

Arts, Linguistics, Literature and Language Research Journal

THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE OCCURRENCE REPORT FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF THE PHILOSOPHY OF LANGUAGE: THE QUESTION OF SUBJECTIVITY

Sérgio Nunes de Jesus

Professor Doctor. Effective Professor of:
Instituto Federal de Educação, Ciência e
Tecnologia de Rondônia – IFRO. Permanent
professor of the Postgraduate Program -
ProfEPT (IFRO), campus: Cacoal

Celso Ferrarezi Junior

Professor Doctor. Semantics Holder at:
Instituto de Ciências Humanas e Letras da
Universidade Federal de Alfenas, UNIFAL,
Alfenas-MG, Brazil

Ana Christina de Sousa Damasceno

Master Teacher. Coordinator and teacher of
the Pedagogy Course at Faculdade de Ensino
Superior de Parnaíba, FAESPA, Parnaíba-PI,
Brazil

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



Abstract: One of its main functions is to elucidate the relevance of language as a key factor in the construction and definition of the meanings expressed in the police investigation, more precisely in the detailing and presentation of interpretative evidence. In such documents, links and relationships of meaning are found in the interface between language and the respective discourse used, whether direct, indirect or free indirect. A methodology based on bibliographical review and documentary analysis was used, with different authors from the field of linguistics appearing and the ideas of Bakhtin and Voloshinov gaining importance in our analysis. The research has a qualitative nature. In the end, we present the relationship between language and discourse and the construction of meaning, as well as the applicability of these analyzes in the context of police investigations, highlighting that language always arises from an experiential relationship between social entities.

Keywords: 1. Language and Discourse; 2. Police reports; 3. Subjectivity; 4. Bakhtin Circle; 5. Philosophy of Language.

TO START THE CONVERSATION...

In a first analysis, it is worth highlighting that the study of natural languages and linguistic communication processes is not restricted to the meaning and structure of these languages, as one might initially imagine. In the field of non-analytical philosophy of language, for example, as in Bakhtin and Voloshinov (1997), natural languages are understood far beyond a merely material or monochromatic value: they hold meanings and materialize in the form of discourses that are different from their structural materiality.

The process of attributing meanings and their application within social relations has, in processes such as vocabulary selection, syntactic structuring and the definition

of narrative focus, some structural tools, but it is not restricted to that alone. In the formulations of Police Reports, hereinafter (BO), for example, which portray, through the use of language, the relationships between individuals, the power relations occurring in the process and the application of the clerk's interpretation in the text show that there is more than the word material there. In reported speech, for example, the subjectivity factor is fundamental for understanding legal documents, since both the author of the Bulletin (the clerk) and the person testifying who expose their 'truth', or better, what they claim to be the veracity of the facts, but only the clerk records it. In other words, only the 'truth' and the subjective view of the facts that is constructed by the clerk end up in the procedural records (outside the initial instance of the Police Station).

Thus, in the relationship between author (scribe) and interlocutor (deponent), in a formalized environment in which the former represents state authority, there is an exchange of information, views and 'truths' that are interpreted and recorded in writing on the official side of the social relationship and, therefore, it is natural to believe that the subjectivity of the clerk ends up imposing itself anchored in his state authority.

This is because individuals, when placed under the tutelage of the State, this institution, based on its own legal norms about what is 'right' or 'wrong', ends up exercising the monopoly of uttering the truth, as an object of 'proof of the facts. It is expected that this pronouncement respects ethical and moral limits, within the legal scope, accepted by society - without much choice, by the way - so that decisions based on rationality and equity are reached. However, in this journey between the filing of a complaint and the deliberation by the state authority (the Police - Civil, in this case), the interpretation of public agents

may end up interfering. From this perspective, it is understood that subjectivity is a product inherent to the human being and that it presents several facets, but it is precisely in this field of dispute of forces (those intended to be objective and those undesirably subjective) that the “results of the process” can be drastically altered and some injustice be perpetrated.

With all this in mind, throughout this work, we will seek to investigate, especially from the perspective of Bakhtin and Voloshinov's ideas, which elements interfere in this social relationship and in the construction of this genre of official discourse. The work is developed from the perspective of language as a social fact (for Russian authors) and the question of the subject in linguistic exchange relationships. An investigative character of the subjective condition inherent to the individual is established, as language is born as an object aimed at human expression. This way, in addition to investigating the issue of subjectivity in human relationships, this text goes beyond the merely theoretical objective, while also aiming at a more practical reflection on the material pieces called incident report.

To this end, the practice of exploratory research was used, which, for Lakatos and Marconi (1996), is a form of empirical investigation, whose main objective is the formulation of questions or a problem, with the aim of developing hypotheses, increase the researcher's familiarity with the environment, fact or phenomenon or modify and clarify concepts. It is also related to the meaning that people attribute to experiences in the world and the way they understand the world in which we live (PRODANOV, 2006).

According to Gil (1991), exploratory research tends to be more flexible in its planning, as it aims to observe and understand the most varied aspects related to the phenomenon studied by the researcher. Still

according to Gil (1991), the most common exploratory research is bibliographical surveys and, at some point, most scientific research goes through an exploratory stage, as it is natural for the researcher to seek to familiarize themselves with the phenomenon they intend to study.

THE USE OF LANGUAGE IN SOCIAL RELATIONS

A priori, the communicative process is one of the main cognitive activities of human beings, occupying a large part of their brain capacity and having enormous influence on the construction of cognition itself. However, in addition to these biological factors, communication is a social act, whether represented by writing or orally. Regarding this social character of communication, Bakhtin and Voloshinov (1992) emphasize that dialogism is the essence of all verbal interaction. For the authors: “[...] the word dialogue can be understood in a broader sense, that is, not only as communication out loud, of people placed face to face, but all verbal communication, of any type that be” (p. 123).

Therefore, this is one of the reasons to believe that linguistic facts are not restricted to single meanings, presenting multiple meanings. Therefore, it is essential that there is an emphasis on the active character of each subject acting in the communicative act and, no less important than that, on aspects related to the action of otherness in the construction of each individual, with changes in their discursive ethos in real interaction situations. linguistics. So much so that Bakhtin (2004) tends to reject both a subject exempt from their respective social insertion, superimposed on the social, and a subject fully subjected to the socio-historical environment. In other words: it denies the existence of ‘a subject who is as fully a source of meaning for

his or her discourse as a subject fully subject to the discourse of others. This is how there is a middle ground between fully subjective action and social influence on the subject in each linguistic act.

This proposal is that the conception of the subject encompasses a vision of the 'I' for the self, the self for the other and the other for the self.¹ It constitutes this way, the condition of a subjective identity formation. But, on the other hand, it also encompasses a function of the 'self' for the 'other', insofar as it is inserted in a plane of social identity, that is, no longer of the subject within himself, but of the subject on a social plane, exercising a social function and acting on its discursive ethos to constitute itself as a subject in this function, as a participant in a society (cf. BRAIT, 2005) (excerpts that I highlighted). Therefore, language develops as a product of the interaction between individual and society as factors that interconnect:

In reality, every word has two faces. It is determined both by the fact that it comes from someone and by the fact that it is addressed to someone. It constitutes precisely the product of the interaction between the speaker and the listener. Every word serves as an expression of one in relation to the other. Through words, I define myself in relation to others, that is, ultimately, in relation to the collective. The word is a kind of bridge between me and others.

(BAKHTIN, VOLOCHINOV, 2004, p. 113).
(excerpts that I highlighted)

In short, there is nothing in the composition of meaning that is independent of the dialectical broadening of the social horizon. In this sense, as the entities that form a society are in constant transformation, each one this way, integrates and forms the meaning of their own 'self' as a whole (that is: constituted in the relationship with the other). Therefore, there

1. These are established in "Towards a philosophy of the Act".

is no immutability in this relationship between society and individual. In view of this, it is for this reason that meaning, an abstract element equal to itself, is absorbed by the theme and torn apart by its living contradictions, to finally return in the form of a new meaning with an equally provisional stability and identity. (cf. BAKHTIN; VOLÓCHINOV, 1992).

Still in the same line of reasoning, Bakhtin/Volóchinov (2004, p. 144-5) states that: the speech of others develops more than just about the topic, since it enters the syntactic construction of the speech and is considered as an integral unit of this construction. This way, it is added that the cited speech can be seen as preserving structural and semantic autonomy without altering the fabric of the language of the context that integrated it. This way, "the narrator's enunciation, having integrated another enunciation into its composition, elaborates syntactic, stylistic and compositional rules to partially assimilate it, [...]". The author also highlights that in the quoted speech there are dynamic and tense relationships determined by the specific purpose of the quote. Therefore, he states that: "every transmission, particularly in written form, has its specific purpose: narrative, legal processes, scientific controversy, etc." (BAKHTIN, 2004, p. 146).

It is in this context that Bakhtin/Voloshinov's vision turns and develops towards elucidating the particularities of language from a dialogical approach.

In *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics* (1997[1929]), when explaining that his object of study is 'discourse', Bakhtin defines it as "language in its concrete and living integrity and not language as a specific object of linguistics" (p. 181). It thus shows that the interest of his theory is in analyzes carried out based on dialogic relations, at the level of discourse, and not in structural linguistic analyses, in the 'strict sense of the term', at the

level of language, as seems to have been the case. trend in Russian Language Philosophy at the time. He then proposes a new discipline - metalinguistics - as a study of aspects of the life of discourse that go beyond the limits of structuralist linguistics. However, he makes it clear that linguistic analyzes cannot be ignored and their results must be applied by metalinguistic research.

In summary, in Russian Language Philosophy at the beginning of the 20th century, dialogism is the main condition of discourse and, in relation to it, a distinction is made, namely: dialogue between interlocutors and dialogue between discourses. In the first case, there is the founding principle of language, which consists of the production of meanings as the production and interpretation of texts take place between the subjects of interaction. Therefore, intersubjectivity is prior to subjectivity and results from the plurality of the many social voices received and re-elaborated by the individual, since, "the being, reflected in the sign, is not only reflected in it, but also refracted" (BAKHTIN; VOLÓCHINOV, 1992, p. 46). However, each of the subjects occupies a determined space and time and, as entities that constitute a society, they assume participation and responsibility for the activities carried out, which take place on the border between the self and others.

According to the observation of Bakhtin (1992), in *Os Gêneros do Discurso*:

[...] The object of a speaker's speech, whatever it may be, is not the object of speech for the first time in this utterance, and this speaker is not the first to speak of it. In this analysis, the object, so to speak, has already been spoken about, controversial, clarified and judged in different ways, in view of this, it is the core, in which different points of view, world views, intersect, meet and separate. Tendencies. A speaker is not the biblical Adam (...) (BAKHTIN, 1992, p. 319).

Bakhtin (1992), in turn, states that no

discourse is originally pure, since, like every object present in society, in its formation, interpretation and cultural and personal elements are at stake, such as beliefs, values, ideologies, intentions, each person's worldview, etc. Therefore, in this interaction product, there is no complete overlap of an interlocutor over the hierarchical relationship, since the subjects establish themselves based on an active responsive attitude. It is this way that, as we have said, intersubjectivity precedes the construction of subjectivity, since the constitution of dialogical subjects is inherent to human nature, that is, a human being connects to another subject and, to a certain extent, mirrors or mirrors it. the active refraction.

Bakhtin/Volóchinov (1992), in turn, also develops, this way, the concept of "social value index", which affects not only the choice of themes, but, above all, the factor of the practice exercised by the actors in their activities. symbolic manifestations. This way, "nothing other than that which has acquired a social value can enter the domain of ideology, take shape and lay down roots there" (Idem, p. 26). This way, an integration between individual consciousness and social relations will be seen, with the individual subject being an active agent influenced and influencing these manifestations.

While interiority is not considered in a purely subjective way, exteriority is objectively recognized, however, always as a social construction. In view of this, both subjects and their respective social representations will only be able to assume an ideological action to the extent that they present social value given by interindividuality and not based merely on individual consciousness.

That said, given this conception of the process of dialogism in social relations, it becomes easier to understand the relationship established between language and subjects in

a communicative act. The meaning is not in the word, which in MFL is criticized about the Saussurian approach, because for Bakhtin/Voloshinov the 'word' has potential meaning and will have 'as many meanings' as there are contexts in which it is inserted. From this perspective, French Discourse Analysis (AD), for Russians, in the interaction process that presupposes the resumption of what has already been said, is shared knowledge for both theories: dialogic and French discourse analysis.

Therefore, every utterance is a link in the chain of other utterances, which makes language open to new utterances capable of constructing new meanings.

As a result, the conception of language from a dialogical approach is configured as a refusal to any closed way of dealing with questions of linguistic meaning, since, with dialogism being a constitutive and structuring factor, "interaction" with the other is an assumption. Therefore, considering and evaluating language as a manifestor of discourses is, above all, recognizing its "internal dialogicality", since it is not the external compositional form that will determine the dialogical content (BAKHTIN, 1998, p. 92).

It can be seen, therefore, that the Russian Philosophy of Language at the beginning of the 20th century is the precursor of an enunciative-discursive vision that considers and establishes language as an activity that is established in a concrete process in which the sign is established ideologically and dialogically. Therefore, there is no movement of appropriation of linguistic signs in a closed system, given that the sign only exists in circulation. Thus, we see that, in an idiomatic dictionary, there are only virtualities, potentialities that, in use, will be dialogued and ideologized.

Therefore, language has life only when inserted in an enunciative-discursive space.

All manifestations that involve man are constituted as language, statement or text. Thus, his position is clear in (BAKHTIN, 1992), since every 'text' has a subject, is enunciated, and intersects the verbal and the extraverbal (whose meanings are in the verbal and non-verbal components).

Enunciation, therefore, is a process that challenges speaker and listener, is organized in the social environment that surrounds the individual and in the dialogical relationships that are established between individuals.

However, there is a more stable part that dissociates itself from a more unstable one, therefore, it must be observed in the constitution of the interaction: the meaning and the theme (BAKHTIN/VOLÓCHINOV, 1997). While meaning is configured as a more stable dimension, represented by the linguistic materiality of enunciative production, the theme is configured and characterized as a more variable dimension, like the enunciation itself and, therefore, is unique and non-reiterable. Therefore, the theme is made up of verbal and non-verbal aspects.

Furthermore, the constitution in text is a condition for there to be an object of study and thought. In this sense, although language is not limited to the verbal in the notions developed by the so-called Bakhtinian circle, relevance is given to the word as an ideological phenomenon par excellence, that is, it is always socially oriented towards a real or virtual interlocutor. This observation is highlighted in Bakhtin/Volóshinov (1997) when he considers the word as the purest and most sensitive mode of social transformations.

From this perspective, the word intersects the verbal and the non-verbal and is constituted as an utterance, as it receives an accent of value. Therefore, if, on the one hand, the word lives under the sign of otherness when being inscribed in an interpretative way, on the other, every human manifestation, by

having an evaluative accent, is also inscribed as an utterance, as language. Therefore, it can be understood that the meaning and the theme coexist, interdependently in the enunciation, in which space different values develop since the meaning in the enunciation is inseparably constituted from its theme.

However, although the theme depends on meaning and vice versa, as one is not a simple reflection of the other, the “same words” mean differently, that is, they come to life from evaluative social assessments created in the enunciative process, which point to for different historical aspects, not always linguistically signaled, but called out in the enunciation and corresponding to each of the participating subjects.

Therefore, the Russian thinker highlights that “dialogical relationships are absolutely impossible without logical and concrete-semantic relationships, but they are irreducible to these and have their own specificity” (BAKHTIN; VOLÓCHINOV, 1997, p. 184). Having said that, he clarifies that the study of language as a logical relationship requires an enunciative approach and that the study of discourse based on dialogical relationships is irreducible to logicity.

The existence of a single or standardized language, for example, would not be possible unless through oppressive cultural intervention, given that there is great cultural pluralism in nations, that is, disparate cultures use the same linguistic form. One can imagine, therefore, that unifying centripetal social forces could act to eradicate diversity, suppress or marginalize other centrifugal cultural and linguistic forces, which, in turn, come into conflict with the former.

This was what happened, for example, in the processes of European colonization of peoples, in the 14th to 16th centuries, which resulted, according to estimates, in the reduction of the then 13 thousand existing

human languages to the current 6,500-6,800 (depending on the classificatory criteria).

However, centrifugal forces trigger what has been called heterodiscourse, fostering the idea that even the most unified and standardized culture or language is permeated by otherness and historical relativity. The concept of heteroglossia captures the continuous movement of the language, refusing the hegemony and the process of centralization and standardization of a single language, given that there is always a relativity present between the mind and the object. Bakhtin thus highlights that:

In essence, for individual consciousness, language as a living socio-ideological concreteness and as a plurilingual opinion, is placed at the limits of its territory and at the limits of the territory of others. The word of the language is a semi-alien word. It only becomes “proper” when the speaker populates it with his intention, with his accent, when he dominates it through speech, makes it familiar with his semantic and expressive orientation (BAKHTIN, 1998, p. 100). (excerpt highlighted by the author)

After having said that, we assume that language has and forms relevance only when it is exercised by the individual in a dialogical act, that is, when the word is populated by the subjective character and by the intentions and peculiarities of social discourse. It is there that it is completed with meanings from various subjects and their disparate views, becomes socially thematized and becomes viable as a communicative object that ‘produces’ something in terms of language.

LANGUAGE ANALYSIS IN THE CONTEXT OF POLICE REPORTS

In any context of use, language is an analyzable object. And, like any research object, its analysis can be carried out from different theoretical perspectives or even points of systemic focus. Here, as we are dealing with discourses and their relationship with subjectivity, we will focus on how the subjectivity of the police clerk (or the ostensible police officer) when writing an incident report can interfere with the final result of recording the speech given by the deponent and how this can interfere with the informative framework of a process. Therefore, it is appropriate to pay attention to the discourse of these two entities, which make up this relationship of report, 'translated' record and procedural insertion. That being said, it must be noted that:

In reality, every word has two faces. It is determined both by the fact that it comes from someone and by the fact that it is addressed to someone. It constitutes precisely the product of the interaction between the speaker and the listener. Every word serves as an expression of one in relation to the other. Through words, I define myself in relation to others, that is, ultimately, in relation to the collective. The word is a kind of bridge between me and others. (BAKHTIN, 2004, p. 113). (excerpts I highlighted)

which assures us that, in the process of exchanging information between the deponent and the clerk, it must be considered that, in the context of a police investigation, more or less recordings of the speech given by the deponent may occur, a since the clerk 'translates' the deponent's speech into the form of a written record of speech.

In a police investigation, material evidence (such as photographs, documents, elements collected at the scene of the crime, etc.) and subjective evidence that are constituted and acquired by the so-called incident report must

be considered.

The premises for the construction (materialization) of an incident report is that there is absolute meaning in the record of the speech spoken by those who witnessed the scene, by the perpetrator and/or the victim of the alleged crime reported/reported. Regardless of how and by whoever it may be, in principle it is already natural to conceive that these "evidences" are constituted as discourses and, thus, carry with them a strong burden of interpretation of the fact, of acceptance of an accredited version and of subjectivity inherent to the affections that these situations cause. It is not just that language behaves in its 'principled' sense as an exchange of information between social entities, but that this language, in particular, is a 'repainting' of a fact of high level of tension that occurred and in which, in some way, the deponent takes part. Therefore, one could no longer speak of total descriptive exemption on the part of the deponent.

On the other hand, the state authority that records this testimony, which is already somewhat unbiased in its origins, does not do so through sound recording or filming, but does so in the format of a written, non-shorthand record, but selecting information that it judges and constitutes relevant aspects of the event that occurred. and registering them through direct or indirect speech (rare) or through free-indirect speech (statistically more common).

The construction of a speech parallel to the speech given by the complainant is configured as a 're-selection of words and syntactic structures' that can alter the general meaning of the utterance or focal aspects of its content, because it is quite common for the scribe uses a mixture of voices of those who report and those who record the report. In this context of exchanging voices, factors such as environment, worldview, communicative

situation (more or less tense, for example), additional information from each party and acceptance of the other's speech are intrinsically related. Let's think about two concrete situations that illustrate these aspects outlined above:

Situation 1: A poor woman, living in a slum, who reports aggression by her partner/spouse:

The deponent says: *“He grabbed me by the hair and threw me against the wall. I hit my face against the wall and hurt myself.”*

The clerk records the incident report.: *“The deponent alleges that her lover grabbed her by the hair and pushed her face against the wall of his shack, causing injuries.”*

Please note that the translation carried out is inappropriate in several ways:

1. “the deponent alleges that”, “would have” - can be interpreted as a false accusation; it gives the impression that this is a mere allegation and not fact. Likewise, the verb's option for the conditional tense assigns a semantic value of “doubt” to the translation of the spoken speech. Furthermore, the choice of the syntax “alleges the deponent” instead of “the deponent alleges”, changes the focus of the deponent's speech to the fact that what she says may be a mere “allegation”, a non-fact;
2. “your amásio” - although it is a common term in police environments, saying that the partner/spouse is an “amásio” has a pejorative connotation in the deponent's marital relationship and can cause an inference that, in itself, she is not very worthy of trust;
3. “from your shack” - although it was not said that the wall is from a shack or a mansion, extra-discursive information that the clerk has does not appear on record in a way that introduces yet another

pejorative element into in relation to the complainant, who, in addition to living in a “hut”, lives in a “shack”. It is evident that this lexical selection induces stigmas and social prejudices that speak against the complainant;

4. “causing injuries” - the deponent did not say that external injuries were caused. By not seeing external injuries and, by saying that it was an “allegation” against his “friend”, the clerk may lead to an incorrect judgment of the fact, for example, if the corpus delicti examination did not highlight the presence of external injuries on the deponent's face.

As can be seen, in just one sentence, the deponent's speech was altered in content and social value. Together with other documents from the police investigation, these choices (which we do not claim are conscious) can seriously interfere with the outcome of the investigation report.

Situation 2: A poor woman, living in a slum, who reports aggression by her partner/spouse.

The deponent says: *“He grabbed me by the hair and threw me against the wall. I hit my face against the wall and hurt myself.”*

The clerk records the incident report: *“The victim claims that her husband violently grabbed her by the hair and threw her against the wall of the house, and the victim hit her face hard against the wall of the house, causing internal injuries.”*

Note that the translation carried out is equally inappropriate in several ways:

1. “the victim”, “claims” - by labeling the deponent as a victim, it is taken for granted that the aggression occurred and that the complainant was actually “victimized”. The option for the syntax “the victim affirms” maintains the discursive focus on the victim and the option for the verb

“affirma”, in turn, gives the impression of trust and credibility to the report;

2. “violently”, “thrown” and “with force” - the presence of all these lexical elements refers to an intensified action. Although the aggression involved violence, here the deponent’s side is taken and the act of violence is aggravated by adding discursive elements of intensity in the translation to the speech given;

3. “husband”, “house” - in this translation, the words “husband” and “house” are more socially respectful, they give the victim more “reliability”, as they “paint a picture” of more marital and financial stability in the relationship to her (as opposed to “amásio” and “poor house”). In other words, the construction of the deponent’s discursive ethos by others may end up altering the view presented of the deponent in the police investigation report.

4. “internal bruises” - to believe the deponent’s speech and not seeing external bruises on her face, the translation opts for “internal bruises” as a way of configuring an agreement with a possible corpus delicti examination in which injuries were not certified on the deponent’s face. Once again, an extra-discursive interference appears in the translation of the delivered speech into its incident report form.

As it can be seen, the two recordings made appear, to an inattentive observer, to be the speech given. However, they are not and can interfere with the final result of the investigation report, leading to injustices in the judicial outcome, since they are not exempt in relation to the initial speech, even if this lack of exemption does not result from a volitional act on the part of the (a) clerk.

It is worth mentioning, therefore, that, from the perspective of the Philosophy of Language

that we use here, the process of analyzing indirect speech can include two “partitions”: the first, portrays the analysis of the discursive content, which maintains a distance between the quoting voice and the voice cited and focuses more specifically on what is assertive. The second, in turn, represents the analysis of linguistic expression itself and, therefore, aims at the construction, words and ways of saying other people’s speech, so that the subjective character of those who reconstruct it ends up becoming visible.

Thus, it must be understood that it is necessary to analyze and identify the marking and presence of the speeches of the subjects present in the O.B. In this sense, it can be inferred that the language present there is not restricted to just writing, but opens doors to the most varied discourses and interpretations. The other’s words introduced into our speech or ‘translated’ by it, are always coated with something new, that is, the understanding and individual evaluation of those who report.

In the sense specified above, this gains special relevance when we think about the objective of the incident report. After all, your text can strengthen some convictions, whether moral or social, in order to give prominence to certain voices to the detriment of others, reflecting, for example, unconfessed intentions and even unconscious world views, which can be strange and hostile to the content reported in the statement.

As Bakhtin and Voloshinov (1997, p. 41) say, “words are woven from a multitude of ideological threads and serve as the fabric of all social relations in all domains”. Furthermore, they emphasize that “the word is capable of recording the most intimate, most ephemeral transitory phases of social changes” (Idem).

For the authors, it is through discourse that dichotomies in social relations are revealed, which continually renew the [...] “living dialectical synthesis between the psychic and

the ideological, between inner life and outer life” (p 66).

Therefore, language from the dialogical approach cannot be studied outside of society or the discursive environment in which it occurs, since - the utterance, as a concrete unit of verbal interaction, has provisional stability and brings, in its constitution, characteristics of each situation of enunciation in which it is produced and circulates. Furthermore, it is configured as a link in a complex chain of other utterances, that is, it is full of echoes of other utterances, responding to something and anticipating an unspoken response-discourse, but requested in the direction of an interlocutor (real or virtual). The statement is, therefore, an ideological, dialogical, unique, unrepeatable sign and is established differently in each interaction. And it is clear that this relationship inserts the incident report. in the field of discursive analysis, since they constitute a real intersubjective communicative interaction.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

As something ‘alive’ in the field of social interactions, language holds, in its most basic character, an inherent factor in the dialogical relationship between individuals. In this sense, language develops in complex and different ways in each discursive situation.

In the light of Russian Language Philosophy from the beginning of the 20th century, especially that linked to the so-called Bakhtin Circle, we were able to exemplify this process of exchange and applicability of discourses in

the field of incident report production.

Although we emphasize that language is intrinsically related to historical and sociocultural factors, it is observed that it is not appropriate to support an ideal of standardization and hegemony of language as a merely descriptive and informative element, but that it is important to consider subjective and intersubjective aspects in acts of communication.

Based on this and the situations analyzed, we can consider that the BOs, although they are official documents of a state nature, are characterized as a materialization of the clerk’s speech as a form of translation of the deponent’s speech, and which contains, in its respective composition, marks of subjectivities and, consequently, materialities that reveal valuation, worldview and interpretation on the part of the entity that prepares and records it.

In this sense, the question of the subject, as presented in the Philosophy of Language used here, is not something of lesser value in the preparation of official documents (including the incident report.). In the relationship between the entities of the dialogue, the interference of subjectivities deserves relevance, since it defines to a high degree the participation of the subjects in the final materialized discursive result, interfering, later on, in the results of possible legal actions, other legal decisions or even in the simple way of building the citizen image of the subjects involved in the process, which, in itself, is no small feat.

REFERENCES

- BAKHTIN, Mikhail (VOLÓCHINOV, V. N.). *Marxismo e filosofia da linguagem: problemas fundamentais do método sociológico na ciência da linguagem*. 11. ed. Tradução de Michel Lahud e Yara Frateschi Vieira. São Paulo: Hucitec, 1992.
- BAKHTIN, Mikhail (VOLÓCHINOV, V. N.). *Marxismo e filosofia da linguagem: problemas fundamentais do método sociológico na ciência da linguagem*. 8. ed. Tradução de Michel Lahud e Yara Frateschi Vieira. São Paulo: Hucitec, 1997.
- BAKHTIN, Mikhail. *Questões de literatura e estética: a teoria do romance*. 8. ed. Tradução de Aurora Fornoni Bernadini, et al. São Paulo: UNESP/Hucitec, 1998.
- BAKHTIN, Mikhail (VOLÓCHINOV, V. N.). *Marxismo e filosofia da linguagem: problemas fundamentais do método sociológico na ciência da linguagem*. 11. ed. Tradução de Michel Lahud e Yara Frateschi Vieira. São Paulo: Hucitec, 2004.
- BRAIT, Beth. (Org.) *Bakhtin: conceitos chave*. São Paulo: Contexto, 2005.
- GIL, Antônio Carlos. *Como elaborar projetos de pesquisa*. São Paulo: Atlas, 1991.
- LAKATOS, Eva Maria; MARCONI, Marina de Andrade. *Fundamentos de metodologia científica*. 3. ed. São Paulo: Atlas, 1996.
- PRODANOV, Cleber Cristiano. *Manual de metodologia científica*. 3. ed. Novo Hamburgo, RS: Feevale, 2006.