

## From “imbecile” to “Peace of the Lord”: sense effects on a religious live from preacher’s subject-position /

## De “imbecil” à “paz do senhor”: efeitos de sentido numa live religiosa a partir da posição-sujeito de pastor

*Dalexon Sérgio da Silva\**

Post-Doctor in Language Sciences at the Universidade Católica De Pernambuco and Doctor in the Sandwich Doctoral Program at the Universidade de Lisboa e Universidade Aberta de Lisboa - Portugal.

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5977-361X>

*Maria do Carmo Gomes Pereira Cavalcanti\*\**

Doctor in Language Sciences from the Universidade Católica de Pernambuco.

 <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-3158-7209>

**Received:** 26 feb. 2022. **Approved:** 12 mar. 2022.

### How to quote this article:

SILVA, Dalexon Sérgio da; CAVALCANTI, Maria do Carmo Gomes Pereira. From “imbecile” to “Peace of the Lord”: sense effects on a religious live from preacher’s subject-position. *Revista Letras Raras*. Campina Grande, v. 11, n. 1, p. 42-62, mar. 2022. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.8364483>

### ABSTRACT

This paper analyzes a video, which was published on the uol website, on September 19<sup>th</sup> 2020, in which a preacher makes a religious live addressing to his congregation; however, without knowing that the recording had already started, he promotes two antagonistic statements. First, when imagining that the camera was turned off, he harasses his wife by calling her “an imbecile”. Then, imagining that the camera was on from that moment on, he greets his listeners with “embrace the Peace of the Lord.” Thus, in light of the theoretical perspective and analytical procedures of the French Discourse Analysis (FDA), based on the Pêcheux studies in France, Orlandi and scholars in Brazil, this work aims to analyze these two statements published in video, crossed by historicity and by ideological functioning. To this end, it mobilizes the concepts of subject, discursive formation, sense effects and discursive memory, observing that the camera used for a live, is not only shown as a filming object of a social event, but works through the constitutive exteriority, as a socio-historical symbolic object that marks the presence of at least two antagonistic discursive formations in which the pastor subject presents in the thread of his discourses, promoting different meaning effects in new discourses.

\*

 [dalexon@uol.com.br](mailto:dalexon@uol.com.br)

\*\*

 [carmingpc@yahoo.com.br](mailto:carmingpc@yahoo.com.br)

KEYWORDS: subject position, discursive formation, sense effects, discursive memory.

### RESUMO

*Este artigo analisa um vídeo, que foi publicado no site do Uol, no dia 19/09/2020, no qual um pastor faz uma live religiosa se dirigindo aos seus fiéis. No entanto, sem saber que a gravação já tinha iniciado, ele produz dois enunciados antagônicos. Primeiro, ao imaginar que a câmera estivesse desligada, destrata a sua esposa chamando-a de “imbecil”. Depois, ao imaginar que a câmera estivesse ligada, a partir desse momento, ele saúda aos seus ouvintes com “aceitem a paz do Senhor”. Assim, à luz da perspectiva teórica e dos procedimentos analíticos da Análise do Discurso de linha francesa (AD), baseado nos estudos de Pêcheux, na França, de Orlandi e estudiosos no Brasil, este trabalho objetiva analisar esses dois enunciados publicados em vídeo, atravessados pela historicidade e pelo funcionamento ideológico. Para isso, mobiliza os conceitos de sujeito, formação discursiva, efeitos de sentidos e memória discursiva, ao observar que a própria câmera usada para a live, não se mostra apenas como um objeto de filmagem de um evento social, mas funciona, por meio da exterioridade constitutiva, como objeto simbólico sócio-histórico que marca a presença de, pelo menos, duas formações discursivas antagônicas, nas quais o sujeito pastor apresenta no fio de seus discursos, promovendo efeitos de sentidos díspares em novas discursivizações.*

*PALAVRAS-CHAVE: posição-sujeito, formação discursiva, efeitos de sentidos, memória discursiva.*

## 1 Initial considerations

The UOL website has emerged in 1996, being one of the content portal precursors in Brazil. The company works together with four other companies from the Folha Media Group conglomerate. It was this same website which presented, on September 19th 2020, a news entitled: “Without noticing the camera on, a preacher insults wife before a live transmission: imbecile”, where this news relates the preacher’s dissatisfaction with the shooting equipment’s position. In this context, it is Edson Araujo the preacher in the “patriarchalist” husband subject-position, who swears the wife helping him, gets up and slaps her. The aggression was registered through a cell phone camera having him not realizing the live recording had already begun by the preacher. On behalf of that, the preacher returns to his seat, insults his wife and after sitting, starts the preaching saying: “embrace the Lord’s peace”.

On the same date, on the website *Istoé*, there was a headline running entitled: “Without knowing he was live, preacher slaps and curses woman on a live transmission”, presenting the information that a pastor, from “Igreja Deus é Amor” (The Lord is love church, in English), in São Paulo, assaulted his wife during a live broadcast. At the time, preacher Edson Araújo, uncomfortable with the camera angle, demonstrates lack of control senses when he says to his wife: “It sucks, shit. Get things together, imbecile. Get it right”, without realizing that he is being recorded.

On the same date, the website *Pragmatismo político* (Political Pragmatism, in English)

brought on an article entitled “Evangelical pastor assaults wife without knowing he was being recorded” promoting the spreading of two colliding and impacting statements on social networks. As mentioned, this communication vehicle also focuses on the fact that, before starting a live, imagining that the camera was off, the subject gets annoyed with the equipment’s position and mistreats his wife by calling her an “imbecile”. Seconds later, figuring out the camera was on from that moment on, he changes the tone and calmly greets his listeners with “embrace the Lord’s peace”.

In face of the preacher's statement, meaning effects ran on social networks, giving opportunity to criticisms about the religious leader position. The utterance corresponds to already-said, describable within a linguistic materiality, which meaning will emerge from the relations between utterances (ARAÚJO, 2014). This article aims to answer the following research questions: What are the meaning effects created from the utterances brought by the preacher? How are the discursive formations presented in these statements? How are discursive memory and interdiscourse presentified in the preacher's words?

The present paper is delivered in order to present the initial considerations to the reader, objective, problematizations and the methodological procedure. In the second moment of the paper, we intend to make some theoretical considerations about the theoretical and analytical device that supports this research, the French Discourse Analysis, founded by Pêcheux in Europe and developed in Brazil by Orlandi and other scholars. Next, it is intended to bring the discursive corpus analysis, constituted by the video extracted from the *Uol* website, aired on September 19th 2020, emphasizing the meanings effects, the discursive formation, the subject-positions given by the preacher’s position, as a place inscribed in historicity by the constitutive exteriority. Therefore, this article analyzes how certain meanings are authorized and others prohibited, from the speaker subject-position, challenged by ideology, by the crossing of heterogeneous discursive formations, and by the discursive memory activation, which favor the imaginary formations projection in relation to the meanings effects the sayings cause on listeners. Then, the conclusion of the work will be accomplished with the final considerations. In view of that, it is worth noting that, in the next item, some theoretical considerations brought in this work are explained.

## 2 Religious discourse, discursive formations, imaginary, discursive memory and

## interdiscourse in the Pecheuxian Discourse Analysis

The religious discourse core is the “approximation” of the subjects (faithful people) to God, through a subjection to a discursive formation. Within the scope of any discourse, there is no way to reflect on the subject separated from his or her ideological subjection. Thus, the constitution of the individual as a subject happens through his submission to language, to ideological interpellation and to individualization by the State and by institutions, which are considered as family, school, religion, among others (ORLANDI, 2007a). In the State, in institutions, we are under its effects, since the discursive practice is related to social practices in general (ORLANDI, 2011).

Religious discourse is a practice in which the ideology functioning is observed, especially with regard to the word attributed place. In the meantime, in the religious discourse the voice of God speaks, which is materialized in the preacher’s voice and it is marked by a dissymmetry between speaker and listener, as they belong to two disparate world orders and touched by an unequal hierarchical value. On the spiritual plane, the speaker is God, therefore eternal, infallible, almighty; the listeners are human, therefore, mortal, fallible. The spiritual world dominates the temporal and the voice of God is spoken in the preacher “as if” God spoke. However, the representative of the Lord’s voice is not confused with Him, it is not God (ORLANDI, 2011). It is up to the priest to interpret the voice of God, who is anointed for that (DIAS, 1987).

In another article, Orlandi (2007b), re-elaborates his notion of religious discourse. In this discursive typology, God is the place of the silence omnipotence. In the meantime, the man needs this silence place to establish his specific speech, the one of his spirituality. In religious discourse, religion institutes another significance site to speech and a different status to the preacher's sayings. Furthermore, silence is as significant matter as words. In relation to local silence, censorship is the prohibition of saying, the subject's inscription in certain discursive formations (ORLANDI, 2007b).

Regarding this form of silence, it is observed, based on studies by Althusser (1985), Pêcheux (2009) states that there is only ideology for the subject and to the subject. Thus, ideology produces evidential effects to the subject, through which “everyone knows” what is a worker, a boss, and in addition, a believer, a preacher, among others.

In religious discourse, the subject is marked by his submission, by adherence. This discourse

reflects in itself God's word in the sense of reiterating, of a repetition (ORLANDI, 1987). In religious discourse there is a non-reversibility, that is, there is no exchange of roles in the interaction and, therefore, it is considered authoritarian, that is, there is a tendency to monosemy in language and an attempt is made to nullify the dynamics of taking the word by the listener. In this discursive typology, the speaker produces the sense of an exclusive agent, erasing his relationship with the interlocutor. However, there is the illusion of reversibility, the "talking" to God through the preacher. In light of this, the miracle is the reversibility illusion corroboration, the interchangeability from one plane to another (ORLANDI, 2011).

For the faithful people, the God's spokesperson raises a hierarchical relationship of command, for being at a high level in the Christian hierarchical chain. In religious discursivization, the pure, the sacred, are lived and for the followers of a religion, divine laws are prescribed, evil surrounds the faithful subjects, who are constitutively endowed in their nature for a tendency to transgression (ALMEIDA, 2000).

There is an overdetermination in verbal religious discourse, creating as an ideological effect, the transparency of meaning. In this way, religious discursivity is made present by certain forms of language (ALMEIDA, 2000). According to Orlandi (2011), there is the vocative usage, the metaphors imperative. Speech itself is ritualized, even when it is configured by an informal speech relationship. This is because "when you talk to God, you do so through prayers or expressions more or less crystallized (such as: Oh my God! Make it so...)" (ORLANDI, 2011, p. 247) and one can put as an addendum the subject who speaks in the name of God: The Peace of the Lord be with you all; embrace the peace of the Lord...

According to Orlandi (2012a 2012b, 2012c, 2012d, 2011, 2013, 2017), every subject's discourse is ideologically marked. The author (1998, 2012d, 2013) states that the subject is a historically constituted site of meaning, that is, a position. Accordingly, as pointed out by Pêcheux (2009), the subject position is characterized as an imaginary object that occupies a space in the discursive process. This position is not equivalent to physical presence and empirical places in a social structure. These places are representations in the discourse.

According to Pêcheux (2014), there are, in every society, rules of projection, which imply the ability to imagine oneself in the place of the listener, from one's own place. Imaginary formations rest

on the conditions of production, which refer to the immediate context of enunciation and the socio-historical and ideological context. In the meantime, the imaginary formations have functioning mechanisms, that is, every saying points to others already-said as possible sayings in the future. In anticipation, the subject anticipates the interlocutor regarding the effects of meanings that he or she thinks to induce in the listener. In power relations, the place from which the subject speaks is constitutive of his saying, so that the teacher's speech is worth more than the student's, due to a hierarchical issue, for example. According to Pêcheux (2014, p. 82), “[...] what works in discursive processes is a series of imaginary formations that designate the place that each A and B attribute to themselves and to the other, the image they make from their own place themselves and from the other's place [...]”.

Pêcheux (2014) goes on to state that any social formation has projection rules that establish relationships between empirical situations and the representations of these situations. There are different situations corresponding to the same position and a situation can be represented as several positions. As Silva (2019) attests, what the subject expects to make sense to the interlocutor is an interpretation of a previous discourse, which is part of the speaking subject's imaginary formations and creates images of the subjects, the discourse's objects. Considering Jakobson's “informational scheme”, Pêcheux (2014) states that it is not a matter of transmitting information between A and B, but of “effects of meanings” between interlocutors, where A and B designate certain places in the social formation, for example, positions of boss, of worker. These places correspond to representations in discursive processes.

Given that, the AD subject not being the source or origin of the saying is worth noting, as he perceives himself as affected by forgetting number 1, which occurs at an unconscious level. This illusion is constitutive of the subject. Interpellation is the subjection of the subject as an ideological subject, so that each subject is led without realizing it, having the impression of acting according to his will, to occupy a place in the social formation, and this is an elementary ideological effect, as proclaimed Pêcheux. (2009).

According to Orlandi (2012a 2012b, 2012c, 2012d, 2011, 2013, 2017), ideology is not concealment, but is part of the relationship between language and the world, corresponding to the subject's imaginary relationship with the material conditions of existence. It is the same Orlandi

(2007a, 2012a, 2012b, 2012c, 2012d, 2011, 2013, 2017) who will claim that there is an injunction to the subject to interpretation and, in the same way that Pêcheux (2009), believes that a word means differently, depending on the subject's position and its inscription in one or another discursive formation. Subsequently, Pêcheux (2009), the subject is dominated by a DF with which he or she (dis)identifies and that constitutes him or her, as a discursive and ideological subject, as attested by Silva (2019).

Thus, the AD subject is not the empirical, one, psychological subject, but is cleaved, split between “the other” (interlocutor) and the Other (unconscious/interdiscourse), constituting himself or herself as a subject through ideological interpellation (PÊCHEUX, 2008, 2009). In this way, faithful subjects are ideologically challenged by the “Church”, as it is constituted as a symbolic object, a place of meanings interpretation and administration, as stated by Almeida (2000). Through the activation of discursive memory, the faithful people perceive church as a place of purification, “interlocution with God”. As stated by Pêcheux (1999):

[...] the discursive memory would be what, in the face of a text that appears as an event, comes to reestablish the “implicit” (that is, more technically, the pre-constructed, cited and reported elements, transverse discourses, etc.) that its reading needs: the legible condition regards the legible itself [...] (PÊCHEUX, 1999, p. 52).

The discursive memory understood as interdiscourse by Orlandi (2013) is worth attention. Making sense to our words, they already had sense, as it corresponds to previously spoken knowledge elsewhere and that crosses our discourses. In this article, the notion of discursive memory is adopted as something different from interdiscourse. In this way, discursive memory is a regionalization of the interdiscourse, limited to what can be said in a discursive formation (DF) and, therefore, it is lacunar, full of holes, being, then, highlighted that the memory of the interdiscourse is totalizing, saturated (INDURSKY , 2011a).

According to Ferreira (2020), discursive memories are possible sayings that are updated at the moment of enunciation, as an effect of forgetfulness related to a process of memory displacement. Under this scope of investigation, discursive memory is the result of a dispute of interpretations for past or present events. It can be said that discursive memory crosses the DF. In this sense, the concept of discursive formation (DF) was created by Foucault and resignified by

Pêcheux, who sought to show in his studies that every subject is challenged by ideology and that ideology is materialized into discourse. Thus, Pêcheux states that:

We will then call discursive formation what, in a given ideological formation, that is, from a given position, determined by the state of the class struggle, determines what can and should be said (articulated in the form of a harangue, a sermon, a pamphlet, an exhibition, a program, etc.) [...] (PÊCHEUX, 2009, p.147).

It can not be told what you want in any situation, because words, expressions derive meaning according to the positions held by those who uses them and the discourse depends on the discursive formation in which the subject is inscribed (PÊCHEUX, 2009). Another relevant point for the analysis of this article is the notion of interdiscourse. According to Pêcheux (2009, p.149): “[...] we propose to call interdiscourse this “complex whole with dominant” of discursive formations [...]” “something speaks” always “before, elsewhere and independently”. This is because the interdiscourse is the exteriority that determines the interiority or intradiscourse.

According to Indursky (2011a, p. 87) the interdiscourse [...] “works as a memory of all the sayings [...]” In this direction, if a meaning can no longer be remembered within a DF, it cannot be erased from interdiscourse. Interdiscourse encompasses discursive memory and refers to the complex of all DF; all the meanings produced there are made present, and not just those authorized by the subject-form. Thus, nothing that has been said can be absent because the interdiscourse is not endowed with gaps and amalgams all the meanings produced by anonymous voices, even those that have already been forgotten.

In this approach of discussions, Costa (2020), understands the interdiscourse as the site of return of knowledge from the discursive memory through which effects of meanings are (re)produced within each DF. The interdiscourse is marked at a discourse constitution level, working with the resignification of the subject on the already-said, the repeatable, determining the movements of the subject in the borders of a DF. The interdiscourse appears as the pure “already said”. According to Orlandi (2012d, p. 74) it “is not located anywhere, it is a web of meanings”.

Pêcheux (1999, 2009, 2014) considers that the interdiscourse determines the dominant DF. It is in the DF that the constitution and the identification of the subject occur. There are discursive modes of subjective functioning for taking a position and identifying or not a particular DF to Pêcheux (2009). In the first modality of subjective functioning, subjection takes place in the form of autonomy,



free will. In this context, it is possible to affirm that the subject identifies with a certain DF. According to Indursky (2005), there is only “space” for the same meanings. The subject identifies with the subject-form, responsible for the knowledge organization that is inscribed in a DF. This is what Pêcheux calls the “good guy” discourse.

The second modality characterizes the discourse of the “bad subject”, as there is already doubt, questioning, distancing, contestation in relation to the DF in which the subject is inscribed, although he or she is on it. The subject counter-identifies himself with the subject-form, with some DF knowledge that affects him and establishes a resistance to this subject-form and to the knowledge that organizes. In the third modality of subjective functioning, there is a transformation-displacement. There is a disidentification of the subject with a DF and its subject-form and an identification with another DF.

According to Indursky (2011), the DF has porous borders that allow the transit between different DFs. This happens with different symbolic objects and in different areas: social, political, media, religious, amongst others. As Orlandi (2007a, 2007b, 2012a, 2012b, 2012c, 2012d, 2012e, 2011, 2013, 2017) asserts, the meaning is erratic and the subject is itinerant.

The effect of senses is another pertinent point in this work. According to Orlandi (2012a, 2012b, 2012c, 2012d, 2011, 2013, 2017), the senses cannot be just any, and what matters are their effects.

In short, to understand what is the meanings effect, it is to understand the need of meanings and subjects constitution ideology of. It is from the historically regulated relationship between the many discursive formations (with their many possible meanings that limit each other) that the different effects of meanings between the speakers are constituted. Without forgetting that the speakers themselves (subject positions) are not prior to the constitution of these effects but are produced with them. It is also important to remember that the limit of a discursive formation is what distinguishes it from another [...] which allows us to think [...] that the discursive formation is heterogeneous in relation to itself, as it already evokes the “another” meaning that it does not mean [...]” (ORLANDI 2007b, p. 21).

According to Indursky (2011a), the discourse rises to a repeatability regime due to the fact that it has been repeated intensely over time, and, as a result, has gained regularization. It happens that new formulations cause changes in the crystallized senses, promoting a destabilization in the regularization processes.

The movement of destabilized meaning effects will drift, allowing them to linearize in the formulation flaws, mistakes, lapses (LASSEN, 2010). Furthermore, the effects of meaning create many sites of significance depending on the subject position inscribed in a DF. Carrying out such considerations, we will next analyze the discursive corpus.

### 3 For an theoretical-analytical gesture

Figure 1: Materiality analysed



**Statements mobilized by the preacher:**

- 1) "Do the things right, imbecile"
- 2) "Get it right, come on, Debora"
- 3) "Embrace the Peace of The Lord."

Source: Uol website. Available on: <https://noticias.uol.com.br/cotidiano/ultimas-noticias/2020/09/19/sem-perceber-camera-ligada-pastor-xinga-esposa-antes-de-live-imbecil.htm>

Here, we present our interpretation gesture on the beat of our theoretical-analytic procedure, analyzing what appears to be obvious, but which, from the Discourse Analysis of Pecheuxian strand materialist perspective, this obviousness that the camera has the functionality to record and broadcast the preacher-subject's live can be questioned. That is because, according to Pêcheux (1999) and Orlandi (2007, 2011, 2012a 2012b, 2012c, 2012d, 2013, 2017), we understand the camera shows itself in its functioning as an object loaded with historicity, which produces meanings from of its inscription in the imaginary that crosses and constitutes it. According to Orlandi (2007b, 2011, 2012a 2012b, 2012c, 2012d, 2013, 2017), dammed/interdicted meanings escape any symbolic object to signify.

Thus, we understand that the camera is shown in this live as a discursive materiality pointing to the interdiscourse as a place of discourse inscription, which inscribed in the constitutive historicity, determines its functioning by the historicity present there. Thus, we are not interested in analyzing a

camera as a physical object, which records and transmits images and sounds, but as a symbolic object, as it functions in a unity of meaning in relation to the situation, in its discursivity.

At this point, we analyze the production conditions of the speech mobilized by Edson Araújo, who on the date of the event, suited the preacher subject-position in the Pentecostal Church *Deus é Amor* (removed from the office by the church after the live). As mentioned earlier, he swore at his wife before starting a religious live that would be broadcasted on social media. The verbal aggression was recorded by the cell phone camera without him realizing that the live recording had already started. In the video, which is also circulating on social networks and gospel news websites, Araújo is sitting down preparing for a sermon when he gets up to adjust the equipment's position he would do the shooting. A slapping noise is heard behind the camera and the equipment moves.

Araújo returns to his seat while cursing his wife, Debora, with whom he broadcasts on the internet. "Do things right, imbecile," he says. "Get it right, come on Debora", he adds nervously. After sitting down and taking a deep breath, he addresses the camera, already starting to preach: "Embrace the Peace of the Lord"

In view of the above, it is possible to perceive that the preacher's cell phone camera, thought of as a symbolic object, marks the presence of at least two discursive formations in which two subject-positions are inscribed seeming to be antagonistic, the discursive formation of the preacher (which must position itself as the propagator of divine truths, the sower of peace, union and love among the faithful) and the discursive formation of a husband (who presents himself on the live broadcast as sexist, authoritarian and with aggression refinements). It is in this look at a symbolic object that Pêcheux (2009, p. 147) states that discursive formation is "what, in a given ideological formation, that is, from a given position, determined by the state of the class struggle, determines what can and should be said. This is because, according to Orlandi (2012d, p. 30), "in front of any symbolic object 'x' we are urged to interpret what 'x' means?". In this movement of interpretation, the meaning of this 'x' appears to us as content already there, as evidence... The interpretation is always ruled by specific production conditions that, however, appear as universal and eternal. The injunction to interpretation in the face of any symbolic object is precisely the core of the ideologies functioning that challenge subjects to create meanings. Therefore, it is part of the process of meanings/knowledge/subjects.

Through the DA bias, Edson Araújo is constituted as a subject by ideological interpellation, since ideology is the interpretation order and it is precisely when interpreting the subject is crossed by the ideologies circulating in a given social conjuncture (PÊCHEUX, 1999, 2014).

Thus, we see the functioning of the “macho” ideology marked by the authoritarianism present in Edson's utterance, when he utters “imbecile”, as well as the Christian ideological formation movement, when he utters: “Embrace the peace of the Lord”, This linguistic surface points to the constitutive exteriority in historicity, for what has already been said elsewhere, which marks the social event in which an evangelical Christian, especially if associated with a Pentecostal strand, must enunciate when meeting someone of the same current of faith: “The peace of the Lord, my brother (my sister).” It is here that we see the presence of the gaze through the DA bias at work, which led Pêcheux (2014) to state, in his studies, that something speaks first somewhere independently and differently.

However, it is important to emphasize that the subject is also constituted by submission to the language and also by individualizing/being individualized by the State and social institutions, as he acts affected by the “standard” sociohistorically determined by such institutions, for example, by church, by school etc. Thus, Edson Araújo, identified by the *Deus é Amor* religious institution, also identifies himself through his inscription in a discursive formation of a preacher and through the senses and knowledge that circulate in it. Therefore, inscribed in the pastor's DF, meanings circulate for promoting the Peace of Christ, conversion and the good fruits proclaimed by love, which Christian subjects must bear.

This is how when the pastor subject mobilizes the statement 3) “Embrace the Peace of the Lord”, there is, in the live, at that moment, an erasure husband discursive formation, who is authoritarian, because when he perceives (imaginary formations crossed) that the camera is on, live, he positions himself in other conditions of discourse production, touched by the imaginary formations of what can and/or should be said by a Pentecostal evangelical pastor, in his Christian subject-form.

When he does not realize that the camera is on, we see his inscription in the sexist, authoritarian DF, as we can see in statements 1 and 2, respectively: “Do things right, imbecile”, “Get it right, come on Debora”. We see here what Pêcheux (2014, 2008, 2009); Pêcheux and Fuchs (2014) understand as the state of class struggle. Here, we can analyze the position of women being

constructed as inferior to the position of men, as they are constituted by the authoritarian speech, which makes the subject Edson attribute to his wife the role of the one who has to serve him, the one who has to do things for him. The verbs “*Arruma*” (arrange, in English) and “*Faz*” (do, in English) in an imperative tone that show on the linguistic surface demonstrate that the analyzed wife subject-position in this live presents herself as the one who should do and arrange things for her husband in order to please him, since, as Pêcheux (2012, 2009) points out, the meaning also derives from of the syntax.

However, with the effect of gradation, the husband positions himself as the one who has the right to demand, not only having his wife serving him, but also having her serving him in a right way, when he says: “Do things right”, “Get it right”. Thus, he positions himself demanding his wife to seek completeness in serving him in a way he considers to be “right”. But, after all, what is right? Here, we analyze it as being the biggest struggle in the class state suitability between husband and wife. What is the position that fits in this relationship shown in the video? We observe the passivity of serving and obeying the husband orders.

Thus, there is a tendency towards non-reversibility, since the woman does not act as an interlocutor, and the husband signals him as the only speaker. According to Orlandi (2011, p. 239), “[...] reversibility is the condition of discourse”. The wife-subject position, in the social role culturally attributed to women, is shown as the ones who should seek the husband completeness in words, who shows himself with the right to disqualify his spouse services, to the point of reaching the apex of using the linguistic term “imbecile”, mobilizing the effects of derogatory meanings to describe his wife as useless, with short or foolish intelligence, for example. According to Orlandi (2013, p. 34), DA seeks to “listen to the unsaid in what is said, as a presence of a necessary absence [...]”

According to Orlandi (2013, p. 26) “[the] Discourse Analysis aims to make us understand how symbolic objects produce meanings [...]”. This is how the camera, taken as a symbolic object (which produces meanings crossed by imaginary formations), in its discursive materiality (material form of discursive practices), occupies a place of significance in our analysis, because, as already said, it marks precisely the change of position of the subject Edson who, interpellated mainly by Christian ideologies and sexist, it shows itself inscribed in different discursive formations. In this bias, we can understand that the camera promotes a network of affiliations of meanings of repression, but also

moves a network of pacification affiliations meanings, of union in a relationship with the transcendental (The Lord gave him the Great other).

This is how the subject subjectivizes himself as a preacher and as a husband. Between senses and knowledge from “imbecile” to “Peace of the Lord”, the subject is subjectivizing himself affected by the imaginary of what can and/or should be said to his religious community at the social event broadcast live when imagining the possibility of the camera being on, transmitting its statements or being off, not its enlightenment, within the imaginary formations scope, its religious community wants to hear from the evangelical church *Deus é Amor* preacher, because as Pêcheux (2008) shows us, all saying takes place in a sociohistorically situated gesture to certain conditions in which discourses are mobilized in a given social conjuncture.

According to Indursky (2011b), “[...] it is the interdiscourse that determines a DF, that is, the interdiscourse contains the sayings that cannot be said within a given DF [...]”. From the above, it is necessary to point out that it is possible, within a *preacher’s discursive formation*, to have senses and knowledge that (re)fight against it, because Pêcheux when shifting his theory from the first to the third period of AD, revisiting it, showed us there is the discursive formations heterogeneity. Through this, we understand that within a DF, discourses from other discursive formations coexist, which implies the difference and contradiction favoring as a DF constitutive characteristics. Therefore, every formulation has, in its associated domain, other formulations that it repeats, refutes, transforms, denies, in short, in relation to which certain specific memory effects are produced (COURTINE, 2009).

However, what we aim in this article is not to homogenize discursive formations (a conception displaced by Pêcheux), but in a didactic view to reflect on the way in which the subject transits through different discursive formations, producing the erasure of certain senses and knowledge from the DFs in which he inscribes himself between the possible (how can he position himself when imagining the camera turned off?) and the historically determined (how should he position himself as a pastor before the faithful?).

At this point, when imagining that the camera is off, the husband subject allows us to perceive the presence of interdiscourse, as there are many DFs circulating, since Pêcheux (2009), interdiscourse is understood as a complex of DFs. This is how the interdiscourse is saturated, as

there is no lacunar effect. Then, based on Indursky (2011a), we analyze that interdiscourse encompasses discursive memory and all DFs: for example, *preacher's DF* (even though he is positioning himself as a brute), *authoritarian DF* and *husband's DF*.

Therefore, we analyzed when realizing the camera was on and the believers community could already have access to what one expects to hear from a preacher, from the one who must position himself as the God spokesperson, from the one who is authorized by the religious community to speak in divine silence, he makes us observe the functioning of discursive memory about meanings and knowledge that one expects to hear from a pastor enrolled in this discursive formation (one who preaches peace, love, unity, respect for others, among other values). It is about this mode of functioning that Pêcheux (2014) tells us in any social formation there are projection rules that establish relationships between empirical situations and the representations of these situations.

From the above, the discursive memory analyzed is lacunar, a memory that does not encompass all DFs, but the DF in which the preacher subject must be identified to enunciate to his religious community, in this case, the DF of a pastor, which in the video appears to be counter-identified with the sexist DF, presenting itself as aggressive when he imagines that the camera is off.

Thus, when analyzing such aspects, we see the meanings effects produced in this live are mainly due to the presence of the cell phone camera, taken as a symbolic object, which leads the analyzed subject to show us that there are meanings not authorized to circulate under certain productions conditions (social event in which a preacher religiously addresses to his faithful believers). Therefore, meanings of violence must be silenced, but we observe that such meanings circulate freely within the production conditions scope of the a discursive husband formation, who shows himself as someone who must be served by the wife who owes obedience to his orders ("Do things right , imbecile", "Get it right, come on Debora").

According to Pêcheux (2008, 2009), ideology is a ritual with flaws, gaps, fractures, which means that no subject is fully identified with a discursive formation. What was the "impossible" order, in the preacher's DF unsaid, now appears as what can and should be said, in the husband's DF, emerging a new network of formulations that counter-identifies with a religious leader feeling affiliation DF network.

Thus, the discursive memory makes emerge a discursive functioning characteristic of a given historical moment, in the thread of discourse. At the moment when in the husband-subject position, there is a effects of violence production, disrespect, allowing us to notice the resumption of a socio-historical conjuncture in which the husband is the provider and authority within the family, which he can, should say and do what he wants, because he is the “head”, the patriarch who leads decisions inside and outside home.

In this way, the words of the pastor’s subject are updated at the enunciation moment, as effects of forgetting something he says before, in another place, independently. In the husband’s subject position, it is signified by the disrespect and command that is part of a historical process in which the woman’s voice is silenced, which results in a dispute of interpretations gestures about how the subject enrolled in the preacher’s DF should act, also registered in a family authority DF.

This is how the discourse mobilized by Edson Araújo, occupying the preacher and husband subject-position, causes meaning effects in this live. As the discourse concept itself, we reiterate that it is understood here as a meanings effect between speakers (PÊCHEUX, 2014). It is an effect precisely, because when refuting the “transparencies” (of the subject, of language, of history, of “reality”), what remains for the subject are the effects (of objectivity, of transparency, of successful communication ...).

### **Final remarks**

Religions have been transmuting in their liturgical structures, as they venture into new forms of evangelization that go beyond television, print media, radio and reach digital media. Paraphrasing Melo (2015), the process of mediatization of religious discourse allows churches to reach a larger and more diverse audience and imposes new forms of “interlocution” with the faithful on religious.

In this way, social networks also allow the production of positive or negative effects on the speaker, as happens in the production conditions analyzed in this article in relation to Pastor Edson. It was in this way that the article in question brought historically marked religious discourses, materialized in a discursive unit that allows the already-said to be inscribed in a memory and in an actuality to enunciate, promoting descriptions and reflections.



From the theoretical-analytical procedure of the Pecheuxian materialist Discourse Analysis (AD), we were able to analyze that the religious subject is positioned in a socially situated time and space, in the imbrication between the linguistic and the social, taking into account that, for Pêcheux (1997), interpretation is materialized in/by history, and this is how ideology works and challenges subjects to occupy positions in a given social conjuncture.

In this way, we seek to answer the following research questions that disturbed us in this article: What meaning effects are produced by the utterances mobilized by the pastor? How are the discursive formations presented in these statements? How are discursive memory and interdiscourse presentified in the pastor's words?

Thus, we analyzed that the statements “Do things right, imbecile”, “Get it right, come on Debora” and “Embrace the Peace of the Lord”, mobilized through the subject-position of preacher and husband, creating meaning effects of chauvinism, patriarchy, brutality, cursing, depreciation and, in an opposite way, contradictorily religiosity and peace effects of senses.

We observed that the discursive memory and the interdiscourse, crossed by the imaginary formations of the subject, bring the already-said about the discursive formation of preacher and husband, because when imagining that the cell phone camera was off, the subject husband made us realize that there were many DFs circulating (husband, pastor, wife, sexist, evangelical, among others).

Therefore, we saw how the interdiscourse is saturated, not having a lacunar effect and, as shown by Indursky (2011a), we analyzed that the interdiscourse encompasses discursive memory and all these DFs brought in our analysis. Realizing that the camera was on and his religious community could already have access to what is expected to hear from a preacher, as the spokesperson for God, who is authorized by the religious community to speak in divine silence, this enunciator subject allowed us to analyze the discursive memory functioning about meanings and knowledge that one expects to hear from a preacher enrolled in this discursive formation (one who preaches peace, love, unity, respect for others, amongst other values).

The effect of contradiction between the subject-position of pastor and the subject-position of husband occurs because, as Almeida (2000) points out, for the faithful, the pastor is God's spokesperson, who raises a hierarchy relationship in his command, for being, in this way, at a higher

level in the Christian hierarchical chain. Therefore, what is expected of a pastor is that he also presents good attributes in the position-subject of a husband, who must be peacemaker and loving, according to biblical teachings, such as those contained in the book of Ephesians 5: 21-26 (BÍBLIA SAGRADA, 1993), where it is stated: “Husbands, love your wives, as Christ also loved the church and gave himself up for her”. Therefore, since the Bible is the book that serves as a rule of faith and practices of the Christian subject, it is understandable that such reports circulate in the discursive memory of the evangelical community *Deus é Amor*, to whom the pastor subject addresses himself in this live observed here.

From the above, the discursive memory analyzed appeared to us as lacunar, a memory that does not include all the DFs, but the DF in which the pastor subject must be identified to enunciate to his audience, in this case, the DF of a preacher, which, in this article, proved to be counter-identified with the sexist DF, which presents itself as aggressive, when the subject imagines that the camera is off.

Finally, it is important to point out that we do not seek to talk about beliefs or disbeliefs, nor about moral or spiritual values of a given religion, but about a symbolic object (a more theoretically appropriate term in relation to the framework used than the object of knowledge), which produces effects of senses in a live from the subject-position of pastor (husband).

<b>CRedit</b>
<b>Acknowledgement:</b> Not applicable.
<b>Financing:</b> Not applicable.
<b>Conflicts of interest:</b> The authors certify that they have no commercial or associative interest that represents a conflict of interest in relation to the manuscript.
<b>Ethical Approval:</b> Not applicable.
<b>Contributor Roles:</b> Conceptualization, Data curation, Investigation, Methodology, Project administration, Resources, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing.. DA SILVA, Dalexon Sérgio; CAVALCANTI, Maria do Carmo Gomes Pereira.

## References

ALTHUSSER, Louis. *Ideologia e Aparelhos Ideológicos do Estado*. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, Lisboa, 1985.

ALMEIDA, Eliana de. *Discurso religioso: Um espaço simbólico entre o céu e a terra*. 2000. 143 f. Dissertação (Mestrado em Linguística) – Instituto de Estudos da Linguagem, Universidade Estadual de Campinas, Campinas, 2000.

ARAÚJO, Annyelle de Santana. As noções de enunciado para Bakhtin, Foucault e Pêcheux. *Revista Linguagem. Estudos e pesquisas*, Catalão, v.18, n.1, p.181-206, 2014.

BÍBLIA SAGRADA. Tradução de João Ferreira de Almeida. 2 ed. São Paulo: Sociedade Bíblica do Brasil, 1993.

COURTINE, Jean-Jacques. *Análise do discurso político*. O discurso comunista endereçado aos cristãos. São Carlos: EdUFSCar, 2009.

COSTA, Maria Alcione Gonçalves da. A luta pelo poder dizer “impeachment” e “golpe” na narrativa midiática do impedimento de Dilma Rousseff. *Revista da Abralín*, v.19, n. 3, p. 504-529, 2020.

DIAS, Romualdo. *De Deus ao povo*. In: ORLANDI, Eni Pucinelli (Org). *Palavra, Fé, Poder*. Campinas: Pontes, 1987.

FERREIRA, Maria Cristina Leandro (Org). *Glossário dos termos do discurso*. Campinas: Pontes, 2020.

ORLANDI, Eni Pucinelli. Discurso e argumentação: um observatório do político. *Fórum Linguístico*, Florianópolis, n. 1, p. 73-81, jul./ dez. 1998.

INDURSKY, Freda. A memória na cena do discurso. In: INDURSKY, Freda; MITTMANN, Solange; FERREIRA, Maria Cristina Leandro (Orgs.). *Memória e história na/da Análise do Discurso*. Campinas: Mercado de Letras, 2011a, p. 67-88.

INDURSKY, Freda. Formação discursiva: Ela ainda merece que lutemos por ela? In: SEMINÁRIO DE ESTUDOS EM ANÁLISE DO DISCURSO-SEAD, 2., 2005. Porto Alegre. *Anais...* Porto Alegre: UFRGS. p. 1-11.

INDURSKY, Freda. Da interpelação à falha no ritual: A trajetória teórica da noção de formação discursiva. In: BARONAS, Roberto Leiser. (org). *Análise de Discurso: apontamentos para uma história da noção-conceito de formação discursiva*. 2. ed. São Carlos: Pedro e João, 2011b.

LASSEN, Dulce Beatriz Mendes. Efeitos de sentido: tentativa de contenção e deslizamento. *Cadernos do IL*, n. 40, p. 73-82, 2010.

MELO, Mônica Santos de Souza. A utilização das redes sociais pela igreja: novas formas de diálogo com o fiel. *Glauks*, v. 15, n. 01, p. 71-86, 2015.

ORLANDI, Eni Pucinelli. Os falsos da forma. In: ORLANDI, Eni. P. (org) *Palavra, Fé, Poder*. Campinas: Pontes, 1987, p. 11-28.

ORLANDI, Eni Pucinelli. A questão do assujeitamento: um caso de determinação histórica. *Revista eletrônica de jornalismo científico*, 2007a. Disponível em: <https://www.comciencia.br/comciencia/handler.php?section=8&edicao=26&id=296> Acesso em: 05 out. 2021.

ORLANDI, Eni Pucinelli. *As formas do silêncio*. No movimento dos sentidos. 6 ed. Campinas:

Editorada da Unicamp, 2007b.

ORLANDI, Eni Pucinelli. *Discurso e leitura*. 9. ed. São Paulo: Cortez, 2012a.

ORLANDI, Eni Pucinelli. *Discurso em análise*. Sujeito, sentido, ideologia. 2. ed. Campinas: Pontes, 2012b.

ORLANDI, Eni Pucinelli. O discurso religioso. In: ORLANDI, Eni P. *A linguagem e seu funcionamento*. 6. ed. Campinas: Pontes, 2011, p. 239-262.

ORLANDI, Eni Pucinelli. *Análise de Discurso*. Princípios e Procedimentos. 11. ed. Campinas: Pontes, 2013.

ORLANDI, Eni Pucinelli. *Discurso e texto*. Formulação e circulação dos sentidos. 4. ed. Campinas: Pontes, 2012c.

ORLANDI, Eni Pucinelli. *Autoria, leitura e efeitos do trabalho simbólico*. 6. ed. Campinas: Pontes, 2012d.

ORLANDI, Eni Pucinelli. *Eu, Tu, Ele*: Discurso e real da história. 2. ed. Campinas: Pontes, 2017.

PÊCHEUX, Michel. Análise automática do discurso (AAD-69). In: GADET, François; HAK, Tony. (Orgs.). *Por uma análise automática do discurso*. Uma introdução à obra de Michel Pêcheux. 5. ed. Campinas: Editora da Unicamp, 2014.

PÊCHEUX, Michel. *O discurso*. Estrutura ou acontecimento. Tradução Eni P. Orlandi. 5. ed. Campinas: Pontes, 2008.

PÊCHEUX, Michel. *Semântica e discurso: uma crítica à afirmação do óbvio*. Tradução: Eni Pucinelli Orlandi et al. 4. ed. Campinas: Editora da Unicamp, 2009.

PÊCHEUX, Michel.; FUCHS, C. A propósito da análise automática do discurso: atualização e perspectivas (1975). In: GADET, François; HAK, Tony. (Orgs.) (2014). *Por uma análise automática do discurso*. Uma introdução à obra de Michel Pêcheux. 5. ed. Campinas: Editora da Unicamp, 2014.

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

SILVA, Daléxon Sérgio da. Freiras silenciadas versus “santos” padres abusadores, o poder está na posição: análise discursiva de uma reportagem sobre casos de abusos sexuais na igreja católica da França. *Intersecções*, ano 12, n. 1, p. 158-175, 2019.

### Consulted websites

UOL. *Sem perceber câmera ligada, pastor xinga esposa antes de live: ‘imbecil’*. Available on: <https://noticias.uol.com.br/cotidiano/ultimas-noticias/2020/09/19/sem-perceber-camera-ligada-pastor-xinga-esposa-antes-de-live-imbecil.htm>. Access in: August 4th 2021.

ISTOÉ. *Sem saber que estava ao vivo, pastor dá tapa e xinga mulher em live*. Available on: <https://istoe.com.br/sem-saber-que-estava-ao-vivo-pastor-da-tapa-e-xinga-mulher-em-live/>. Access in: 04 Agosto de 2021.

O CANAL. *Primeiro Impacto, telejornal do SBT, vira nova dor de cabeça de Ana Maria Braga na Globo.* Available on: <https://ocanal.com.br/primeiro-impacto-telejornal-do-sbt-vira-nova-dor-de-cabeca-de-ana-maria-braga-na-globo/> Access in: August 4th 2021.

PRAGMATISMO POLÍTICO. *Pastor evangélico agride esposa sem saber que estava sendo gravado.* Available on: <https://www.pragmatismopolitico.com.br/2020/09/pastor-evangelico-agride-esposa-sem-saber-que-estava-sendo-gravado.html>. Access in: August 4th 2021.

CANAL TECH. *Tudo sobre UOL. História e notícias. Canaltech.* Available on: <https://canaltech.com.br/empresa/uol-inc/#:~:text=Pioneiro%20na%20Internet%20brasileira%2C%20a.conglomerado%20de%20m%C3%A9dia%20Grupo%20Folha>. Access in: August 4th 2021.