



Discourse Analysis of LGBT Speeches: Discursive Formations and the Constitution of Subjects and Meanings^{1,2}

Dóris Maria Luzzardi Fiss



Lucas Carboni Vieira

Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul
Brazil

Citação: Fiss, D. M. L., & Vieira, L. C. (2021). Discourse analysis of LGBT speech: Discursive formations and the constitution of subjects and meanings. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 29(164). <https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.29.6316>

Abstract: This article discusses the interpretive gestures of LGBT subjects and their identification processes. It also performs a discursive listening of their statements about themselves and conditions of production and analyzes the processes by which subjects and meanings are (un)done, considering the constitutive heterogeneity of the statement. We then pose the questions: How do LGBT subjects produce statements about themselves? What meanings are evident when they are invited to talk about their experiences? What does it mean to be part of this group? The main theoretical framework was based on the works of Michel Pêcheux (1997, 2024), among others. The empirical work involved semi-structured interviews addressed to two gay men, a bisexual woman, and a non-binary transvestite who identified herself as pansexual, aged between 20 and 50 years. We conclude that, affected, in a contradictory and tense way by normativity and by the insistence to exist despite it, the subjects are constituted from their identification, or not, with circulating knowledge in

¹ This study was financed in part by the Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior - Brasil (CAPES) - Finance Code 001.

² This is an unofficial translation of the original in Portuguese, and has not been peer reviewed.

antagonistic discursive formations that are a manifestation of an ideological formation of customs. From the relation of forces between the discursive formations, effects of purge, curtailment, hope and humanity resonate.

Keywords: discourse analysis; LGBT; Michel Pêcheux

Análise discursiva de falas LGBT: Formações discursivas e a constituição de sujeitos e sentidos

Resumo: O artigo discute os gestos de interpretação de sujeitos LGBT e seus processos de identificação, descrevendo a relação do sujeito com as memórias deste campo. Realiza, também, uma escuta discursiva de seus dizeres acerca de si mesmos desde suas condições de produção e analisando os processos pelos quais sujeitos e sentidos se (des)fazem, considerando a heterogeneidade constitutiva do dizer. Assim sendo, perguntamos: Como sujeitos LGBT produzem dizeres sobre si mesmos? Que sentidos são evidenciados ao serem convidados a falarem a respeito de suas experiências? O que significa fazer parte deste grupo? Michel Pêcheux (1997, 2024) foi o referencial teórico principal, entre outros. O trabalho empírico envolveu entrevistas semiestruturadas endereçadas a dois homens gays, uma mulher bissexual e uma travesti não-binária que se identificou como pansexual, com idades entre 20 e 50 anos. Concluímos que, afetados, de modo contraditório e tenso pela normatividade e pela insistência em existir apesar dela, os sujeitos se constituem a partir de sua identificação, ou não, com saberes circulantes em formações discursivas antagônicas que são manifestação de uma formação ideológica dos costumes. Ressoam, da relação de forças entre as formações discursivas, efeitos de sentido de expurgo, cerceamento, esperança e humanidade.

Palavras-chave: análise de discurso, LGBT; Michel Pêcheux

Análisis discursivo del habla LGBT: Formaciones discursivas y constitución de sujetos y significados

Resumen: Este artículo analiza los gestos de interpretación de los sujetos LGBT y sus procesos de identificación, describiendo la relación del sujeto con las memorias de este campo. También realiza una escucha discursiva de sus dichos sobre sí mismos desde sus condiciones de producción y analizando los procesos mediante los cuales se (des) hacen sujetos y significados, considerando la heterogeneidad constitutiva del dicho. Entonces, preguntamos: ¿Cómo los sujetos LGBT producen dichos sobre sí mismos? ¿Qué significados son evidentes cuando se le invita a hablar sobre sus experiencias? ¿Qué significa ser parte de este grupo? Michel Pêcheux (1997, 2024) fue el principal marco teórico, entre otros. El trabajo empírico consistió en entrevistas semiestructuradas dirigidas a dos hombres gay, una mujer bissexual y un travesti no binario que se identificó como pansexual, de entre 20 y 50 años. Concluimos que, afectados, de manera contradictoria y tensa por la normatividad y por la insistencia de existir a pesar de ella, los sujetos se constituyen a partir de su identificación, o no, con saberes circulantes en formaciones discursivas antagónicas que son manifestación de una formación ideológica de costumbres. Resuenan, desde la relación de fuerzas entre formaciones discursivas, efectos de purga, recortamiento, esperanza y humanidad.

Palabras-claves: análisis del discurso; LGBT; Michel Pêcheux

Discourse Analysis of LGBT Speeches: Discursive Formations and the Constitution of Subjects and Meanings

Michel Pêcheux (1997, 2014) is the main theoretical reference in this study on how LGBT subjects enunciate their life experiences, produce meanings about their experiences, and bring very relevant contributions to the fields that are put in relation - language, sexuality and research crossed by education. Accompanied by Orlandi (1996, 2001, 2012), Leandro Leandro Ferreira (2003, 2007), Kosik (2010), Ernst-Pereira and Mutti (2011), Lagazzi (2015) and Zandwais (2015), the French philosopher developed a materialist theory of the meanings that involved

[...] reflecting around the concrete operation of language in its discursive work and describing how it is inscribed in social practices, configuring discursive processes that emerge in certain historical conditions through the relations of inequality, subordination, antagonism and alliance between classes, observed within the institutional apparatuses. (Zandwais, 2015, p. 78)

Taking Michel Pêcheux's discourse analysis (DA) as the main theory, we discuss how LGBT subjects³ enunciate their life experiences, how they produce meanings about their experiences. How do LGBT subjects produce sayings about themselves? What meanings are evident when they are invited to talk about their experiences? What does it mean to be part of this group? The general objective of this research is to explain the gestures of interpretation of LGBT subjects and their identification processes, describing the relationship of the subject with the memories of this field. We also list three specific objectives: 1) conduct a discursive listening to LGBT people sayings, understanding the movements of stabilization and destabilization of the networks of meanings, of the memories of saying; 2) understand the sayings of LGBT subjects, about themselves, from their conditions of production; 3) to analyze the processes by which subjects and meanings are (un)done, considering the constitutive heterogeneity of the saying. As data production device, we use semi-structured interviews and we had the participation of two male interviewees and two females. After clarifying the topic and the objectives of the investigation, an invitation was made to these interlocutors to speak and they were asked to read a Free and Informed Consent Term signed by them, representing both ethical care and registration of the acquiescence of each in relation to the study and voluntary participation in it.

The approximation between Pêcheux (1997, 2014) and the debates about sexuality are justified due to the few productions that propose this link. Likewise, the possibility of contributing to discussions about the experiences of LGBT people, making them visible and causing a shift in the normativity, is a relevant factor. Research, from the perspective of DA, is always a cut that is established due to the relationship between the analyst and the materiality to which he or she approaches. It is in the dialectic between corpus and theory that the work emerges. According to Mutti (2011, p. 819): “[...] the analysis procedures, interwoven with the theoretical principles, meet the specificities of each research, in such a way that the establishment of the object of analysis, the speech, and the corpus that represents it, already consists of one of the analytical steps.”

It follows that exploring language, as discourse analysis urges to be done, may represent a challenge that implies better understanding of how relations are constituted and the meanings manifested in them in different conditions of production. In this sense, concepts such as

³ We understand that the acronym LGBT has been updated, in order to represent with greater materiality, the growing diversity of this community, resulting in versions like LGBTQI or even LGBTQIA +. Such changes add relevant visibility to the defense of LGBTQIA + rights. We chose, however, to keep using the acronym LGBT due to the timing of the work and the keywords used in searching the repositories that use this acronym as a concept.

language, history, discourse, meaning, subject, ideology, reformulated by Pêcheux (1997, 2014), are crucial to the apprehension that “when” and “where” are specificities that directly affect what and how sexuality is spoken about. Moving the subject through the time axis, we see the most diverse understandings about sexual practices and pleasure. Moving the space axis, we perceive that, in the same historical moment, the meanings suffer transformations here and there, making possible other meanings that, in other places, are not possible.

The subject in DA is taken by history, that is, he is interpellated as subject due to the historical conditions that determine him. The idea of an autonomous subject is an illusion. According to Pêcheux (2014, p. 73), “[...] the essential of the materialist thesis is to place the independence of the external world [...] in relation to the subject and simultaneously the dependence of the subject with respect to the external world.” Therefore, the subject is not based on an individuality, on an individualized “me.” The subject exists in a social and ideological space. Likewise, he is not the organizing center of his saying, he is not the center of his saying. The meanings, thus, are produced from places occupied by the subjects, considering socio-historical and ideological conditions of production of the discourse: “The subjects have an active and determining role in the constitution of the meanings, but this process escapes their control and their intentions” (Orlandi, 1996, p. 135). Such conceptions challenge us to think about what meanings the discourses about sexuality have caused to unfold over time, what is the historicity of this term, since the different sayings about sexuality directly affect the sayings about LGBT people and the ways in which they experience their sexuality. It is from the relation of forces between the possible and the impossible enunciation, between the said and the unsaid, that LGBT subjects are constituted.

Thus, strongly affected by conceptual legacies left by Michel Pêcheux, in this study we follow the movement of meanings that resonate from the word sexuality—which is a matter of discourse, of research and of education—since we indicate the need for reflections, such as the ones proposed, to also inhabit school and non-school spaces, contributing to think about the stabilization, or not, of certain meanings in detriment of others in the engendered curricular practices. Therefore, we place ourselves as discourse analysts who, positioned against any order of discrimination, identified, in the possibility of sensitive listening and discursive analysis, a way to better understand how LGBT subjects produce meanings within a socio-cultural structure of discrimination. Affected, in a contradictory and tense way by normativity and by the insistence to exist despite it, the subjects in this research are constituted from their identification, or not, with circulating knowledge in antagonistic Discursive Formations—Discursive Formation Social Hell and Discursive Formation Personal Freedom. They are both a manifestation of an Ideological Formation of Customs. From the relation of forces between the discursive formations, four fundamental meaning effects resonate: purge, curtailment, hope and humanity. These subjects, affected by discrimination, constitute themselves in the movement, in a heterogeneous way, assuming various subject-positions, sometimes in conflict with each other.

Due to the way in which these issues are addressed in the article and the relevance of the topic under discussion, it is organized into sections in which the LGBT sayings are analyzed in a denser way. Likewise, there is a section dedicated to the discursive analysis of the corpus. It discusses the meanings associated with the processes of constitution of the subjects who are the interlocutors of the research, evidenced from interpretive work.

Methodology

The proposal is a qualitative study, considering that it is in this modality of study that one works “[...] with the universe of meanings, motives, aspirations, beliefs, values and attitudes” of a level of reality that “[...] cannot or should not be quantified” (Minayo, 2007, p. 21). Furthermore, DA does not attempt to quantify events or facts, but to understand discursive processes.

Two gay men, a bisexual woman and a non-binary transvestite who identified herself as pansexual, aged between 20 and 50 years, participated in the research. All reside in Porto Alegre

(Rio Grande do Sul / Brazil) and have academic formation ranging from technical education to master's. The production of data involved semi-structured individual interviews with the research interlocutors. They combined closed-ended and open-ended questions, with some guiding questions (GQ) to conduct the conversation and “reaction questions” (RQ) that could or could not be used due to the conversation with the participants:

Table 1*Questions Used in Semi-structured Individual Interviews*

GQ 1	Taking your life experience as a reference, what does it mean to be a man / woman / gay / lesbian / bisexual / pan ... person?
RQ 1.	Taking your life experience as a reference, what does it mean to be LGBT?
GQ 2.	Which moments of your life experience do you consider remarkable?
RQ 2.	Why do you consider this moment remarkable? What at such a moment made it come to your mind now? What feelings are present in these remarkable moments?
GQ 3.	Imagine that your adult self is in front of your child self. What would you say, or what advice would you give, to this child?
RQ 3.	How old is your child self, to whom you wish to report? How was life at that moment? Why did you choose this moment?
GQ 4.	Now imagine that your “future self” has come to speak with you. What would you like him/her to tell you?
RQ 4.	How would you like your life to be at the moment of your “future self”? How old will he/she be?

Note: elaborated by the authors

The driving questions were presented to all interviewees as a way to introduce each topic discussed, while the reaction questions were developed as a possible way to continue the interview, and could be used or not, depending on what was enunciated by the participants. The decision to develop the research through interviews is linked to the commitment with an active and sensitive listening to what the participants say, considering that this interview moment is a genuine surrender of the interviewed subject—he/she reveals him/herself through what was said and what was not said. His/her story (a part and a side of it) is little by little staged by the weaving of words and silences, whether they are chosen or escaped, in order to enunciate him/herself. With the focus they choose, they enunciate their own interpretation of the world. As Gaskell (2002, p. 75) puts it:

Fundamentally, in a well-done in-depth interview, the personal worldview of the interviewee is explored in detail. Although such personal views reflect the residues or memories of past conversations, the interviewee holds the center stage. It is his personal construction of the past. In the course of such an interview, it is fascinating to listen to the narrative in construction: some of the elements are very well remembered, but spoken details and interpretations may even surprise the interviewee himself. Perhaps it is only by speaking that we can know what we think.

Working with DA, we recognize that “[...] residues or memories of past conversations” are not an “although”—they are conditions of the possibility of saying. The subject, in order to be able to say, resorts to the memory, to the interdiscourse, which makes listening to the interviewees even more riveting.

To better understand the academic production that themes the approximation of Discourse Analysis with LGBT issues, we carried out a five-year bibliographic research. The survey considered the productions carried out in the time frame from 2014 to 2018. This

research was carried out in three virtual repositories: Biblioteca Digital Brasileira de Teses e Dissertações, Scielo and LUME. The research was carried out around the axes “Sexuality” and “LGBT,” being operated through six descriptors:

Table 2

Descriptors

GRUPO 1	GRUPO 2
Sexuality	LGBT
Sexuality and Discourse	LGBT and Discourse
Sexuality and Discourse Analysis	LGBT and Discourse Analysis

Note: elaborated by the authors

We counted end-of-course papers (undergraduate and specialization), dissertations, theses, and published articles. Due to the comprehensiveness of the term “Discourse Analysis,” which refers to more than one discourse study mode (such as critical discourse analysis, Michel Foucault’s discourse analysis, among others), an individual analysis of the papers was necessary. By verifying the bibliographical references and reading the works, either in full or in parts, it was possible to observe whether, in fact, they were linked or not to Michel Pêcheux’s proposals of analysis. It was noted, in this process, that in some cases Pêcheux’s DA was used only as an analytical methodology and not as the theoretical basis of the work. Because of the density of the theoretical device of DA, the intricate process of conceptualization and conceptual transformation carried out in this discipline, its merely analytical use is not possible. It requires an in-depth reflection on its concepts, a vertical development of its postulates in order to move analytical resources of discourse understanding, which does not match a strictly instrumental use.

In all repositories, the quantity of productions behaved in a similar way: the number of papers presented in the descriptors “Sexuality” and “LGBT” is much higher than the papers indicated for “Sexuality and Discourse Analysis” and “LGBT and Discourse Analysis.” In a way, this result would be expected since, when moving from the general descriptors to the more specific intersections, the tapering effect is inevitable. However, the difference between one category and another is quite expressive. In the BDTD, for example, using the descriptor “Sexuality” a total of 3,238 papers are listed in the research period. When using “Sexuality and Discourse Analysis,” this number drops to a total of 20 papers. Taking the marker “LGBT,” the discrepancy seems to decrease due to the lower production of papers that made use of this acronym: a total of 178 in the period investigated, compared to four that approach DA and use LGBT as a research descriptor.

Looking at the LUME data, taking 2,129 papers associated with the theme “Sexuality,” this number drops to a total of eight when it comes to “Sexuality and Discourse Analysis.” In 2016, five papers were produced—one dissertation, two theses, and two end-of-course papers. The following year, no papers were produced in any of the modalities, and in 2018, three papers (two dissertations and one thesis) were written. For the marker “LGBT,” 454 papers were identified, while for “LGBT and Discourse Analysis” the total number of productions drops to 3. In the years 2014, 2017, and 2018, no papers were produced with these markers. We found one end-of-course paper in 2015; in 2016, one monograph, and one dissertation.

In Scielo, the total number of papers with the marker “Sexuality” is 471, falling to 0 with the marker “Sexuality and Discourse Analysis”—although the research indicated 18 papers, none of them used the Pecheuxian referential. With the marker “LGBT,” 71 papers were identified, which were reduced to 3 when searching for those linked to AD. Considering the numbers presented in BDTD and LUME, the course modality in which there is a higher concentration of research conducted in the field of sexuality in interface with DA is the master’s degree. The difference, however, is small: from 2014 to 2018, 18 theses were produced, while in the same

period 13 dissertations were written. The difference becomes even greater when we collect this data for undergraduate studies—only four monographs were written in this period.

Theoretical Disposition

In the context of the peak of structuralist thought, Michel Pêcheux criticizes the scientific practice of his time. Intending to provoke the social sciences, he embarks on a theoretical journey full of turns that resulted in discourse analysis. As a student of Louis Althusser, this link is manifested in DA through Pêcheux's concern with the issue of dialectics and the constant search for understanding the functioning of ideology. His work demonstrates the philosopher's scientific clarity and plasticity in the elaboration of DA, which was born within a project of composing a general theory of ideologies, following Louis Althusser, and he did not abandon this theory.⁴ In addition, Pêcheux reveals a singularity present in his journey that involved approximation, provocation and dialogue with linguistics and psychoanalysis too.

It is possible to understand the materialistic aspect of Discourse Analysis when reading the text “Spiritual and intellectual reproduction of reality” (Reprodução espiritual e racional da realidade, in Portuguese) by Karel Kosík (2010) in which the author explains that dialectics, an essential issue for DA, is initially developed by Marx, when dealing with the class struggle and the fetish. It is later discussed by Lenin, followed by theorists who continued their discussions, such as Lukács (of whom Kosík is a disciple) and Voloshinov. It will be after this accumulation of reflections on dialectics that Althusser, followed by Pêcheux, will deal with the issue. It is essential to highlight this because it embodies the long tradition of thinkers that, directly or indirectly, Pêcheux becomes heir, tinging discourse analysis as a discipline with very specific political and social commitments. In *Language, Semantics and Ideology* (Semântica e Discurso in Portuguese), Pêcheux refers to DA as a “science of the proletariat,” pointing to an effect of identifying it with a theory that considers the political together with the linguistic aspect.

Keeping his eye on linguistics, Pêcheux tensions the theoretical reverberations of Saussure's concepts about language. The language, taken from the “Saussurian” perspective, does not open space for dialectics, thus refuting the *praxis* of interpreting “things in the world” (Kosík, 2010), since there is no space for interpretive gestures by the subject who it is limited to the “flat” use of a closed language. Pêcheux performs the “[...] displacement of the text to the language and the displacement of the function to its functioning” (Laggazi, 2015, p. 86). Such displacements brought the discourse to the center of the DA, in which the enunciation is the discourse unity and the language its materiality.

The language is affected by historical relations and, therefore, it is insufficient for DA to focus on it as a closed system in itself. Fated to interpretation, it is in the linguistic game of said and unsaid that man interprets the world around him: language is an indispensable mediation. Discourse, a social-historical object, is a process that allows observing relations between language and ideology, taking the former as a common material basis. It is in the discourse that we can observe “[...] the relations between ideology and language, as well as the effects of the game of language on history and the effects of language on history” (Leandro Ferreira, 2003, p. 193).

It can be understood as “[...] a process anchored in displacements and continuous breakdowns of the fixity of the linguistic base due to the historical events in which it is inscribed” (Zandwais, 2015, p. 78). The discourse is treated by Pêcheux, according to Zandwais, at the same time as an object and as a process “[...] tied to history and the event, that is, to the condition of becoming.” I order to paraphrase Leandro Ferreira (2003), DA deals with the examination of linguistic issues considering historical and ideological dimensions, with the language having an unstable, heterogeneous and contradictory nature.

When it comes to sexuality, if we resort to medical documents, which since the 19th century have been granted the right to the final word on the subject, we would not be able to

⁴ acc.to Narzetti (2008).

identify the opposite of the established: we would find only the relationship between the pathological and the normative, the disease and cure; the criminalization of other ways of living pleasure and love, understood in this domain as “protective measures” to the subject himself. The concept of historicity, in its break with Positivist thinking, is what allows the analyst to slide down the thread of discourse with the deep and meticulous look that DA demands. In other words, recalling considerations by Ernst-Pereira and Mutti (2011), the analyst apprehends, in the analysis, the way in which the materialities register the imbrications of the social aspect in language.

In DA, the concept of *ideology* is reframed from a discursive conception. It “[...] is not a set of representations or the concealment of reality, nor is it a “defect” of those who have no conscience” (Leandro Ferreira, 2003, p. 191). Ideology results from the interaction of language with history, in the process of constituting subjects and meanings. The functioning of the ideology generates the sensation of evidence of meanings and that the subjects are the source of what they say. In accordance with Orlandi (2001, p. 105), “[...] ideology is not in x, it is in the imaginary mechanism of producing x, with x being a symbolic object.” Therefore, ideology does not point to concealment, but to the production of evidence: that of subject and that of meaning. For this to be possible, the subject is affected by two fundamental oblivions: the ideological one, related to the unconscious, and the referential one, related to the enunciation.

Meanings are not attached to words. It is the gesture of interpretation that demonstrates the subject’s relationship with language in the production of these meanings. This occurs within the possibilities of the network of memories, it occurs externally—history, so “[...] meaning is never individual, nor does it present itself as something that has already been produced” (Leandro Ferreira, 2003, p. 193). The subject intervenes in directions that are managed in view of inhabiting a space of interdiscursive memories, neither being in the speaker’s possession nor existing loose. The material character of the meaning, masked by its evidence of transparency for the subject, constitutively depends on the meaning of the ideological formations, this being postulated in relation to two Pêcheuxian theses: the meaning does not exist in itself and all DF disguises, by the transparency of the meaning that it constitutes, its dependence on the IF complex.

Sexuality is an effervescent theme that swarms in the social imagination, transforming and remodeling itself over time and space. The current Brazilian political situation has triggered a strong climate of instability, insecurity and conservatism. Previously cooled speeches (re) emerged, (re) taking the common space with force and demonstrating that, contrary to what is said by common sense, expressive portions of the Brazilian people are prejudiced and deeply contradictory in the way they experience these prejudices. Despite a history of resistance and struggle and all the advances achieved in Brazil and in the world, Brazil is the country that kills the most LGBT people in the world, with the highest rates among transvestites and transsexuals⁵. On September 18, 2017, the Federal Court of the Federal District released psychologists to treat gays and lesbians as patients, enabling “sexual reversal” therapies despite all the opposition of the Federal Council of Psychology that, since 1999, prohibits such therapies. It also contradicts the decision of the World Health Organization, which in 1990 removed homosexuality from the world list of diseases. In 2019, the Federal Supreme Court revoked the release of such therapies⁶.

⁵ <https://catracalivre.com.br/geral/cidadania/indicacao/brasil-e-o-pais-que-mais-mata-LGBT+s-no-mundo-1-cada-19-horas>. Access: 19/09/2017.: <http://revistagalileu.globo.com/Sociedade/noticia/2017/05/brasil-ainda-e-o-pais-que-mais-assassina-LGBT+s-no-mundo.html>. Accessed 19/09/2017. <http://g1.globo.com/profissao-reporter/noticia/2017/04/brasil-e-o-pais-que-mais-mata-travestis-e-transsexuais-no-mundo-diz-pesquisa.htm>. Accessed 19/09/2017.

⁶ <https://oglobo.globo.com/sociedade/ministra-do-stf-suspende-decisao-que-permitia-terapia-da-cura-gay-23618721>. Accessed 20/10/2020.

In Porto Alegre (Rio Grande do Sul), on September 10, 2017, Santander Cultural closed the exhibition “Queermuseum—Cartographies of Difference in Brazilian Art” after ultra-conservative movements pressured for it. The accusations pointed out that the exhibition was an apology for pedophilia, zoophilia and profanation of sacred symbols. On September 12, the coordinator of the Operational Support Center for Children, Youth, Education, Family and Successions, Denise Villela, and the District Attorney of Children and Youth of Porto Alegre, Júlio Almeida, visited the exhibition and were categorical: the allegations were unsubstantiated⁷. Another controversy was generated around the philosopher Judith Butler: 320,000 digital signatures were collected so that the lecture, to be given by Butler at SESC Pompeia (São Paulo), was canceled. At the Federal University of Bahia, teachers and students were threatened with death for researching issues related to gender and sexuality⁸. Added to this are murders and cases of violence. Even though there is no specific law enacted by the Brazilian Congress, the STF (Federal Supreme Court) was responsible for criminalizing LGBTphobia. Therefore, the STF’s decision allows the criminalization of homophobia and transphobia, considering that acts of prejudice against homosexuals and transsexuals are framed in the crime of racism⁹. Despite legal regulations, cases are underreported¹⁰ and appear to be accentuated in the context of pandemic and quarantine.¹¹ Such a small overview helps to illustrate, even if only briefly, the paradoxical situation of LGBT people in Brazil.

As a scientific term, sexuality emerged only in the 19th century, becoming a medico-legal device (construction of *scientia sexualis*). This results in a whole medical, biological, legal and moral apparatus that directly affects the production of meanings about the forms of exercising pleasure. If, before this moment, sexual acts and practices were the focus of concerns, it will be the subjects who become the center of attention. This change in the status of sexuality results in a series of transformations in the discourses about sex, completely reformulating the possibilities of subjects’ enrollment in this or that way of experiencing their sexuality. The creation of homosexuals and heterosexuals is one of several discursive events that reformulate the production of meanings about sexuality, which, in a certain aspect, involving disturbances in the network of memories, reminds the definition of event proposed by Michel Pêcheux (1997, p. 17): “[...] the event is the meeting point between the present and memory.”

In this regard, it is important to clarify that Katz (1996) is the author who addresses the “invention” of heterosexuality and homosexuality—which, in discursive terms, was in fact a creation. Before this point, there was no specific way to refer to subjects who were involved with people of the same or opposite sex. The term sodomy was not restricted to homosexual practice, even though “[...] commonly associated, in civil legislation, with love between people of the same sex” (Trevisan, 2018, p. 160). It follows from this that the event “creation of heterosexual and homosexual” became discourse, starting to configure the rhetoric that remains until today. According to Zandwais (2015, p. 1), it can become “[...] object of different readings, [...] and even controversial interpretations.” Thus, the study of the processes of production of meanings related to sexuality demands an understanding of the society in which the discourses emerge,

⁷ <https://www.sul21.com.br/jornal/promotor-diz-que-nao-existe-pedofilia-na-exposicao-queermuseu/>. Access: 20/09/2017. <http://zh.clicrbs.com.br/rs/entretenimento/arte/noticia/2017/09/queermuseu-acusacoes-de-apologia-e-profanacao-nao-se-aplicam-a-exposicao-fechada-dizem-juristas-9895588.html>. Accessed 20/09/2017.

⁸ <https://www.correio24horas.com.br/noticia/nid/professora-da-ufba-e-ameacada-de-morte-por-cao-de-pesquisa/>. Accessed 16/08/2018.

⁹ Crimes por LGBTfobia estão definidos pela Lei do Racismo (Lei 7.716/1989).

<http://www.stf.jus.br/portal/cms/verNoticiaDetalhe.asp?idConteudo=414010>. Accessed 20/09/2017.

¹⁰ <https://g1.globo.com/jornal-nacional/noticia/2020/09/19/levantamento-mostra-subnotificacao-de-casos-de-homofobia-e-transfobia.ghtml>. Accessed 20/09/2017.

¹¹ <https://www1.folha.uol.com.br/cotidiano/2020/06/um-ano-apos-stf-criminalizar-homofobia-relatos-de-lgbtphobia-crescem-na-quarentena.shtml>. Accessed 20/09/2017

since they are constituted from events, as the creation of the heterosexual and the homosexual terms, the *Stonewall Riots*, among others, in a given society, breaking historically defined meanings. Therefore, the interpretation of any discursive materiality implies the consideration of its conditions of production—the historical moment of the discourse’s emergence and the memory it calls for, since it is “[...] in the contradictory game between the present and the memory in which it accomplishes the articulation between language, history and memory that historicity of saying is constituted” (Cavalcante, 2018, pp. 60-61).

In the production of meanings reserved for sex and its most different practices, the dominant interpretive gesture, when dealing with the past, is a homogenization of experiences that highlights the subject about whom it is allowed to speak: white and undoubtedly heterosexual man. Weeks (1999, pp. 38-39) points out that

[...] the language of sexuality seems to be overwhelmingly masculine. The metaphor used to describe sexuality as a relentless force seems to be derived from assumptions about male sexual experience. [...] Using the metaphor (“penetrates”) suggests an incredibly unconscious devotion to male models of sexuality. On some level, this may seem like an unfair criticism, given that sexologists have indeed tried to recognize the legitimacy of female sexual experience. In fact, sexologists have often perpetuated an old tradition that saw women as “the sex,” as if their bodies were so saturated with sexuality that there was no need to conceptualize it. But it is hard to avoid the feeling that, in their writings and perhaps also in our social consciousness, the dominant model of sexuality is the male one. Men are the active sexual agents; women, because of their highly-sexualized bodies, or in spite of it, were seen as merely reactive, “awakened to life” by men, in Havelock Ellis’s significant phrase.

What, in DA, drives the concept of imaginary formations: how, in the collective imagination, are the notions about sex and the experience of pleasure established? Sex in history is always spoken from this bias: it is the pleasure of the man who is cinematographed, transformed into scenes in TV series, in music videos, in movies. Sexism and heteronormativity go hand in hand. This concept refers to the idea of a “compulsory heterosexuality,” working in such a way that “[...] it is believed that heterosexuality is the most natural, normal and healthy way of living sexuality. When the subject runs away from this norm, he is seen as deviant, abnormal, sick, incomplete, immature” (Balestrin, 2017, p. 18). These pathologizing attributions are a result from medico-legal thinking that conceptualizes sexuality as a field of health and law.

Michel Foucault (1993) argues that the interdiction of sexual experience occurred through what was said and not through the censorship of saying. It was this set of enunciations that marked, sectioned, structured and hierarchized normality and abnormality about sexual practices. Foucault finds it significant when science takes sex transforming it into an object of research, into a scientific artifact: it will be within the “aseptic and neutral” Positivist science that we will talk about the pleasures of the body. This “safe place” to deal with something so elusive and disturbing could be interpreted as the scientists’ need to deal with sex from a protected place, where they were hermetically isolated from such a controversial and inconstant object. It is interesting to remember the case of Alfred Kinsey (1894-1956), American biologist and sexologist, who, in the 1940s and 1950s in the United States, generated great controversy. In part, the controversy was due to Kinsey’s direct involvement in the sexual practices of the participants in his research. This direct involvement with the object of his study—and even more so with the participants of his research—becomes a direct affront to a regal science that prides itself on its impartiality and its distance from what becomes its focus of interest and study. Beyond this need for distance, Foucault demarcates the imperatives of the morality of the time, which were materialized in medical norms.

Unable to say anything about their sexual practices, scientists turned their gaze to the freakish, the strange, the perverted, the extravagant, pushing the field of sexuality to the other. Richard von Krafft-Ebing (1840-1902), a German psychiatrist, is an interesting example of this movement. He took from the Austro-Hungarian writer Karl Maria Kertbeny (1824-1882) the terms homosexual and heterosexual, turning them into diseases, in 1886, in his book *Psychopathia sexualis*. Contrary to Kertbeny's objective, which treated homosexuals and heterosexuals as natural and positive variations in sexuality, Krafft-Ebing understands them both as pathological (Katz, 1996). His view of sex attributed to the desire for procreation the only healthy form of exercise. The delimitation of the normal was due to the border relationship with the abnormal: the focus was not to understand the functioning of the "healthy practice of sex," but to "enlighten" the deviants. This discursivization of sex by science served to transcribe, in terms of norms and prescriptions, the traditional prejudices and fears. They materialize, then, in a new disease-cure relationship.

Foucault states that, in the study processes of organizing the "science of sexuality," what needs to be considered are not the conscious or unconscious illusions that have been superimposed on the scientific process. One needs to turn one's gaze to the foundation of regimes of truth about sex. It is necessary to consider that

[...] the progressive formation (and also the transformations) of this 'game of truth and sex', which the 19th century bequeathed to us, and from which nothing proves, even if we have modified it, that we are free. Ignorance, subterfuge, dodges were only possible and only had an effect based on this strange enterprise: telling the truth of sex. (Foucault, 1993, p. 56)

The meanings of sexuality established by this regal science were so dominant that one can treat heteronormativity as an invisible regime (Louro, 2001), imperceptible given its predominance—placing the norm as something that cannot be seen and, therefore, one finds it difficult to challenge it. Foucault follows the path of his thought, taking up the ritualistic of the Catholic confession, implemented in 1215, at the Lateran Council. From this moment on, Christians should confess all their sins in order to achieve redemption. It establishes, then, a relationship between confession and the finding of the "real truth," in other words: the legitimate truth of the subject is now valued based on what is extracted via confession. This perspective changes the logic of thinking about people, since the individual,

[...] for a long time, was validated by the reference of others and by the manifestation of their attachment to others (family, loyalty, protection); later, they became validated by the discourse of truth that they were able (or obliged) to have about themselves. The confession of truth was inscribed at the core of the procedures of individualization by power. (Foucault, 1993, p. 58)

Individuality is now established from another perspective—that of the revelation of what lies hidden in each one. The West begins to function based on a logic of confession, which has extended to the most diverse fields of knowledge, the act of confessing circulates in the most different instances of private and public life. Since the Middle Ages, the correlate of confession is torture, considered the final and genuine mechanism for extracting the truth. Foucault provokes our thoughts by questioning whether the link between sex and confession has not generated the need for the concealment of the former, the construction of the secret, of something to be confessed, making sex the spurious, the hidden, which needs to be isolated in the most secluded part of each one of us. Brazilian society shows an interesting relationship in this sense: the country that most kills transsexuals in the world is the one that consumes the most trans pornography. The rate is 89% higher than the world average of accesses in this category. Despite this "hidden truth," which avoids its confession at all costs, because it would reveal the "real form of the individuals," torture and death are materialized in the transvestite body that becomes

meaningful on the borders of the aberrant and the desired: it is not a man, but it is also not a woman; it has breasts, but it also has a penis. It is a body that breaks boundaries and messes with the most intimate notions of Brazilian men and women.

Confession, linked to penitence, as a form of redemption administered by priests as emissaries of the divine, is transformed by the Counter Reformation, by pedagogy in the 17th century, and by medicine in the 19th century, going beyond the relationship priest/faith and materializing between children and parents, students and pedagogues, the sick and psychiatrists, delinquents and experts. “The motivations and the expected effects of it diversified, as well as the forms it takes: interrogations, consultations, autobiographical narratives or letters [...]” (Foucault, 1993, p. 62). It enters the scientific discursivity, composing the way in which science deals with sexuality. Foucault, then, wonders about the ways in which science has managed to officialize what he called “extortion of sexual confession” and maintain its scientific status. He points to four paths: 1) Through a clinical codification of “making people talk”: in the attempt to decipher symptoms and signs, confession is combined with examination; 2) Through the postulate of a general and diffuse causality: sex, in its dangerous nature, could affect the most diverse areas of life, demanding then a thorough scrutiny; 3) Through the principle of a latency intrinsic to sexuality: the functioning of sex is obscure, which implies saying that not even the subject himself knows “what to confess,” there are things that, even for him, are not cognizable. Thus, it is the indispensable interaction with science that will enable to bring this side to understanding; 4) Through the method of interpretation: the truth is not only the result of the subject that speaks about himself, but of the work arising from the encounter between the confessing subject and the confessor, the one who, from his place of knowledge, talks about what is confessed to him; 5) Through the medicalization of the effects of confession: recoding of confessions into therapeutic operations. This transfers sex from the logic of guilt/ sin to the regime of the norm and the pathological.

This trajectory drawn by Foucault serves to point out the difference between the East and the West. While the East developed an *ars erotica*, in which the secrets of sex were passed from master to apprentice, in a relationship of valorization of the accumulation of sexual knowledge, the West founded the *scientia sexualis*, which has little to do with living experiences of this pleasure, but establishes aseptic logics to talk about what becomes considered sexuality. Our society assigned itself the task of producing “true discourses” about sex, trying to adjust, not without difficulty, the ancient procedure of confession to the rules of scientific discourse. The *scientia sexualis*, developed from the 19th century on, paradoxically, keeps as its core the singular rite of compulsory and exhaustive confession, which constituted, in the Christian West, the first technique to produce the truth about sex. Observing this movement of the constitution of the discourse of sexuality from a positivist perspective: how is it possible to consider this scientific work as neutral? How is it possible to say that it is aseptic, when it is the heir of a deeply affected conception and a political and religious position?

Foucault’s text becomes particularly interesting for the discourse analyst when he states that “[...] the history of sexuality—that is, of what functioned in the 19th century as a specific domain of truth—must be made, first of all, from the point of view of a history of discourses” (Foucault, 1993, p. 67). It is necessary to understand the constitution of the discourses on sexuality, its borders, its fringe, its crossings, in order to be able to deal with this theme in a complex and profound way.

Jeffrey Weeks begins his article by bringing the figure of a person who has AIDS. He does so to establish a provocative point: the culture of perfect bodies tormented by the epidemic of a highly degenerative disease. Called “gay cancer” in the first years of its emergence, AIDS was taken (as it still is by conservative sectors of society) as a manifestation of divine punishment, which revealed a sexual perversity inherent in those who were infected. The regime of revelation of truth of which Foucault speaks is present in the relationship with this disease. Weeks (1999, p. 36) asks himself

What is the relationship between, on the one hand, the body as a collection of organs, feelings, needs, impulses, biological possibilities and, on the other hand, our desires, behaviors, and sexual identities? What makes these topics so culturally significant and so morally and politically fraught?

These initial questions serve to establish the need to overcome sexuality from a biological viewpoint: it is more than the mere functioning of the body. It is inscribed in the complexity of culture, linking itself to beliefs, ideologies and imaginations, establishing a non-intrinsic meaning with the bodies: “[...] the best way to understand sexuality is as a historical construct” (Weeks, 1999, p. 36). Highlighting the transformations in the use of language about sexual practices, the author demarcates the change about the sexual lexicon. The trajectory of the sayings and the transformations of conception are markedly non-natural, resulting from defined power relations. These relations are crossed by markers such as gender, race, and class, further complicating the implications about sexuality. Weeks (1999, p. 40) defines sexuality as “[...] a general description for the series of socially constructed and historically shaped beliefs, behaviors, relations, and identities [...].” His proposal approaches DA by highlighting the need for historical context in order to understand sexuality. Opening space for a non-univocal conception of sexuality—it is established in a causal relationship with history.

Weeks resumes Foucault’s contributions to the discussion of sexuality, demarcating the direction of the French philosopher’s criticism: they are directed at sexologists and essentialist thinkers of sex, who, in their scientific effort to establish what is healthy and what is pathological, have strongly contributed to the importance given today to sexual behavior. The social dimension of sexuality causes physically identical sexual acts to be meant differently in diverse cultures and historical periods. Jonathan Ned Katz, an American historian, provokes the reader with some accounts of history in his book *The Invention of Heterosexuality* (1996). Such clippings narrate times when heterosexuality was not the basis for validating sexual practices. One of the examples is the case of New England from 1607 to 1740, a time when the social concern was procreation due to the need for sustainability. This cultural trait was so marked that “[...] the New England colonists married earlier than those of old England, and their norm of maximizing procreation gave rise to a higher colonial birth rate than in England or Europe at the time” (Katz, 1996, p. 48). Religious and legal mechanisms were created in this society to regulate the use of procreational ability, not heterosexuality, since the term would only appear 200 years later. Thus, anal sex, zoo-philia, masturbation and adultery were against the dominant reproductive order and, therefore, were fought and punished.

The death penalty for sodomy, common in all colonies, and the public execution of some men for this crime, violently represented the great sin of any eros considered contrary to reproduction. The contrast operating in this society was between fecundity and sterility, not between the eroticism of different and equal sexes. (Katz, 1996, p. 49)

The man, then understood as the source of fertility, who wasted his “seed” in non-procreative acts was summarily punished, while the woman, despite also being understood as fertile and a source of creation, was not so vigilant in her sexuality, because it was considered that there was no waste of her creative power. This example is interesting to establish parallels between the homosexual act between two men in different historical moments. If today the sexual relationship between men “makes” both homosexuals (even generating the erasure of the possible bisexuality of those involved), history shows that this logic of meaning has not always been in force: at some moments in the history of Brazil (as well as in ancient Greece and Rome, which implies a discursive reverberation) the ill-seen man was the one who allowed himself to be penetrated and obtained pleasure in this act. Thus, the notion of the universality of sexuality is truncated.

Within the theories of the social construction of sexuality, there are several strands. Some of them even argue that the direction of sexual desire itself (for example, the choice of the object or hetero/homosexuality) is not intrinsic or inherent to the individual, but is constructed. Others, of a more radical orientation, understand that there is no sexual drive/energy attributed to the body, they are also constructed by culture and history. This great variation of understandings about sexuality opens up a wide range of possibilities of interpretative gestures for the issue, all of them, however, opposing the logic of a single meaning for sexuality. In this way, the concern of the debates on sexuality shifts from the reasons/origins of homo or heterosexuality to the whys and wherefores and the mechanisms used by a certain culture to privilege and marginalize this or that sexual expression.

The encounter of the Portuguese with the Indigenous people, in the land that would come to be called Brazil, was a confrontation of meanings about sexual practices. The Lusitanians, loaded with Christian religiosity and the torments of sinful acts, came across the natives who had their own way of understanding sex. It was with astonishment that the Catholic dogmas saw the Land of the Southern Cross, amazed at the “promiscuous and lustful” practices of the natives. The Indigenous sexuality, seen by the Europeans as uncontrolled, earned them the nickname “deviants in paradise,” given by historian Abelardo Romero (Trevisan, 2000, p. 64). The Indigenous people’s whole logic about their sexual practices subverted European concepts. They did not give importance to virginity, condemned celibacy, did not bond in strictly monogamous relationships, which resulted in the contestation of polyandry and polygamy among the indigenous. Everything implied a different order of understanding of affective relationships, leading the Jesuit José de Anchieta to attest that he had never heard of a case of murder due to adultery or jealousy among the Indians. There were records, to European astonishment and surprise, of Indigenous women arranging new lovers for their husbands.

But among the depraved customs of the inhabitants of this tropical paradise, nothing shocked the Christians of the time more than the practice of “nefarious sin,” “sodomy” or “filthiness”—names then given to homosexual intercourse [...]. Such horror was understandable: for Europeans—Catholic or Reformed—sodomy was among the four clamantia peccata (“sins that cry out to heaven”) of Medieval Theology. (Trevisan, 2000, p. 65)

Reports about different tribes point out that the Indigenous people did not see anything outrageous in the “nefarious sin,” to the point of telling their deeds openly. They also highlight cases of natives who had tents where they had relationships with men, establishing some kind of relationship similar to male prostitution, certainly with other meanings, different from those attributed by the White men. In 1549, Manoel da Nóbrega reported that many settlers took native women, “[...] following the customs of the land.” Trevisan also reports on the slang *tivira* (or *tibirô*) used among Brazilian Indians, which, in Tupi language, means “man with a broken butt.” He presents the existence among the Guaicurus Indians of castrated men who took on feminine roles, called *cludinas*. For the Guaicuru-caduveos, the *cludinas* or *cludinbos* (names designating the castrated animals) played the role of prostitutes in the tribes. In Northeast Brazil, among the Botocudo Indians, the gender roles were not demarcated in the way we know, they were not demarcated by anatomical differences, but by behavioral issues, which gave the designation of men-women and women-men. Consequently, the notions of masculinity and femininity were not taken in the same way as they were in Europe.

It is interesting to note that Peter Fry and Edward MacRae (1991) speak of Indigenous tribes in Paraguay and the United States that presented this flexibilization about the concepts of gender and sexuality. The Guaiiqui from Paraguay identified the functions of the tribe through the bow and the basket. Bows for the men, who constituted themselves as subjects in the hunt. A basket for the women, who were responsible for harvesting. It was shameful for one gender to touch the objects of the other. However, the authors present two cases that help us understand

this system. The first case refers to Chachubutawachugi, who had no bow and did not know how to hunt. When he became a widower, he was not accepted by other members of the tribe. Unable to exercise the role assigned to his gender, he had to “pick up the basket.” He then became a subject to be mocked and less respected by the younger members of the tribe. The second case deals with Krembégi, who also had no interest/skills in hunting, but his attitude to the fact was different: he let his hair grow, lived among the women, learned to make ornaments and, furthermore, liked to relate to other men as the passive one in the relationship. Krembégi “crossed” the gender boundary, and was read in the tribe as a woman, without suffering any kind of demerit. The men who related to him, being active in the relationship, did not have their masculinity questioned.

Among the North American Indians, a similar concept of women-men and men-women was found:

In many indigenous tribes, such as among the Guaiacui, it was perfectly possible for a man to “transform” into a woman and even marry another man. These people were known as men-women. Conversely, women were also socially transformed into men, often marrying other women as well. These are the women-men. These berdaches, as they are generically called, like Krembégi, were generally well accepted and in many cases were attributed exceptional powers of healing and prophecy. (Fry & Macrae, 1991, p. 37)

Among Brazilian Indigenous tribes in colonial times, the notion of magic and healing was also linked to sexual practices with the shaman, as well as to the transfer of his mystical and occult knowledge. Furthermore, Trevisan describes cases of Indigenous women who played masculine roles, as they were considered by the Portuguese. These women were known as *tribades*. They used short hair, had military functions, and could even marry other women, assuming, in such a relationship, all the social functions of men. This behavior of the Indian women was interpreted by the Europeans as a result of the men’s submission to sodomy, “[...] a result of paganism and laxity of customs” (Trevisan, 2000, p. 68). It is important to highlight that the nefarious sin was usually associated with the greater sin of unbelief or heresy, which allows us to think that a discursive relationship was established between sexual practices and the belief or not in the Bible and divinity, the sin, in this way, became directly an offense to the divine. All these particularities of sexual life in colonial Brazil merged in such a way with European beliefs that they affected the ways in which white people lived their sexuality here.

In this depraved context, a moral metamorphosis takes place: guilt is suspended.

In his famous letter about the discovery of Brazil, the scribe Pero Vaz de Caminha commented that the indigenous women walked with “their female parts so high and so tight and so clean of their hair that, when we looked at them very closely, we were not at all ashamed.” In the 17th century, based on his experiences in Brazil, the Dutch historian Caspar van Baerle [...] universalized a curious observation that would become paradigmatic: *ultra equinoxialem non peccari*—“after the equator there is no sin.” Among the foreigners who arrived here in the following centuries, a non-deliberate consensus was created, going beyond the limits of nationality and doctrine: it seemed as if the tropics put Christian moral duties in parentheses, and nothing else was forbidden. Thus, the city of Recife had become the biggest center of prostitution in America, in the 17th century, during the Dutch period. (Trevisan, 2000, p. 69)

Prostitution was very present in the colony, whether in big cities or in the villages. In Bahia and Rio de Janeiro, it was considered uncontrollable, to the point that Portuguese ladies adorned their slaves to prostitute them in the streets. The Brazilian clergy came to be known as the most despicable, for getting involved without hesitation in the sexual practices of the colony. The

situation seems to have barely changed with the arrival of the king of Portugal, Dom João VI, in 1808, and neither with the independence in 1822, under Dom Pedro I, known for having many mistresses, even after his marriage to the Archduchess Dona Maria Leopoldina of Austria.

Into this cultural mix between Europeans and natives comes a third element, from a third continent: the Black people. Brought to Brazil as slaves, uprooted from their lands, families, and cultures, Africans make up the history of the country as a whole. It is estimated that in 1584, out of a total of 60,000 inhabitants of Brazil, 14,000 came from Africa. “In the 18th century, the state of Bahia alone started importing from Africa 25,000 individuals per year” (Trevisan, 2000, p. 115). The Brazilian slaves exercised the most diverse functions ranging from manual labor to sex work. It was common practice at that time for the masters to have relationships with female slaves, and they were also the ones who initiated the children of the plantation owners. Likewise, it was common for White boys to be initiated into sexual practices through submission to Black boys of their own age. In this society so marked by sex, special importance was given to the phallus, justifying that patriarchs had their daughters’ suitors spied in order to know the size of their penis, otherwise they would not allow the marriage. Such concern also affected the choice of Black slaves: those who were considered to be poorly endowed or malformed were regarded as unvirtuous slaves. Venereal diseases found fertile ground in this highly sexual culture that paid little attention to hygiene or public health issues.

Syphilis

had become the Brazilian disease par excellence, both in the master’s house and in the slave quarters. It was transmitted from the masters to the slaves and from the slaves to the children of the masters—both during the nursing of the babies and during the sexual initiation of the white boys, since the black *mucamas* performed both functions, at different times of their lives. (Trevisan, 2000, p. 117)

Around syphilis, a whole symbolic relationship about men’s sex lives was established. The body marks of the disease were meant as marks of virility, as a proof of an active development of their masculinity, evidenced in the skin due to an intense sex life. Those who did not present such marks were a reason for debauchery, because they would be less virile. In this sexual amalgam, Catholicism reigned as the dominant religion. Rosaries, prayers, saints, reliquaries, medals, churches, and processions made up the symbolic world of the Brazilians of this time, marked by venereal diseases. As Trevisan points out, “[...] inside the houses, prayers were said in the morning, at meal times, and at night, in the room of the saints; these obligations were attended indistinctly by the masters, their families, servants, and slaves. There were prayers for everything” (Trevisan, 2000, p. 118). In this sacro-prophane climate, Brazil lived between the pleasures of sex and the prayers of the divine.

As expected, in times of Reformation, the Catholic Church reacted and the Inquisition erected its bastion of “purification.” The Tribunal of the Holy Office started operating in Portugal in 1536, and remained active until 1765. Due to the scarce documentation about the presence of the Inquisition in the Portuguese colonies, it is admitted that the first visit was made in 1591 in Bahia. However, the power of the Inquisition in the Portuguese colony extends until 1821, when it was officially extinguished. During the visitation processes of the Inquisition, the “light and sinless” climate of Brazil was transformed into a climate of constant tension and worries. The operation of the inquisitorial processes took place within certain stages. The Time of Grace was the period of some weeks in which sinners could assume their guilt and confess before the Tribunal, and have their sentences mitigated. It was also the period when confessions had to be made: everyone was responsible for their individual conduct. Whoever was aware of a religious crime and did not denounce it, was also liable to punishment.

Once the accusations had been made, the confessions of the guilty parties began, with the help of so-called familiars, who were people hired by the Court

especially to gather information and discover suspects. For the interrogations, the inquisitors used ready-made lists, which contained 71 types of crimes, within which two hundred types of defendants could be placed. (Trevisan, 2000, p. 131)

People from all social classes were affected by the courts of the Inquisition, which was concerned, summarily, with crimes related to the Catholic faith and its dogmas, but also judged crimes against morals and customs. Sodomy was a crime against the faith, receiving heavy punishments that could go as far as the death penalty. The history of sexual practices in Brazil is, in part, crossed by this climate of insecurity, uncertainty, mistrust and sin.

As of the third decade of the 19th century, the liberal and civilizing State felt the need to extend its social control. Trevisan (2000) points out that the awareness of the patriarchal family's incapacity to protect its members provoked the State to act on this social nucleus, using scientific prescriptions from the fields of health and education. The sanitization process is established from the medical viewpoint, intruding into the family. "Starting from the idea of a healthy body, faithful to the ideals of racial superiority of the white bourgeoisie, rigorous models of good moral conduct were created, through the imposition of a sanitized sexuality" (Trevisan, 2000, p. 172). Links were established between marriage and fidelity, reinforced by the right to sexual pleasure within the home: a necessary bond to overcome extra-marital sexuality in order to reduce the high incidence of venereal diseases. Such ideals were circumscribed in a discourse of patriotic superiority; the quality of Brazil came to depend on the quality of the "new family" that was being established, morally and socially delimited. Masculinity and femininity were intertwined in the concepts of paternity and maternity, freeing medicine to identify the abnormal—those who deviated from the norm: "[...] the libertines, celibates and homosexuals, considered irresponsible citizens and adversaries of the biological-social well-being, as they deserted the supreme role of man-father" (Trevisan, 2000, p. 173). Here the celibates are not the religious, but those who remained unmarried.

Medicine started to assign symptoms to these subjects who, due to their distancing from normality, were susceptible to physical and psychological diseases. From this trinity of degenerates, the homosexual was the most serious, for refuting their "natural vocation of man." This new moment in the discourse about sex, now from the viewpoint of sexuality, demanded a new figure. No longer would one speak of the sodomite, but of the pederast. The one who had been effeminate, who had not exercised his virile disposition in an adequate manner, leading him to this "degrading vice." The pederast began to occupy a double space in the medical discourse: he was a deviation to be catalogued, but also a threat in the face of disrespect for the norm. The man who disrespected his place and the functions of masculinity ran the imminent risk of degenerating. A kind of moral panic seems to be established in the imaginary of the subjects, who are held individually responsible for their non-standard behavior within the established rules of what it means to be a man.

If the bourgeois-hygienic standard helped to extinguish the bestial punishments of the colonial period, it is also true that it took its toll, helping to create a self-repressed, intolerant and well-behaved citizen, entirely available to the State and to the Homeland. The new order established by the hygienic standardization used scientificism to exercise a therapeutic control that would replace the old religious control. By progressively distancing itself from the universe of law (secular or religious), the hygienic ideology placed its references in the terrain of the scientific norm. Now, citizens owed obedience less to God than to the physician. And, in place of Christian dogma, the standard of normality came to reign. It was through this breach that psychiatry could enter, to enhance the control of science over people with sexual practices considered deviant. (Trevisan, 2000, p. 175)

With the advance of sexology and the deepening of psychiatry's dominance over the field of sex, legal devices use legal medicine to definitively link the deviant to the field of mental health. The pederast becomes the sick one, not only the abnormal, which implies another perspective on this subject that "[...] was no longer guilty for transgressing the norm, which meant his unimputability, from a legal point of view" (Trevisan, 2000, p. 177). In criminal law, psychiatrically based approaches emerged, alerting to the growth of pederasty and to the practices of "anal onanism with women, of unnatural coitus.

Foucault points out this movement of organization of the scientific discourse through the absorption of marks of the religious discourse. When dealing with the issue of confession, he points out how the legal-medical mechanisms of the saying, of the constitution of the notion of a truthful reality to be unveiled, penetrate society, transforming its logic of functioning. From the hands of the Church to the hands of Medicine, sex is reconfigured. If before it was an object of moral control, it is now an object of scientific study, which implies deep reformulations in the conception of sexual practices, of pleasure (is it of the body or of the spirit?) and of the subjects.

Analysis

We found, in the process of analyzing the interviews, a strong relationship between the lunar cycle and the participants of this research. Subjects of the interval, of non-fixity, of movement, of constant transition, sliding from phase to phase, transforming themselves, proposing a new cycle, but still maintaining something of the "already there." Thus, New Moon (NM), Crescent Moon (CM), Full Moon (FM) and Waning Moon (WM) were the nicknames chosen. Our starting point, for this analytical gesture, was based on the phrase "freedom" (and related entries such as "free" and "freeing.") From this phrase, meanings of transgression, courage, shatter of the stabilized in the norm escape, enunciated from ideological positions assumed by the interviewed subjects, echoing different meanings that leave traces on the ways in which these subjects produce meanings—which can be recognized in discursive sequences (DS) as those cut out of the *corpus*:

Table 3

Syntagma "Freedom" - Meanings of Transgression, Courage, Shattering

NM	[...] I still don't feel totally free to ... open ... totally ... [emphasis added]
CM	When I was with my fiancé ah ... I was very happy, of course, but the biggest feeling of all was that ... yeah ... I had won, let's say, a freedom. [...] this feeling of ... of freedom, of having managed to do something that I wanted to do for a long time. [emphasis added]
FM	[...] first, I experience this identity and this expression for the sake of freedom, I feel free ... ah ... identifying myself in this way and expressing myself in this way. [...] assuming this non-binary transvestite identity, you know, and assuming that femininity in me, because ... it freed me from some closets, you know? I always felt trapped. [...] So living as a non-binary transvestite for me is very liberating. [emphasis added]
WM	[...] Being able to be free inside your own home when you still live with your parents, for example, is something that ... is emancipatory, like that. [emphasis added]

Note: elaborated by the authors

By mobilizing the concepts of *lack, excess and estrangement* (Braga, 2017; Ernst, 2009; Ernst-Pereira & Mutti, 2011), it is possible to approach the phrase "freedom" from the perspective of *excess*, having appeared in 19 discursive sequences (DS). This "freedom," which inhabits a becoming-desirous ("I will be free when ..."), which inhabits the border ("it is liberating, however ..."), which marks stages of life ("I felt free the moment ..."), breaks out in the

discourse of the interviewed subjects given the probable need to fix this meaning effect as possible, or even, necessary to “[...] guarantee the stabilization of certain meaning effects in view of imminence (and danger) of others that overlap them” (Ernst-Pereira & Mutti, 2011, p. 830). Such a need points to a meaning effect that is constantly strained. Its presence indicates the conflict of forces that are materialized in social relations—placing, on the one hand, tradition, the containment of the possibilities of experiencing sexuality and the affection of non-heterosexual forms, and, on the other hand, desires, drives of affection, pleasure, experience, experimentation, other possibilities. It is established a functioning of interpellation to the social, on the part of these subjects. It is as if the four Moons said: “Why can’t I still be free? Why can’t I still live in peace?” Such functioning points in the direction of the memory of LGBT lives and struggles: the possibility of being free exists in the *already-there*, putting into connection the interpretation of the current moment with the memory of “being free” as something possible for non-heterosexual people.

As NM says: NM - [...] I still don’t feel totally free to ... open ... totally ... [emphasis added] The adverb of time “still” does not speak only for NM. Said by her, from her conditions of production, it indicates a statement: “It is not possible for me at this moment, but I hope it will be in the future!” But, considering the interdiscourse, “still” becomes a question directed to her: “You still don’t feel totally free?” which could be followed by another question: “Why?” It would be like a moment of encounter between all those who fought for LGBT rights, echoes from the present and the past revealing meanings in conflict: freedom and oppression linked to the hope that is not made in waiting, but in hope, in the sense of “hoping” that echoes from “still,” imposing itself as insistence on resisting, insistence on existing. Desire, understood as an action and not as a “mere seal in the thing” (Fanon, 1967, p. 168)—there is resistance in the desirous existence.

We used the dictionary as a starting point¹², understanding that it is a discursive object to read and that it contains the record of the historicity of words (Petri, 2018). As much as the dictionary may correspond to a “logically stabilized universe,” it does not have dominion over the living language and the many meanings that resonate with it, because “[...] the words, in use, are subject to meaning reformulations, according to the subjects’ historicity” (Mutti, 2014, p. 374). The opacity of the language is noticeable when observing that the enunciation immerses “[...] in a network of associative relationships—paraphrases, implications, comments, allusions, etc.—that is, a heterogeneous series of enunciations, operating under different registers, and with variable logical stability [...] (Pêcheux, 1997, p. 23).

When WM says that “[...] transgenerity is not very liberating socially. Quite the opposite. It is a prison for us, it is hell [...] personally it is very liberating, socially it is hell [...],” approaches the two extremes to which LGBT lives are subjected: personal freedom and social hell. Speaking of his experiences, he speaks for many other voices and questions the oppressive silencing of cisgenerity. Thus, the Discursive Formation of Social Hell (DFSH) and the Discursive Formation of Personal Freedom (DFPF) were revealed.

Pêcheux (2014, p. 168) refuses the view of the subject as being transparent to himself, adding that the subject-form “[...] is, in fact, an effect and a result, that is, precisely, anything but a starting point” since this starting point, not being the man, the subject, the human activity, corresponds to the ideological conditions of reproduction / transformation of production relations. The Pêcheuxian subject does not refer to the physical presence of individual organisms, an empirical person. They are determined places in the structure of a social formation - the place of the teacher, the place of student, father, mother, woman, man and so on. Such places are represented in the discursive processes in which they are put into play. The place is present, but transformed by imaginary formations (Pêcheux, 1993). For DA, the subject is fluid, divided, decentralized. In other words, since studies developed by Leandro Ferreira (2003), the

¹² We used Caldas Aulete Digital. Available in: < <http://www.aulete.com.br/>>

subject of the discourse, as a position among others, in its relationship with language, is always constituting itself and, at the same time, constituting the language in which history is inscribed. If one does not submit—become subject—to language and history, the meanings are not constituted.

In the DFSH, the subject is urged to be silenced, not to produce meanings and to stiffen the saying, while in the DFPP there is disidentification with the control exercised by the DFSH since it seeks ways to shatter the dominance of the DFSH meanings. It is the shattering gesture of the dominant meanings that puts LGBT life in the place of transgression and, therefore, is targeted by normativity. Within the spectrum of this community, there are lives that are even more provocative, like that of trans people, mainly non-binary subjects who break a series of concepts considered indispensable for social structure. In this symbolic clash between the norm's desire to paraphrastically sediment the meanings about sexuality, gender, social identity, LGBT lives seem to assume a polysemic nature, tensioning what is already stabilized.

It is necessary to highlight the effect of “already expected” in the face of certain enunciations. When we take something for granted, we need to be suspicious of this obviousness and that “something that has been made obvious” - ideology is working to produce evident, natural things. In the case of the LGBT people suffering, the “evident suffering” denotes ideological work that needs to be “made visible.” As Pêcheux and Fuchs put it (2014, p. 164):

[...] “ideology interpellates individuals in subjects”: this constitutive law of *ideology* is never performed “in general,” but always through a determined complex set of *ideological formations* that play within this set, in each historical phase of class struggle, a necessarily unequal role in the reproduction and transformation of relations of production, and this because of its “regional” characteristics (Law, Morals, Knowledge, God etc.) and, at the same time, of their class characteristics. For this double reason, discursive formations intervene in ideological formations as components.

The IF is the “great basis” from which interpretation is possible, since it is through a part of the IF, the DF, that the meaning effects are possible. Therefore, the domains of an IF are organized in discursive formations, limiting what

[...] can and should be said (articulated in the form of a harangue, a sermon, a pamphlet, a report, a program, etc.), from a given position in a conjuncture, in other words, in a certain relation of places internal to an ideological apparatus and inscribed in a class relation. (Pêcheux & Fuchs, 2014, pp. 164-165)

It is from the link to a specific DF that the subject interprets the socio-historical facts, due to the position he or she occupies in a given conjuncture. We realize that in the materiality of this *corpus*, the Ideological Formation of Customs (IFC) is in operation. It is from it that subjects and meanings are constituted since their inscription, sometimes conflicting, in the DFSH or the DFPP. In IFC, voices and practices that seek to consolidate the notion of sexuality move from a univocal bias based on the assumption that there is only one possible form of expression.

Echoes of memory boom here and there, affecting the constitution of the meanings, making themselves present. The voices of the Middle Ages, with their notion of “nefarious sin” linked to unbelief and heresy (Trevisan, 2018, p. 102). Flagellated bodies, tortured, burned under the leadership of the Portuguese Inquisition. “Sodomy.” a phrase that referred to homosexual practices, was understood as a serious crime against the faith, and it was also linked to a crime of *lèse-majesté*. Not only was the individual condemned - the blame fell on his family, who suffered confiscation of assets and various reprimands (Trevisan, 2018). The Philippine Ordinances¹³ even condemned people who knew about “sodomites” and did not report them. In the creation

¹³ Legal compilation that was in force in Portugal from 1603 to 1867 and in Brazil until 1916.

of the new Criminal Code (1916), influenced by French Enlightenment thoughts, the legal figure of sodomy was eliminated. “Crimes for offending morals and morality” arise (Trevisan, 2018, p. 164), and it is in this classification that homosexuality is included.

In later Criminal Codes (1940, 1969, and during the dictatorship of 1964), this perspective was maintained, extending to the prohibition of public exposures of materials considered “obscene.” Hygienists, coroners and psychiatrists came into the scene, when the Brazilian State resorted to medicine to extend control over families, at the end of the 19th century, updating the control mechanisms: the figure of the “sodomite” gives way to that of the “pederast,” a sick subject. The religious recedes and the police officer takes the lead in partnership with science to cure the sick person and save the nation (Cowan, 2015).

This historical overview on non-heterosexual sexualities is organized within the IF that we designate as Ideological Formation of Customs (IFC). In it, the possible knowledge about morals, (good) customs, the good citizen, are directly linked to the exercise of a very specific sexuality, not only in practice, but in a series of approaches, conceptions, behaviors. The gender expressions are quite clear—there is no space for transit. If it occurs, it is not only the subject who suffers, depending on historical time (condition of production), it is the divine who suffers, the soul, society, the family, the motherland. It is because we are (still) linked to the FIC that the suffering of LGBT people is taken, discursively, as “evident,” “obvious,” “natural.” Such evidence, however, is interpreted from different Discursive Formations and, therefore, even it is shattered due to the disparate ideological inscriptions of subjects who, always being themselves constituted as interpretants, make them affected by ideology. From a conservative subject-position, it is “evident” that LGBT suffer, after all they sinners, sick, promiscuous. Suffering is a “natural” consequence of “choosing” a problematic life. Here, space is opened for enunciations that have emerged in public debates about the “gayzista dictatorship,” the non-existence of discrimination and, yes, an attempt to build privileges.¹⁴ In contrast, from a progressive subject-position, although suffering is also taken as “evident,” this is due to the recognition of the existence of LGBTphobia, the work of normativity in the desire for standardization, the effects of oppression. It is recognized that normativity works actively in order to restrain the “different,” understanding that, due to the DF to which individuals are subjected, the “different” establishes, or not, as everything that is not heterosexual and cisgender.

Discursive Formation of Social Hell (DFSH)

Hell does not result from assuming oneself, because this is “liberating” and “loving is never ugly” (NM): hell is the other people, their gaze or the abandonment of the LGBT subject by the absence of “eyes to see and ears to hear” (NM). These subjects enunciate a meaning effect of conflict, or discomfort, that is established in the body and in words, when the Moons point out the torments about the identification of a sexuality or gender identity, presented to them as deviants. “[...] My first thought of what it is to be gay, was to be a mistake” (FM), “[...] since I was a child, I understood that I should not manifest my sexual identity [...] that was different from the norm” (CM).

In the enunciations, we recognize a pre-built effect, as they refer to something thought and agreed before, elsewhere, by social institutions and without consulting the four Moons. The meanings of words do not exist in themselves; they result from the historical situation of the forces that are in dispute (Pêcheux, 2014). It is up to the analyst to be aware of the positions held by those who employ them. Thus, listening to the social voices that resonate in the enunciations justifies, to a certain extent, thinking about a Discursive Formation of Social Hell (DFSH) in which specific knowledge, that affects specific social groups, condenses towards the condemnation of the “non-normative” subjects: those who break the rules “will be punished in the eternal fire,” the sinners. The meaning effects of purge and restriction emerge. From them it

¹⁴ See <https://veja.abril.com.br/brasil/falta-coragem-para-enfrentar-a-ditadura-gay/>

was possible to observe a way of organizing enunciations according to the regularities identified when the difficulties of LGBT life are problematized.

Considering the dictionary meanings of the linguistic materiality “hell,” the “underground place where the souls of the dead dwell,” the “habitation of demons and sinners” or that “intense pity, tribulation vehemently motivated by passions and remorse” is the social place of LGBTs. Due to the dominance of the norm, this seems to be one of the first places occupied by the subjects of this social group, as indicated by FM, pointing out different meanings to homosexuality throughout life: “[...] I think I spent ... [.. .] I spent all of my ... all the decade there, as a teenager, like that, very scared” (sic) [emphasis added]. CM also makes reference to this place of silence, of the pain that forbids saying, by presenting that, being called a “fag” by his older sister, he “[...] didn’t know what it was (to be a fag), but I evidently didn’t want to be [...] I should have been about five, four” [emphasis added]. NM, when talking about what she would to her child self, points out that she would like to advise her to be more courageous, less afraid, because “[...] today I know that I could have been much happier and even accomplished, if I had not stopped doing so many things for fear of what others would think” [emphasis added]. Composing these enunciations, WM speaks of her adulthood, the conflict and the clash of looks that made her confront the Other (the culture) and the other (interlocutor), in a conflictive relationship between the other/Other’s desire for acceptance and a need for repulsion of them, given the assumption that the welcome would not occur, living moments when “[...] I wouldn’t even be able to walk on the street, sometimes, you know, even wearing sunglasses, headset, I saw how much people looked at me” [emphasis added].

In the *already-there* about non-heterosexual sexualities, the meaning of crime, sin, deviation, error is stabilized. Meanings that escape from notions that cover different areas of knowledge: normativity made use of religion, science, law, in an attempt to guarantee the fixity of the meanings. The purge meaning effect condenses the discursive strategy of immobilizing the subject by the ostracization of saying—he ceases to “belong to the world of light.” Meiling Jin, a Black British poet, of Chinese origin, writes about returning home after deportation. Immigrants who return to a place with which they do not always establish a relationship of belonging, because the place in which they learned to exist do not recognize the legitimacy of their existence in it (Bhabha, 1998).

LGBT people seem to be looked at as illegal aliens in their own land, a land in which the right to have their presence and existence recognized as legitimate is questioned at all times. A land from which the other person / interlocutor wants to see the LGBT / illegal foreigner deported. Hell is the look of that other / interlocutor and that Other / Culture that sees LGBT as illegal, clandestine, criminal, sinner. He is relegated to the “social hell” explicitly enunciated by WM or indicated by the four Moons as part of what we call the paraphrastic family of interdiction that is consistent with a subject-position of caution:

Table 4

Paraphrastic Family of Interdiction, Position-subject of Caution

FM	[...] the negative experiences, you know: prejudice, homophobia, these things, I have always lived it, since I was very young. So even my first, my first thought of what it is to be gay, was that it was a mistake.
CM	[...] with the family the question is suffering, affliction, anxiety... [...] the child [...] I was ... I probably wouldn’t like the adult I became. [...] some of the oldest memories I have of my sister are ... her talking ... I mean, talking ... she cursing me saying I’m a fag. And it was something I didn’t know what it was, but I evidently didn’t want to be...
WM	[...] living as a non-binary transvestite for me is very liberating. Transgenderity is not socially liberating. Quite the opposite. It is a prison for us, it is hell, you know. I know

	that ... you know ... I want to talk about happy things, good things, too... Personally, for me it is very liberating, socially it is hell.
NM	[...] I would like her to tell me that ... that I didn't hurt the people I love. That it was a silly concern ... That my daughter is super happy and really accepted...

Note: elaborated by the authors

When WM declares transgenerity as a social prison, her utterances resonate in the words of the other Moons, echoing her sayings, and from them escape meanings of lack, fear, caution, disappointment, distress in the face of discourses that make homosexuality a “mistake” that justifies the social pseudo-law to blame LGBT for hurting the people they love and, in a way, being sentenced to a long time of doubts. That is what NM points out when she states that she would like to know, from her future self, that her sexuality has not hurt the people she loves. In other words, she would like to receive a prison release permit out of that doubt from which perhaps unspoken but presumed questions may arise: “Did I hurt the people I love? Does my daughter really accept me?” remaining there, shattered, a meaning of doubt that is, at the same time and contradictorily, a meaning of love, responsibility and lack of love. As a thread that binds all the meanings, the meaning effect of restriction is perceived, pulsing in the enunciations cut out from the *corpus* and pointing to a feeling of loneliness, abandonment, lack that constitutes LGBT people as social subjects. Lack of the loving word of the family. Lack of sympathy from the co-worker. Lack of the possibility of simply being who you are without fear of having your body marked by “social hell.”

Orlandi (2012, p. 95) recalls that “[...] language is a practice: not [only] in the sense of performing acts, but because it practices meanings, it intervenes in the real. This is the most solid way to understand symbolic praxis. From this, we can observe, in the enunciations of the four Moons, the voices of historical subjects who, when they enunciate (denounce) a meaning of hell woven with affliction, cursing, fear and caution, they put themselves against this hell insofar as, by the unsaid, they let out some nonconformity in the face of “prejudice,” “homophobia,” incomprehension, restraint: WM declares that she wants to “talk about happy things, good things, too,” resounding in “also” a meaning of desire (which reverberates in “I want”), she wants to add serene words to so many experiences and so many “[...] feelings that are not very cool” (CM); NM reveals, as part of her desire, the listening to the word that will calm the time of a life that insists on existing, therefore, on resisting. Despite the dominance of the restriction meaning effect in the discursive sequences (DS) under analysis, we dare to speculate that, as historical subjects, the four Moons rise against a certain harassment of what may be the dominant ideology in the Ideological Formation of Customs, they stand against meaning effects that put them in an *ethos* devoid of voice and political legitimacy and, at the same time, they make an effort to say and not say what is expected of their social place—that they are not what they are, because they are an “error.”

Discursive Formation of Personal Freedom (DFPF)

Establishing a relation of opposition to the knowledge that circulates, more regularly, in the Discursive Formation of Social Hell, we identified another DF—the Discursive Formation of Personal Freedom which, touching the porous borders of the DFSH, even tries to infiltrate it as a dissident agent whose knowledge enters and circulates in a space with which it is not identified, making a movement of disidentification with the dominant knowledge to the point that a new DF is founded. Regarding the configuration of a DF, it is known that it is

[...] the interdiscourse that delimits the set of what can be said and that a DF historically exists within certain class relations and derives from specific conditions of production [...] a DF [...] identifies a domain of knowledge and disguises, due to the transparency of the meaning constituted within it, its

dependence on the interdiscourse of discursive formations, intricate in the complex of ideological forms [...]. (Cazarin, 2010, p. 111)

It is through looking at the interdiscourse that the understanding of the production of the meanings is allowed. It is also necessary to observe the subject-positions that reveal both the external and internal discursive heterogeneity of the DFs worked on here. Such positions can be placed in DFs in different ways, being more or less harmonized with the knowledge constituted in them. Thus, the “good subject,” the “bad subject,” and the modality of “disidentification” are identified. The first is considered “good” because it reflects without question the knowledge of the DF to which it is affiliated. The second generates questions, tensions, withdrawals, revolts, without, however, completely disidentifying him or herself from its original DF. The disidentification, on the other hand, is the rupture with a DF through identification with another one and, as Lopes (2019) points out, when resuming Indursky, “[...] this modality makes it possible to speak of a “gap” since, although the subject does not stop being ideologically challenged, there is “a certain space of freedom” that allows movement.”

It is important to emphasize that it is from the Ideological Formation of Customs that the DFs identified here operationalize their functioning. The DF represents, in language, an excerpt from the IF, recognizing that it is “due to the whole complex of the IFs” that the DF conception arrives at: “[...] what, in a given IF, that is, from a given position in a given situation, determines, by the state of the class struggle, what can and must be said” (Pêcheux, 2014, p. 166). In the DFPF the evidence that indicates the sinful, deviated, pathological nature of LGBT subjects is questioned, overturned. In polysemic movements before the norm, other meanings are condensed, allowing to perceive these subjects as human subjects, complex, beyond their sexual experiences, who found paths of freedom to live despite all the aggressions and attempts of the normativity to subdue them. FM, despite concerns about the context of attacks on LGBT people and the need for greater community unity, points out that “Besides, it’s beautiful! It’s beautiful to be a fagot!” “Besides” is an expression that indicates the remaining elements, it is an adverb with the meaning of “moreover, furthermore, besides that.” Today it is an expression widely used to close the issue of a conversation, as if it were “as to what was left to say.”¹⁵ Thus, this linguistic mark points in the direction of all the remaining elements mentioned by FM throughout the interview, and can be understood as the heteronormative attempts to standardize and erase the LGBT subject.

Also, the discursive functioning of the words, “thing” and “things,” used by FM 22 times, is worth emphasizing. Consider the following DS examples:

Table 5

Discursive Functioning of the Words "Thing" and "Things"

1.	[...] <u>the negative experiences</u> , you know: <u>prejudice</u> , <u>homophobia</u> , these things, I have always lived it, since I was very young.
2.	[...] we need to be aware that things are not so good for us.
3.	I think ... that it is important to have this feeling of community like that, we have very little ... And among the little letters there, there is a lot, a lot to ... <u>to be questioned</u> , a lot ... a lot... a lot of <u>deconstruction to be done</u> , too...
4.	[...] what is it for me today ... that ... I don’t know, when you asked the question there was only such a good thing, like “being a fagot (laughs) is great (laughs), and the like.”.. <u>You feel good about yourself</u> , <u>empowerment</u> and everything else, you know, all the positive adjectives of ... of <u>human emancipation</u> , you know?

Note: elaborated by the authors

¹⁵ <http://www.linguabrasil.com.br/mural-consultas-detail.php?id=9827&busca=> Accessed June 1, 2019.

When using the word “thing,” FM refers to something that has already been said: conceptions to be demystified about “being an activist or militant,” questions to be addressed to LGBT people with regard to the LGBT movement, deconstructions about the LGBT movement, positive experiences related to “being a fag,” “feeling good about oneself” / “human empowerment” / “human emancipation,” activities for which he did not consider himself fit at some point in life due to the “ghosts” by which an LGBT is surrounded, family freedom, attitudes of struggle and resistance to be assumed by the LGBT community, absence of LGBT references in the past / presence of more recent references. When using the word “things,” FM points to “prejudice,” “homophobia,” “negative experiences,” limitations, activities that he likes, LGBT references that already exist without always being accompanied by quality criteria. The subject moves between the two Discursive Formations, perhaps it is possible to recognize, still, a third DF more associated with an institutional subject-position of someone who thinks about the LGBT movement and is concerned with the forms that the struggle has taken—an Institutional Discursive Formation which will not be discussed in this article because it is not its objective to talk about the discursivization of struggles and LGBT movements in the enunciations of this research.

“Things” seems to build a discursive referential insofar as, using an invisible thread, the analyst will sew the words and make visible the relations of meaning formed between them that refer to an outside and, in that outside, they find noise from the everyday life of LGBT subjects in a society that still does not fully recognize their place and voice as legitimate. “Things” returns in “Besides.” However, in this return there is a disturbance: if, before, the meaning effect of restriction and purge resonated strongly, now it will need to fight for space with the meaning effect of humanity because, despite everything, “it is beautiful to be a fagot.” Based on the elements with which “thing” and “things” are linked, one could rewrite, again, FM’s enunciation: “Besides, it is beautiful to be a fag, it is beautiful to be LGBT,” by adding another formulation— “[...] we need to be aware that things are not so good for us.”

This beauty affirmed in the midst of so much suffering, so much difficulty, seems to be one of the faces of this discursive formation: reorganization of meanings of containment, shame, punishment that can and must be said from the FIC, for a resumption of the voices of *Stonewall Riots*, the “gay power,” the Brazilian sexual irreverence that, since colony times, baffled and disoriented Europeans. In other words, as suggested by Indursky (1997), through the mobilization of the category of discursive memory, it was possible to relate what is said in the discursive sequence (DS) with other discourses: the said (“[...] things are not so good for us”) that refers to situations of difficulty and resumes sexist and prejudiced discourses, giving visibility to a threatened subject-position, tensioned by another saying (“Besides, it’s beautiful! It’s beautiful to be a fag!”) that resumes libertarian discourses from past times, discourses that dared to break the pattern in order, perhaps, to produce disturbances in the stabilized meanings, imposing itself on the previous one and giving visibility to a bold subject-position.

Taking the phrase “freedom” as indispensable for the understanding of this DF, we list its dictionary meaning:

Table 6

Syntagma "Freedom" – Dictionary Senses

Freedom - feminine noun in Brazilian Portuguese	
1	Possibility to act according to one’s will, but within the limits of the law and socially accepted rational norms.
2	State or condition of who is free
3	Suppression of abnormal, illegitimate and immoral forms of oppression.
4	Autonomy, independence.
5	Condition of those who are not subjected to any physical or moral constraint.

Freedom - feminine noun in Brazilian Portuguese	
7	License, permission.
8	Attitude of those who are familiar (sometimes somewhat daring) with the person or persons with whom they speak.
9	State of what is with free movements
10	Condition of a free man.
11	Philosophy Condition of a being who is free to express the different aspects of his nature or essence.
12	Autonomy that certain social groups enjoy.
13	More or less bold or audacious way of acting.

Note: elaborated by the authors

Resuming the conversation with WM, we identified that “freedom” appears 17 times in the discourse, as shown by some DSs:

Table 7

Syntagma "Freedom" in the Thread of the Speech

1.	[...] I experience this identity and this expression for the sake of freedom I feel very free ... ah ... identifying myself in this way and expressing myself in this way
2.	And in the course of my transit process like that, I started to see how much freedom it brought me... Personal freedom, right?
3.	Making this relation of freedom / happiness with this social hell is to protect yourself. I don't expect to be approved of... by anyone, so you know, in that sense, let it be cis, my happiness, my freedom does not depend on that person
4.	<i>(talking about winning the social name)</i> It meant giving a new meaning to my birth, you know. It was about having autonomy and freedom, to be born the way I want ... you know. Without imposing a gender that said “no, that person belongs to that gender; that person will have such a name” got it?

What subject is this that enunciates the achievement of “personal freedom”? Or, even more precisely, which subject is it that needs to enunciate the achievement of “personal freedom”? What society is this so that it is necessary to make such an announcement? How does such a society see this subject who, despite being taken as a subject of rights, is not a subject of freedom? Why do we talk, at a given moment, about personal freedom and not just freedom? This is the subject in which (1) “the possibility to act according to one’s will [...]” does not fully apply, as it does not fit “[...] within the limits of the law and socially accepted rational norms.” This subject does not have (10) “the condition of a free man,” nor is he the target of (3) “suppression of abnormal, illegitimate and immoral forms of oppression.” It seems impossible for us not to disregard this last part: “[...] abnormal, illegitimate and immoral oppression.” Would the oppressions suffered by LGBT subjects be considered so? Depending on the answer, another question arises—would the LGBT subject be considered a subject of rights and, therefore, worthy of not suffering “abnormal oppression”? From the DFPPF, the human figure of this subject condenses, questioning this view on freedom that, much like the French Revolution, proclaimed freedom, but not for everyone. In DFPPF, LGBT subjects seek to extend these meanings of freedom to themselves, asserting their rights to be subjects of rights. This is a subject-position they have assumed since their identification with the DFPPF: a subject of rights position.

The rise of the subject of rights resulted from the emergence of the idea of profit in economic relations: from a rural subsistence economy it moved on to an artisanal and urban economy. Artisans, merchants and peasants began to seek their rights, leading to the foundation

of legal power with the eruption of the subject of rights- “[...] a subject responsible for his actions, to which the tense history of his constitution attributed him rights and duties” (Laggazi, 201, p. 19). Furthermore, there is the fact that, according to Pêcheux’s perspective, a new form of subjection took place—the “fully visible form of autonomy” articulated to a kind of reconfiguration of the subject of rights that, depending on the way in which law entered social relations, his social existence is permeated by rights, duties, responsibilities, demands and justifications. It is worth noting, here, that the tension between subjects of rights and subjects of “not-so-many-rights” became more visible during the 2018 elections, when the United Nations Organization (UN) ruled on the growing risks for the LGBT community, women and Blacks.

Resuming, once again, one of the analyzed enunciations of FM—“Besides, it is beautiful! It’s beautiful to be a fag—and returning to the WM’s DSs cut due to the presence of the word “freedom,” it is possible to speculate that “personal freedom” is the materialization of a counterpoint to a non-existent “social freedom,” after all, “social hell” is what exists. Thus, in order to make it more specific: freedom exists, but it is in the personal field. There is “autonomy, independence,” but circumscribed to personality and not coming from a welcoming social group.

This “personal freedom” is, therefore, in the social space, a “more or less bold or audacious way of acting” of LGBT people, or even an “attitude of someone who is familiar (sometimes somewhat daring) with the person or persons with whom they speak.” Despite the social game of normativity, LGBT is familiar with this game and the organization of a “personal freedom” arising from a space without “social freedom” is a provocation, a bold attitude. This game appears in the WM’s enunciation, when she says that: “[...] for me, many times in my process, it was very difficult to go out on the street ... the way I am, how I like to dress, I would go out you know... you know why? I thought: if I don’t go out that way, if I don’t live that way, people will think that this kind of life doesn’t exist, got it? So, I have to be like that.”

Despite being “very difficult to go out on the street” (Social Hell), WM knew that if she “didn’t go out that way, people wouldn’t know about other ways of existing” and, in this movement in opposition to the possible social, WM enunciates another position, a position of opposition: for not having replicated her identification with the subject-form that organizes what may or may not be said within the scope of the Discursive Formation of Social Hell, we perceive in WM a subject divided in relation to herself- which is materialized in a position of disidentification towards the knowledge that is inscribed in the DF in which she is inscribed. Disidentification that results in the emergence of another DF - the Discursive Formation of Personal Freedom in which we identify the Meaning Effect of Hope (ESE) and the Meaning Effect of Humanity (ESH). In the first one, the research participants stated the expectation of happiness to come, that despite the difficulties of the present, tomorrow will bring more reasons to smile, more achievements, more freedom. In the second one, the participants enunciate the plurality of aspects of being LGBT. Being LGBT is not just about your sexuality, it covers all the complexity of human nature.

NM, when asked about the meaning of being a bisexual woman, puts it this way: “[...] when I manage to live fully, it means freedom and happiness [...]” “When” and not “If.” This mark, the adverb of time “when,” caused *strangeness* in the sense that, perhaps, we did not expect to find it in this context. “To live fully” is not a possibility, but a certainty in what is to come: in “when I live fully,” we hear something like “soon I will live fully,” “the moment I live fully”—this living fully will arrive, without a doubt. In addition, this seems to be the “when” of desire due to the, sometimes, contradictory meanings, evidenced in the words of NM and that make up the discursive surroundings of “when”—meaning effects of restriction, purge, fear, caution, courage, empowerment, hope, freedom. In other words, in chorus with Fiss (2003, p. 258), it is as if the “when” would be constituted in the

[...] significant by which the desire slides and which organizes it. Lacan, in *The Ego in Freud’s Theory and in the Technique of Psychoanalysis* (1985), recalls that desire is a relationship of the human being with lack of something.

This lack is lack of being, properly speaking. It is not a lack of this or that, but a lack of being through what exists. By extension, this lack is beyond anything that can present it and the desire is translated as the desire for nothing that can be named. And if the desire does not dare to say its name, it is because the subject has not yet made appear this name.

Therefore, and because such heterogeneous meanings resonate in the surroundings, more or less close to “when,” it is fair to say that there is a certain demand there—NM’s demand for “social freedom” beyond “personal freedom.” According to Fiss (2003, p. 259), as “[...] demand is a form of common expression of desire, which is opposed to the notion of need,” we speculate the possibility of identifying in NM a desiring subject that demands recognition of her desire, recognition on the part of the other / Other to whom her demand is directed. In spite of the flames of social hell, in spite of the purge, of fear, the future reserves a happiness that is to come and is linked to a counterpoint to the Social Hell. That seems to be her demand: more than happiness to come, she longs for the recognition of herself as someone who has the right to be happy. The meaning effect of “happy certainty” echoes when NM talks about her relationship with her partner. Despite revealing, at the beginning of the interview, her fear of walking hand in hand on the street, as it would draw much attention to them, at a certain moment, the meaning effect of hope emerges: “After a while let’s go out on the street hand in hand and that’s it. Let’s get married, huh? How could I not go out with my wife, kiss my wife, right? Simple like that.”

“After a while” makes a temporal indication that something important for the speaker, at some point, will happen—despite the difficulties and the current context: NM will go hand in hand with her wife “and that’s it,” after all, “How could I not go out with my wife? How could I not kiss her? Simple like that.” “Simple like that” resonates as if it were an adjective expression that trivializes Social Hell, removing from it the coercive force that it presupposes to have: the meaning effect of restriction is dimmed by the meaning effect of hope. This trivialization of Social Hell (in the sense of making it common, insignificant, worthless or with less value) is not due to ignoring its effects or, still, because the affectation of its effects does not occur. It happens due to a movement of rupture with its dominance: NM envisions a time when the constraining social pressures are going to cool down. It is as if she concluded, regarding this time, that “After a while I will no longer submit ourselves to it and that’s it. Simple like that.”

Also considering the linguistic mark “not” in “How could I not go out with my wife [...]?” sliding from linguistic functioning to discursive functioning and thinking about the power / knowledge relations with which language plays and which also articulate a game in language, the implicit (sometimes explicit) negation in the “not” particle has a particular consequence that allows considering this fact as a functioning of singularization of meanings. It implies another insertion of the subject that authorizes distrust of a certain displacement of meanings, because, from a word that usually indicates negative meanings, pulse, in NM’s saying, positive meanings since the movement of personal freedom establishes a direct relationship with the hope for better moments: it is as if NM said “This very moment, despite the difficulties, will pass, simple like that, and when that happens, freedom and happiness will be fully lived.” Not because NM ignores the effects of “social hell.” In this NM’s DS resonates a meaning of inescapable certainty about the better days and that meaning seeps away from a “not” that, more than marked by the emptying of the negative value due to a doubt, makes the voice of a subject who takes on a hopeful, empowered, courageous position. A subject who, given her heterogeneity, sometimes hesitates and is turned around as in the enunciation “Because I know today that I could have been even happier and fulfilled, if I had not stopped doing so many things for fear of what others would think [...]”: from this” not” escapes meanings that, although not of negation, affirm setbacks that correspond to the answer given by NM in relation to” things in life ,” to” social hell .” Withdrawals that she regrets, because she realizes that “[...] could have been even happier and fulfilled if [...] I had not stopped doing so many things.” The condition inherent in the

particle “if” returns in the form of hope and the same meaning of hope manifests itself when talking about the window of the future, what future NM would say to present NM: “I would like her to say to me [...] it’s good that you stopped being silly and lived (laughs) [...] I don’t regret it... go for it that you won’t regret anything” [emphasis added].

The expectation, the desire, expressed through the verb “would like” materializes the relationship of forces established between the present, uncertainties, difficulties, fears, and the hope for a future of greater joy. Through the paths of the unsaid, we can see that NM did not want non-suffering. NM could, for example, have stated that she would like to be informed by her visitor of the future that “the bad times are over,” “that the difficulties are gone,” “that she survives.” However, the social context is not the epicenter of desire, although it is undoubtedly its surroundings: “[...] it’s good that you stopped being silly [...]” puts in the subject, NM, the key of desire. She would “stop being silly” and, despite the context, despite the difficulties that may persist in the future, the “when” would have arrived and full happiness and freedom too, she would live fully. NM does not seem to seek control of what is beyond her reach—she cannot completely change the Other / other, that is, our interlocutor does not seem to have easy transformations on the part of the set of economic, political, social, always cultural, powers from which society is organized. However, she believes she is the origin of another possibility for the production of meanings, because if she stopped being silly, she could fully experience freedom and happiness: “Simple like that,” “That’s it.” It can be observed, here, a subject deluded from her autonomy who takes responsibility for freedom and happiness, therefore, a meaning effect of the subject’s autonomy. NM’s own projection of the future is hopeful: a lady in her seventies “[...] and with colored hair! (laughs) More tattoos! (laughs) Surfing, if the joints let me (laughs) [...]”

The other Moons also showed similar movements when asked about their versions of the future. Despite not crying when looking at the window of the past, childhood, thinking about FM who would come from the future touched him. According to him, he was moved, because “[...] it is difficult to think, now, about a future, right ... [...]” Despite this, the FM of the future has brought good news. A “[...] very crazy old hippie [...] well surrounded by people and... telling stories to people (gets emotional) (sic) [...]” This old hippie would come to tell you “[...] it was all worth it [...]” [emphasis added]—life, despite everything, was worth it. The expression “it was worth it” materializes the relations of social hell with the shattering of meanings that ended in the Discursive Formation of Personal Freedom. Peace, tranquility, the balance of the “old hippie” point in the direction of fulfilling experiences. Not exempt from difficulties or problems, neither FM mentioned the disappearance of a context of difficulties, of a context in which LGBTphobic discourses are no longer practiced. But he enunciates this state of mind of those who lived what they would like to have lived, “without regrets,” as he says, using the music of the French singer Edith Piaf, “*Je Ne Regrette Rien*”—“I have no regrets” in free translation. The 70-something-years-old FM came to announce a future of no regrets, resonating, in his words, meaning effects of discreet joy for the lived and of tranquility.

WM also spoke of this becoming of tranquility when thinking about his version of the future: “[...] I imagine a person tired of living, (laughs) you know, a person quite tired of living, but a person with tranquility, with a tranquility you know. A person with white hair, whiter than I am now got it? (laughs) and calm about things too, you know ... [...] a person also from the future who maybe did a lot (emphasis) of things I would like having done, maybe even more (emphasis) than I imagined, right [...]” [emphasis added] (sic). The news from the future WM also did not refer directly to the context, but to a subject who, despite being tired of living, at eighty-three years old (curiously, a change in the participant’s age at the time of the interview: thirty-eight), is “[...] calm about things.” In this “tranquility,” enunciated twice, in the achievements made in the experiences lived beyond what might be expected, resonates a meaning effect of hope for overcoming social hell in the exercise of personal freedom. This “tranquility” future, of achievements beyond expectations, is based on the liberating experience of gender identity and

expression. Assuming a liberating subject-position, despite the conditions of production of his sayings and his existence, seems to generate this hope in a “tired, but peaceful” future. In this “tiredness” the effects of Social Hell resonate and echo in the discourse as a meaning effect of purge and a meaning effect of restriction, “the fire has left its marks,” it tired the scourged body. However, it was unable to destroy it. Tranquility supersedes this tiredness: “[...] a person quite tired of living, but a person with tranquility [...]” The phrase “but” refutes the tiredness of living, the sufferings of “social hell”: the most important is the tranquility acquired by experiencing “personal freedom.” There is “social hell,” it generated fatigue, exhaustion, but “personal freedom,” the assumption of being who one wants to be, resulted in this tranquility enunciated in the future by a becoming WM.

WM recognizes the social context: there are limits to the possibilities of freedom and happiness, there are “the things in life” that surround it like “ghosts” (FM). If denying oneself is weakening, assuming oneself is strengthening to the point of finding paths of happiness and freedom despite the meanings of purge and restriction that escape from prejudiced discourses, despite the social practices from which such discourses live. There are other paths to be taken and, in the cracks, in the porosity of normativity, one can be happy, hopeful, free. It is possible to be “exactly what you would like to be.” Returning to FM’s enunciation: the “besides” is overcome; in the end, “it’s beautiful to be a fag.” It is beautiful to be a trans person. This beauty assumed in the unsaid, we reiterate, is not due to a reverie in relation to suffering and difficulties, it is the materialization of resistance. The phrases “never,” in “Never stop being yourself,” and “exactly,” in “[...] I am exactly what I would like to be,” allow us to realize that, despite everything, the beauty happens, hope echoes, the meanings of control and stiffening of LGBT subjects in the dispute with meanings of resistance and self-enunciation.

WM talks about the impossibility of existing if she is purged. When she goes out on the street and feels she is targeted by the eyes of the other, she works again the meaning of oppression and looks back at them, inquiring about their restlessness, inquiring about their staring and making herself seen “exactly” for what she is, for living her freedom by being “exactly” what she wants to be. She does it as a testimony, because, as she said, “[...] if I don’t live that way, people will think that this kind of life doesn’t exist, you know. So, I have to be like that [...] [emphasis added]

The “social hell” fire cannot completely stiffen these subjects—after all, the meaning cannot be contained, it always escapes. While the meaning escapes, possibilities, other paths, are revealed through which mechanisms of resistance to established meanings from which conservative discourses become advocate.

Conclusions

The understanding, resulting from the discursive analyzes, that resistance has always existed, was never absent from games of power, as much as possible, cracked tradition, prevented it from taking over, the recognition of an Ideological Formation of Customs began to be outlined, manifested in two Discursive Formations—the Discursive Formation of Social Hell and the Discursive Formation of Personal Freedom. The DFSH needs to make evident the “impossibility of being” LGBT. That is how ideology works. However, the DF of Personal Liberation appears. What once seemed impossible, indissoluble, unbreakable, trembles. As an impenetrable image that is beginning to fade, the “impossibility” of being LGBT begins to give way to “living things” as WM said. In this path that emerges, as a mirage before the eyes, the apparent impenetrability of normativity is weakened. Tradition, as a monolithic concept that cannot be faced, seems to have its space weakened. A certain network of meanings is disturbed. Perhaps we can talk about updating the memory of gender and sexuality relationships.

It does not seem wrong to say that normativity still dominates the relations of forces that permeate sexualities and gender expressions. However, it works through the illusion of its irrevocable strength—wouldn’t the best armor be the evidence of impenetrability? Who would

try to pass through an “evidently” insurmountable defense? Many have tried. They did it. They have succeeded. In the insurmountable aspect of tradition, heteronormativity, cisgenerity, LGBT lives erupted, altering what could be said, revolving memory, generating events. Subjects of “despite.” Despite the fire of social hell, the scourge of the inquisition, the medicine attempt to cure, the judicial prison, despite the violence, despite the discrimination and the fear, “they made themselves.” Put another way, and taking the words of the Moons: subjects of “much more.” Much more than tradition and good manners could handle it. Much more than intolerance, much more than moral panic, much more than the death of the body. Much more than flesh-and-blood individuals or “individual biological organisms,” subjects of saying, inhabitants of the world’s memory inscribed in the repeatable history and, therefore, provocation to conservative discourses.

It is true that the meaning effects of purge and restriction flowed from their words, marked by suffering. But “much more” than that, meanings of hope and humanity shone. Meaning effects marked by a constant movement of subject-positions, continuous slides in which, “much more” than just sufferers and oppressed, LGBT subjects are permeated by meanings of freedom, hope, humanity, resistance, of struggle, of restlessness, of transformation. A wealth of meanings of “human emancipation,” as FM said, is the source of these subjects, who learned to find, in the supposedly opaque and insurmountable armor of normativity, spaces to be and live. Even within the social hell, WM lives with a lot of freedom and expresses exactly who she wants to be. Even surrounded by ghosts, FM has a lot of faith in people’s determination, after all, “being a fag is beautiful.” Even with family battles, with the suffering posed by LGBTphobia enunciated by CM, he dreams of transforming lives, spreading small transformations, adopting a child. Even in the face of fear of hurting her own people, NM, after a while, will go hand in hand with her future wife. To be LGBT is to be much more than “this world that is not ready” can handle it. For this reason, these subjects, who sometimes had their lives so emptied of meaning, continue to resist and provoke the other’s gaze to rethink themselves. To assume oneself to be incomplete, to assume oneself as lacking opens space for an unlimited “much more”—which, in a certain way, allows invoking the essential consideration of the opacity of language, that is, the recognition that other meanings are always possible. In DA, although language is the basis of all discursive processes, it does not support itself. As a result, DA needs to inscribe historical materialities in its domains, as it removes the positivist perspective from the historical question, cracking homogeneity and opening space for the contradiction, therefore, for the constitutive heterogeneity of all saying.

References

- Balestrin, P. A. (2017). Introdução aos estudos de gênero e sexualidade. In: C.C. Silveira, M. C. Friederichs, R. F. R. Soares, & R. A. Silva. (Orgs.), *Educação em gênero e diversidade* (pp. 9–21). Tomo Editorial.
- Bhabha, H. K. (1998). *O local da cultura*. Ed. UFMG.
- Braga, D. V. (2017). O que estranha o olhar do analista de discurso? Um exercício de reconhecimento do fato discursivo. *Fórum linguístico*, 14(Número Especial), 2428–2439. <https://doi.org/10.5007/1984-8412.2017v14nespp2428>
- Cavalcante, M. do S. A. de O. (2018). Nas tramas do discurso da reforma do ensino médio: Acontecimento, ideologia e memória. *Conexão Letras – Língua, Discurso e Ensino*, 13(19), 59–68. <https://doi.org/10.22456/2594-8962.85033>
- Cazarin, E. A. (2010). Gestos interpretativos na configuração metodológica de uma FD. *Organon* 24, 103–118. <https://doi.org/10.22456/2238-8915.28642>
- Cowan, B. Homossexualidade, ideologia e “subersão” no regime militar. In: J. N. Green & R. Quinalha (Orgs.). *Ditadura e homossexualidades: Repressão, resistência e busca da verdade* (pp. 27–52). São Carlos.

- Ernst, A. G. (2009). A falta, o excesso e o estranhamento na constituição/interpretação do corpus discursivo. Seminário de Estudos em Análise do Discurso, 4, *Anais do IV SEAD - Seminário de Estudos em Análise do Discurso*. UFRGS.
<http://anaisdosead.com.br/4SEAD/SIMPOSIOS/AracyErnstPereira.pdf>.
- Ernst-Pereira, A. & Mutti, R.M.V. (2011). O analista de discurso em formação: apontamentos à prática analítica. *Educação & Realidade - Dossiê Língua, discurso e sujeito na educação*, 36(3), 817–833. http://www.ufrgs.br/edu_realidade
- Fanon, F. (1967). *Os condenados da terra*. Civilização Brasileira.
- Foucault, M. (1993). *História da Sexualidade I: A vontade de saber*. Trad. Maria T. C. A. & J. A. G. Albuquerque. Edições Graal.
- Fry, P., & Macrae, E. (1991). *O que é homossexualidade*. Brasiliense.
- Gaskell, G. (2012). Entrevistas individuais e grupais. In: M. Bauer & G. Gaskell. *Pesquisa qualitativa com texto, imagem e som* (pp. 64–69). Vozes.
- Indursky, F. (1997). *A fala dos quartéis e as outras vozes*. Editora da UNICAMP.
- Katz, J. N. (1996). *A invenção da heterossexualidade*. Trad. por Fernandes. Ediouro.
- Kosik, K. (2010). Reprodução espiritual e racional da realidade. In: K. Kosik. *Dialética do concreto*. Trad. C. Neves & A. Toríbio. Paz e Terra.
- Laggazi, S. (2015). Em torno da prática discursiva materialista (pp. 85–100). *Organon - História das ideias: diálogos entre linguagem, sociedade e história*, 30(59). <https://doi.org/10.22456/2238-8915.57217>
- Leandro Ferreira, M. C. (2007). A trama enfática do sujeito. In: F. Indursky & M.C. Leandro Ferreira (Orgs.). *Análise do Discurso no Brasil: Mapeando conceitos, confrontando limites* (pp. 99–18). Claraluz.
- Leandro Ferreira, M. C. (2003). O caráter singular na língua no discurso (pp. 189–200). *Organon - Discurso, língua e memória*, 17(35). <https://doi.org/10.22456/2238-8915.30023>
- Lopes, J. D. (2019). *BNCC e(m) discurso: Competências, sentidos e posições-sujeito*. Trabalho apresentado no 8º Seminário Brasileiro de Estudos Culturais e 3º Seminário Internacional de Estudos Culturais na ULBRA. Texto digitado.
<https://doi.org/10.4000/medievalista.2936>
- Louro, G L. (2001). *Currículo, gênero e sexualidade*. Porto Editora.
- Minayo, M. C. de S. (2007a). O desafio da pesquisa social. In: M. C. S. Minayo (Org.), S. F. Deslandes & R. Gomes, *Pesquisa social: Teoria, método e criatividade* (pp. 9–29). Vozes.
- Mutti, R. M. V. (2014). Indisciplina e discurso pedagógico: Efeitos de sentidos diversos em confronto. *Educação*, 37(3), 347–358. Disponível em:
<http://revistaseletronicas.pucrs.br/ojs/index.php/faced/article/view/18082/12443>.
<https://doi.org/10.15448/1981-2582.2014.3.18082>
- Mutti, R. M. V. (2011). O texto jornalístico no discurso pedagógico: o que diz o aluno. In: M. J. Coracini & A. Ernst-Pereira (Orgs.), *Discurso e sociedade: práticas em análise de discurso* (pp. 157-186). ALAB/EDUCAT.
- Narzetti, C. N. P. (2008). *A formação do projeto teórico de Michel Pêcheux: De uma teoria geral das ideologias à análise do discurso*. UNESP.
- Orlandi, E. P. (2012). *Análise de discurso: Princípios e procedimentos*. Pontes.
- Orlandi, E. P. (2001). Boatos e silêncios: Os trajetos dos sentidos, os percursos do dizer. In: E. P. Orlandi. *Discurso e texto: Formulações e circulação dos sentidos* (pp. 127-139). Pontes.
- Orlandi, E. P. (1996). *Interpretação: Autoria, leitura e efeitos do trabalho simbólico*. Pontes.
- Pêcheux, M. (1997). *O discurso: Estrutura ou acontecimento*. Pontes.
- Pêcheux, M. (2014). *Semântica e discurso*. Unicamp.
- Pêcheux, M., & Fuchs, C. (2014). A propósito da análise automática do discurso: Atualização e perspectivas (pp. 163-252). In: F. Gadet & T. Hak (Orgs.). *Por uma análise automática do discurso: Uma introdução à obra de Michel Pêcheux*. Editora da UNICAMP.

- Petri, V. (2018). “História de palavras” na história das ideias linguísticas: Para ensinar língua portuguesa e para desenvolver um projeto de pesquisa. *Conexão Letras – Língua, discurso e ensino*, 13(19), 47–58. <https://doi.org/10.22456/2594-8962.85032>
- Santos, S. S. B. (2014). Pêcheux. In: L. A. Oliveira. *Estudos do discurso: Perspectivas teóricas* (pp. 209-234). Parábola Editorial.
- Trevisan, J. S. (2000). *Devassos no paraíso*. Record.
- Weeks, J. (1999). O corpo e a sexualidade. In: G. L. Louro (org.) *O corpo educado: Pedagogias da sexualidade* (pp. 35-82). Autêntica.
- Zandwais, A. (2015). Discurso, texto e sentidos: Um olhar para além das heranças positivistas. *Organon – História das Ideias: Diálogos entre Linguagem, Sociedade e História*, 30(59), 71–83. <https://doi.org/10.22456/2238-8915.56702>

About the Authors

Dóris Maria Luzzardi Fiss

Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul

fiss.doris@gmail.com

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4771-0726>

Graduated (Full Degree) in Portuguese/English Letters and respective Literatures from the Pontifical Catholic University of Rio Grande do Sul, Masters and Doctorate in Education from the Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul. Associate Professor III in the Department of Education and Curriculum at the Faculty of Education and Permanent Professor of the Graduate Program in Education at the Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul. Head of the Department of Education and Curriculum (2020-2022). Leader of the Research Group on Education and Discourse Analysis/GPEAD (UFRGS/CNPq). Member of the Research Group at the Center for Studies on Access and Permanence in Education (Instituto Federal Fluminense / CNPq).

Lucas Carboni Vieira

Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul

carboni.vieira@gmail.com

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7916-5964>

Degree in Pedagogy, Master and Doctorate in Education at the Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul. Participant of the Research Group on Education and Discourse Analysis/GPEAD (UFRGS/CNPq). Teacher of the Initial Years in the Private Teaching Network of Porto Alegre.

education policy analysis archives

Volume 29 Número 164

December 6, 2021

ISSN 1068-2341



Readers are free to copy, display, distribute, and adapt this article, as long as the work is attributed to the author(s) and **Education Policy Analysis Archives**, the changes are identified, and the same license applies to the derivative work. More details of this Creative Commons license are available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>. **EPAA** is published by the Mary Lou Fulton Institute and Graduate School of Education at Arizona State University. Articles are indexed in CIRC (Clasificación Integrada de Revistas Científicas, Spain), DIALNET (Spain), [Directory of Open Access Journals](#), EBSCO Education Research Complete, ERIC, Education

Full Text (H.W. Wilson), QUALIS A1 (Brazil), SCImago Journal Rank, SCOPUS, SOCOLAR (China).

Please send errata notes to Audrey Amrein-Beardsley at audrey.beardsley@asu.edu

Join EPAA's Facebook community at <https://www.facebook.com/EPAAAAPE> and **Twitter feed** @epaa_aape.