

FRONTIER WALKERS: RESISTANCE AND NORMATIVITY IN LGBT+ SPEECHES¹

Dóris Maria Luzzardi Fiss²
Lucas Carboni Vieira³

Abstract: This research dealt with in this article addresses LGBT+ enunciations about discrimination that takes the form of LGBT+phobia . Held in 2016, it had the collaboration of sixteen participants aged between 19 and 36 years old and residing in Porto Alegre, Gravataí, Canoas or Alvorada, in the State of Rio Grande do Sul . It tries to understand discourses, evidencing the meaning effects related to LGBT+phobia and the ways in which these meanings are linked, or not, to movements of resistance to heteronormativity. In the data production stage, we used virtual questionnaires, through the free Survey Monkey platform , constituting a qualitative work from the perspectives of Menga Lüdke, Marli André and Maria Cecília de Souza Minayo. The research is justified by the search for understanding of the possibilities of LGBT+ people saying, apprehending how the silencing, the interdiction of saying and the transgression are materialized in a tense way in the discourses. Jonathan Ned Katz, Júlio Assis Simões, Regina Facchini and João Silvério Trevisan invite you to think about the history of hetero and homosexuality. Michel Pêcheux and Eni Orlandi are the central references to discuss games of power present in language games, enabling a less naive approach to discourses. Two meaning effects were identified - struggle ME and violence ME, inscribed in two antagonistic discursive formations - DF of Transgression and DF of Normativity, which, in turn, materialize the Ideological Formation of Heteronormativity Such discoveries demonstrate that subjects and meanings are constituted through the act of wandering, sliding, or in the interval. Even though sometimes silenced, LGBTs+ constitute the interval between the silence caused by LGBT+phobic words and gestures from others and the disruptive transgression.

Keywords: Sexuality; LGBT+ ; Discourse Analysis; Michel Pêcheux.

Andarilhos das fronteiras: a resistência e a normatividade nos discursos LGBT+

Resumo: A pesquisa de que trata este artigo aborda enunciados LGBT+ acerca da discriminação que assume a forma de LGBT+fobia. Realizada no ano de 2016, ela contou com a colaboração de dezesseis participantes com idade entre 19 e 36 anos e residentes em Porto Alegre, Gravataí, Canoas ou Alvorada, no Estado do Rio Grande do Sul. Ela intenta compreender os discursos, evidenciando efeitos de sentidos relacionados à LGBT+fobia e os modos como tais sentidos se vinculam, ou não, a movimentos de resistência à heteronorma. Na etapa de produção de dados, utilizamos questionários virtuais, através da plataforma gratuita Survey Monkey, constituindo um trabalho qualitativo a partir das perspectivas de Menga Lüdke, Marli André e Maria Cecília de Souza Minayo. A investigação justifica-se pela busca de entendimento das possibilidades do dizer de pessoas

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

² Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul (fiss.doris@gmail.com)

³ Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul (carboni.vieira@gmail.com)

LGBT+, apreendendo como o silenciamento, a interdição do dizer e a transgressão se materializam de modo tenso nos discursos. Jonathan Ned Katz, Júlio Assis Simões, Regina Facchini e João Silvério Trevisan convocam a pensar sobre a história da hetero e da homossexualidade. Michel Pêcheux e Eni Orlandi são as referências centrais para problematizar jogos de poder presentes nos jogos de linguagem, possibilitando uma aproximação menos ingênua dos discursos. Dois efeitos de sentidos foram identificados – ES de luta e ES de violência, inscrevendo-se em duas formações discursivas antagônicas - FD da Transgressão e FD da Normatividade, que, por sua vez, materializam a Formação Ideológica da Heteronormatividade. Tais descobertas demonstram que sujeitos e sentidos se constituem na errância, no deslizamento, no intervalo. Mesmo que por vezes silenciados, LGBTs+ se constituem no intervalo entre o silêncio decorrente de palavras e gestos LGBT+fóbicos de outros e a transgressão disruptiva.

Palavras-chave: Sexualidade; LGBT+; Análise de Discurso; Michel Pêcheux.

NEW GESTURE, NEW LOOK

The Discourse Analysis (henceforth DA) founded by Michel Pêcheux is a constant invitation to the challenge. It is necessary to resume, review, rethink, reorganize understandings and concepts, moving continuously between Linguistics, Historical Materialism and Psychoanalysis - taken from Pêcheux's restless and provocative perspective. The concern of the French philosopher was the development of a materialist theory of discourse committed to understanding the discourse in its dialectical relationship with the historical materialities. The approximations-transformations proposed by Pêcheux reveal the kaleidoscopic nature of this interpretative subject, which requires movement, displacement, multiplicity, to remain alive and significant. In this sense, when dealing with the issue of the discourse analyst being trained, Ernst-Pereira and Mutti (2011, p. 824) point out that:

[...] the work and its author, founder of a field of knowledge, remains alive as it can be the target of appropriation in new enunciations by researchers, even supporting resumes of the rebellious meaning, as the author himself demonstrated in his meta-reflection.

The movement seems to be in the essence of DA, growing as it allows rethinking, reworking, looking again. Discourse analysts are committed to contributing to the growth of this interpretation subject, returning to the scope of Pêcheux's theory and adding contributions to its history (ERNST-PEREIRA; MUTTI, 2011). Moved by this provocation, we return to an analytical corpus previously discussed, challenging us to approach it with another look. This corpus was produced and discursively analyzed for the first time as part of research activities developed in 2016.

The objective of the research, at that time, was to understand how LGBT+ subjects produce meanings about LGBT+phobia and the activism of this community. We had sixteen interlocutors, who lived in Porto Alegre and the Metropolitan Region (Canoas, Gravataí and Alvorada), in the State of Rio Grande do Sul, Brazil. They were aged between 19 and 36 years old. All participants were LGBT+ subjects⁴. For this article, we focus our perspective on the issue of LGBT+phobia. In working with the corpus, which consisted of 105 enunciations, we were surprised by two discourse formations - DF of Normativity and DF of transgression inscribed in an Ideological Formation of Heteronormativity. In the first DF, the meaning effect found showed the subjugating consequence of heteronormativity, which criticizes the LGBT+ saying. On the other hand, in the second DF, the meaning effect found demonstrated the movement of resistance and rupture with the control of the normativity. We noticed, in this work, that, despite the advances and the history of struggle of the LGBT+ community in Brazil and in the world, the discourses of this community still suffer the action of censorship, control of the normativity, deletion. However, even if the LGBT+ subjects insist on enunciating from a heteronormativity place, they also resist, creating ruptures through it, to be able to say things about themselves, under a valuation and respect bias of non-normative ways of living sexuality.

THE WORK OF THE PHILOSOPHER PÊCHEUX

Since the goal of developing a materialist theory of discourse or meanings⁵, Michel Pêcheux embarked on a journey of conceptual turnarounds and discomforts. A journey that was faced with such commitment that led the researcher to criticize his own theory in a systematic way, making it go through different stages, insofar as he saw the need for theoretical change of what he had postulated⁶. DA arises at a strong moment in structuralist thinking in scientific practices. Ferdinand de Saussure, when making the epistemological break that separated language and speech, structures Linguistics, reserving the former a

⁴ There are several terms that have been attributed to the LGBT community, recently other letters have emerged in order to adequately represent everyone who is part of this group. Here, I will use LGBT+ as a way to refer to non-heterosexual people.

⁵ acc.to LAGAZZI, Suzy. Em torno da prática discursiva materialista. *Organon*, Porto Alegre, v. 30, n. 59, p. 85-100, jul./dez. 2015. Available at: <https://seer.ufrgs.br/organon/article/view/57217/35601>; LAGAZZI, Suzy. Linha de Passe: a materialidade significante em análise. *RUA [online] - Revista do Laboratório de Estudos Urbanos do Núcleo de Desenvolvimento da Criatividade*, n. 16, v. 2, 2010. Available at: <http://www.labeurb.unicamp.br/rua>.

⁶ About this, acc.to MALDIDIER, Denise. *A inquietação do Discurso - (Re)ler Michel Pêcheux hoje*. Campinas: Pontes, 2003; ORLANDI, Eni P. *Análise de Discurso: princípios e procedimentos*. Campinas: Pontes, 2012; OLIVEIRA, G.A.; NOGUEIRA, L. *Encontros na Análise de Discurso: Efeitos de Sentidos Entre Continentes*. Campinas: Ed. da UNICAMP, 2019.

prominent place as an object of analysis. The language, considered by the Saussurian point of view, is separated from all dimensions that are external to it. Its relationship with the social and the subject is removed, being understood as “an abstract system of rules” (INDURSKY, 1998).

Passing through Chomsky and Labov, Linguistics remains working with the aseptic language, despite Labov's provocation about the homogeneity of the language and the ideal speaker / listener. With Benveniste, an element of greater impact will be brought closer to Linguistics: it rescues subjectivity, pointing out that the speaker appropriates the language, founding subjectivity by saying "I", which establishes a "You" towards whom this "I" directs itself. The position and appropriation of the language varies between speakers, who exchange positions between I-You. From Benveniste's intervention, the language starts to mention what is external to it. In the 1960s, the sentence limit was overcome, scientific interest became about the text, a movement that opens the possibility of understanding the text from a more complex perspective than a set of phrases, as Linguistics would postulate. While Text Linguistics and Semiotics focus the text as an object of analysis, the DA turns its gaze to the discourse, assigning a specific concept to the text, taken as an open and pragmatic unit, assuming the role of materiality through which discursivity is reached. This change made discourse a conceptual object to be constituted within the theoretical scope of DA.

The provocations of Discourse Analysis to Linguistics are more disruptive than those made by Text Linguistics and Semiotics, since they propose turnarounds to the concept of language and the binomial language / speech. If, for Linguistics, the language is closed in itself and must be separated from the outside to be the object of study, for Pêcheux's theory, this division is inconceivable. Language is a non-transparent, opaque materiality that does not contain the meanings in itself - it is in the relationship with history that the meanings are produced. A series of key concepts is then incorporated into Discourse Analysis, or, as Ferreira (2003) would say, the DA toolbox, indispensable for the production of knowledge based on this theory-methodology by Michel Pêcheux. Subject, discourse, history, ideology and meaning are nodal elements of Pêcheuxian work.

The subject of Pêcheux, unlike the conscious and full subject of Benveniste, is fragmented, subjugated and affected by ideology, even though he believes he is the master of the meanings and the origin of what he says (believes that, as effects of ideology, are indispensable for the possibility of saying). In AAD69, Pêcheux puts the subject as a non-empirical being, not just an individual human organism. In

1975, Pêcheux enunciates the DA proposal as a non-subjective theory of subjectivity, which means that the subjectivity of discourse analysis is not centered on the conscious subject - it recognizes the subject's place of existence in contradiction and incompleteness. The Pêcheuxian Subject

[...] is not at the origin of the saying, because he is doubly affected. Personally and socially. In the constitution of his psyche, this subject is endowed with an unconscious mind. And, in his social constitution, he is challenged by ideology. It is from this link between unconscious and ideology that the subject of Discourse Analysis is constituted. It is under the effect of this articulation that the DA subject produces his discourse. (INDURSKY, 2008, p. 10-11)

In other words, despite the subject's conscious mind, internal (psychic, unconscious) and external (ideology) affectations influence the way he produces his discourse. These affectations, which are not controlled by him, demonstrate his impossibility of absolute control over the meanings he believes to produce.

The divided nature of this subject also points to the inhomogeneity of the discourse. The discourse, as conceptualized by Pêcheux (1993, p. 82), "is a meaning effect between interlocutors", non-empirical interlocutors, historically determined subjects. Discourse is a social process that has its materiality in the language. It is in it that we can observe "[...] the relations between ideology and language, as well as the effects of the game of language on history and the effects of history on language" (FERREIRA, 2003, p. 193). Not existing in isolation, the discourse is bordered by other domains of knowledge called Discursive Formations (DF). Pêcheux takes this concept from Foucault, who says that identifying a DF at the moment when

[...] if it is possible to describe, among a certain number of enunciations, a similar dispersion system, and in the case where among the objects, the types of enunciations, the concepts, the thematic choices, if a regularity can be defined (an order, correlations, positions and functioning, transformations) [...] (FOUCAULT, 2008, p. 43).

It will be the complex of discursive formations that characterize the interdiscourse, which functions, for the discourse, as the memory of saying (INDURSKY, 1998). It is from within the discursive formation that the meanings will be attributed. The subject submits himself to what can and should be said in the DF to which he joins and from that he gives meanings. It is the specificity of this functioning that allows us to affirm that the meanings can always be different.

It is the place of inscription of the subjects that defines the possibilities of meaning, it is through the affiliation to this or that discursive formation, inscription in this or that ideological position, that one becomes the subject of the discourse.

Understanding discursiveness requires recognizing this game between ideology-language-history, which leads to the need to know the conditions of production in which a given discourse is produced. "Where?", "when?" and "by whom?" are socio-historical questions that directly affect the possibility of apprehending the meanings of a discourse - it is not possible to carry out this analysis just by limiting ourselves to the linguistic data of the intradiscourse, it is necessary to resort to its context of production so that one can glimpse its possibilities of meaning. The importance of the conditions of production is emphasized by Pêcheux himself (1993, p. 78) when he warns that:

[...] linguistic phenomena of a dimension greater than the sentence can effectively be conceived as a function, but with the condition of adding immediately that this function is not entirely linguistic [...] and that we can only define it in relation to the mechanism for placing protagonists and discourse objects, mechanisms that we call "conditions of production" of the discourse.

The importance of the conditions of production is linked to the status of the history for DA. Theory linked to historical materialism, it recognizes a real from History, which is produced by the subject but not being transparent to him. History, therefore, is not considered as a factor external to the language. It is constituent, involves and interpenetrates; it is signified by it and signifies it. The analytical movement from History to text is not something that is made. Instead, the text is considered as a linguistic-historical materiality. Undoubtedly, there are connections between History "out there" and historicity of the text (the plot of the meanings in it), however, it is not automatic, literal, transparent, having two ways. History is history because it demands meanings. In these terms, talking about the historical determination of the subjects and the meanings does not correspond to any kind of condemnation to conditions of which they would become hostages *ad eternum*, but points to a continuous process of updating memories: "The meanings and subjects could be any subjects and meanings, but they are not. Discourse analysis works between the possible and the historically determined" (ORLANDI, 2001, p. 103).

In Discourse Analysis, ideology also undergoes a conceptual transformation. It is the result of the interaction of language with History, in the process of

constituting subjects and meanings. This is attested by the fact that there is no meaning without interpretation, man is provoked to seek meanings in front of any symbolic object, to seek to understand what it means. Due to the functioning of the ideological process, this apprehended meaning always seems to be there, being accessed / understood by those who approach it in the same way that it will be by everyone who approaches it. The functioning of ideology generates the sensation of evidence of (always obvious) meanings and that the subjects are always the source of what they say. Illusions arising from two fundamental oblivions. Oblivion number 1 causes the illusion that we are the source of what we say, while oblivion number 2 makes us believe that what we say is enunciated from a direct relationship between word and world, generating the impression that it could not have been put another way (PÊCHEUX, 2014). In **Semântica e Discurso (Language, semantics and ideology : stating the obvious)**, Pêcheux states that “[...] the ideological instance exists in the form of ideological formations [...]” (2014, p. 132). It is to these ideological formations that the discursive formations are linked, thus allowing the subjection to a certain ideology.

By combining these concepts with the *corpus* of analysis, in a relationship of mutual provocation and transformation, the discourse analyst develops his or her craft. The analyzed *corpus* directly provokes our theoretical approach, just as the theory serves as an analytical tuning fork. In the case of this article, the *corpus* provoked the need to seek the question of silence the way it is worked on by Orlandi (1993). Orlandi points out that silence is one of the possible ways of creating meaning:

Language, on the other hand, is already a categorization of silence. It is peripheral movement, noise. [...] Language is a significant combination of existence and is produced by man, to domesticate meaning. Speech divides the silence. Organize it. Silence is dispersed, and speech is focused on uniqueness and discrete entities. Shapes. Visible and functional segments that make meaning *calculable*. (ORLANDI, 1993, p. 34).

Furthermore, silence is a “horizon and imminence of meaning” (ORLANDI, 1993, p. 13). The author also differs from silence - as a place of possibilities for the meanings and breathing of words - and silencing - the politics of silence - which acts to curb the possibility of saying, censoring the subject. It is this dimension of silence that resonates in this article. The silencing of LGBT+ people by heteronormativity, carried out in such a way that it silences the lived experience of these subjects when they are invited to talk about their reality. Despite this effect of

heteronormativity, it is necessary to consider that "[...] silence can be considered both as part of the rhetoric of domination (that of oppression) and of its counterpart, the rhetoric of the oppressed (that of resistance)" (ORLANDI, 1993, p. 31). Which points to the subject's divided and contradictory nature, which is constituted in the relation of forces between sedimentation and renewal of saying, or even between paraphrase and polysemy. From this conception, it is possible to understand the relationships between the silencing and the resistance silence of the LGBT+ subjects who participated in this research.

WHAT HAS BEEN ALWAYS ECHOES

Despite common-sense claims that homosexuality has erupted in recent years, the works of Júlio Assis Simões and Regina Facchini (2009), Jonathan Ned Katz (1996) and João Silvério Trevisan (2000) prove that such beliefs are fallacious. It might be argued, further, that some of the ideological work of heteronormativity itself includes erasing the history of LGBT+, thus maintaining obligatory heterosexuality. This normativity is conceptualized by Britzman (1995, p. 79) as "the obsession with normalizing sexuality, through discourses that describe the homosexual situation as deviant". The movement of erasing the histories and experiences of non-heterosexual people in the History of Brazil and the world points to the movement of silencing presented by Orlandi, which here manifests itself in the restriction of the sliding of subjects by discursive formations - there is an interruption of possibility of saying in History. Through the domination of the meanings, censorship forbids the subject's inscription to certain discursive formations, the subject's identity is immediately affected as a subject-of-discourse, because "[...] identity results from identification processes according to which the subject must enroll in one (and not another) discursive formation so that his words make sense" (ORLANDI, 1993, p. 78).

Katz, in a provocative way, affirms that heterosexuality was invented, rescuing, in his book, the historical moment when the term heterosexual begins to be used. A discursive event is evidenced, because until now there was no specific form or concept defined for those who were emotionally and sexually involved with people of the same sex. Katz points out that the first use of the word heterosexual in the United States is in 1892, in an article by James G. Kiernan, published in the medical journal of Chicago (KATZ, 1993). At this time, the use of the term did not refer to the current dictionary concept of heterosexual - it was a sexual perversion in which subjects could periodically present desires for both sexes, as well as being accused of "reproductive deviation", that is, they sought sexual pleasure without the

intention of having children. In Kiernan's article, the term *homosexual* also appears, but described as a subject in full mental inversion, which makes him organize himself psychically in the opposite way to his biological sex. The prospect of Kiernan brought the cultural tradition of the ideal reproductive sexual health.

However, the nickname of the terms hetero and homosexual is from the Austro-Hungarian writer Karl M. Kertbeny (1824-1882), who had contact with Karl H. Ulrichs, a German lawyer and writer, who can be considered as one of the first rights activists of free sexuality. Ulrichs developed a long work in this field, starting in 1864, describing the men who had a feminine love impulse (that is, they loved other men), whom he called *Uranier*; as well as the women who had a masculine love impulse (who loved other women), whom he called *Urnide*. *Uranier* and *urnide* opposed *Dionäe* or *Dioning*, the "real men". Despite this opposition of "real men", Ulrichs identified himself as *Uranier* or Uranian, and developed his work defending the naturalness and legitimacy of the love of a *Uranier* or an *Urnide*. He defended the end of laws that criminalized homosexuality and traveled through Germany with this agenda, meeting a lot of resistance. Both he and Kertbeny defended gay rights. In 1869, Kertbeny published an anonymous pamphlet against the adoption of the "unnatural fornication" law across Germany, where he used the term homosexuality for the first time (23 years before the term appeared in the United States). The term coined by Ulrichs ends up falling out of use, remaining the one of Kertbeny.

The emerging sexology of the 19th century takes over Ulrichs' terms to address the issue of sexual orientation. The German psychiatrist Richard von Krafft-Ebing (1840-1902) starts to conceptualize homosexual and heterosexual in his work *Psychopathia Sexualis* (1886). It is from Krafft-Ebing's perspective of considering the only healthy sexuality the one that turns to reproduction, that Kiernan finds basis for his thoughts, including erroneously pointing out that the German psychiatrist was the co-founder of the terms homo and heterosexual. Thus, for him, both sexual manifestations are considered pathologies, as they are governed only by lust. It is only in Freud's work (1856-1939) that the heterosexual will be constituted as a positive, natural and good drive. The psychoanalyst breaks with the idea that linked sexuality health to the reproductive instinct and links it to the search for pleasure, causing a profound conceptual turnaround in the perspectives of sexuality. Katz states, in a provocative and forceful way, that Freud's work results in the construction of a heterosexual identity, as his psychoanalytic perspective is not focused on the sexual act - which was the focus of analysis until then - but on thought and desire.

Freud uses *heterosexual* to refer to an emotion, to various *erotic impulses*, *instincts* or *desires* and to a type of love. His term *heterosexual* also refers to a type of activity and person. These uses tend to make the feeling, not the act, define the heterosexual. This contrasts with the old reproductive model that focused on the acts. In Freud's modern usage, *heterosexual feeling* defines being heterosexual, whether or not one practices heterosexual acts. Freud promotes the creation of a heterosexual identity. This doctor also helped to form our belief in the existence of something unitary and monolithic with a life and a determining power of its own: *heterosexuality*. (Katz, 1996, p. 75) [author's emphasis].

Until 1920, Freud's healthy and natural heterosexuality would be disseminated as a current idea, becoming an invisible mark in Western culture, as the reproductive pattern of sexuality in the 19th century was overthrown. Havelock Ellis' work is also highlighted by Katz as important for this overthrow and for standardization. Despite recognizing the Freudian effect on the issue, Simões and Facchini (2009, p. 39) point out that:

It would perhaps be an exaggeration to say that nineteenth-century sexology "created" homosexuals. After all, doctors were trying to understand a phenomenon that was unfolding before their eyes, not only in the offices and courts, but also on the streets, at theaters and cafes, and whose existence was well before their efforts at classification and intervention.

We partially agree with the authors' statement. It is consistent to point out that it was not the concern of medicine with ways of experiencing pleasure that led to same-sex involvement. However, it is necessary to recognize, from the assumptions of Discourse Analysis, that the creation of the terms *heterosexual* and *homosexual*, and its conceptual delimitation, results in a discursive event - that is, it generates a rupture in the discursive memory, in what is repeatable (INDURSKY, 1998, p. 18). The language materialized a scope of meanings and possibilities of saying based on the historicity of these concepts. Another moment that stands out in LGBT+ history as a discursive event, which breaks and opens another source of possibilities to say, is the Stonewall Riots, on June 28, 1969.

In the 1940s, nuclei of homosexual activism began to appear in the United States, continuing the movement started in Europe to fight for rights. These groups of gays and lesbians wanted to build a respectable image for homosexuals, seeking full social integration. This style of activism began to change in 1950-1960, incorporating more radical approaches, driven by the "beat generation" and the

hippie counterculture movement. Such movements are a response to the cultural repression of North American society at the time, deeply conservative in terms of the Cold War and McCarthyism (SIMÕES; FACCHINI, 2006). The incorporation of all forms of cultural expression capable of cracking the dominant order ends up generating cracks in the paradigms of sexuality. It is in this context of effervescent protest that the Stonewall Riots take place.

Stonewall Inn was a bar located on Christopher Street, in Greenwich Village in New York. It gathered gays, lesbians, transvestites, whites, blacks and Latinos. The bar did not have a license to sell alcohol, moreover, it was reason for suspicion of connection with the mob and held go-go boys shows with few clothes (SIMÕES; FACCHINI, 2009), becoming an interesting target for the police action that was under "city cleansing" regime. At that time, in the USA, several advertisements and documentaries were paying attention to the risks of homosexuality, warning and threatening everyone who could fall into this abnormal and destructive lifestyle. It is important to highlight that the patrons of the bar were people who would, one way or another, had reached marginality: they were youths who had been driven from their homes by their homosexuality, boys and street girls, Latino and black transvestites. The police systematically invaded and closed the establishment, searching men and women, arresting transvestites and drag queens. By law, it was necessary to be dressed in at least three pieces of clothing of one's gender. Therefore, transvestites and drag queens were always at risk of being arrested.

On June 28, 1969, the police raided the Stonewall Inn, searching and arresting those present. There is, however, an explosive response against police action. The next day, graffiti with the words "gay power" marked the walls of Christopher Street. This date is now considered the "Gay and Lesbian Pride Day", a name that will later be revamped with the objective of expanding its representativeness. It is important to consider that

[...] it was not a spectacular isolated event, but it signaled a more general change in the experiences of a good part of the populations of homosexual men and women, in the sense of making it visible and a source of pride that until then had been a source of shame and disturbance that should be kept underground. "The love that dared not say its name" had taken the streets, created its own network of exchanges, meetings and solidarity in the new identities of gays and lesbians, referring to the uniqueness of their sexual desires. Slogans such as "coming out" or "coming out of the closet" were put into practice, with the intention of recreating a new way of existence according to the specificity of the vilified sexual desire, such as

shelter, resistance and combating hostility and oppression (SIMÕES; FACCHINI, 2009, p. 45).

The Stonewall Riots generated a spirit of empowerment for homosexual identities. There is a possibility of being living in society: the struggle. A new perspective of activism emerges: that of confronting all the logic and cultural structuring about sexualities and erotic experience that “did not concern a specific sexual preference or orientation, but was, rather, equivalent to an erotically subversive way of life” (SIMÕES; FACCHINI, 2009, p. 45). LGBT activism, from this point on, no longer wants to be integrated into society as it stands, it wants to break with the current culture, to confront traditions. Over the years, this rebellious spirit has cooled down - largely due to the institutionalization of movements - but the logic of fighting for rights remains.

THE ECHOES NOW

The participants in this research are Brazilian and live in this country, being affected by our culture and our identity traits. As LGBT+ people, they are provoked to a rupture, as non-heterosexuality is still not considered welcome by a significant portion of Brazilians. In the current context of the country, of a strong political crisis and an intense conservative wave, they are subjects that produce meanings from a position of risk and uncertainty for tomorrow. Such a position, however, may not be noticed. If, on the one hand, there has been a greater celebration of LGBT+ culture in recent years, developing a whole - cultural and financial - niche market⁷ for gays, lesbians, transsexuals and bisexuals, on the other hand, due to the prejudiced policy that has been established in recent years, legitimate human rights guidelines have been vilified⁸.

To be LGBT+, in the Brazilian reality, is to be and be in a fluid, unstable and dangerous reality. Despite the approval of LGBT+phobia as a crime⁹, the underreporting of cases of crime against LGBT+ people demonstrates resistance from government institutions to take responsibility for violence against this social

⁷ In 2016, LGBT buying potential in Brazil was estimated at R\$ 419 billion, equivalent to 10% of GDP. Available at: <http://oglobo.globo.com/economia/potencial-de-compras-lgbt-estimado-em-419-bilhoes-no-brasil-15785227>. Access: 20/09/2017.

⁸ acc.to <https://exame.com/brasil/sem-diretrizes-claras-no-govern+o-bolsonaro-lgbt-temem-violencia-e-descaso/>. Access: 20/09/2017.

⁹ Crimes for LGBTQIfobia are defined by the Racism Law (Law 7.716 / 1989). Available at: <http://www.stf.jus.br/portal/cms/verNoticiaDetalhe.asp?idConteudo=414010>. Access: 20/09/2017.

group¹⁰. Considering the conditions of production is important because they give rise to what is possible to be said, that mobilize the possibilities of saying from what has already been said, from discursive memory or, in other words, from interdiscourse. As Orlandi (2012, p. 32) underlines: “The fact that there is something already said, that supports the very possibility of saying everything, is fundamental to understanding the functioning of the discourse, its relationship with the subjects and with the ideology”. Therefore, the fundamental consideration on the interdiscourse enables remit the saying of respondents to a membership of discourses, a memory, identifying it in its historicity and, by extension, political and ideological commitments.

The analysis of the relations between interdiscourse and intradiscourse authorizes to say that, in the enunciations of the LGBT+ people who collaborated with this investigation, meanings of liberation about being LGBT+ in Brazil echoed very difficultly: after all, it is a hostile context to this social group. The already-said about gays, lesbians, bisexuals, transvestites and transsexuals resonate, and the discourses of the participants are linked to these statements, to this already enunciated memory, which structured meanings to the ways of being homosexual in Brazilian society. Such discourses act on the subjects, causing sedimentation or ruptures of meaning, and the words can be understood as

[...] meanings effects that are produced under determined conditions and that are somehow present in the way it is said, leaving traces that the discourse analyst has to apprehend. These are clues that the analyst learns to follow in order to understand the meanings produced there, putting in relation the saying with its exteriority, its conditions of production. These meanings have to do with what is said there, but also in other places, as well as with what is not said, and with what could be said and was not. In this way, the margins of saying [...] are also part of it. (ORLANDI, 2012, p. 30).

Thus, the historical context is a factor that cannot be ignored, given the importance of its influence on the production of enunciations due to the fact that what is said do not correspond only to decodable messages.

WALKING ON THE FRONTIERS

The discourse analyst's work, taking into consideration the ways of doing proposed by Pêcheux, is artisanal. In order to get to the thread of the discourse, it

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

takes delicate work of observation, inquiry and treatment of the material collected. DA is translated as “[...] a type of analysis that shows the relationship between linguistic marks, indicated in the intradiscourse by the analyst, and the interdiscursive meanings that are immaterial, related to the memory” (ERNST-PEREIRA; MUTTI, 2011, p. 819). It is up to the analyst, therefore, to show, in the materiality of language, whether verbal or non-verbal, the functioning of the discourse and, in addition, to show in the analysis the way the materialities register the imbrications of social aspects in language. One of the difficulties the analyst faces relates, specifically, to the constitution of the discursive *corpus* based on the cut made in the empirical *corpus* and, consequently, the organization and application of descriptive and interpretative procedures without forgetting notions that are essential to work with and from DA - “[...] the subject submitted to the ideology and the unconscious, the structuring memory of saying and the opacifying meaning” (ERNST-PEREIRA; MUTTI, 2011, p. 826).

In order to “strip the word” (ERNST-PEREIRA, 2012), turning the empirical *corpus* in a discursive *corpus*, it is necessary to accomplish what Eni Orlandi calls “desurfacement” (2012). It is necessary to consider the imaginary formations of the research participants, remembering to also take into account their relations of meaning, forces and anticipation through the clues left in the thread of the discourse.

The relationship of the research subjects with the theme that was proposed to them and their projections about it influence the analyzes made. Also, there is the influence of the imaginary formations they make about themselves as social subjects, LGBT+ people, Brazilians, as well as their representations of this research and about us as -researcher-subjects. Questions such as: “Who am I to participate in this survey? Who am I to say what I am saying? Who are they to ask me these questions? Who will read and how will they interpret what I say?” are questions that populate the subjects' enunciations. Understand such crossing is to crack the illusion of transparency of the language, revealing that what is said is not only and exclusively “what it seems to be”. The “imaginary mechanism” (ORLANDI, 2012, p. 40) is also a factor in the conditions of production: we are not talking here about the LGBT+ empirical subject, but as a discursive position, nuanced by imaginary formations. In other words, the LGBT+ subject, despite his or her social situation of oppression, can enunciate the place of heteronormativity and this is an important factor to be considered.

The data collection used in this research was done through the Survey Monkey virtual questionnaire platform¹¹ and had 10 questions. For this article, we made an excerpt, highlighting the questions that invited the research collaborators to address LGBT+phobia and life experiences. The four questions used here presented the following enunciations:

<i>Question 7</i>	Do you consider that there is LGBT+phobia? Do you suffer from it?
<i>Question 8</i>	Do you think that homophobia can be fought? How?
<i>Question 9</i>	If you believe that it is possible to fight homophobia, what do you do to fight it?
<i>Question 10</i>	We consider the experiences to be something very special. Therefore, we would like you to share a story of your personal trajectory that is related to your experience as an LGBT+ subject. Any report is welcome here: affective, professional, family, positive or negative. Life is made up of different experiences and we value them all. Thank you for participating in this survey, answering the proposed questions and for sharing your story with us!

In the first work carried out with the answers to these questions, the tenth one caused the reformulation of the look with which we approached the enunciations: the silence pulsed there. Several collaborators did not answer the question, leaving it blank, while others answered that they preferred not to share any experience. It is necessary to reflect upon the imaginary formations that possibly affected the subjects participating in the research. Recognizing the specificity of this work, focused on LGBT+phobia issues, the subjects who participated in it were invited specifically for belonging and identifying themselves as members of this social group. Thus, by answering the questionnaire, they are undoubtedly affected by the questions that they make to themselves - who am I: for participating in this survey; to give this answer; to speak this way, etc. The answers given by each collaborator of this research are permeated by such inquiries that evidence one of many traits of their personalities - the fact that they are not heterosexual.

This means that, in other words, this work focuses on what “makes them deviant” before heteronormativity and, as a result, evokes the consequences they face due to their deviation. When half of the participants do not answer question ten, preferring not to share their personal experiences, this silence demonstrates

¹¹ Available at: <https://pt.surveymonkey.com/>

an imaginary formation that affects the LGBT+ subject: he/she knows that his/her suffering, discomfort, experiences of pain due to discrimination, are despised in our culture. In fact, not only despised, as in many cases, but this suffering is seen as a form of “regeneration” of deviated sexuality, of corrigendum, and death, “justified” in the face of the non-recovery of the subject. Cultural perspective proven by shocking cases reported in the media: in July 2020, two teenagers stoned and burned alive a young homosexual guy in Bahia¹²; the case of the father who raped his daughter who had assumed to be a lesbian, seeking to prove to her that sex with men was better;¹³ the father who beat his eight-year-old son to “teach him how to become a man”, resulting in the child's death¹⁴; the mother who stabbed her son and with the help of her stepfather set the body of the 17-year-old on fire¹⁵. So, when asked “who am I to participate in this research / give these answers?”, one of the possible answers is “I am someone who, being LGBT, could have been/can be stoned, beaten, raped, murdered”. These imaginary formations seem to be condensed in Phelan's discursive sequence¹⁶ when answering the tenth question: “My story is made up of resistance, pain, affirmation, prejudice and overcoming”. Such enunciation is so representative that it finds resonance in the answers of other participants to questions 7, 8, 9 and 10. We could, therefore, observe two antagonistic meaning effects: struggle meaning effect and violence meaning effect.

We then looked up the dictionary meanings¹⁷ for the words Phelan used to describe his story as an LGBT+ person: resistance, pain, affirmation, prejudice and overcoming. We proposed some slides from the discursive sequence (DS) of the research participant, where we replaced the lexical items with their stabilized meanings. These transformations give more materiality to the DS, helping to reach a clearer understanding of the situation that Phelan enunciates. Small changes, the use of italics and brackets have been proposed only to adjust the meaning of the sentences.

¹² News available at: <https://oglobo.globo.com/sociedade/adolescente-de-14-anos-confessa-que-apedrejou-queimou-jovem-gay-na-bahia-porque-nao-gostava-de-homossexuais-1-24538448>. Access 02/11/2020.

¹³ News available at: <https://catracalivre.com.br/geral/cidadania/indicacao/pai-e-condenado-por-estuprar-filha-que-se-assumiu-lesbica/>. Access 02/11/2020.

¹⁴ News available at: <http://g1.globo.com/rio-de-janeiro/noticia/2014/12/homem-que-matou-filho-no-rio-por-ser-afeminado-vai-juri-popular.html>. Access 02/11/2020.

¹⁵ News available at: <http://sao-paulo.estadao.com.br/noticias/geral,mae-confessa-ter-matado-filho-de-17-anos-a-facadas-parentes-falam-em-homofobia,10000099650>

¹⁶ The names presented here were chosen to protect the identity of the research collaborators.

¹⁷ The virtual dictionary Aulete was used. Available at: <http://www.aulete.com.br/>

<i>My story is made of...</i>	...the ability to withstand; ...struggle sustained against an attack.	Resistance
	... moral or psychological suffering caused by bitterness, agony, loss; ...regret, remorse.	Pain
	...the feeling of those who assert themselves, impose themselves, are fulfilled.	Affirmation
	...the preconceived opinion (about <i>me</i>) by someone without knowledge or reflection; ... the discrimination or rejection of people, groups, ideas, etc. regarding (<i>my</i>) sexuality.	Prejudice
	... to dominate, win, get rid of, remove (<i>difficulties</i> , <i>pain</i> , <i>prejudice</i> ...)	Overcoming

From these slides, placing them in relation to the *corpus*, we could observe how two meaning effects were produced. The first one approaches "resistance", "affirmation" and "overcoming", while the second condenses "pain" and "prejudice". One effect enunciates the contradiction to heteronormativity, while the other enunciates the weight and pain arising from its action and control.

STRUGGLE MEANING EFFECT

In this meaning effect, the subject manifests the taking of an action that generates a rupture in the functioning of heteronormativity. The purpose of the normativity is to condition those who seek to depart from it, clearly demarcating the limits that should not be crossed. For this, several socio-cultural tools are used that constantly draw the attention of the subjects so that they remain in the normativity. Jokes are a very clear manifestation of this effect. When a cisgender man¹⁸, supposedly heterosexual, manifests behaviors that are out of the normativity, those around him do not immediately engage in physical aggression - they use irony, mockery, to "warn" the subject. It will be in the case of "recurring transgression" that more intense mechanisms of repression come into effect, which go beyond verbal intervention into the field of physical aggression - in some cases resulting in murder.

The subjects enunciate their movements of resistance to heteronormativity, highlighting the weight that the act of "coming out" has on the social fabric and the consequent role of "clarifying" those around them about the lives of LGBT+

¹⁸ Cisgenderers are individuals who identify with the gender identity attributed to the biological sex they were born with, while transgenderers are those who do not identify with the identity attributed to their biological sex.

people. It is observed, through the formulations of these subjects, the breaking of the censorship effect: they empower themselves with their identity, building other values and meanings from the recognition of non-heterosexuality. This rise of a way of being in society, of another possibility of living affective / sexual experiences, puts in check the silencing effect of heteronormativity that tries, at all costs, to curb access to this way of being in discourse and in society. Phelan, describing his history as marked by "resistance", "overcoming" and "affirmation", seemed to condense, in a single enunciation, the different forms of struggle and resistance presented by the other participants. As we can see in the following DSs, which are answers to question 9:

<i>Garwin</i>	I try to fight homophobia by being myself and showing that being gay is just a label and does not define my totality as a person.
<i>Vougan</i>	Not being ashamed to show who I am , and showing these people that the weapons they used against homosexuals no longer work, that we are much safer to go out and show who we are with all our personality traits without fear to live who we are .
<i>Nolan</i>	I insist on inserting myself as gay in all the environments I need to be in, and I make sure that everyone understands that I am gay, and that it doesn't make any difference.
<i>Jarvis</i>	I live! I exist, I work, I study, I produce, I nail it, I am beautiful, I manifest myself, I have fans!
<i>Amadeus</i>	I enlighten the people I know.
<i>Tristan</i>	I try to bring information to anyone who demonstrates some form of prejudice.

The subjects enunciate about the *ability to withstand* the effects of heteronormativity, *the struggle sustained against their attacks*, through *affirmation*, the *imposition* of their identity. They *dominate*, *win*, *get rid of*, *get free of*, *remove* the shroud, not from prejudice, but from the norm, which silences them. We perceive here a resumption of the moments of struggle in which the possibility of saying that you are gay breaks the realm of absolute heteronormativity and a new way of existing is possible: the struggle, the resistance, the transgression. Even if they are not aware of this, the interviewees recover the "spirit" of the past the moment when they assume their personalities socially. Each and every one who poses as non-heterosexual, "assuming their deviation", makes discursive use of "gay power", causing changes in the interdiscourse about homosexualities. They also invoke the history of Brazilian homosexual movement, which brought to our lands this opportunity to say you are non-heterosexual.

The mark of this resistance, of this struggle, was manifested in the form of answers to question 10, in the discursive sequences of participants who agreed to answer it.

<i>Alden</i>	I think I suffered a lot due to the influence of people who have prejudice against homosexuals [...] I started coming out slowly , first to my brother and then to my mother, who did not accept it so easily (she forbade me to tell my father) and during this period I started to open up more to myself , accept myself and stop imposing so many barriers on how I should dress, speak, act, how I should behave before society.
<i>Vougan</i>	[...] I became surer of my actions and my personality at the exact moment I told my family (which was not at all surprised) and they gave me and give me all possible support to be who I am.
<i>Arela</i>	I believe that the story of when I came out as a lesbian (explaining asexuality and polyamory can be complicated for those who are not part of it) to my mother was, until today, the most striking .

These DSs seem to indicate exactly the rupture and departure from the normativity, as something that frees the meanings for the subjects, allowing them to flow again through the available meanings. Discursive formations determine what can and should be said in its historical flow, however, Orlandi (1993, p. 79) points out that:

Censorship establishes a set of power relations by which it configures, in a localized way, out of what can be said, what must not (cannot) be said when the subject speaks. The relationship with the “sayable” is therefore modified when censorship intervenes: it is no longer a question of the socio-historically sayable defined by discursive formations (the possible saying): one cannot say what has been prohibited (must be said). In other words, one can't say what one can say.

The possibility of saying that you are homosexual is available in the interdiscourse - the history of the LGBT+ movement shows all the ruptures and provocations that marked this new place. Heteronormativity, however, persists, prohibiting the memory of discourse, seeking to prevent its access. In this correlation of forces, the control weapon of the normativity is the non-rise of deviation. It maintains control when the subjects do not force the barriers of silencing in order to access the possible saying that is censored. By not manifesting outside the possibilities established by the heteronormativity, the subject is not the target of reprimands. We can see this kind of operation in popular sayings that enunciate: "one might be gay, but there is no need to be a fag". The fag is the one

who opens up the work of the politics of silence. Insofar as he becomes “glaring”, “flashy”, “unpleasant” because he is effeminate, because he is “scandalous”, he discovers the normativity: he is only unpleasant because there is a rule, which he disobeys. Likewise, transvestites and transsexuals or masculine lesbians. These subjects clearly reveal the patterns and are visible precisely because they break them. Trevisan (2000, p. 20) talks about this effect of normativity, when dealing with the media that opens concessions to sexualities that deviate from the normativity, giving them a glamorous and exotic air: “an act of condescension that tolerates only under strict circumstances, accepting a “clean” homosexuality, from which any trace of “rebellion” is purified.

The act of coming out of the closet has a similar effect: it stretches and tensions the margins of censorship while making them visible. It happens in such a way that it is “natural” to identify the gestures, the words, the clothes, the way of walking, which escape from the normativity. The subjects unconsciously dominate the rules of heteronormativity. Jarvis enunciates the weight of the rise of sexuality for the politics of silence: “I live! I exist, I work, I study, I produce, I nail it, I am beautiful, I manifest myself, I have fans!” (sic). The mere fact of “staying alive, lasting, existing, passing on to posterity, enjoying life”, as indicated by the dictionary for the entry **to live**, considering the position of LGBT+ subject, is an affront and a continuous struggle against the domains of the normativity.

VIOLENCE MEANING EFFECT

The resistance and the struggle manifested in the words of LGBT+ people are always flanked by the attempt of heteronormativity to take over the possibility of saying again, making new censorship cuts. Apparently, the LGBT+ subject is still unable to enunciate, detaching himself from the possibility of oppression - which reinforces his reality every day. The fear of being the target of “prejudice” and “pain”, which Phelan has marked in his history, is reflected in the discourses of the interlocutors more or less directly. Violence is a pulsating meaning in the words of collaborators. We can observe this functioning in the answers given to questions 7 and 10:

Question 7

<i>Alden</i>	Yes. It exists and we can see it in several media groups. I don't suffer from it directly, but it influences my social attitudes.
<i>Arela</i>	I suffer from LGBTphobia more in the sense of coming out of the closet for family members, since I know they would never accept who I really am.
<i>Morgan</i>	I know it exists, because I already suffered from it when I was a child. Not anymore. But I fear I may suffer.
<i>Kendall</i>	Yes. I suffer in daily life, but no physical violence has hit me. Yet.

Question 10

<i>Alden</i>	I think I suffered a lot with the influence of the people who have prejudice against homosexuals [...] I only realized what was going on when I was 21 years old , because I noticed that the lives of everyone happened normally and I was leaving mine aside because of the opinions of people who didn't matter.
<i>Vougan</i>	During elementary school was indeed difficult, not because other students did not accept me but because I did not accept myself. Once I started to understand who I was and how I would do it, things seemed to get easier and lighter, I don't care so much about comments and laughter [...] .
<i>Albion</i>	I don't like to share.
<i>Owyn</i>	I grew up in the LGBT community, so being gay has always been normal for me. [...] The only time I wanted to be someone else was when I got beaten when I was coming home. It may seem absurd, but coming home bleeding just because who you are causes some concepts and attitudes to be questioned.
<i>Morgan</i>	The most relevant story I have to tell is not about the suffering of rejection for being gay in childhood and adolescence ; it is connected with the suffering of the internal demand that this caused me. I couldn't even touch another boy until I had emotional conditions strong enough to tell someone in the family that I'm gay. [...] I was able to relate to a boy for the first time at the age of 25 (2016)

Along with these discursive sequences there are several answers that were not given to question 10, the only some participants did not answer. It seems to pulsate, in this not enunciation, the violence meaning effect, which prefers not to say, not to materialize. The LGBT+ saying is marked by violence in all forms - whether in the past, in lived experiences; whether in the present, suffering the actions of cultural impositions; whether in the future, with the fear of being the target of it.

Observing the marks of violence in the LGBT+ discourses, we arrive at the effects that heteronormativity and its control mechanisms condense on the subjects. Violence is not a distant or impossible reality, quite the opposite - it is a certainty, a concrete fact, that will happen at some point in the history of LGBT+ people. Be it in childhood, at work, in the family, etc. If not in the past, it will happen either in the present or in the future. Being LGBT+ is to recognize the eminent discrimination and prejudice that at any moment can be manifested.

Social acceptance is always tenuous, putting the LGBT+ community on a constant alert - there is no certainty about respect for tomorrow. Added to this are the emotional effects that affect the subjects. As Morgan, Alden and Vougan enunciated, it was not the suffering caused by schoolmates the greatest burden they have carried - it was the intimate torture of doubt, shame, uncertainty, the paralyzing fear of "being what" they were actually accused of being. The subjective violence that forces the subject to the non-being is a constant in LGBT+ discourses. We realize here a new historical turnaround, which takes up the ways of understanding sexuality and social pressure to control it, referring to Brazil colony and the Inquisition times. The history of sexuality in Brazilian lands is pulsating and transgressive. It became a cause for concern and disgust for the European clergy, who recognized in Brazil a land where the rules would be dissolved.

The inquisition was in force in Terra do Cruzeiro until 1821 and had specific mechanics of operation. Starting with the *Autos-da-fé* (acts of faith), open ceremonies of the process, being succeeded by the Grace Time. This period of a few weeks gave room for sinners confess their flaws, receiving mitigated punishment. Furthermore, it was the obligation and right of any citizen to denounce the sins of others, establishing a climate of constant control and vigilance - anyone could denounce a sinner who would be called before the inquisition and respond to public prosecution. Inquisitorial punishments were the most diverse: fines, prisons, confiscation of property, banishment from the city or country, forced labor (in galleys or not), being branded with red-hot iron, execration and public flogging and even castration, amputation of ears, death by gallows, death by fire, impalement and drowning. Sodomy, for

[...] implying as much disorder as possible in procreation, [...] was considered a very serious sin, which never prescribed, and remained worthy of punishment for a long time. As it was a deviation dictated directly by the devil, the Church and the Inquisition associated the practice of sodomy with witchcraft and the heresies of the Cathars and Templars (TREVISAN, 2000, p. 110).

t

The relationship established in the words of the participants in this research is precisely about the fear brought about by the inquisitorial processes. Violence - or , to put it another way, “normativity corrigendum” - on LGBT+ subjects comes from several points, retaking the fears of the 18th-19th century of spiritual damnation, physical expulsion and death. Heteronormativity, reviving itself over time, makes use of various forces of inquisition, sustaining the urging fear of violence. The more conservative religious control still plagues sexualities with discourses about hell and demonic possessions. The risk of death and physical violence is constantly portrayed in the media, even if deliberately ignored by the authorities. We need, also, to add another mark on the sexuality history in Brazil, dating back to the 1920s. Medicine transforms into a psychiatric-police issue the homosexual practice, requiring constant treatment and intervention for social health (Trevisan, 2000).

It is from this set of discursive memories that the LGBT+ subject is discursivized. Struggling in search of other meanings, which refer to liberation and appreciation of a different way of being and loving, these subjects face the policy of silence of the normativity, facing centuries of discrimination and retaking the voices of those who, before us, fought for the right to exist.

THE STORY THAT IS STILL BEING WRITTEN...

It is in the struggle and movement that the LGBT+ subject is constituted. Seeing himself constantly threatened by normativity, this subject needs to break with the force of censorship in order to be able to say what, by the thread of the discourse, could be said, but which is imprisoned. In this article, the subjects showed all their discontinuity, their movement, their interval character. Confronted by meanings of control, sometimes they cannot escape it, but at other times they break with discursive bonds and return to meanings that echo from the past, struggle and empowerment meanings. Thus, two Discursive Formations stand out that dispute the dominance of the senses: a DF of Transgression, in which the struggle meaning effect is inscribed, where the voices of Stonewall Riots, of the Brazilian group *Dzi Croquettes*, of the newspaper *O Lampião*¹⁹ resonate. The

¹⁹ *Lampião* had its first publication in May 1978, with a circulation of 10,000 copies, being the first Brazilian newspaper to address homosexuality from a political perspective and with the intention of renewing the image of the homosexual. “The newspaper sought to offer a treatment that would combat the image of homosexuals as creatures destroyed because of their desire, incapable of personal fulfillment and with a tendency to reject their own sexuality” (SIMÕES; FACCHINI, 2009, p. 85). This movement was more complex, as it sought to account

other, the Discursive Formation of Normativity, seeks at all costs to enforce the control of sexuality and ways of living in society. It goes back to the inquisition, pathologizing and repressive medicine, seeks different mechanisms in the social fabric to prevent subjects from fully accessing the possibilities of saying, imprisoning them in unique meanings.

Despite the history of activism, struggle, resistance of the LGBT+ community, it still is deeply affected by heteronormativity. Both discursive formations find themselves linked to the Ideological Formation of Heteronormativity. Still, it is based on the normativity that the LGBT+ subjects enunciate about the way they desire and love, because the mark of “deviation”, of “rupture” is yet dominant. The normative control effect still looms powerful, affecting LGBT+ and heterosexual people who see themselves limited in their possibilities of experiencing, living and feeling.

However, we speculate that the resistance, resilience and affirmation meanings that resonate in the discourse of Phelan will still reverberate in other LGBT+ sayings. And, therefore, it is appropriate to intuit that Phelan, representing so many other voices from the LGBT+ community, inhabits a border, that is, a “place from which something begins to be present in a movement not dissimilar to that of the walking, ambivalent articulation, from the beyond” (BHABHA, 1998, p. 24) that marks a progress, that promises a future, but does not depart from the present, which ends up giving visibility to the discontinuities, inequalities and ruptures that constitute the subjects. But what is something that starts to make itself present? A subject who visualizes more than one place of saying, more than one position, denaturalizing the meaning of words.

Even though there are mechanisms for controlling the foundation of other meanings where there are already the stabilized ones, the meanings slide, the discourses have no fixed limits. As Orlandi (2001, p. 134) recalls, “[...] its borders are mobile, since, depending on the existence of discursive processes, what we have are states of these processes, which are always in motion and in constant interrelationship”. In this way, what is linked to a discourse as a constituent part can only be defined because of its relationship with what is linked to other discourses that delimit it. It is always necessary to consider this relationship between discourses in the analysis of enunciations and, therefore, the presence of voices that

for other minorities who were also oppressed in addition to denouncing the discrimination and police violence that affected the LGBT community.

end up leaving in the discourse the presence of other enunciations made in another time and space. This means that the analysis, because it goes beyond the linguistic surface, makes it possible to identify contradictory meanings that wage a permanent struggle in the relationships they establish. Contradictory meanings such as those evidenced in our analyzes, meanings in dispute such as struggle and violence.

It seems to us that LGBT+ subjects are constituted exactly on the borders between different discursive formations or networks of meanings, looking for unique ways to live identification processes with their community and with the society of which they are part. As Boaventura de Sousa Santos (2001, p. 347) says, “the emerging subjectivity is happy to live on the border”. In other words, this is where it is formed, in a continuous decision-making process and, equally, of advances and setbacks in relation to the decisions taken. After all, “cultural identities are neither rigid, let alone immutable. They are always transitory and fleeting results of identification processes” (SANTOS, 2000, p. 135). That is to say, even the LGBT+ identity, apparently solid due to the way in which certain concepts crystallized its referents in it, hides negotiations of meaning, clashes of temporality in constant process of transformation. Apparently rival meanings and knowledge come to co-exist in spaces of negotiation between differences, creating openness for resistance and resuming voices that fought before us, to build a more just and secure world for all of us.

REFERÊNCIAS

BHABHA, Homi. **O local da cultura**. Belo Horizonte: Editora da UFMG, 1998.

BRITZMAN, Deborah. O que é essa coisa chamada amor. Identidade homossexual, educação e currículo. **Educação e realidade**, 21(1), 71-96, 1995.

ERNST-PEREIRA, Aracy. “Escovando” palavras: movimentos possíveis de interpretação. In: FANTI, Maria da Glória di; BARBISAN, Leci Borges. **Enunciação e Discurso: trama de sentidos**. São Paulo: Contexto, 2012. p. 95-102.

ERNST-PEREIRA, Aracy; MUTTI, Regina Maria Varini. O analista de discurso em formação: apontamentos à prática analítica. **Educ. Real.**, Porto Alegre, v. 36, n. 3, p. 817-833, set./dez. 2011. Disponível em: <http://www.seer.ufrgs.br/index.php/educacaoerealidade/article/view/18486/14344>

FERREIRA, Maria Cristina Leandro. O Caráter Singular da Língua Na Análise de Discurso. **Organon**, Porto Alegre, v. 17, n. 35, p. 189-200, 2003.

FOUCAULT, Michel. *A Arqueologia do Saber*. Trad. De Luiz F. B. Neves. Rio de Janeiro: Forense Universitária, 2008.

INDURSKY, Freda. A Análise do Discurso e sua inserção no campo das ciências da linguagem. *Cadernos do IL*, Porto Alegre, n 20, p. 7-21, 1998.

INDURSKY, Freda. Unicidade, desdobramento, fragmentação: a trajetória da noção de sujeito em Análise do Discurso. In: MITTMANN, S.; CAZARIN, E.; GRIGOLETTO, E. (Orgs.). *Práticas discursivas e identitárias - Sujeito e língua*. Porto Alegre: UFRGS, 2008.

KATZ, Jonathan Ned. **A Invenção da Heterossexualidade**. Trad. por Clara Fernandes. Rio de Janeiro: Ediouro, 1996.

LAGAZZI, Suzy. Em torno da prática discursiva materialista. *Organon*, Porto Alegre, v. 30, n. 59, p. 85-100, jul/dez. 2015. Available at: <https://seer.ufrgs.br/organon/article/view/57217/35601>.

LAGAZZI, Suzy. Linha de Passe: a materialidade significante em análise. **RUA [online] - Revista do Laboratório de Estudos Urbanos do Núcleo de Desenvolvimento da Criatividade**, n. 16, v. 2, 2010. Available at: <http://www.labeurb.unicamp.br/rua>.

LÜDKE, Menga; ANDRÉ, Marli E. D. *A Pesquisa em Educação: abordagens qualitativas*. São Paulo: EPU, 1986.

MALDIDIER, Denise. **A inquietação do Discurso - (Re)ler Michel Pêcheux hoje**. Campinas: Pontes, 2003.

MINAYO, Maria Cecília de Souza. O Desafio da Pesquisa Social. In: MINAYO, Maria Cecília de Souza (org.); DESLANDES, Suely Ferreira; GOMES, Romeu. **Pesquisa Social: teoria, método e criatividade**.

OLIVEIRA, G.A.; NOGUEIRA, L. **Encontros na Análise de Discurso: Efeitos de Sentidos Entre Continentes**. Campinas: Ed. da UNICAMP, 2019.

ORLANDI, Eni Puccinelli. **As Formas do Silêncio Nos Movimentos dos Sentidos**. 2. Ed. São Paulo: Editora da UNICAMP, 1993.

ORLANDI, Eni. P. Boatos e Silêncios: os trajetos dos sentidos, os percursos do dizer. In: _____. **Discurso e Texto**: formulações e circulação dos sentidos. Campinas: Pontes, 2001. p. 127-139.

ORLANDI, Eni P. **Análise de Discurso**: princípios e procedimentos. 10. Ed. Campinas: Pontes, 2012.

PÊCHEUX, Michel. Análise Automática do Discurso. In: GADET, Françoise; HAK, Tony (orgs.). **Por uma análise automática do discurso**: uma introdução à obra de Michel Pêcheux. 4. ed. Campinas, São Paulo: Editora da UNICAMP, 1993. p. 61-162.

PÊCHEUX, Michel. **Semântica e Discurso**: uma crítica à afirmação do óbvio. 5. ed. Campinas, São Paulo: Editora da UNICAMP, 2014.

SANTOS, Boaventura de Sousa. Um discurso sobre as ciências na transição para uma ciência pós-moderna. **Estudos Avançados**, São Paulo, v. 2, n. 567.

SIMÕES, Júlio Assis; FACCHINI, Regina. **Na trilha do arco-íris**: do movimento homossexual ao LGBT. São Paulo: Fundação Perseu Abramo, 2006.

TREVISAN, João Silvério. **Devassos no Paraíso**. 3ª ed. Rio de Janeiro: Record 2000.

Recebido em 12 de dezembro de 2020

Aprovado em 14 de fevereiro de 2021