FROM LANDLESS TO SETTLER: USE OF METAPHOR AND METONYMY IN RESETTLED DISCOURSES

Juliana de Oliveira Mendonça Ribeiro[1] and Welton Rodrigues de Souza[2]

ABSTRACT

The rural context of the city of Castilho-SP is currently characterized by the legalization of thirteen settlements, of which the Celso Furtado Settlement, the second largest in the region, the locus of this research, brings together one hundred and eighty-seven families. With the goal of contributing to studies on identity and on the subject-settler, the article intends to problematize the representations that a resident of the settlement makes of herself when she was designated as landless, addressing metaphor and metonymy through the theoretical constructs carried out by Orlandi (2015) and Fiorin (2002). To discuss the considerations about subject and discourse, we based ourselves on the theoretical assumptions of Pêcheux (1990) and Foucault (2018); identity, in turn, is seen in the wake of Hall (2020) and Coracini (2007); concept of exclusion, we refer to the contributions of Bauman (1998) and Bhabha (1998). The work is inscribed in the discursive bias, based on the Foucaultian archaeogenealogical method, which aims to discuss how knowledge arises and how it is transformed. To collect the data, we conducted an audio recorded interview in the settlement itself, in which the settler answered the question: how did she see herself as a landless person? We observed that exclusion is manifested through the representations that the settler attributes to the current identity and the images that she believes society makes of her.

Keywords: Identity. Exclusion. Metaphor. Metonymy. Landless.

---

[1] Doctorate in Letters
Federal University of Mato Grosso do Sul, UFMS, Brazil
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0001-4867-4317
LATTES: http://lattes.cnpq.br/2643556921640915
[2] Doctorate student in the Graduate Program in Education - Presidente Prudente
Universidade do Oeste Paulista, Unoeste, Brazil
E-mail: weltonprofessor10@gmail.com
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9779-7022
LATTES: http://lattes.cnpq.br/2632832859120465

INTRODUCTION

This research is the result of some concerns in the face of readings by scholars who focus on rural work in Brazil, among them Caldart (2004) and Martins (2003 and 2010), in addition to the interest in the study of the representation/identity of the settled subject. This interest is due to informal conversations we had with some settlers who provide services in the *Encontro das Águas* Condominium, six kilometers from the Celso Furtado settlement, in Castilho-SP. In these conversations, they sometimes let go what they "think" of their condition as settlers, in ambiguous formulations or statements, which provoked us to undertake this search for their sayings.

The globalized world of which we are part allows us to question various concepts crystallized during the history of some social group, which can lead to a discriminatory practice, in which social power can generate hegemonic thoughts and interdict those who do not believe in a homogeneous society.

According to Martins (2003, p. 122), the landless encampment can be defined as "the concrete appearance of the provisional, of nothingness and of the multiplication of all the legacies that could have existed one day [...] it is a moment of experiencing a process of desocialization, of elimination of social references and values that guide loyalties and behaviors". By qualifying the landless encampment as "provisional", Martins (2003) points to the fact that some basic requirements for human survival are generally not offered in this space.

Faced with the lack of resources, residents also lose the right to socialize, a situation that can put them on the margins of society. To this is added, according to Rodrigues (2011, p. 13), "that any type of social formation is tensely systematized in search of homogenization based on ideological positions of specific classes and groups". We understand that, even seeking homogenization, any type of social formation is considered heterogeneous, since it is based on several instances produced by the State. The notion of homogeneity is a necessary illusion of the subject, which is not materialized because there is no transparency of meaning, since its discourse can be sustained by subjectivity. In the certainty that he is capable of being the owner of his discourse and holder of his choices, intentions and decisions, the subject relies on this necessary illusion, forgetting that several voices are present in his speech, revealing his ideological inscription, his historicity and the discursive formations that permeate his sayings.

Also according to Rodrigues (2011, p. 21), social formations are defined as "heterogeneous". If they are totalizing and hegemonic, it is only by virtue of "a set of effects in their multiple materializations disseminated in the social fabric". Thus, in order to change from the condition of landless to settled, it is necessary to produce and regularize land ownership, through a document provided by INCRA (National Institute of Colonization and Agrarian Reform), which grants autonomy to legally settle the families of these rural producers.

To contextualize the MST (Landless Workers' Movement) in Brazil, we turn to Caldart's (2004) text, in which the author clarifies that the movement had its greatest repercussion on May 4, 1978, when about 1800 settler families were expelled from the Nonoai Indigenous Reserve, in Rio Grande do Sul, legally owned by Kaingang Indians since 1847. This fact contributed to the development of one of the main social movements in Brazil, the Landless Movement.

It is known that today, in Brazil, there is still an inequality in the distribution of land, thus predominating land concentration and, as agrarian reform does not happen, the implementation of the policy of rural settlements has been strengthened. We observe that the objectives of the MST go beyond agrarian reform, seeking the social inclusion of the landless and settlers. Landless encampments, which are usually perpetuated on the side of the roads, have a precarious infrastructure, in which several families raise their children, who, in turn, are exposed to social confrontations and lose their reference, which can contribute to social exclusion. (MARTINS, 2010).

That said, we propose to contribute to studies on the identity of the subject-settler, problematizing the representation he makes of himself when he was designated as landless, approaching metaphor and metonymy from the bias of Orlandi (2015) and Fiorin (2002) and for the concept of exclusion, we refer to the contributions of Bauman (1998) and Bhabha (1998).

This work is part of the perspective of the deconstructivist discourse, in which Coracini (2003, p.18) states that it is necessary to "problematize the situations naturalized by habit and that, for this very reason, seem unquestionable". We understand that we must understand the historical-social context of the subject in order to work on the discursive corpus with the purpose of deconstructing dichotomies and certainties built throughout history. Thus, we propose the deconstruction of homogeneous social groups and the fragmentation of behaviors. From this perspective, we consider that every discourse is

subject to deconstruction and, therefore, cannot present a meaning prior to interpretation, since the constitution of meanings is a result of various social spheres. We note, according to the author, that both the discursive approach and the deconstruction work with the social determination that acts in the constitution of the meanings. And in the archaeogenealogical method of Foucault (2008), in which the constitutive historicity added to the values in the social moment is addressed and reconstructs the historical singularities and their ruptures. In this way, the archaeogenealogical method developed by the philosopher excels in creating critical awareness about the circulation of discourses in the face of accepted truths and values practiced. This method supported the procedures for the analysis of the excerpt of the audio recorded interview with one sitting in the settlement itself.

Thus, this article is divided into three parts: presentation of the theory that underlies the analysis, by the concepts of exclusion, metaphor and metonymy, the methodology is inscribed in the discursive-deconstructivist perspective and in the Foucaultian archaeogenealogical method and the third item corresponds to analysis, in which we address metaphor and metonymy.

METHODOLOGY

According to Orlandi (2015, p. 59), Discourse Analysis "does not have a specific methodology, a model, a scheme already given that allows or could only frame data or a way of working with them", and it is up to the analyst to "adopt principles and procedures". Thus, there is no appropriate "scheme" for all those who propose to analyze discourses, because the purpose of DA is not to reinforce statistical data in quantitative research and does not excel in naming people, through numbers, tables and graphs. In the author's wake, we understand that the conditions of production comprise the subjects and the situation in which their discourse is uttered, interpreting the context, which encompasses a given discourse and the representation of the subject through the utterance he utters. Thus, the conditions of production act directly in the constitution of the senses and contribute to the analysis of a discursive event, pointing to the images that the speaker makes of the place from which he speaks, of himself, of the other and of the referent, images that direct and provoke meanings in his saying.

The notion ôf representation, on the other hand, is understood, according to Brandão (1998, p. 35), "as an operation, through which the subject appropriates the object, something that is heterogeneous to him and, converting it into an idea, makes it

homogeneous to consciousness". When thinking about representation, we resort to the discursive imaginary of Pêcheux (1990): every subject attributes images to the other and to himself. Through these images, he elaborates his discourses and determines the relations of meaning, which can be produced according to the social place he occupies. We observed that the social position occupied by the subject is inherent to his saying and, sometimes, can refer him to the place of the other. We then understand that the place that the subject occupies is responsible for his discourse and for the image he makes of himself and the other. In this article, we analyze the excerpt of an interview, recorded in audio and transcribed with the purpose of showing, in the words of the settler, the representation of her condition as a former landless person and of society.

The theoretical framework of the research was built through bibliographic investigations pertinent to French Line Discourse Analysis and Cultural Studies. The text also includes the studies carried out on the Landless Movement.

This investigation is part of the discursive-deconstructivist perspective, in which the analysis of any linguistic fact, according to Coracini (2003), must take into account the conditions of its production, that is, the historical-social context, the space where it was uttered, as well as the discursive place occupied by the subject, with the purpose of problematizing certain conducts. It is also based on the Foucaultian archaeogenealogical method, which aims to answer how knowledge arises and transforms, which, in a Nietzschean terminology, Foucault called "genealogy". We understand that there is no theory of power, but an understanding of how it is historically constituted, basing the idea of power on a provisional and unfinished theory. Power is not directed only by the State, but proliferates in various institutions, characterizing micropowers (Foucault, 2008). Archaeology, on the other hand, has the premise of approaching epistemology, that is, knowledge, building a history of knowledge. Foucault (2008) states that episteme can be defined as the specific order of knowledge and the configuration it assumes in a historical context.

The concept of interview, in turn, is treated from a discursive perspective that is regularized by a production situated in history and society, and can be carried out in a place agreed with the interviewer, which favors a more direct contact with the interviewee. It is worth remembering that the interview cannot be seen only as a mere instrument for collecting opinions that seeks to respond to the interviewer's personal desires. We understand that it aims to identify, in discursive practices, the meaning of the text and to

carry out a work of resignification, with the purpose of reaching the understanding of what was (not) said (Rocha *et. al.*, 2004).

RESULTS

French Discourse Analysis emerged in the French intelligentsia in the 1960s, marked by the conjunction between philosophy and political practice, already as a transdisciplinary field, which allows the discourse analyst to move between language and the social, in order to seek various theoretical networks and transform their view through them. Its initial milestone dates back to 1969, with the publication of the work *Automatic Discourse Analysis (AAD),* with Michel Pêcheux (1988), and the journal *Langages.* From these publications, DA reacts against structuralism, seeking the study of the subject, its discourses and its practices. It is worth remembering that DA was pressured by two factors that reflected a state of crisis at the time of its foundation: the evolution that was expanding in linguistic theories and the transformations in the historical and political field.

DA reflects the historical, social, economic and cultural path of the subject, revealing the composition of the meanings of his sayings in the face of the materialization of his language and demonstrating to the other which discourses permeate his identity. This is not innate to the human being and not concrete, but a continuous process of construction/transformation. And in this continuous process, language mediates between man and the social environment of which he is a part and, through his discourse, we observe the production of meanings that emanate from his sayings. Thus, by reading Orlandi (2015, p. 15 and 16) we understand that "discourse analysis does not work with language as an abstract system, but with language in the world, with ways of meaning, with men speaking, considering the production of meanings as members of a certain form of society".

Discourse, in turn, is defined by a set of utterances that are configured through ideological formations, considered unstable by the French DA. We understand that there is no discourse considered "unique", since the same discourse can be uttered by different subjects. The meanings of words are not literal, since they are linked to exteriority, so that all discourse is produced and guided by what has already been said[3] and manifests its effects of meaning through materiality. Pêcheux (1990) emphasizes that what has already been said is driven by the unconscious and ideology, elements that, in DA, cease to reside

only in language and become constitutive of discourse. The subject then presents himself as an individual interpellated by the ideologies that surround him; he is not, therefore, a mere supporting actor of the discourse, but the one responsible for the discourse he delivers, split by the interdiscourses that guide his sayings and constitute his identity. Pêcheux (1990) also takes up Althusser's concept of ideology, to fix the place of ideology in the construction of his theory of discourse. For him, the Ideological State Apparatus is not the expression of the dominant bourgeois ideology, but the place and means for the realization of this domination, that is, the dominant ideology is propagated in the discourses of social institutions, with the purpose of questioning the subjects, thus guiding the discourse.

Since the subject is questioned by social institutions, we refer to the concept of identity from the perspective of Coracini (2007), in which she reports that in the face of the illusion of univocity, the subject believes he is responsible for the formation of his identity, not attributing his constitution to the other. This is presented as an unfinished process, which is guided by moments of identification revealed by the discursive formations and the subject's unconscious. Identity is not, therefore, ready and finished; it is filled from our exterior and by the gaze of the other. In this way, every subject undergoes a constant identity transformation, due to the fact that he transits through various social institutions. We noticed a social search to name a certain group or nation, believing that, in this way, it is possible to attribute identities that seek homogeneity. In this regard, Coracini (2007, p. 49) points out that "there is no possible identity except in illusion, in the promise always postponed of awareness with oneself, of the imagined (and invented) belonging to a nation, to a group that equals or likens those who are unequal, unassimilable".

We understand, with Coracini (2007), that the search for the completeness of the subject in the face of his identity makes him believe in a homogeneous identity, even constituting himself as a desiring being. By believing in homogeneity, the personal characteristics of the individual, his historicity and the discursive formations that constitute or form his discourse are disregarded. By quoting Lacan, the author affirms the difficulty of considering alterity, since we fear annulling the characteristics of the subject and its discursive productions.

According to Hall (2020, p. 7), "the issue of identity is being extensively discussed in social theory [...] the old identities, which for so long have stabilized the social world, are in decline, giving rise to new identities and fragmenting the modern individual." We observe,

therefore, that concrete and conclusive identity is no longer part of the concept of modern identity and that the subject is no longer seen as a unified being; There is a process of change that is established today: the subject destabilizes the concept of homogenization and shakes the social structures that defend the fragmentation of identity. Therefore, an identity crisis is established in social environments, due to the fact that several subjects are not prepared to conceive the idea of a heterogeneous subject, which deconstructs the concept of univocity. The issue of destabilization brings a split subject, who is seen in and through the eyes of the other. There is a loss of sense of self and the subject is not stable and defined, since, in order to "form" his identity, he is invaded by various circumstances, such as ethnicity, gender, religion, social class and others. The changes that occurred in his life and the contact with other subjects represent his transformation process.

Hall (2020, p. 38) states that, in identity, "there is always something imaginary, or fantasized about its unity. It always remains incomplete, it is always in process, always being formed." Therefore, identity is not driven by rationality, but by the processes that emanate from the unconscious and by the ideological formations that surround the subject. In this way, we understand that incompleteness is part of their essence, as this subject seeks and desires, fantasizes and idealizes their self and the world of which they are a part. We understand, then, that identity is not ready and finished; it develops over time, through processes of identification that are inherent to consciousness and are presented throughout the subject's life.

Hall (2020) also states that the concept of identity can dialogue with cultural tradition, through a dynamic process of transformation and reiteration, in the same way that the articulations of cultural differences highlighted by Bhabha (1998) are carried out, when he refers to the "in-between-place", stating that the relationship with tradition enables subjects to seek an identity and confer authority to their discourses. Bhabha (1998, p.21) points out that "the recognition that tradition grants is a partial form of identification. By re-enacting the past, it introduces other cultural temporalities that are incommensurable in the invention of tradition." We understand that this process ends up removing from the subject the possibility of "original identity" or "received tradition", since these clashes in the face of cultural difference are consensual and conflicting, confusing our definitions of tradition and modernity.

Because we believe in a subject interpellated by social institutions, by the presence of the other, we then approach the concept of exclusion with the purpose of understanding

how these relations are made in the discourse and how they determine the place that the subject occupies in the environment in which he lives.

According to Bauman (1998, p. 27), the excluded subjects "do not fit into a standard accepted by most people, which makes them strangers, because their mere presence causes discomfort, bringing obscurity and generating uncertainty through their behaviors". We note that each society produces its strangers, at the same time that it creates aesthetic and moral standards to be followed, since these subjects do not fit into the behaviors stipulated by society.

Exclusion is not a state; it defines man's relationship with others. It does not have a single form, as it encompasses several groups and is determined by various behaviors, such as humiliation, violence and even exploitation. Nor is it a failure of the system, which some believe must be fought for disrupting social order. (Sawaia, 2001).

These social groups, according to Bhabha (1998, p. 21), do not only correspond to the image of the people who are part of them, but also to the "discursive and disciplinary place from which identity issues are strategically and institutionally posed". We understand that the institutions that shape the identity of the subject and conduct his discourse make him establish a conduct that he deems appropriate for the majority of people, trying to discipline him, which in a way corroborates the exclusion. Even in the face of this disciplinary power, the subject does not become passive, which contributes to him leaving his mark of resistance. According to the author, this conduct can, for many people, generate a "stain" on the subject's identity.

For Bhabha (1998), the place of difference and alterity never moves away from the subject's social life, configuring itself as a pressure that is gradually established, which occurs unevenly throughout the subject's life, contributing to discriminatory practices that can disqualify social groups. Thus, we understand that the discriminatory effects are carried out through a strategy of refusal of that or that which does not fit into the vast majority of social conducts and does not accept subjection.

In postulating exclusion, Bhabha (1998, p. 163) mentions that discriminated subjects "can be instantly recognized, but they also force a recognition of the immediacy and articulation of authority". We understand that, by recognizing the authority that is around him, the subject acquires the power of intervention and frees himself from silent repression, representing, through the statement, aspirations, behaviors and the voices that permeate his sayings.

In the case of the places from which the subjects of the research enunciate, we can say that they are in-between-places, which are the result of social, ideological and racial differences. Bhabha (1998, p. 20) states that "it is in the emergence of interstices, the overlapping of domains of difference, that the intersubjective and collective experiences of nation, than community interest or cultural value are negotiated." This subject of the "in-between-place" realigns the boundaries of space and time and dialogues with its past to highlight its identity transformation. Thus, we understand that he does not have a defined social condition and transits between the past (the before) and the present (the now). In addition, we note that metaphor and metonymy also permeate in his sayings.

To discuss metaphor and metonymy, we can turn to the study carried out by Fiorin (2002, p.65) in which the author seeks to undertake the sign as a denotation and connotation. To this end, the author addresses that the "sign is the union of a plane of expression with a plane of content". And as an example, he presents the denotative meaning that permeates the word eye, which defines the organ of the body responsible for vision, and the word cat (mammalian and domestic animal), which together call the word cat's eye, which encompasses a meaning. In the language, the term "cat's eye" designates, according to the scholar (2002, p. 65), "a flat iron placed on small poles installed along the roads, which reflect the light of the headlights of the automobiles, to mark the limits of the roadbed".

We then understand that the sign denoted on the plane of expression is a sign to which we can add a plane of content. Thus, by adding meaning to the meaning already existing in the sign denoted, we corroborate with the change of meaning, thus creating another meaning for the connoted sign. In view of this, Fiorin (2002) justifies that this relationship is concluded if there is a significant relationship that is added to the already existing other.

When we go through the studies of meaning carried out by Fiorin (2002), we visualize the concept of metaphor and metonymy in the utterances. For him, metaphor is the addition of one meaning to another by means of a relationship of similarity and by the transfer of meanings. Therefore, when we return to the example of the expression "cat's eye", we understand that devices placed on the sides of roads are defined in this way by the fact that they reflect light, as happens with the eyes of the mammalian cat. Metonymy, on the other hand, is the addition of meaning to another, generating proximity in which the property of being designates being, as an example we cite the sayings: hunger is always

illiterate, in hunger it is resuming the expression miserable, since in metonymy the being designates another.

Orlandi (2015), on the other hand, emphasizes the metaphor by addressing the unconscious and the historicity that permeates the subject's sayings that stabilizes means of procedures of analysis of the subject's discourse. Thus, the metaphorical effect, the slippage, typical of the symbolic and the place of interpretation, ideology and historicity "are proper to the relationship of language and discourse. That is, according to her, these slips and the metaphorical effect on interpretation point to the duplicity of discourse that in psychoanalysis involves the unconscious, and in discourse analysis involves ideology. Thus, it is in the slips of the senses that the metaphorical effect —is at the basis of the constitution of the senses and the subjects (Orlandi, 2015, p. 63).

Still for the author, when working with discursive materiality, the analyst can stabilize the paraphrase and metaphor in the analysis within his practice, considering the equivocation, that is, the failure of the language inscribing itself in history. Thus, paraphrase and metaphor can be defined as basic analytical supports, since both are defined differently by discourse analysis. Therefore, when we think about the configuration of discursive formations, it is the paraphrase that is at the basis of the notion of drift, which in turn is related to what Pêcheux (1990) defines as a metaphorical effect, which would be the semantic phenomenon manufactured by a contextual substitution, producing a slippage of meaning, in which the analyst's gesture of interpretation, When describing and interpreting a discourse, it operates with paraphrase and metaphor as constitutive of the functioning of discursiveness.

For Orlandi (2015), paraphrase and metaphor have the function of making explicit procedures of analysis and constitute a mark of specificity of discourse analysis, as it introduces a notion of metaphor that does not derive from literary studies, in the same way that the concept of memory does not refer only to chronological notions. Thus, when working with these notions within the corpus, the analyst has the possibility of working on what is stabilized and the subject's mistake in the discourse.

DISCUSSION

The statements analyzed are from a 37-year-old settler, designated A1, who became a settler six years ago, having remained in the condition of landless for four years. In this excerpt, she talks about the representation of the condition of being landless:

A 01: For the social we were a bunch of vagabonds... When we were landless it was complicated... because you had to live in a canvas shack, right... there wasn't a bathroom... you had to dig a hole surrounded by tarpaulin to relieve yourself... you lived a precarious life for help from other people... because you were there and couldn't work... the assistance they gave us was very little, right... you couldn't go out to work... neither man nor woman... So you had to stay there, right... For the record that you lived there... to be able to get a piece of land, right[...] We went through humiliation like this, sometimes... that sometimes people passed by on the edge of the road, cursed us... he said that we were troublemakers, right/ he said... "Go to work you bum you landless"... then it was humiliating... but how we wanted a piece of land, right... we submitted to everything to this... that days and days passed I left today I left tomorrow... thank God that one day it worked out, it came out and we did it.

Right at the beginning of her words, the settler states that the condition of being landless placed her as a "slut", bringing the effect of a sense of profiteering that detaches her image from a subject that is encompassed in most social molds, due to the condition of not working to promote her own livelihood. To corroborate this view, according to Michaelis (2014, p. 35), the term "band" is defined as "gathering of people or animals; faction and party; undisciplined troops; company of evildoers; gang; a certain number of families associated on a permanent basis and inhabiting a certain region; people who walk the streets asking for financial help for some work or for some work". By resorting to the theoretical constructs of Fiorin (2002), we observe that the junction of the signs "band" and "vagabond" leads to the concept of metaphor and metonymy, since for the author metaphor is realized by the addition of one meaning to another through the relationship of similarity and transfer of meanings. Therefore, we understand that the term "band" asks for another sign to determine which band we are referring to, in which the word "vagabond" was inserted, thus bringing an effect of depreciating meaning to the representation of the landless and the metonymy, which for Fiorin (2002) is understood as the addition of meaning to another meaning.

We observe the reiteration of "a gente", placing all the settlers in the same condition, because they suffered from the same human deprivations, in the period in which they lived in the landless camps. These deprivations are presented throughout the cut. In the words: "because you had to live in a canvas shack", "you didn't have a bathroom", "you had to dig a hole surrounded by canvas to relieve yourself", we note that the condition of being landless does not provide subject A1 with "taking care of himself", which, for Foucault (1998), means developing activities and creating conditions that contribute to existence. On the other hand, by expressing all the precariousness experienced as landless, A1 also brings the discourse of victimization, which, according to Martins (2003), is a situation that can be contextualized historically and socially: to be a victim is to become or be elected by

society as a target of isolation, since one's conceptions of life are not in accordance with the conduct of the majority of individuals.

The use of the imperfect tense, in "had", "could", "submitted", "lived", produces a sense of repetition, of habit or frequency, which is combined with the effects of obligation and prohibition, arising from the deontic modality that surrounds the statements, referring to the past of A1 and the conducts that he should follow in order to remain within the camp. "Today", in the condition of being settled, resorts to memory, which, according to Pêcheux (1990), memory brings the ideologies presented by the interdiscourse, which permeates the subject's sayings, the already-said.

The pronoun "they" refers, by indirect anaphora (AI), to the other, to the representatives of Incra, who grant some help to the landless during the period in which they stay in the canvas shacks. On the other hand, the deictics "there" and "there", according to Fiorin (2005), bring the concept of occupied space, of place, designating the camps of the landless, represented sometimes as close, sometimes as distant, although also by AI, but always as a restricted space of scope. It is important to clarify that the relationship of IA occurs, according to Marcuschi (2005), when there is no textual antecedent.

The words: "you couldn't go out to work" and "neither the man nor the woman" configure power relations imposed by Incra: a criterion adopted for the transfer of land, the landless must remain during the day and at night in the camps, without any employment relationship, permeating here the institutional discursive formation of Incra. We understood, then, that remaining in the camp and meeting the demands of the Institute was defined as a condition of power, but a temporary submission, up to the reach of the lands, as evidenced by the verbal forms of imperfect, in its aspectual sense of a process that had its occurrence/duration interrupted. In view of this, we mention Gore (1994): in order to understand why the subject is exposed to a condition of submission, we must observe the particular points that lead him to such conduct. We also believe that what Bhabha (1998) postulates is pertinent here: it questions not only the image of the person, but also the discursive and disciplinary place from which his strategies are conducted by the institutions to which he belongs. In the case of the landless, they remained on the "margins of society", with the purpose of reaching the piece of land.

The excerpts: "we sometimes went through humiliation", "that sometimes people passed by on the edge of the road, cursed us" and "said that we were troublemakers" are

inscribed in the discursive formation of exclusion, as they bring the look of the other, the restlessness of society in the face of the presence of the settlers. According to Bauman (1998), every person who is not linked to any moral or aesthetic social model brings the discomfort of his presence, for being "imagined" as a stranger by the other. Thus, the fact that the landless are exposed in the camps set up on the side of the highways provokes a negative representation of themselves by society, which sees inactive people (because "they couldn't go out to work") and scattered shacks, in disorder.

The excerpt "vai trahá vagabundo seu sem-terra", in direct discourse, brings to the enunciative scene the discourse of the other, in a manifestation of the heterogeneity shown to which Authier-Revuz (1990) refers, constituted by the discursive formation of exclusion. It is the gaze of the other – organized society – focusing on those who are on the margins of society. Prevented by INCRA from seeking sustenance outside the landless encampment and even in the face of precarious life and social exclusion, the interviewee states that she resisted and continued in the encampment, because land ownership was her objective. This fact is observed when she says: "we submitted to all this". The "all this" brings the feeling of exclusion, lack of resources, humiliation and submission. This submission is not understood simply as a power relationship imposed by INCRA, since, according to Martins (2003), there is always a motive, an objective, an interest of the landless in remaining in a situation of discomfort in order to later reach their home, their comfort and enter the rural labor market.

In this aspect, we must observe the meaning that assumes (or the effects that emerge) of the verb "work": for subject A1, the true work is the salaried, linked to the world of capital. In failure, he ends up assuming himself as a "non-worker", just as the other sees him, although he has a "justification" for not doing it: the power of the institutional other over him and his condition of submission. The subject's discourses do not converge, therefore, to "finished" identities, but to flexibilities and ambiguities, oscillating in the representations that cross this subject.

Still in the excerpt "vai trahá vagabundo seu sem-terra", the term sem-terra, consists of metaphor and metonymy, because in view of the studies carried out by Fiorin (2002) the term "sem" plus the word "terra", brings the concept of metaphor and metonymy because each word has its own meaning and by associating them, we arrive at a linguistic sign. In addition, Orlandi (2015) states that the metaphor reports the historicity that permeates the sayings of the subject that stabilizes means of analysis procedures, so when called

landless, the settler believes that she is being disqualified within the social condition she found herself in.

CONCLUSION

In the statements of A1, we observed the need to report the lack of subsidies within the camps, such as the lack of bathrooms. In addition to presenting this undignified condition of survival, she talks about the offenses and humiliations to which she was subjected when she was landless.

We noticed in A1's statement that even after having changed from being landless and settled, she feels socially excluded, especially when she was referred to by the other as "landless". In view of this, she presents in her words a feeling of indignation in the face of her past as a landless person. We then observe that the desire for defense is portrayed when she manifests that she only wanted a piece of land to carry out her work.

We highlight the discourses of victimization and conquest, in the words of the sitting, showing. In addition, we note the discursive formations: religious, in which the settlers rely to achieve possession of the land; the labor one, to manifest the constant struggle for the settlement; and exclusion, recognizing that exclusion is a mark of the identity of those who fight for land, whether as landless or settled.

We hope that the results of this research will contribute in some way to the recognition of these subjects as participants in the social fabric, which would contribute to the demystification of the image of the exploitative, profiteering and predatory landless. In addition, we believe that research aimed at citizens whose identity is shaped by a discriminatory society can gain a voice and conquer their social place. We emphasize that the fact that some subjects manifest their discourses can contribute not only to academic research, but also to social recognition and to the encouragement of others to expose their ideologies.

Finally, we register here our discursive look, but other possibilities of interpretation are plausible in various approaches. We believe that interpretation is not limited to the text, but focuses on the reader, the senses and the effects, which enables other contributions, from new perspectives.

REFERENCES

1. Authier-Revuz, J. (1990). Heterogeneidade(s) enunciativa(s). In C. Cruz & W. Geraldi (Trad.), Cadernos de estudos linguísticos, 19, 25-42. Campinas: Ed. UNICAMP.

2. Bauman, Z. (1998). O mal-estar da pós-modernidade (M. Gama, Trad.). Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar.

3. Bhabha, H. K. (1998). O local da cultura (M. Ávila et al., Trad.). Belo Horizonte: UFMG.

4. Brandão, H. H. N. (1998). Subjetividade, representação e sentido. In Subjetividade, argumentação e polifonia: A propaganda da Petrobras (pp. xx-xx). São Paulo: UNESP.

5. Caldart, R. S. (2004). Pedagogia do movimento sem-terra. São Paulo: Expressão Popular.

6. Coracini, M. J. R. F. (2003). A análise do discurso na linguística aplicada. In S. T. R. de Castro (Org.), Pesquisa em linguística aplicada: novas contribuições (pp. 16-31). Taubaté: Cabral Universitária.

7. Coracini, M. J. R. F. (2007). A celebração do outro: arquivo, memória e identidade: línguas (materna e estrangeira), plurilinguismo e tradução. Campinas: Mercado das Letras.

8. Fiorin, J. L. (2002). Introdução à Linguística. São Paulo: Contexto.

9. Fiorin, J. L. (2005). As astúcias da enunciação: as categorias de pessoa, espaço e tempo (2ª ed.). São Paulo: Ática.

10. Foucault, M. (1988). História da sexualidade I: a vontade de saber (M. T. da Costa Albuquerque & J. A. Guilhon Albuquerque, Trad.). Rio de Janeiro: Edições Graal.

11. Foucault, M. (2018). Microfísica do poder. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra.

12. Foucault, M. (2008). Arqueologia do saber (L. F. Baeta Neves, Trad.). Rio de Janeiro: Forense Universitária.

13. Gore, J. M. (1994). Foucault e educação: fascinantes desafios. In T. T. da Silva (Ed.), O sujeito da educação (pp. xx-xx). Petrópolis: Vozes.

14. Hall, S. (2020). A identidade cultural na pós-modernidade. Rio de Janeiro: Lamparina.

15. Marcuschi, L. A. (2005). Anáfora indireta: o barco textual e suas âncoras. In I. V. Koch, E. M. Morato & A. C. Bentes (Orgs.), Referenciação e discurso (pp. 53-102). São Paulo: Contexto.

16. Martins, J. de S. (2003). O sujeito oculto: ordem e transgressão na reforma agrária. Porto Alegre: UFRGS.

17. Martins, J. de S. (2010). O cativeiro da terra. São Paulo: Contexto.

18. Michaelis, D. (2014). Dicionário da Língua Portuguesa. São Paulo: Melhoramentos.

19. Orlandi, E. P. (2015). Análise do discurso: princípios e procedimentos. Campinas: Pontes.

20. Pêcheux, M. (1988). Semântica e discurso: Uma crítica à afirmação do óbvio. Campinas: Pontes.

21. Pêcheux, M. (1990). O discurso: estrutura ou acontecimento (E. P. Orlandi, Trad.). Campinas: Pontes.

22. Rocha, D., Daher, M. D. C., & Sant'Anna, (2004). A entrevista em situação de pesquisa acadêmica: reflexões numa perspectiva discursiva. Polifonia, 161-180. Cuiabá: EDUFMT.

23. Rodrigues, M. L. (2011). Análise do discurso na graduação: teoria & prática. Dourados-MS: Nicanor Coelho Editor.

24. Sargentini, V., & Gregolin, M. do R. (Orgs.). (2008). Análise do discurso: heranças, métodos e objetivos. São Carlos: Claraluz.

25. Sawaia, B. (2001). Uma ideologia separatista? In As artimanhas da exclusão: análise psicossocial e ética da desigualdade social (pp. 119-127). Petrópolis: Vozes.