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ABSTRACT
The entrance of human sciences into Speech Therapy research in Brazil can still be considered recent. Research methodologies used in this area tend to adhere to methods that are more quantitative than qualitative. The goal of this study is to discuss the conceptual basis of Bakhtin’s enunciative-discursive theory and its practical implementation for Speech and Language Pathology Therapy. For this purpose, we present dialogical episodes analyzed in light of Bakhtin’s perspective. The results show that, when social, cultural and subjective aspects are taken into account, this kind of analysis may bring new insights to understanding linguistic processes and the various possibilities of language as far as pathologies are concerned. Thus, one may not only understand language holistically, but also envisage strategies that subjects with and without pathologies employ to maintain their status as speakers/authors.
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RESUMO
A entrada das ciências humanas nas pesquisas da Fonoaudiologia no Brasil ainda pode ser considerada recente. As metodologias de pesquisa adotadas nesta área tendem a aderir a métodos mais quantitativos que qualitativos. O objetivo deste estudo é discutir os alicerces conceituais da teoria enunciativo-discursiva de Bakhtin e sua aplicação para a clínica da linguagem na área da Fonoaudiologia. Para tanto, apresentamos episódios dialógicos que são analisados à luz da perspectiva bakhtiniana. Os resultados apontam que, ao considerar os aspectos sociais, culturais e subjetivos, este tipo de análise pode inovar a compreensão do processo linguístico e das várias possibilidades de apresentação da língua frente à patologia. Desta forma, pode-se não apenas compreender a linguagem holisticamente, mas também visualizar a mobilização de estratégias de que os sujeitos, com e sem patologia, lançam mão para manterem-se na posição de “falantes/autores”.
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Introduction

The entrance of human sciences into speech therapy research in Brazil can still be considered recent. Because it is a health-related area, research methodologies used in this field tend to adhere to methods that are more quantitative, which offer an illusion of objectivity, based on the control of “variables” and the alleged homogeneity of subjects (CHIARI et al., 2012; TING et al., 2013; BEFI-LOPES et al., 2014; CAPELLINI, CÉSAR and GERMANO, 2015). In research on diagnosis, for example, the statistical norm that guides the tests in question does not reflect the state of the subjects under evaluation, but it ends up imposing over them authoritatively, hampering their position toward the evaluation (FRIEDMAN, 2010). Thus, one disregards the fact that norm and normality are also a social construction (CANGUILHEM, 2009).

In the same context, there are quanti-qualitative studies, seeking to overcome the dichotomy between organic vs. society, in order to alleviate the limitations pertaining to the understanding of social processes in language. However, because of the complexity of this type of research, its use is not always successful. According to Minayo (2014), successful use of this approach depends on the conciliation and the complementation between opposite stances based on the relativization of the fragmented perspective of the areas involved, non-hierarchization of the methods, interdisciplinary dialog between researchers from different areas, and consideration of the relations between man and society.

The adoption of qualitative methods in speech therapy research and, more specifically, the entry of the socio-historic perspective into the field (LURIA, 1994; VIGOTSKY, 1998; TOMASELLO, 2000; BAKHTIN, 1986; VOLOŠINOV, 1986) can

---


4 The English version of this work was published under the name of Vygotsky only [VYGOTSKY, L. S. *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*. Edited by M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S.
be considered incipient, because it only occurred at the end of the last century (LIER-DE-VITTO, 1997; SANTANA, 2001; SIGNOR and BERBERIAN, 2012; FRIEADMAN, 2010; COUDRY; FREIRE, 2011; SIMMONS-MACKIE; LYNCH, 2013; SANTANA, 2015). The most frequently used qualitative methods include content analysis, dialectical hermeneutics, operational approach and discourse analysis (MINAYO, 2014). Although these methods can be grouped into the same modality (qualitative), they do not coincide with each other, nor are they homogeneous in themselves. For example, there are several ramifications in discourse analysis, e.g., French discourse analysis (PECHEAUX, 1988; FOUCAULT, 1972), theory of enunciation (BENVENISTE, 1971) and dialogism (VOLOŚINOV, 1986).

Speech Therapy, as a hybrid science, partially stems from both health sciences (medicine) and human sciences (psychology and linguistics). As of the 19th century, researchers in the field have started to seek, in human sciences, insights from socio-historical perspectives as an important methodological device for the analysis of phenomena of normal and pathological language. The reason lies in the fact that the use of language implies a mediation between the subject and his historical background, and his social relations (VOLOŚINOV, 1986). Therefore, taking into account this theorization in clinical practice and in research implies a critical and investigative stance based on evaluative and analytical/descriptive procedures that break away from positivist models.
and theories that accept the linearity between cause and effect and the concept of non-historical subject.

In the face of these considerations, the objective of this study is to discuss the theoretical foundations of the enunciative-discursive perspective and its application, based on Bakhtin’s theory of dialogue, for the purpose of clinical analysis of language in the area of Speech Therapy.

1 Bakhtin’s Perspective as a Basis for Data Analysis

The socio-historical perspective states that the process of appropriation of language can only be understood by means of social interactions mediated by discursive practices. Thus, language is seen as a process whereby the subject makes use of meaningful linguistic signs, materialized in utterances made in a given social sphere. In this scenario, the space of therapy is also understood as a space of social sphere, an arena of production and elaboration of meanings. And the object of analysis of research ceases to be a product of language (finished) to focus on the necessity of understanding the language process (dynamic), ensuring the possibility of understanding new states of language in pathologies (SANTANA, 2001). Attention is needed, therefore, to the resources that speakers draw on in enunciative production, in which the utterance is recognized as a unit of discursive communication (COUDRY; FREIRE, 2010).

The utterance is, thus, the basis of analysis of Bakhtin’s theory. Unique and not subject to isolation, it is mediated by different types of factors, and it is noticeable only from the surrounding social sphere (SIGNOR; PEREIRA, 2011). The form, content and topic of the utterance will vary depending on the interlocutor (VOLOŠINOV, 1986) and it is regulated by discursive genres. In this theory, speech genres are relatively stable utterances, produced within a given sphere of language use. Thus, understanding these genres means understanding text as a human activity of subjects. This is because these genres function as social indices, guided by location, otherness, verbal motivation: “where I speak from, who I speak to, what intention I speak with, from what social place, how I am

---

13 For reference, see footnote 6.
seen by my interlocutor, what strategies I use for speaking, etc.” (SIGNOR; PEREIRA, 2011, p.2).\textsuperscript{14}

Researchers of Bakhtin’s perspective are interested in understanding the utterance production process and the strategies inherent in this process. Therefore, the social sphere, the immediate context and the broader context, which mark the heterogeneity of subjects, are considered to be historically constructed places and social positions that act on the relations established in the dialogical interaction, determining the conditions of verbal production. Therefore, aspects of historical (subjective) and social (ideological) nature, of both the subject and his interlocutor, stand out as necessary elements for understanding both the language and the relation between the subject and his own language and the pathology.

It is in this sense that socio-historical theories (which encompass the enunciative-discursive theory), by detaching themselves from positivist methods, break away from the “production of knowledge produced according to a pattern, opting for a path that withdraws from the mechanical repetition of certain theoretical-methodological procedures” (FREITAS; SOUZA; KRAMER, 2003, p.7).\textsuperscript{15} The choice is, on the contrary, for the assumption of historical and social aspects of language that, consequently, associate the activities of the subject into situations and discursive practices mediated not only by oral tradition, but also by reading and by writing (SANTANA, 2015). The methodological, analytical and interpretative work with texts and speeches is accomplished, thus, from a set of actions which makes it indispensable to set out, recognize, recover and interpret enunciative marks that go beyond linguistic materiality (BRAIT, 2006).

In this scenario, recording and transcription are essential tools that allow revisiting an event that will not be repeated. With recordings, each stage of the process is rebuilt (VIGOTSKY, 1998)\textsuperscript{16} in a way that gestures, tone of voice, body and face movements, speech and writing are evaluated in “360 degrees.” The transcripts of the data, in turn,

\textsuperscript{14} Original quote (in Brazilian Portuguese): “de onde falo, para quem falo, com que intenção falo, de que lugar social, como sou visto pelo meu interlocutor, que estratégias vou usar para falar etc.”

\textsuperscript{15} Original quote (in Brazilian Portuguese): “a produção de conhecimento fabricado segundo um padrão, optando por um caminho que denuncie a repetição mecânica de certos procedimentos teórico-metodológicos”

\textsuperscript{16} For references, see footnote 4.
enable the “preview” of the interpretation made by the researcher about the event (TALMY, 2005). This is because the transcript is already - and it is always - an interpretation of the transcriber.

Thus, based on the remarks above, it can be summarized that Bakhtin-based qualitative research is characterized by the following features:

**Data Source:** Enunciation is always the object of analysis, and one considers the sphere of verbal activity in all semiotic channels of meaning, the expressed meaning (written/spoken) and the implicit meaning (not written/not said/not understandable) in the utterance. According to Vološinov (1986)\(^{17}\), enunciative discourse should be analyzed from the social sphere in which it operates, while considering the asymmetry between the interlocutors, including or not the researcher himself, both in the direct and indirect contexts. When the researcher is present, he must assert his position, sometimes inside, sometimes outside, taking into account the research problem, theoretical assumptions, values and socio-historical context. All of that is meant to reveal something about the subject that he himself is unable to see.

**Hypothesis:** One does not depart from previous assumptions about speech and writing pathologies and about normality, because the processes that occur in the pathology may also occur in normality and vice versa. Thus, the goal is not to prove a theory, or a recurrence, or even to highlight similarities and differences between normality and pathology. One seeks to understand the heterogeneity of language, while recognizing its standards and unpredictability.

**Data Generation:** Data are the result of a constant, integrated articulation between the theory and the object. In this sense, data are not empirical evidence to prove or disprove theories. They can be “unexpected” and “mysterious,” forcing researchers to question their own theoretical assumptions. Thus, researchers should be open to the uniqueness and the idiosyncrasy that reveal the complex relationship that is established between subject/language (CASTRO, 1996).

---

\(^{17}\) For reference, see footnote 6.
Data Transcription: Data must be fully transcribed for analysis in order to reproduce the interpretation of the context of the utterances. Researchers should know, however, that although a transcript is meant to be trustworthy, it is always an interpretation. There are several mechanisms of signification, such as gestures, intonation, facial expressions, speech intensity which are, for example, interpretable.

2 Data analysis

In order to give visibility to the theoretical background and the methodology, three episodes will be presented for analysis: 1) episode with a subject with self-reported stuttering; 2) episode of the evaluation of the writing of a subject diagnosed with Alzheimer’s Disease; 3) interactive episode with a group of aphasic subjects.

The selected episodes were transcribed in full, according to the transcription rules of the NURC project (study on the speech register of educated speakers), which recommends the preservation of typical characteristics of spoken language (e.g.: for elongations, / for breaks, ... for pauses, (( )) for comments by the researcher, etc.).

All subjects signed a term of consent approved by the Research Ethics Committee (Maternidade Carmela Dutra: 36827414.3.0000.0114; UFSC: 132/09; UTP/ CEP 22/2004).

2.1 Episode 1: Subject with Complaints of Stuttering

DA is a 57-year-old man with complaint of stuttering. He has a family history of stuttering and is extremely dissatisfied with his speech. According to DA, in his youth, his stuttering was very expressive and, over the years, became less and less noticeable in relations outside the family environment (DA’s stuttering clearly appears when he is with his relatives). However, in the speech-language therapy clinic, DA’s stuttering does not appear in speech. In this episode, the speech therapist (R1) and DA were walking in the hospital premises. The therapeutic objective was to provide an interaction with unknown people. Therefore, DA is urged to talk with an employee (X1).
R1: but no::ow I want you you to asss :::::asss:::ask me:::/ask... me... where it is
DA: And what do I have to talk about?
R1: It is for you...I want to know wher/...if/ if they know where the bathroom is...where there's a
bathroom around here... some... thing...
DA: oh yes... ((approaches an employee of the hospital)) Good evening ma'am er:: please I'm with
the doctor here at the hospital...could you tell me where the men's room is?
X1: a men's room ... only upstairs...in the thing...then I know where that is... over there in the bath/
there in the::: down here in::: isn't it? there is
DA: Do you mean the reception?
X1: it's... here at the::
DA: oh yes... maybe we can inquire over there at the reception desk, right?
X1: yes...
DA: Okay... nice... thanks.

In the episode above, DA’s speech is free of stuttering and has few common
disfluencies. Interestingly, his speech is more fluent than that of his interlocutors. DA not
only produces fluent utterances but shows a responsive-active attitude (VOLOŠINOV, 1986)18 toward X1’s speech, as he complements her utterance by actively participating in
her fluency (“oh yes... maybe we can inquire over there at the reception desk, right?”). Thus, he recasts the utterances of his interlocutors by complementing the proposed content.
As for R1 and X1, it can be seen that, in R1’s utterances, there is both the presence of
stuttering and common disfluencies, such as elongation (“nooo:::ooow”), truncations and
revisions (“wher/...if/”), repetition of words (“ask...me ask...me”). Similarly, X1’s
utterances show the occurrence of truncations (“bath/”), elongations and hesitations (“there
in the:: in the::”), conversational markers (“down here in:: isn't it?”). The examples of
occurrence of disfluencies, more often found in the speech of normal subjects and less often
in DA’s speech, reaffirm the notion that disfluencies per se are part of normal speech,
whether they are repairing or discursive. In other words, the frequency and type of
disfluencies - criteria for evaluation of stuttering used in the quantitative method - must be
considered with caution. This is because disfluencies play a role within the context where

18 For reference, see footnote 6.
they occur and, therefore, their role in the utterance is interpreted from the context of occurrence.

It should also be noted that normality and pathology intersect in the episode and show that “stuttering” as a pathology is not separated from social interactions: it can change depending on the contexts of production, the interlocutors and the images that the interlocutors make of themselves and of others. In the hierarchy of social values, there is a clear asymmetry in the clinical context of speech therapy, based on the ideology of good speech, between the speech therapist, who has “authority” of judgment on speech, and the subject-patient who seeks to improve his speech. However, the episode shows a different picture from the one expected, contrasting the fluency of the patient and the disfluency of the therapist. The reason is that expression-enunciation is determined by its actual production conditions and implies unique and individual realization of a form given in the act of speech (VOLOŠINOV, 1986). It is also noteworthy that moments such as the one in the episode are not recognized by DA: he is unaware of both the disfluency of the others and his own fluency. Thus, this highlights the weight of the incomplete vision of himself, which marks the problematic relationship with his own speech.

Since it is in otherness that the subject changes and strengthens his identity (BAKHTIN, 1986), understanding the resulting scenario requires the realization that the speech therapist, who plays a role of authority in this relationship context, assigns a positive value to DA’s speech. The receptionist at the hospital, in turn, - as well as other alterities that have no prior knowledge of his complaint - does not recognize him as a stuttering subject, hence she does not have a stigmatized image of him. In other words, this scenario favors DA’s fluency. On the other hand, in the family context, the treatment given to DA reiterates his pathological condition, because a negative value is assigned to his speech, culminating in the materialization of stuttering.

Therefore, there is an intrinsic relationship between speech-language-subject-interaction that should be considered as crucial in the analysis of language. Thus, analyzing fluency based on Bakhtin’s perspective is also about understanding the subject as regards
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19 For reference, see footnote 6.
20 For reference, see footnote 5
his own speech, i.e., the focus of analysis is not stuttering in itself, but the speech of a subject that stutters in the interaction.

2.2 Episode 2: Evaluation of the Writing of a Subject Diagnosed with Alzheimer's Disease

AR is a 76-year-old lady who has been diagnosed with Alzheimer’s disease (recently). She loves to read short stories. For this reason, during the evaluation, she was asked to read the story entitled “Piruá,” written by Brazilian writer Rubens Alves. The objective of the proposed activity was to analyze interpretation of the text and written production based on the reading of this genre. The text was dictated by AR and typed by the researcher into the computer, so that AR could keep up with the text being written. She did not want to write with a pen and paper; she said that her handwriting was “ugly.” The segment below refers to the discussion about the meaning of the word “piruá.” There are two researchers in dialog (R1 and R2).

**R1:** you know what piruá is? Check the definition...

**R2:** it seems that it is a name that comes from indians...it's corn of the popcorn that does not pop up
((looking up a dictionary page on the computer screen))

**AR:** from the indigenous language (...) I would want to know right away what piruá is... then she explained to me that is what's left of the corn... in the dictionary

**R1:** check what it says ((referring to the meaning sought on the Internet))

**R2:** ((reading)) that popcorn that does not burst... stays at the bottom of the pan... people who don't learn, don't progress in any sector of life.... unsettle.... disrupt... want to disturb.

**AR:** so it's sort of similar to 'mess up'.... No! that other word!

**R2:** apiruado?

**AR:** apiruado... must come from that, popcorn popping up from the pan.

**R2:** it is a piruá, cannot learn anything either in school or in life. ((reading examples from the dictionary))... live and learn

**AR:** I've never seen that either... if you talk to people... few of them knew what it is

**R1:** but go back to the text then: “Piruá seems an indigenous word.... it's corn you make popcorn with and does not pop up”...now we can make a metaphor with piruá.... associate it with people... do you know someone who seems like a piruá?
AR: Now it's old... it's not bothering anymore!

R2: then piruá can mean three things... the popcorn that does not pop up... a person who... as he was...

AR: disturbing! but that was not the word... (...) 

R1: so is it difficult to live with a piruá?

AR: it is... he does not interact... but he attracts [other people]

R1: it means a person who does not learn anything, right?

AR: person who doesn't learn anything either in school or in life

R1: when you think about it... what ideas do you come up with?

AR: that we are working with the same figure... a human figure and one thing

R1: food?

AR: treat it as food? ... he also treated it in the text... and he treated it as ... ambiguous...

R1: We will also think like this: what does it mean to have a piruá friend?... what is it like to be a piruá? What is it like to live with a piruá?...if we have a piruá, what happens to us?

AR: in the behavior... you may have the behavior of a piruá...

R1: you don’t get along well...

AR: affinity, there's no affinity...

R1: we have to imagine that living with a piruá is difficult.

AR: it is difficult...

R1: do two piruás get along well together?

AR: I think that one eats the other ((laughs))!

Final text:

Transformation of the piruá

Do you know what piruá is? It seems like a word of an indigenous language. 1. Corn grains which do not pop up when we are making popcorn. 2. A person who does not learn anything, or does not evolve in any one aspect of life. The one who likes piruá is the hen, which is delighted when the corn grain does not pop up. But having a piruá friend is not good because friendship is transitory. The closeness that he shows is not sincere. He didn't pop up to transform. It is hard to live with a piruá, he attracts other people but he does not have good intentions. Although he went through fire, he didn't turn into popcorn. The experiences of life are fire that transforms man. And you want to become a piruá without usefulness or turn into popcorn and be the joy of the feast?

This episode reveals the importance of the written analysis as a process and not as a “final product.” Initially, it is about the search for the meaning of the word “piruá,” which
is infrequently used in (Brazilian) Portuguese. AR’s language work is visible, because the
dialog and the text itself shows the ideologically constructed displacements of meaning
(VOLOŠINOV, 1986), based on looking up the word “piruá” in the dictionary:
transitoriness, betrayal, wickedness, difficulty of coexistence, lack of learning and growth,
meaningless life. However, this text, which has been dictated, read and retextualized by
AR, shows that, in spite of the difficulties of the text and language, the genre “short story”
remains preserved for her.

Genre-based analysis is the central point of a socio-historical perspective. The
reason is that, when using discursive genres for evaluation, the researcher moves away
from the fragmented and metalinguistic activities, which usually make up language tests
(copying, reading and dictation of syllables, words, sentences). Genre-based analysis sets
the author into dialogism with the reader and gives meaning and significance to the written
production. And it is in the position of authorship and based on the image that AR makes of
the reader that she shares with him her worries about the Piruá, inviting him to take a
stance, at the end, about his own life: you are either piruá or popcorn. Thus, it can be seen
that AR writes a text whose style is similar to that of spoken language, based on her life
experience, about everyday events. Hence, she creates an effect of closeness to readers.
Such characteristics are present in the genre short story. It is clearly important, therefore, to
make an analysis that takes into account the dialogical interaction marked here by both the
dialogical relationship between this text and other texts (previously read by AR) and the
dialogical relationship between the author (AR) and her (imaginary) reader.

2.3 Episode 3: Group of Aphasic Patients

This episode was selected from a therapy session of a group of aphasic patients. Two speech therapists and nine aphasic subjects - AM, AR, IR, JO, JU, MA, CO, LU and MC - participated in this research. All the aphasic subjects have difficulty in expression, predominantly, and one of the subjects has difficulty in understanding and expressing himself. In this episode, the therapists (R1 and R2) and the aphasic subjects AM and CO

\[21\] For reference, see footnote 6.
talk about the personal narrative that CO had developed in the previous session. The text refers to the narrative production of an autobiographical book that is being written by the aphasic subjects, and CO wishes to modify the text that had been written in the previous session. In the episode, AM helps CO in the enunciative construction. It should be noted that CO lived for a great part of his life in the United States and uses some words in English when producing his utterances.

**R1:** do you want to change something?
**CO:** ((points again to the text)) *Here, here... Ohh... Yeah* ((gesture meaning “for such a long time”))...
**AM:** cat, armadillo...
**R1:** armadillo?
**CO:** no (...) ((repeats the gesture, pointing to the text))... pa-pa-pa-pa ((throwing) pisshiuuu.. ((movement of fall made with the body) pa-pa-pa-pa. Here... here ((points to the text))
**R1:** ocelot hunted with a shotgun....is that it?
**CO:** yeah... *because is... Yeah* ((gesture with his hands on the wall, climbing, and then throwing) pshiu, pshiu!
**R1:** rifle? shotgun? ((R1 erases what was written).
**CO:** right, right.
**R1:** hunted ocelots with a shotgun?
**CO:** ((makes a gesture with his hands showing three and then three movements in a sequence, seeming to mean three people, and then he counts)) ONE, TWO, THREE. Pshi... Pshi... ((sound of shotgun)).
**R1:** this is it...
**CO:** *because is...* ((gesture with his hands the act of following a path, a trail))
**AM:** Oce... Oce... celot...
**CO:** (With his hands, he continues to make the gesture of following something)
**R1:** cat?
**CO:** ((Gesture indicating a small animal)).
**AM:** WILD BOAR.
**P1:** a dog?
**AM:** wild boar?
**CO:** RIGHT!
**AM:** Yeah.. it's...
**Q1:** Pardon, Mr. AM?
CO: yeah... yeah...
AM: WILD BO-BO-BOAR. WILD BOAR.
R3: BO? I can't understand!
AM: wild boar.
R2: wild boar.
R1: four?\(^{22}\)
CO: no... no! ...yeah... yeah... because... ((points to the text and shows the line to be re-written))...
   ((AM writes the word on the sheet of paper and R2 reads it: WILB BO...))
R2: wild boar.
CO: ((repeats the gesture of pointing to the text).
R2: what is wild boar?
CO: yeah ((gesture of small animal)).
AM: ((makes the same gesture as CO)).
R2: is it an animal?
CO: YEAH!
R2: what animal is it similar to?
AM: similar... wild pig!!
CO: ((gesture for small animal).
R2: a wild pig!
CO: RIGHT... RIGHT... ((gesture meaning “a lot”) but is... ((repeats the same gesture)) yeah, yeah!
R2: then here... ((changes the text where the word ocelot was written)) I'll just add here that it is similar to a wild pig... with a shotgun?
R1: I understand!... wild boar is an animal that was similar to a wild pig.

After this dialog, the therapist R1 continues CO’s personal account:

Once there was an ocelot moving around when I was two years old. I was really afraid. I lived on a ranch in the mountains. My father used to go hunting. He hunted wild boars with a shotgun. I climbed up the trees and shot from up there.

In this episode, CO communicates primarily through gestures, drawings and a few words in Portuguese and English, in addition to the stereotypical phrase “because.” However, when one leaves the formal analysis of speech and analyzes the enunciative

---

\(^{22}\) In the original account in Brazilian Portuguese, wild boar is “cateto,” which was misunderstood as “quatro” (four) because of they are phonetically similar words to a certain extent.
context (verbal and non-verbal), one can see that their difficulties do not prevent them from producing speech; moreover, one can observe CO’s language work when correcting a text written previously. When trying to replace the word “ocelot” with wild boar, CO - along with AM - develops the meaning of wild boar to the therapists. This language work can be seen in the production of several utterances that contextualize the narrated scene, so as to increase the likelihood that the therapist will understand the discourse (he gives clues that it is an animal, it climbs on walls, it is hunted, it is small, it is a wild animal, it is possibly threatening to man). CO’s task is hampered by the absence of the linguistic sign in the repertoire of the therapists. It shows that, in this dialogical passage, the subjects do not share the same world knowledge. Moreover, there is asymmetry of roles and a game of images between therapist and aphasic patient in the context of the interaction. This happens because the therapists do not know the indicated sign; hence, they assume that the aphasic subject produces a paraphasia in place of the target word (“wild boar” instead of “four,” see footnote 22), thus signifying his production incorrectly. AM’s utterance also starts to be legitimized only when CO explains what wild boar means to the interlocutor, through the “gesture for small animal,” confirming AM’s interpretation. Although AM is aphasic, he takes the role of a “puzzle solver” on the scene by translating CO’s gestures into words. It is clear, therefore, that the analysis of the interaction of the group shows an arena for negotiation of meaning (VOLOŠINOV, 1986), in which intersect the researchers and aphasic subjects, unique subjects with their historicity.

**Final Remarks**

This work discussed the theoretical-methodological foundations of the enunciative-discursive perspective directed toward speech and language pathology therapy. In this perspective, language is considered as a concrete and multifaceted phenomenon, embodied in oral and/or written discourse. This approach, developed with the subject, provides an understanding of aspects that often go unnoticed in research studies on language whose

---

23 For reference, see footnote 6.
core is comprised of means and frequencies of speech and writing production, focused only on the psycho-physiological conditions of the speaker.

In this sense, analyzing a linguistic event from the enunciative-discursive perspective highlights the importance of considering enunciation and the utterance as objects of analysis, as well as the social role of interlocutors and the images that are produced in their interaction. Thus, the focus of analysis is shifted from the “pathology” in itself to the “speaking/writing subject,” whether he has a “pathology” or not. Because language is dialogical, both the subject’s discourse and the researcher’s discourse are objects of analysis, because they are evidence of the ideological position of the interlocutors. Thus, data are constructed within the dynamics of interactions.

Based on these issues, the present study sought to show the relevance of adopting the socio-historical perspective for the analysis of language in speech-language pathology therapy. When linguistic facts are problematized based on an investigative approach, one can not only understand language holistically but also view the strategies that subjects - with or without pathology - draw on to keep the position of “speakers/authors.” Therefore, it is clearly crucial to consider qualitative methodological principles for research on language in speech-language pathology therapy.
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