

International Journal of Human Sciences Research

DISCOURSE AND SUBJECT IN ARGUMENTATIVE MOVEMENT ABOUT PLAYING AND PLAYING IN CHILDHOOD

Ana Caroline Del Bem Caldas

Universidade de São Paulo (USP)

<http://orcid.org/0000-0001-8893-3179>

Soraya Maria Romano Pacífico

Universidade de São Paulo (USP)

<http://orcid.org/0000-0002-2973-3254>

All content in this magazine is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution License. Attribution-Non-Commercial-Non-Derivatives 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0).



Abstract: Recognizing play as the main activity in childhood and also that the right to play has been excluded from school routines, this work aims to analyze the discourse produced by subject-students, aged between 6 and 7 years, in order to understand how they argue and build meanings about playing and playing in childhood. The work has as its theoretical foundation the concepts of Michel Pêcheux's Discourse Analysis, to analyze the effects of meanings produced by the subjects, in addition to considering Plantin's studies to analyze the arguments regarding the way subjects talk about their emotions, valuing the affections that can echo in arguments about the right to play.

Keywords: Argumentation, jokes, Verbal and non-verbal speech, Subject.

INTRODUCTION

A quality education must consider the diversities present in the classroom and meet the principles of meaningful learning, in addition to including play as a main activity in childhood to provide child development. However, if we were sure that the right to play and to play was guaranteed to Basic Education students, as it is in the official documents on Basic Education, such as LDB 9.394/1996, ECA 8.069/1990 and BNCC, we would see the activities and practices of/with games more frequently in school routines. However, based on our curricular internships and, in our teaching, we are aware that, despite being guaranteed on paper, the right to play is not exercised inside the school walls.

Instigated by this question, we aim to analyze the discourses produced by subject-students, aged between 6 and 7 years, about playing and games they experienced at school. For this, we proposed to take the reading and interpretation of Candido Portinari's works of art to a classroom of the early years of Elementary School, which allowed the

research subjects to have contact with the artistic language, in order to understand how they argue and build meanings about playing and games in childhood, or rather, if they argue about the child's right to play, having painting as a motto for the practice of argumentation, understood here as a right (PACÍFICO, 2002; 2012; 2016).

This work has as its theoretical foundation the concepts of Discourse Analysis (AD) by Pêcheux (1997; 1999; 2014), to analyze the effects of meaning in the subjects' discourses, in addition to considering the studies of Grácio (2010) and Plantin (2008).) to analyze the argumentation regarding the way subjects talk about their emotions, valuing the affections that can echo in the constructed arguments.

For AD, according to Orlandi (2005), it is important that a subject is motivated to create his own history, his senses and his meanings, a socio-historical subject that produces meaning and meaning in what he does and manages to show his place/ space in argumentation, because speech is argumentation and occupies a political/ideological place. "Language serves to communicate and not to communicate. Language relations are relations of subjects and meanings and their effects are multiple and varied. Hence the definition of discourse: discourse is the effect of meanings between speakers." (ORLANDI, 2005, p.21).

According to Pacífico (2002), argumentation and authorship maintain a relationship of interdependence, because, for the author, argumentation requires that authorship be installed. The discourse that interests us, in this work, was constructed with the arguments of the subject-students. Every discourse is constituted by discursive formations, ideological formations and imaginary formations. Let's start with what Pêcheux (2014) characterized as imaginary formations: the subject imagines what he can say at a given moment, to a given interlocutor,

and, captured by the ideology with which he identifies. The meanings constructed by the interlocution are related to the means of material production, which impacts the class struggle, in a given socio-historical context. This relationship presented constitutes the conditions for the production of discourse, since the exteriority of language is constitutive of the process of production of meanings.

It is hoped, with the results of this work, to reflect on the saying and argumentation of the subject-students, in the initial stage of schooling, in which, despite being essential for the constitution of the subject-child, the affections and emotions that can emerge through play and play are not always considered.

METHODOLOGY

For the construction of the analytical device that would meet our objectives, the speeches about playing were recorded in a field research, in which the subject-students talked about the games played at school, and also the speeches that indicated the interpretations they made. from the works that portray playing and games in Portinari's paintings.

Twenty subject-students participated in the research and activities were proposed for discussion in a circle, in the 2nd year of Elementary School, in a public school in Ribeirão Preto. During the meetings, the following artistic works by Portinari were presented in printed material and contextualized: "Meninos Brincando, 1955"; "Children's Wheel, 1932"; "Boys Flying Kites, 1947"; "Boy with a Top, 1947"; and, "Football, 1935". Through a contextualization of the painter's history, we mention that these works represented Portinari's childhood, lived in the countryside of São Paulo, in the city of Brodowski, his birthplace.

The research project was approved by the Research Ethics Committee of the FFCLRP-

USP, and the choice of school was made and authorized by the Municipal Department of Education of Ribeirão Preto. Data collection was carried out in August and September 2019, at the school, under the supervision of the pedagogical team. During all meetings, recordings of all conversations in groups with the subject-students were made using a voice recorder. The recorded content was transcribed exactly as it was collected. All students in the class agreed to participate in the research and the researchers were responsible for coordinating the group conversations, with no interference from the class teacher during the five meetings.

Researchers and research subjects-students established a dialogue, so that they could perform gestures of interpretation on the artistic works and relate them, or not, with the meanings of play that permeate the school day to day.

Among the conditions of discourse production, we also consider argumentation, a discursive practice in which subjects, when faced with a questioning, expose, dispute and defend their points of view through arguments. In the case of this work, through the orality that supported the interlocution in the conversation circle, it was possible to propose questions and questions about playing, both at school and on Portinari's canvases.

The questions asked during the conversation circle were previously thought and elaborated, a script was created in order to provoke situations for the argumentation, although the discourse analyst is aware that subjects and meanings are built together with the text and, therefore, the meaning can always turn out to be another (PÊCHEUX, 2014). The question, which can also be called "question", according to the theoretical contribution presented by Grácio (2010), directs the discussion to the confrontation

of answers, triggering the argumentation in front of different points of view.

A question, on the contrary, is not characterized by the linearity of the expected answer, but, on the contrary, by ambiguity, in the etymological sense of the term, that is, that it gives rise to at least two meanings of answer. As we saw earlier, Plantin calls this type of question “argumentative questions”. (GRACIO, 2010, p.41)

This way, the subject-students were questioned through “argumentative questions” so that they could put in motion the gestures of interpretation before the artistic works. They discussed what it is like to be a child at the school where they study, if it is important to play, if playing is present at school or not, and also if it is possible to be a child without playing. We seek to listen to the meanings produced by the research subjects about the children represented in Portinari’s works to find out if, in their opinion, the children portrayed are happy playing; if playing brings happiness; if they agree that those who play are happy; whether they agree that the school was made for children; if, it is possible to stay in school without joking; whether the school was made for children; if it is possible to be a child without playing.

In the dominant discursive formation in the school context, in contemporary capitalist society, traditional teaching activities and content learning that disregard the right to play are valued. In relation to this, our objective was to provoke a noise in this dominant discursive formation about the school not being a place of play. For this, “argumentative questions” (PLANTIN, 2008) were asked to provoke the subject-students’ arguments: “Was games made for children?”; “Is school made for children?”; “Is it possible to be a child without playing at school?”.

Initially, we proposed that the subject-students analyze the facial expressions of the children represented in Portinari’s works.

Regarding the works in which it is not possible to see the faces of the children, the following questions were asked: - “Can you tell if these children who are facing away, in Portinari’s works, are happy playing?” – “Does play bring happiness?” – “Do you think it’s true when people say that those who play are happy?”.

To interpret the evidence of the senses, we also resort to the evidential paradigm (GINZBURG, 1989). Ginzburg discusses a method for analysis, in which it is necessary to perceive evidence that are imperceptible to most people, thus establishing the evidentiary paradigm based on semiotics. Learn to interpret, classify and decipher clues and signals. For him, “The connoisseur of art is comparable to the detective who discovers the author of the crime (of the painting) based on evidence imperceptible to most.” (GINZBURG, 1989, p.145). He was able to perceive that there is a form of knowledge that can be on the border between the rigid knowledge of the natural sciences, which operate by demonstration and empirical verification of the analyzed data, and creative forms, such as literature, poetry, myths, etc. Between these two instances is the evidentiary paradigm, which works by tracking signals like a hunter.

We relate this conception of Ginzburg (1989) with the studies of Pêcheux (2014) that values the interpretation of meanings in speeches, based on evidence that can be analyzed and strengthen the analysis of the object of study.

The analyst’s responsibility lies in explicitly establishing an analytical device with which, starting from a careful description of the utterances of his *corpus*, he will be able to explore linguistic/signifying functionings that reveal the traces of the interdiscourse that governs interpretation beyond the calculations of its enunciators – and the calculations of its researchers in the field of Discourse Analysis. This is certainly a work that is always partial, never done “once and

for all”, of methodological configuration and experimentation, through which the analytical device acquires centrality in terms of the possibilities of exploring the semantic margins of an interlocation from a provisional retreat and strategic in interpretation. (BECK; FONSECA; SANTOS, 2019, p. 165)

When analyzing and interpreting the discourses of the subject-students, we work with the notion of a cut which, for AD, according to Orlandi's (1984) concept, indicates a discursive mode of functioning in/of history, discourses of subjects challenged by the ideology.

Therefore, the clippings are not considered as sentences or pieces of a text, since they are related to the entire corpus, so “by discursive unit we understand correlated fragments of language-and-situation” (ORLANDI, 1984, p. 14) and “a clipping is a fragment of the discursive situation” (ORLANDI, 1984, p. 14), and “the clippings are made in (and by) the situation of interlocation, which comprises a less immediate (interlocation) context : that of ideology” (ORLANDI, 1984, p. 14).

For AD, the object to be analyzed is organized into clippings, so that the multiplicity of meanings can be analyzed (ORLANDI, 1984) and investigated through evidence in the discourses that can be interpreted (GINZBURG, 1989). The transcripts that gave rise to the discursive clippings analyzed here, which are presented respecting the way they were produced by the subject-students, at the time of the research, can be found in full in the master's dissertation entitled “Discourse and subject in argumentative movement : games and art in Portinari” (CALDAS, 2021).

We emphasize that “it is impossible to analyze a discourse as a text, that is, as a linguistic sequence closed in on itself, since it is necessary to refer it to the set of possible discourses from a defined state of production conditions.” (PÊCHEUX, [1969]; 1997, p. 79).

So, according to historical materialism, childhood and play are a social construction, the ways in which these concepts are conceived are related to the context and the mode of production of society. The meanings produced constitute the interdiscourse, which is an institutionalized historical element, everything that has already been said by someone somewhere, something “forgotten” that is taken up in the intradiscourse (PÊCHEUX, 2014) –, and memory as part of the interdiscourse that the subject resumes and updates in his speech. Interdiscourse and memory are part of the production and interpretation of meanings, that is, what has already been said affects the present socio-historical and ideological context. (PÊCHEUX, 2014), however:

[...] A memory could not be conceived as a full sphere, whose borders would be historical transcendental and whose content would be a homogeneous meaning, accumulated in the way of a reservoir: it is necessarily a mobile space of divisions, disjunctions, displacements and retakes, conflicts. of regularization. A space for unfolding, replicas, polemics and counter-discourses. (PÊCHEUX, 1999, p. 52).

Due to the socio-historical constitution of the subject and the meaning effects of discourses, including the discourse of art, we consider that the play represented in Portinari's works, which we used in this research, is not the same as the play that subject-children experience in contemporary schools, are different meanings that circulate and resignify from their interlocutors. In contact with Portinari's works of art, the subject-students were launched to interpret and produce meanings that can always be others, that is, they can be different from the meanings interpreted in another socio-historical-ideological moment by subjects who occupy or occupied different discursive positions.

Based on this theoretical-methodological path, we intertwine playing, childhood and art in a network of interpretations and meanings that will be analyzed below.

THEORETICAL FOUNDATION

Because the effects of meaning can be interpreted by the analyst when investigating the evidence in the discursive corpus, the meanings can also be interpreted by the subject-students in contact with the works of art when questioned during the conversation circles held during this course. Art arouses the curiosity of subjects and the senses can be interpreted through works of art. In this interpretive movement, the arguments can be analyzed in the subjects' discourses when they occupy a position that defends, or not, the child's right to play, in the school context.

Making a pun on the word "art", we consider that arguing is an art, in a double sense, that is, both as the subject's creative ability to put his positioning in speech, and in the sense of the subject doing something with the aim of provocation, to go against the standards accepted by social institutions. (PACIFICO, 2012, p. 43)

Our focus here will not be to evaluate argumentation in its rhetorical sense, which originated with the studies of Aristotle (384 BC-322 BC), there are several studies on argumentation that succeeded Aristotle's rhetorical argumentation, but in the perspective that we will defend here, based on AD, argumentation is a right of the subject, who occupies a social position and has, or at least must have, an opinion in the face of a questioning. Furthermore, our objective will not be to evaluate whether an argument is good or bad, in the sense of persuasion defended by the theory of rhetorical argumentation, but to analyze how the subject-students feel when being questioned about the importance of playing, about the existence or not of playing in their experiences, about the possibility of

being a child with or without games. Another important note is that "we defend the right to the practice of argumentation and not just access to texts that simulate teaching about argumentation, such as those that circulate at school, on the production of argumentative-essay texts." (PACIFICO, 2016, p. 192)

Traditional teaching methods value activities in textbooks that do not explore multiple meanings, but activities that require the copying of words and the repetition of meanings already established as "correct". Reading and writing do not guarantee the learning of argumentation, as the discursive practice of argumentation goes far beyond a textual structure and its reproduction.

Despite this, we argue that it is at school that the subject can and must know the unequal power relations involved in argumentative practices in order to exercise their power to argue, to be able to find in the discourses, spaces for argumentation. In other words, the argumentation must be legitimized in the school institution so that the subject, exercising this discursive practice, feels entitled to take the word, to dive into the discursive thread and position himself on the meanings put into circulation in society. (PACIFICO, 2016, p.92)

For a subject to exercise the right to position himself in front of another subject and in the face of questions about the meanings that surround him, he needs to have contact with different readings that allow him to be open to an infinity of interpretations. We know that at school the subject-student has the right to play, to art and to quality education, and quality in this sense is not to carry out many lessons and copy activities in the book or notebook.

As we have seen, in order to argue, the subject must have access to a multiplicity of meanings, must have the right to dispute them; however, in the didactic material we find text summaries, clippings, decontextualized phrases and a recurring

These questions disqualify an activity in a conversation circle that has the objective of valuing argumentation, literacy and the multiple meanings that surround the subjects' discourses. By not considering an oral dialogue activity, the right to argumentation is disregarded, as we defend in this work. Therefore, our intention was to value orality in the conversation circle that opened the possibility for the construction of multiple meanings, of fundamental interpretation gestures for the argumentation.

Based on the studies by Grácio (2010), we found a theoretical contribution that supports us with a work on several authors who explore the concepts of argumentation, so there is not a single and best idea, but different ideas and positions that analyze the discourses with emphasis on what a given discursive position defends. Among these different authors who defend an interactionist perspective, Plantin, Perelman, Toulmin, Angenot, Ducrot, Amossy and others, we chose Plantin's studies to analyze the arguments regarding the way subjects talk about their emotions, valuing the affections that can echo in the argued senses.

For Plantin (2008), from a question or questioning, antagonistic arguments can arise, which, when confronted, demonstrate two or more points of view, but this does not mean that one argument is better than the other. This conception of Plantin, in our view, can be thought based on the DA perspective, so that each argument represents a discursive position, that is, depending on the discursive position that the subject occupies (teacher, student, boss, employee, etc.) and from the discursive formation with which he identifies, the arguments can be contractual or polemical. By relating the concepts of DA to Plantin's (2008) studies of dialogic argumentation, respecting the specificities of each theoretical

perspective, we understand that the discourse analyst can interpret whether a discourse is more or less argumentative, without intending to analyze which is the best argument, since that is not the point of these two theories.

The pendulum movement (PETRI, 2013) between theory and methodology, which supports the analytical device of DA, favors and enriches our process of analysis of argumentation. In the case of this research, the production and interpretation of the subject-students' discourses when talking about the works of art was possible because they recognized themselves as subjects who have the right to argue in the face of the questions presented by the researchers, even if the arguments were antagonistic to the dominant discursive formation.

We understand that the subject-students argued based on their emotions, which, if thought from the DA, may be related to the conditions of discursive production with regard to the game of imaginary formations, that is, who am I to talk about it like that? X. Plantin's studies (2010) provide us with a contribution on the role of emotions in argumentation, because for the author there is no argument that is totally devoid of emotions, which, according to him, are not contrary to reason. For Plantin (2010), in a discursive practice, reason and emotion are constitutive of discourse and both are part of the discursive movement of the subject.

And as we do not work evaluating whether an argument is good or bad, as well as we do not conceive that the argument is based on reason, since the subject does not own his saying, he is captured by ideology to produce X or Y meanings, we start from the principle that arguments can circulate in relation to a given discursive object, whatever the ideological formations materialized in given discursive formations to which the subject is affiliated. According to the Pêcheuxian AD,

the discursive formation materializes the ideological formation of the subject, and:

Discursive formation refers to what can only be said in a given time and social space, to what takes place and is realized based on specific, historically defined conditions of production; it is about the possibility of explaining how each utterance has its place and its rule of appearance and how the strategies that engender it derive from the same game of relationships, how a saying has space in a specific place and time. (FERNANDES, 2008, p. 48-49)

On ideology, Pêcheux draws on Marxist meanings reformulated by Althusser to state that the understanding of ideology is fundamental for the constitution of subjects and senses; to produce meanings, the subject is affected by language, by ideology and traversed by history, remembering that there is always the ideological mechanism working to make the interpretation seem natural, as if it could only be one.

Thus, ideology captures the subject who is inserted in a society, which was formed by historical determinants, and, from that, the subject is able to signify through language. “For Pêcheux (2014), there is no discourse without a subject and there is no subject without ideology: the individual is addressed as a subject by ideology and that is how language makes sense.” (ORLANDI, 2005, p.17).

ANALYSIS: SUBJECT AND SPEECH IN MOVEMENT

As already mentioned, data collection for our research took place in the school context. The school is an Ideological State Apparatus, where the dissemination of the dominant ideology in society occurs (ALTHUSSER, 1985), an ideology that constitutes the subject’s discourse, which is challenged by the dominant discursive formation in capitalist society (discourse on meritocracy, on the

value of capital, on the valuation of individual skills, digital technologies, etc.), which does not mean that all subject-students will be addressed in the same way and will produce the same discourses.

The relations of force and power in a society influence the production of the senses. Through the mechanism of anticipation, which is supported by imaginary projections, the subject imagines what can or cannot be said, “what works in discursive processes is a series of imaginary formations that designate the place that A and B assign each other. each other, the image they make of their own place and the place of the other.” (PÊCHEUX, [1969], 1997, p.82, emphasis added by the author).

Based on the theoretical-analytical device, the analyst aims to understand the effects of meaning produced by the subject and whether he reproduces or resists the relations of power and force existing in society. Let’s look at the meanings put into discourse by the subject-students of Elementary School. For this work, we selected three excerpts from our *corpus*:

Stretch 1:

Subject A: It’s because playing distracts our head.

Subject C: Happiness is that when I’m very sad I prefer to play, when I call my neighbor to play she doesn’t want to, then I call my sister, then my sister doesn’t want to play with me, then I play with another friend, then her grandfather plays with us, we make a mess there and then we play again, because friends are for playing and that’s why it’s happiness.

Subject A: Happiness is a friend, right?

Subject E: When I was playing on the cell phone yesterday, my friends called me and I dropped the cell phone and went to play.

In this clipping, the meanings of playing are related to happiness and friends, as we read in: “Because a friend is for playing and that’s why

it's happiness", and, "Happiness is a friend, right!". We interpret that play and friend work as arguments for the promotion of happiness, as if one nomination defined the other, as we observed in the formulations that follow the same syntactic structure: "happiness is a friend"; "happiness is that when I am very sad I prefer to play [...]", in which the verb to be, in the third person singular, in the present tense, links happiness to playing and to a friend.

However, AD argues that subjects are heterogeneous, as are discursive formations; therefore, other meanings can circulate in the same classroom, produced by subject-students of the same age group, and, in the case of this research, by subjects who had access to the same screens as Portinari and participated in the same discussion promoted by the researchers. Thus, in the following discursive entry, faced with the same questioning that made possible the formulations analyzed in clipping 1, the subject-students, when asked if playing is important at school, build other effects of meaning, other arguments against the dominant discursive formation, such as it shows us the clipping below:

Stretch 2:

Subject E: Auntie, school was made for studying, but some funny guy taught to play at school.

In this sense, subject E argues that school was made to study, as if there were an opposition of meanings between studying and playing, an effect of meaning constructed with the use of the adjective "funny", which works in an evidential way producing meanings of grace, of clowning, affront, undisciplined student, formulations used in the school context to demean students who do not act according to the discipline and seriousness determined so that learning can occur, meanings that build the dominant discursive formation in the traditional school, understood here as one that functions as an Ideological State

Apparatus and does not open space for dissent, for polemics, for argumentation. According to this dominant discursive formation, the school must not be a place to play, a discursive formation legitimized by the voice of the adult, by the school management, by the teacher who are challenged by the dominant ideology, and, in the case of subject E, he reproduces these meanings in his speech. This discourse is naturalized by ideology, and the school is an Ideological State Apparatus and the dominant ideology is disseminated in the school institution (ALTHUSSER, 1985), as well as in all social institutions, such as the family, for example. For this discursive formation, the use of "funny" circulates meanings that the game gets in the way, that the person who plays does not take school seriously. Following this argument, we would have another position for playing and games, which would not be understood as activities that must be part of a serious pedagogical practice, through which content can be taught and learned, with great commitment and respect to the child who learns, as the official documents on Basic Education assert, which guarantee the child's right to play.

"Subject E" reproduces the discourse of the subject who occupies the discursive position of "good subject"; on the other hand, "the funny guy" is the subject who occupies another discursive position, that of "bad guy", who stands against the "conservative and traditional conception of school"; then, the good-subject identifies with the dominant discursive formation and does not question the saying of the other (PÊCHEUX, 2014). The use of "the funny guy" to refer to someone who tries to break with the senses of order and school discipline indicates a subject who is in another discursive formation that is not the dominant one, therefore, he occupies the position of a bad subject.

In which the subject of the enunciation 'turns' against the universal subject through a 'taking a position' that consists, this time, of a separation (distancing, doubt, questioning, contestation, revolt...) with respect to what the 'universal subject' 'makes him think': he fights against ideological evidence, on the terrain of this evidence, evidence affected by negation, reverted to its own terrain. (PÊCHEUX, 2014, p. 215).

Both discursive formations are constituted by discursive memory and ideology, with interdiscourse being the place where all discursive formations circulate. We still have the following in the subject E's words: "but some funny guy taught us how to play at school." The use of the word "taught" demonstrates that the subject was captured by the dominant ideology according to which everything needs to be taught, an ideology disseminated by the school and by the school-subjects (teachers, directors, coordinators, employees).

The subject uses the language challenged by the ideology that captures him, in one way or another, at a given socio-historical moment. As, for example, in the school space, who dictates the rules according to the school culture that we have is the adult/director/teacher; meanwhile, the subject-student needs/must respect the teacher, otherwise he is considered outside the standards expected institutionally. But when the subject-student occupies a position of resistance and does not accept what is imposed, he questions the meaning and can migrate from one discursive formation to another, which can affect the construction of arguments and the taking of a position, of "good -subject" to "bad-guy".

Words, expressions, propositions, etc., change their meaning according to the positions held by those who use them., which is to say that they acquire their meaning in reference to these positions, that is, in reference to the *ideological formations* (in the sense defined above) in which these positions

are inscribed. then we will call, *discursive formation*, that which, in a given ideological formation, that is, from a given position in a given conjuncture, determined by the state of the class struggle, determines *what can and must be said* (articulated in the form of a harangue, a sermon, a pamphlet, an exhibition, a program, etc.). (PÊCHEUX, 2014, p. 147, emphasis added by the author).

When asked if "Were games made for children?", and, if "Was the school made for children?" everyone said yes. After these questions, the following problematizing question was asked: "If school was made for children, is it possible to be a child without playing at school?". As an initial response, everyone said that it is not possible, soon after the justifications that emerged in the conversation circle, some arguments were formulated.

Stretch 3:

Researcher: Do you think it is possible to be a child without playing at school?

Everybody: No.

Subject C: Very annoying.

Subject E: Very silent.

Subject K: No kidding, it would be boring, there would be no recess.

Subject J: I was just going to have a lesson.

Subject B: The hands would get really tired.

Researcher: Why?

Subject B: Because it would be a long time doing homework without playing, it would get tired, we need to play, right aunt.

Subject I: It would be boring if there were no games, because we wouldn't play.

Subject E: There would be no cafeteria, no recess.

Subject F: I wouldn't have physical education, art.

Subject B: Auntie, it was going to be a stuck school.

Subject C: Art is really cool.

Subject H: Couldn't read a book.

Subject E: Couldn't draw.

Subject M: Because it's boring to not play.

Subject S: Because playing without playing, the body is not healthy.

Subject O: Like we were going to play running for the body to get well, right?

Subject N: If there was no joke, everyone would pick up their cell phone.

Subject C: But we were going to take it hidden, because you can't bring your cell phone to school.

Subject E: No kidding, it gets boring.

Subject B: If you can't play, if you can't do anything, this school will be like a prison. The only good thing is playing.

Subject I: If we didn't have fun, we couldn't have fun, we couldn't run, do children's things, we couldn't even play with toys.

Subject A: And I couldn't even have toy day at school.

Subject B relates not playing to prison: "It would be a stuck school." and "If you can't play, if you can't do anything, this school will be like a prison. The only good thing is playing." When relating school to prison, when arguing that it is not possible to be a child without playing, the meaning of the word "prison" slips into other possible meanings, because here "prison" is not in its literal sense, "the act of imprisoning behind bars", or, "being captured because you committed a crime", but "prison" in the sense of losing the freedom to play inside the school, in the sense of being bound by the obligations that are imposed, in the sense of following rules, in the sense of having pain in the hands for having to do a

lot of homework, in the sense of being boring to be without games, in the sense of isolation, punishment and punishment, among an infinity of possible meanings to be interpreted indicially with the linguistic use "prison". Here, in our third discursive entry, we observe the slide from the meanings of "prison" for those who commit a crime and are in a penitentiary, to the metaphorical meanings of "prison" at school related to the loss of the right to play.

There is a slippage of the effects of the senses, that is, the word is said in another sense. It is possible to identify polysemy, the construction of other meanings, meaning can produce significance through metaphor, through "metaphorical effects", which can produce another argumentative course.

We will call the *semantic phenomenon* produced by a contextual substitution a metaphorical effect, in order to remember that this "slip of meaning" between x and y is constitutive of the "meaning" designated by x and y: this effect is characteristic of "natural" linguistic systems, as opposed to codes and "artificial languages", in which the meaning is fixed in relation to a "natural" metalanguage: in other words, a "natural" system does not include a metalanguage from which its terms could be defined: it is itself its own metalanguage. (PÊCHEUX, 1997, p. 96)

Faced with some meanings already interpreted, we cannot fail to mention Foucault (2014) when dealing with the meanings of prison, of being trapped in a discursivity, of the loss of rights and of saying, because even if only through discursive memory, "One knows oneself all the inconveniences of prison, and it is known to be dangerous, if not useless. And yet we don't 'see' what to put in its place. It is the detestable solution that cannot be given up. (FOUCAULT, 2014, p. 224). In line with Foucault, we have in clipping 3 the manifestation of an argumentative discourse that builds the senses of loss of the right to play related to "prison".

Some meanings that were prohibited at the beginning of our research are now interpreted with strangeness by the subject-students, due to the questions that were put in speech to provoke ruptures in the naturalized meanings. The questions denaturalize the dominant discursive formation about the school being a place to study and the non-valuation of playing at school, and, in this movement, the questionings are awakening the argumentation of the subject-students with the formulation of meanings, until then, prohibited. The movement made for the problematization of the right to play to happen was possible through the arguments of the subject-students. We are faced with an argument that defends playing the school, because without playing the school would be a prison. For us, we have arguments based on emotions here, as Plantin (2010) teaches us. In some discourses it is possible to identify polysemy and metaphorical effects; in others, paraphrase, repetition of the same meaning.

The analyzes never end, because for Discourse Analysis it is not possible to work on the linearity and stagnation of interpretations, the discourse is movement between subjects and meanings in/through history. As the subject is socio-historically-ideologically constituted, the data collected can be submitted to other analyzes that explore other meanings that echo in our *corpus*.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

In this article we analyze the argumentative movement of the elementary school students in the face of a questioning about playing and games at school, having as a starting point for the interpretation and formulation of the arguments five canvases by the painter Candido Portinari, which portray children's games.

Based on the concepts of AD, it was possible to analyze the effects of meaning

produced by the subject-students in their speeches, and, based on Plantin's (2008; 2010) studies on argumentation, we were able to interpret how the subjects talk about their emotions, valuing the affections that can echo in the argued senses. Through the valorization of orality as a possibility for the construction of argumentative discourses, determined by the conditions of production (interdiscourse, memory, imaginary formations), we constitute our *corpus* in which meanings echo depending on the discursive formations involved.

The practice of argumentation is seen here as a right, as well as the right to play. said by a censorship imposed by society is seen as silence; however, the supposed silence is always accompanied by infinite possibilities of meaning (ORLANDI, 2005).

We understand that the school must be the place to think and reflect on other (im)possibilities to sign up and stand out politically in society, since everything that must follow ready-made molds and imposed rules ends up silencing subjects and meanings. However, the dominant discursive formation in the school does not value the work with polysemy or interpretation, since the school institution asserts itself in the work with paraphrase and the subject-students are captured by the dominant ideology and repeat what they can and do. must be said. However, in the case of our research, the subject-students, when faced with a situation of questioning and problematization that opened the possibility for the movement of the senses, argued according to their emotions, as we interpret with the metaphor in which being a child without playing is being doomed to "prison", having rights restricted, not having the freedom to be what you want due to the obligation to follow the rules imposed by the school.

Through the discourses and arguments of the subject-students, it was possible to

interpret the dispute of the senses about the dominant discursive formation according to which the school is the place to study and not to play. By having access to other senses, the research subjects produced ruptures in the dominant discourse, as they assumed the right to argue in favor of the senses with which they identify, in this case, children need play and friends to be happy.

An activity that listens to and interprets orality through a conversation circle can favor situations of argumentation, in which the subject-student, when questioned by the teacher, can argue against or in favor of certain meanings, interpret and position himself in his speech.

REFERENCES

ALTHUSSER, Louis. **Aparelhos ideológicos de Estado**. Tradução: Walter José Evangelista; Maria Laura Viveiros de Castro. Rio de Janeiro: Edições Graal, 1985.

BECK, Maurício; FONSECA, Rodrigo Oliveira; SANTOS, Aretuza Pereira dos. Recortes discursivos, paradigma indiciário e procedimentos contra-indutivos. **Linguagem em (Dis)curso** – LemD, Tubarão, SC, v. 19, n. 1, p.153-171, jan./abr. 2019. DOI:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/1982-4017-190102-DO0219>. Disponível em: http://www.portaldeperiodicos.unisul.br/index.php/Linguagem_Discurso/article/view/6998/4297. Acesso em 26 jul. 2021.

CALDAS, Ana Caroline Del Bem. **Discurso e sujeito em movimento argumentativo: brincadeiras e arte em Portinari**. 2021. Dissertação (Mestrado em Educação) - Faculdade de Filosofia, Ciências e Letras de Ribeirão Preto, Universidade de São Paulo, Ribeirão Preto, 2021.

FERNANDES, Cleudemar Alves. **Análise do discurso: reflexões introdutórias**. 2.ed. São Carlos: Claraluz, 2008.

FOUCAULT, Michel. **Vigiar e punir: nascimento da prisão**. Tradução: Raquel Ramallete. 42.ed. Petrópolis/RJ: Vozes, 2014.

GINZBURG, Carlo. **Mitos, emblemas, sinais: morfologia e história**. Tradução: Federico Carotti. 2.ed. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 1989.

GRÁCIO, Rui Alexandre. **A interação argumentativa**. 1.ed. Coimbra: Grácio Editor, 2010.

ORLANDI, Eni Puccinelli. **Análise do Discurso: princípios e procedimentos**. 6.ed. Campinas, SP: Pontes, 2005.

ORLANDI, Eni Puccinelli. **Efeitos do verbal sobre o não-verbal**. São Paulo: Cortez; Campinas, SP: Editora da UNICAMP, 1995.

ORLANDI, Eni Puccinelli. Recortar ou segmentar? *In: Linguística: Questões e Controvérsias. Série Estudos*. Uberaba: Faculdades Integradas de Uberaba, 1984. p. 09-26.

PACÍFICO, Soraya Maria Romano. **Argumentação e autoria nas redações de universitários: discurso e silêncio**. Curitiba: Appris, 2012.

PACÍFICO, Soraya Maria Romano. **Argumentação e autoria: o silenciamento do dizer**. 2002. Tese (Doutorado). Faculdade de Filosofia, Ciências e Letras de Ribeirão Preto/USP, Ribeirão Preto, 2002.

PACÍFICO, Soraya Maria Romano. O direito à argumentação no contexto escolar. *In: PIRIS, Eduardo Lopes; OLÍMPIO-FERREIRA, Moisés. (Org.). Discurso e argumentação em múltiplos enfoques*. 1ed. Coimbra: Grácio Editor, 2016, v. 1, p. 191-212.

PÊCHEUX, Michel. Análise Automática do Discurso. Tradução: Eni Orlandi. *In: GADET, Françoise & HAK, Tony. (Orgs.). Por uma análise automática do discurso: uma introdução à obra de Michel Pêcheux*. 3.ed. Campinas, SP: Editora da UNICAMP, 1997. p. 59-158.

PÊCHEUX, Michel. Papel da memória. *In: ACHARD, P. et al. (Org.) Papel da memória*. Tradução e introdução José Horta Nunes. Campinas: Pontes, 1999.

PÊCHEUX, Michel. **Semântica e discurso**: uma crítica à afirmação do óbvio. Tradução: Eni Puccinelli Orlandi et al. 5.ed. Campinas, SP. Editora da UNICAMP. 2014.

PETRI, Verli. O funcionamento do movimento pendular próprio às análises discursivas na construção do “dispositivo experimental” da Análise de Discurso. *In*: PETRI, Verli; Dias, Cristiane. **Análise de Discurso em perspectiva**: teoria, método e análise. Santa Maria: UFSM, 2013. p. 39-48.

PLANTIN, Christian. **A argumentação**: história, teorias e perspectivas. Tradução: Marcos Marcionilo. São Paulo: Parábola, 2008.

PLANTIN, Christian. As razões da emoção. *In*: MENDES, Emilia; MACHADO, Ida Lucia (Orgs). **As emoções no discurso**. Campinas, São Paulo: Mercado de Letras, 2010. p. 57-80.