), mainly considering the values given to words in different historical events and spaces.

Therefore,if language can be defined as a material body of a social body and discourse as a complex and hybrid object that reflects the contradictions among superstructures and infra-structure (social forces), we have to think also that the social organization, reflected by discourse, is the result of social and historical work of subjects.

It is important to emphasize that understanding the values given to words in discourse implicates to understand that Voloshinov (2010) treats the word *(slovo)* as part of discourse (rech), without considering the division between *'langue et parole',* but replacing, first of all, the original sense of the word (logos).

This question seems to be fundamental because his position is quite different from the European structuralism that separates the comprehension of a language as: (social) system and (individual) use.

We have to consider at the same time that the words inscribed 'in rech' cannot be conceived without their utterances, without the voices that speak together. The utterances

---

9   We are working here with the brazilian translation of 'Discourse in poetry and Discourse in Novel'

10 It is important to observe that in a footnote of english version of 'Marxism and the Philosophy of Language' the term theme is considered a provisional one. It refers to the 'significance of a whole utterance.' Op.cit, 1973,p.99.

implicate always the voice of the other oriented inside historical conditions, inside an active context that is being articulated with our voice to produce an answer. In other words, it is necessary to inscribe the others' words, their values in our symbolic world.

These features represent the way discourse functions as a whole, including an important place to the subject. And the character of our comprehension about reality depends of this process.

The subject, consequently, cannot be defined in a pre-determined way, because it is constituted as subject in a process where the combination of voices of the other, the meanings of the other compound his symbolic world and these voices and meanings are mixed with his voice and his meanings in the 'theater of life'. That's why the notion of dialogue can not be restricted to empirical speakers.

We could say therefore, that the notion of subject presented in *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language* (MFL) is a pioneer notion that will be employed in semantics and marxists' studies of language developed later by linguists such as Oswald Ducrot in his study entitled 'Le dire et le dit[11], Jacqueline Authier-Revuz, in her study entitled 'Les non-coincidences du dire'(1998) and by a marxist philosopher, Michel Pêcheux, in his study entitled 'Analyse automatique du discours'[12] (1990), where he presents the subject divided, by the feature of heterogeneity.

So, these questions acquire great importance, mainly in *Marxism and the philosophy of language* (MFL) because a marxist reading on subjectivity will redefine different 'classical' notions of subject by a rupture, not only with the abstract objectivism but also with an idealistic view of subject that describes subjectivity as a question of individual style[13].

In *Hacia una Filosofia del Acto Etico[14] [Toward a philosophy of act]* (1997:8) Mikhail Bakhtin affirms that it is only in the world we live in we can really know, interpret and create, considering that we produce judgements of value through concrete experiences. But these experiences happen in some historical circumstances and we live them situated at social places. Then, we only can recognize ourselves as subjects and attribute senses to things by recognizing ourselves as subjects socially situated first of all. By this point of view, according to Mikhail Bakhtin, all theoretical reason loses the consistence if it is not sustained by practical reasons because it is from practical reasons that emerge the basis of supporting the subject in the singular event of "being a subject" (op.cit.,p.20).

By taking the conditions above, our utterances can not be reduced to psycho-physical acts or abstract utterances for they express the way exotopic references are internalized and at the same time externalized, emerging in our discourse, reflecting the proper condition of subjectivity which qualify us under different circumstances.

According to this perspective, we might not think about the relationships among sub-

---

11 We refer to the classic study of Oswald Ducrot entitled 'Le Dire et le dit' published in Portuguese 'O Dizer e o Dito' (Campinas: Unicamp Editions, 1984) where the author presents his polyphonic theory of enunciation, based on na interpretation of Bakhtin's studies about polyphony. In this study he criticizes Ann Banfield for her comprehension of the Indirect free style in 'Oú l'epistemologie, le style et la grammaire rencontrent la théorie littéraire' Langue Française 44 (1979), p.9-26. We refer also to the studies developed by Jacqueline Authier-Revuz about the 'non coincidences of saying. In Portugueses 'Palavras Incertas: as não coincidências do dizer' (Campinas: Ed. da Unicamp,1998).

12 The french philosopher Michel Pêcheux presents his conceptions of subjectivity based on the notion of heterogeneity of the subject. See ' Por Uma Análise Automática do Discurso', Campinas: Unicamp Editions, ,1990. [For an Automatic Analysis of Disourse].

13 Voloŝinov observes in a chapter entitled 'Two trends of thought in Philosophy of Language' (1973:50) that althought 'the School of Vossler' can be defined by the rejection of linguistic positivism their followers consider all facts of language as facts of style. This kind of conception according to Voloŝinov seems to be idealistic.

14 We are working here with the spanish translation of 'K filosofii postpka' entitled 'Hacia Una Filosofia del Acto Ético'. De los borradores y otros escritos. San Juan: Antrophos Editions, Universidad de Puerto Rico, 1997.

jectivity, culture and values without a dialectical reading of socio-political borders that divide social classes and at the same time report us to different *weltanschauungen* (visions of world). These *weltanschauungen* are related to labor division, to different ways of symbolic production, and also to ways the subjects are divided by the language they speak.

The different languages, dialects and jargons whose workers, peasants, fishers, thieves, beggars, students and scientists use, for example, reflect the ways how each class is articulated as an ideological, linguistic and cultural community, and they show how individuals recognize each other by their ways of producing and existing.

Going, therefore, from the field of language to the domain of discourse, it implicates the necessity of thinking on the places attributed to utterances, to subjects and about the ways subjects represent themselves, through a symbolic order, in discourse. We cannot ignore anymore the roles of the domain of experience, the role of comprehending the experience and the place memory occupies in our discourse for explaining the concrete work of senses.

In *Questões de literatura e de estética[15] [Questions of literature and aesthetics]*, Mikhail Bakhtin replaces questions on discourse considering that it can be understood only like expression of relationships derived from the intersection of social voices produced in different spaces and times. These voices conduct the borders of utterances and their contents to opacity. It is necessary to understand the effects they produce to the hearer/reader by analyzing the ways they are reported to the other's discourse and how they circulate in different contexts.

The process of intersection between space and temporality configures discourse as an inaccessible object to linearity. And the property of escaping from the linearity of time and space Bakhtin calls chronotopos[16].

Considering the point of view of Physics we can say that time moves always ahead. From the point of view of Mikhail Bakhtin the relationship between time and space cannot be examined simply as an axis of successions. By this way, taking some parameters of the Theory of Relativity but at the same time interpreting the relationships time-space, Bakhtin investigates how progressive and regressive movements in human mind work, and how they produce conditions of interpretation inside certain circumstances that are inscribed in the events.

Hence, the political event emerges in *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language* (1986) as a condition to explain how contradictions operate for characterizing both, the contradictory relationship between State and society – superstructures and infrastructures. It can explain the ways superstructures get positions of controlling social forces and also how social forces build imaginaries that represent themselves in a social order, considering the conflicting relationships that they maintain with superstructures.

According to this point of view, the space-time relationships and the ways social voices are crossing, considering the references of Mikhail Bakhtin in 'Questions of Literature and Aesthetics' (1990), we are allowed to understand the relationships between utterances and events inside a context of struggle of classes as a question of ethics. And we can not divide ethics and aesthetics in the domain of Literature anymore.

It is important to consider also that the representations of the way the subjects recognize themselves in the struggle of classes allow us to reflect on the conditions the super-

---

15 We are working here with the brazilian version of 'Questions of Literature and Aesthetics', 'Questões de Literatura e de Estética, São Paulo, Hucitec Editions, 1990.

16 According to Bakhtin (1990:211) the word chronotop was originally used in mathematics and it was explained based on the theory of Relativity.

structure conducts its actions promoting exclusion, division, silence and the oppression of social forces. On the other hand, it is important to think about the conditions under social forces organize themselves and produce senses as social bodies.

The first relationships can be considered under the circumstances that the superstructure is over and "beyond" society[17], planning actions that intervene in the process of subjectivation of subjects, inside the proper relationships with the State. But all this process presupposes consequences that are not predictable, considering that the comprehension of acts and the speech of the other implies always an active reaction, a replica that works similarly as a "counterword" according to Bakhtin/Voloshinov (1986, p. 132).

But if the sign can work only with multiple senses in symbolic and social-historical plans and considering that it is inscribed in different concrete utterances produced in living events, then, for thinking about the ways the subject produces senses through his utterances, it is necessary to understand that the event inscribed in a political order needs a rupture with "objective" conditions that conduct us to the empiricism of the subject's unity. So, to understand the work of a sign, we have to deconstruct the stability of the meanings in language.

The 'event of the utterance', this way, builds a deontology that divides subjects in relation to senses they inscribe in their utterances as well as in relation to the social voices to which they are affiliated and that delimitate their spaces of uttering.

Thus, the way subjects and sense are constituted in the symbolic order and in the "arena" of the division of social classes, according to our point of view, let us representing, under an empirical form, the dialectical relationships between superstructure and social forces. In other words, we can represent the process of struggle of classes divided inside different spheres of power in a society.

Considering these questions, understanding the 'event of utterance' (*sobytie vizkazivanie*) – as it is qualified by Voloshinov in *Chto Takoe Yazik* [*Quest ce que la langue et le langage*], 2010, implies the comprehension that the borders between the utterances are very weak, because the proper utterance is constituted as a kind of hybrid composition of space-time, full of voices and senses that represent different ideological positions, which are marked in a special form. These borders are not transparent in the linguistic materiality plan, but the semiotic material that constitutes them (the word, the gesture, the intonation) lead us to different values inscribed in utterances.

This is the real condition of discourse, according it is qualified in *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language* (1986, p. 104): it can justify why there is a 'deep abyss' between the materiality of language – syntax – and the problems that constitute discourse, because syntax can be explained only by linguistic system, and the material that constitutes the utterances, taken in events, can only be perceived when it is taken in a social universe and in an ideological domain.

We have to consider also that according to MFL there is no place to objective and universal relationships that delimitate the senses words acquire as an immediate replica of reality. So it is necessary to realize that the same words can be taken, for instance, as replicas of dialogues that appear in different and conflicting contexts and get distinct values, according to the historical events they appear.

In order to illustrate these questions, we can refer to the use of some words in different contexts of production. The expression '*All power of State to the soviets*' used by

---

17 It is important to emphasize that in democratic regimes the superstructures need to work for the society and not be distant of it. Superstructures can not organize their goals divorced of the interests of social forces.

Bolcheviques during the period of political transition from the aristrocratic regime to the communist regime in URSS produced positive effects to create a revolutionary state in the politics of the nation. When the *bourgeoise, however,* becomes united with menchevi-ques, with the small *bourgeoise a*nd with the monarchists to explode the revolutionary movements the same expression '*All power of State to the soviets*' seems to be quixotic, becoming object of a 'ridiculous scene'.

The slogan '*Let's articulate capital to work*' uttered by Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva at 'mass media' during his political campaign to Presidency in Brazil, with the intention of performing an alliance between the Workers Party (PT) and the Liberal Party (PL) would be evaluated as hilarious to brazilian communists and socialists militants, considering the fact that where there is capital, there is *plus value* and where the work is fundamental, it can not have *plus value.*

This slogan circulates although between some political groups during his campaign and produces unexpected effects. And one the most important effects is the erasure of the fact that antagonist forces are moved by opposed interests.

We can say, then, that the work of senses in discourse is composed by a plurality of evaluative accents constituted by the values words acquire in different conditions of production. This way, the phenomenon of polissemy can be viewed as one of the main conditions of the organic functioning of discourse.

There is only opposition between denotation and connotation when we oppose the living language, the language used in daily activities, in different spheres of social life and where different ideological accents are inscribed, to a 'sedimented' language that is represented like an illustration of monosemy.

Only a conception of language that excludes concrete conditions of use could present symmetries between signifiers and meanings. Language, in this case, is taken as a mere object of knowledge, as a non-real language, disable of reflecting on casual determinations that affect it and, consequently, about their consequences.

Linguists create a fiction in which monosemy constitutes an unique part of reality inside a system, while for the dominance of discourse no meaning is an "unique object, identical to itself" (ibid., p. 106), once the relationships between signs and signifiers are both inscribed in distinct social-historic universes and depend on the chain of events, in which the subjects are, at the same time, protagonists and experiencers.

According to Bakhtin/Voloshinov (1986 p. 111), all forms of expression comprise two facets: an interior content and its exterior objectivation for the other, in such way that, yet inseparable, the interior content and its forms of objectivating are not defined by a common center of organization.

Hence, it is the expression that organizes and determines the work of utterances. The function of answerability as a "living word" it is not simply produced in our memory, because it has an origin in the other, it is signified according to our values and finally it is directed to the other.

Dialogue could be understood, by this way, as a resonance. In other words, as the word of the other acquiring meanings in our words. And at the same time this "function of the other," could be thought as a symbolic representation acquired in social horizons and defined from the lived experiences, by the subject, inside different fields of ideological creativity (cultural, scientific, judicial, politic, artistic, etc.). Therefore, the "living word" is a kind of combination among experiences, images, representations and verbal signs that reflect who we are.

On the other hand, for Bakhtin/Voloshinov (1986), the word is not a property of those who speak, nor property of those who are the object of speech, its place could be described like a frontier, determined, on one hand, by the social stock of signs that configure interests of social classes and groups, and on the other hand, by immediate social situations that determine the resonances.

The word (*slovo*) could be compared, that way, to a bridge: territory by which everyone go through, but it doesn't belong to those who cross it, its shapes of social orientation, express a dialectical relationship between what was lived – experienced – what was felt – experimented. The values which word acquires configure ideologies that represent forms through which subjects are recognized collectively and orient their experiences with different axiological accents.

In order to make explicit the condition of the evaluative accent that words acquire on events, let's take an example of Bakhtin/Voloshinov (1986, p. 115) when they report to a lived situation by 'hungry men', expressing their feelings in a context of other hungry men (unemployed, beggars, individuals who live under the poverty threshold) that need to eat.

We are going to analyze this situation under the context of *"Fome Zero",* a brazilian slogan that circulated during the government of the President Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva in Brazil, that means 'no hungry people.' This slogan intended to create a social behaviour of solidarity and encouraged brazilian people to help beggars and unemployed workers by giving them food. First of all, let's describe some conditions of living and understanding the social reality of poverty.

A man can be conscious on his condition of poverty: a) as a "casual/incidental/fortuitous" event, regardless the possibility of recognizing his condition in the middle of the others that suffer from the same deprivations as class. The poverty to this individual will be identified as shame, as inferiority, as individual rejection, as misfortune to his own fate, but never as a form of exclusion that the society in which he lives produces.

However, other man can be aware of the place he occupies inside a social organization by looking at the way the society that excludes him, uses to portray him: then, he can recognize himself through the resonances of the others' discourse as an incapable person, a pariah (let's remember the *'Fome Zero'* discourse), a marginal or even a thief, someone that lives outside the rules of the society.

In the first case, the discourse about poverty will be covered with an accent of resignation, of penance, of shame. The beggar can be close to its interlocutor telling the deprivation he suffered, the unhappiness, the tragedies of his life, which lead him to be marginalized, a beggar, and ask for help.

In the second case, the dialogue with the interlocutor will no longer be configured as a 'personal drama', it can come covered by the necessity of negating an image which was given externally and that is 'attached' to his condition of poverty as being something 'natural'. Therefore, he can get close to his interlocutor to ask for help, already saying that he does not steal, he does not rob, assault or practice extortion with others, but asks for help because he needs to.

As we can see, it is not only the hunger, the deprivation in itself, that organizes the axis of the utterances of these individuals when they ask their interlocutors to obtain material aid, but the ways in which they become conscious by the experiences they have in the social environment in which they are involved.

The 'model' of discourse of each one, the expression taken, in that case, on the contingency of the limit of social deprivation, will be oriented, on one hand, according to the

level of alienation of the individual in relation to the ways society excludes him, or even, according to the way in which society produces resonances to signify the conditions of existence of excluded people, and, finally, with the place these marginalized people attribute to themselves when approaching their interlocutors.

Therefore, while the first man apologizes for having necessities, the second one acts in a coercive way, inscribing the images and discourses of others in his discourse and intimidating his interlocutor.

Mikhail Bakhtin, in his book *Questões de Literatura e de Estética* observes that there is no way of thinking about the concrete utterance without considering that 'it emerges, in a significant way, inside a determined social and historical context', touching 'thousands of existing ideological threads, weaved by the ideological conscience around a specific object' (1990, p. 86).

So, we can say that the concrete utterance is actively inscribed in the ways the dialogue represents the values of the social body, from a polyphonic perspective. The concrete utterance incorporates in its interior some index that works like answers to the speech of the social body like a resonance, as an attempt of giving consistence to its object, and at the same time, printing marks in this body that show how the subject is aware of the way the word of others' echoes in his discourse and transforms the possibilities of organizing his 'own' senses.

The different stylistic and semantic aspects of discourse, under this view, are compiled by a process of dialogical interaction with relationships produced in day-to-day experiences and mediated by signs that materialize the awareness of subjects on their own realities.

Therefore, the interpretable in the discourse might be understood as a mediation work among the senses taken from life's experience, the word of the other and the values that they acquire as the word of each one inside a dialogical process. In this process senses become complex because they're not individual, nor universal and they acquire their own outline. So, it is the process of comprehension that allows subjects, inside a certain social order, to catch values and senses produced under the conditions in which their experiences are mediated by the symbolic order.

The senses, according to this point of view, that are notably dialectical, cannot tie themselves only to the most immediate experiences of the subject, to the sensations and to the perceptions which they imply, but they need to find support on the ways symbolic shapes acquire certain values and are mediated by heterogeneous conditions.

Based on the view of Bakhtin/Voloshinov (1986), thus, all conditions of representing the objects need a work of mediation that presupposes a movement towards the attenuation of immediate relationships between reality and the symbolic order.

The domains of 'interior words', as part of the order of senses, do not exist if we can't know the exotopic conditions that compose them as a form of objectifying the synapsis between the life's experiences and the symbolic values the signifiers acquire.

To complement the ideas about discourse as a symbolic work, some questions proposed by Mikhail Bakhtin in *O discurso na Poesia e o discurso no Romance* (1990) allow us to establish correlations between the domains of discourse and dialogue: The discourse comes from the dialogue as a 'living replica', it is constituted of a set of orientations that find echoes in the discourse of others and, at the same time, answer to their discourse. That way, according to Bakhtin, even if constituted in the atmosphere of things 'already said' discourse is oriented, as an answer, that wasn't uttered yet – but what was invoked to come and it was expected.

It is with the responsive function, therefore, that we understand the essential force of discourse. It is this force that leads the speaker, who is at the same time, an interlocutor, free from a passive function, to put the 'interior words' in counterpoint to the external dialogue, producing important consequences like abstracting the utterances of the sphere of reproduction.

This also would be one of the fundamental arguments, according to the point-of-view of Bakhtin/Voloshinov (1986, p. 47) in *Marxismo e Filosofia da Linguagem*: 'the 'living truth' is always surrounded by the contradiction between what is reproduced and what is transformed, between the "stability of yesterday and the instability of tomorrow'.

So, in this process it is possible to configure the conditions of functioning of discourse as an exercise of expression regulated by an organic logic of intersubjectivity that can be translated by the principle of the non-reproduction of what is said.The answerability is the force, the active work where senses become different, become others.

Considering these questions, discourse is the domain where the meanings become organic because they are implied in answers that are invoked by the exercise of dislocation, of transformation of the 'word already sedimented in a changeable word, subjected to external contingencies that are convoked, in a permanent way, to a work of "metaphorization[18], i. e., transference of properties of a determined signifier to another, with expansion and, at the same time, dislocating meanings.

For instance, the lexical item democrat, according to the brazilian dictionary of synonims and antonyms Houaiss[19] (2011), that inscribes in its words the effects of contradictions of the social body, is synonym of igualitarian, anti-autoritarian, but also of liberal and elitist. How to explain its contradiction? It seems that the political events in each historical context can explain that.

If we report to the brazilian Liberal Party that composed the alliance of the Lula's government since its first election, we'll see that this Party, in its conditions of formation, receives such a designation by being constituted, notably, by liberal professionals, adept to capitalism, with capitalist production methods. However, the Liberal Party, by suffering a political stress in the alliance with a Party that was legitimized as the guardian of the non-capitalist production methods, adopted a new designation: 'Democratas' that means democratic.

Therefore, the properties of the signifier liberal, that can be identified to capitalist's practices is only apparently erased, in fact, they are transferred to the new designation. When producing a new relationship of equivalence between the attributes of being a capitalist and the attributes of being a democrat, the members of the former Liberal Party answer to the criticism of brazilian socialists with an euphemism, with the character of answerability; it has the function of erasing the negative semantic charge acquired by the lexical item liberal, transferring its attributes to a new lexical item that is ambiguous.

To understand better the ambiguity of these transferences it is important to remember that, according to Bakhtin/Voloshinov (1986, p.98), Linguistics 'elaborated its methods and categories working with dead monologues' and abstract dialogues, regardless the observation of their own reality by the social masses.' It should observe the continuous march of languages, their contradictions, paying attention to their different forms

---

18 We adopted the notion of metaphor proposed by Frank Palmer in 'Semantics: a new outline' (1976) that describes the metaphorical work of expressions by a transference of properties of some signifiers to the properties of different words giving them new lives.

19 We refer to brazilian dictionary 'Houaiss: sinônimos e antônimos'. São Paulo: Publifolha Editions, 2011.

of discourse produced daily, on squares, parades, rallies, popular movements, finally, in concrete situations in which classes are recognized or confronted. These are some gaps that converted the Science of Language into an alien, considering the reality of organic functioning of language.

Some Final Words

This study seeked to raise some questions with the intention of characterizing the concrete conditions of discourse as a hybrid object, from the point of view of the Semiotics developed in Russian/Soviet context.

By realizing exotopic questions and analyzing, at the same time, the work of linguistic structures in discourse, the ways utterances acquire senses, we tried to investigate the complexity of relationships that allows us to characterize our object as a complex and heterogeneous unit. Therefore, we investigated the influence of historical, social and structural elements for understanding the conditions that transform language, taken by linguists as an abstract system, into a living material.

Being oriented by many questions presented by Mikhail Bakhtin and Valentin Voloshinov we concluded that the domains of discourse, characterized by their material conditions, have to consider their ideological tendencies, the values acquired by words in different historical situations. And, on the other hand, they must be oriented in relation to the function of answerability, that is the force which explains why the 'known words' might be always unknown in concrete situations, acquiring new senses in the contingencies in which the utterances are produced.

References

AUTHIER-REVUZ, Jacqueline. *Palavras incertas: as não-coincidências do dizer*. Campinas: Ed. da Unicamp, 1998.

BAKHTIN, Mikhail (VOLOCHINOV, V.) *Marxismo e filosofia da linguagem*. Problemas fundamentais do método sociológico na Ciência da Linguagem. São Paulo: Ed. Hucitec, 1986.

BAKHTIN, Mikhail. *Para uma filosofia do ato responsável*. São Carlos: Ed. Pedro & João, 2012.

BAKHTINE, Mikhail. (VOLOCHINOV, V). Le marxisme et la philosophie du langage. Essai d'application de la methode sociologique en linguistique. Paris: Minuit Ed., 1977.

BAKHTINE, Mikhail. *Esthétique de la creation verbale*. Paris: Ed. Gallimard, 1984.

_____. Questions of Literature and aesthetics.

BAJTIN, Mijail. *Hacia uma filosofia del acto ético*. De los borradores y otros escritos. Puerto Rico: Ed. Anthropos, 1997.

_____. *La palabra em la vida y la palabra en la poesia*. Hácia uma poética sociológica. In: Hacia una filosofia del acto ético. De los borradores y otros escritos. Puerto Rico: Anthropos Ed., 1997.

_____. *Questões de literatura e de estética: a teoria do romance*. São Paulo: Unesp/ Hucitec, 1990. Trad. Aurora Fornoni Bernardini et al.

DUCROT, Oswald. *O dizer e o dito*. Campinas: Ed. Pontes, 1987.

HALLIDAY, M.A., HASAN, R. *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman Editions, 1976.

HOUAISS, A. *Dicionário Houaiss: sinônimos e antônimos*. São Paulo: Publifolha, 2011.

LAHTEENMÄKI, Mika. Estratificação social da linguagem no discurso sobre o romance; o contexto soviético oculto. In: Mikhail Bakhtin: contribuições para a filosofia da linguagem e estudos discursivos. ZANDWAIS, Ana (org.), Porto Alegre: Sagra-Luzzatto Ed., 2005.

PALMER, Frank. *Semantics: a new outline*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.

PÊCHEUX, Michel. Análise automática do discurso. In; por uma análise automática do discurso. *Uma introdução à obra de Michel Pêcheux*. Campinas: Ed. da Unicamp, 1990.

VOLOCHINOV, Valentin. *El marxismo y la filosofia del lenguage*: los principales problemas del método sociológico em la ciência del lenguaje. Madrid: Alianza Editorial, 1992. Traducción Tatiana Bubnova

_____. *A construção da enunciação e outros ensaios*. São Carlos: Ed. Pedro & João, 2013. Organização, trad. E notas:João Wanderley Geraldi,

VOLOŠINOV, Valentin. *Marxism and the philosophy of language*. Cambridge\ Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1973.

VOLOŠINOV, Valentin. *Marxisme et philosophie du langage*. Les problems fondamentaux de la méthode sociologique dans la science du langage. Limoges: Ed. Lambert-Lucas, 2010. Traduite par Patrick Sériot et Inna Tylkowski-Ageeva.

_____. *Qu'est ce que la langue et le langage?* Limoges: Ed. Lambert-Lucas, 2010, p.521-572.Traduit par Patrick Sériot et Inna Tylkowsky Ageeva.