Dialogues at the scholarly argumentative text: an analysis of consensual and polemical enunciates / *Diálogos na dissertação escolar: um estudo sobre os enunciados de senso comum e de polêmica*

*Rinaldo Guariglia**

ABSTRACT

This paper examines two dialogical categories of the scholarly argumentative text: consensual one (common sense enunciates) and polemical one (opposed to common sense contents). Three dialogical matrices are investigated: the dialogue between subject-producer and other social voices, and text-proposal, and interlocutor-examiner. These dialogues insert a set of textual and discursive properties which are consensual category manifestations or polemical ones in accordance with the argumentative arrangement of text. Among the dialogical properties are wholeness enunciates, argumentative-descriptive enunciates, strict logical reasoning, breakage of text-proposal, interrogative-rhetoric enunciates and paraphrases from the text-proposal.
KEYWORDS: Polemics; Common Sense; Argumentation; Scholarly Argumentative Text

RESUMO

Este estudo examina duas categorias dialógicas regidas pela argumentação nas redações argumentativas escolares, que respondem pela propagação de sentidos do senso comum (categoria de consenso) e de sentidos que se contrapõem ao senso comum (categoria de polêmica). Há três matrizes dialógicas observadas em redações escolares: os diálogos do sujeito-produtor com outras vozes sociais, com a proposta de redação e, principalmente, com o interlocutor-examinador. Esses diálogos inserem um conjunto de propriedades que ora são manifestações da categoria consensual ora da polêmica, e estão de acordo com o exercício argumentativo do texto. Entre as propriedades dialógicas estão a aplicação de noções generalizantes, a organização de enunciados descritivos, a observação de um raciocínio lógico formalizado, o rompimento com a proposta de redação, a inserção de enunciados interrogativo-retóricos e o uso de paráfrases extraídas da proposta.
PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Polêmica; Senso Comum; Argumentação; Dissertação Escolar

---

* Professor at Centro Universitário Unifafibe – UNIFAFIBE, Bebedouro, São Paulo, Brazil; CNPq; guarigliar@gmail.com

Introduction

The social and historical scene causes some dialogical relations that work the arrangement of discursive genres. Specifically, the scholarly argumentative genre presents four main dialogical papers: subject-producer, subject-examiner, social scenery and text-proposal. The enunciator of scholarly discourse dialogues with other three pillars of the argumentative dialectic, the dialogical matrices: the relation between subject-producer and text-proposal, subject-producer and subject-examiner and subject-producer and other social and historical voices. These matrices arrange necessary strategies for the argumentative practice.

The strategies are established through the dialogical properties that permeate the discourse and the text of scholarly genre. The three matrices substantiate the rhetoric directives that aim to validate of a hypothesis extracted from a text-proposal (whose function is to make possible a thematic from that the producer suggests a hypothesis). The dialogical properties are: thematic reduction, partial positioning adoption, breakage of text-proposal, enunciate-paraphrase from text-proposal, polarization, interrogative-rhetoric enunciate, strict logical reasoning at hypothesis-arguments-thesis, wholeness enunciate and argumentative-descriptive enunciate. These properties are shown in the dialogue considering the subjective positions: producer, examiner, text-proposal/hypothesis and social scenery.

The dialogism, which works the dialogical relations between subject-producer and the triad: social-historical voices, subject-examiner and text-proposal, is the basis that produces the dialogical properties acting in the scholarly argumentative genre. For that, there is the investigation of two argumentative categories which intersperse the dialogical matrices and the properties: consensual one (common sense enunciates) and polemical one (opposed to common sense contents).

1 The argumentative categories of consensus and polemics

The social and historical voices, one of the dialogical matrices of the scholarly argumentative discourse, propitiate to the enunciator the possibility of convergence with

a dominant discourse of the common sense or of divergence of one, through a polemical counter-argumentation arrangement.

The construction of the critical opinionated reasoning does not dispense the contraposition of discourses, since the origin of a discourse is its contradictory. So, a common sense meaning receives the dialectics of its reverse, in spite of an eventual extinguishment of this reverse by the argumentation.

The congruency with a common sense and its divergence happen inside enunciate. Thus, it is not appropriated to understand that a text, in its entirety of meaning, presents an agreement with a common sense discourse or a disagreement of one. It is more appropriated speak of consensual and polemical *enunciates* than properly consensual and polemical *text*. They are enunciates of the consensus referring to the congruence, and enunciates of the polemics, to the divergence.

Some enunciates carry out the function of producing an agreed meaning or controversial one. To fulfill this finality, enunciate must link to at least one of three dialogical matrices: subject-producer and other social and historical scenery, subject-producer and subject-examiner and subject-producer and text-proposal. Obviously, it depends also on needs of the argumentation.

Those enunciates practice the functions dictated by specific argumentative categories whose function is to cause, in the discourse and in the materiality of the text, the dialogical relations of the scholarly argumentative genre. These categories organize the contents from social scenery, and consider, for that, rhetoric strategies necessary to the conviction of the interlocutor, and orders arranged by intertexts of the scholarly text, the text-proposal. So, the category of consensus is responsible for the propagation — and for the circulation — of discourses defended and formalized by the social scene; ergo, they are discourses that *reflect* the social setting. The category of polemics causes a debate that tries, in principle, to repel the discourse of other subject; thereafter, to validate it or effectively refute it. So, they are discourses that *refract* the society. In case of validation of the common sense, it is not more a monologized discourse, previously to the polemics, because, anyway, a new conscience will pass by it:

> [...] any speaker is himself a respondent to a greater or lesser degree. He is not, after all, the first speaker, the one who disturbs the eternal silence of the universe. And he presupposes not only the existence of the language system he is using, but also the existence of preceding

utterances – his own and others' – with which his given utterance enters into one kind of relation or another (builds on them, *polemicizes* with them, or simply presumes that are already known to the listener). Any utterance is a link in a very complexly organized chain of order utterances (BAKHTIN, 1986, p.69, researcher's italic).

A consensual conception does not predict necessarily a discourse adopted by a majority of individuals pertaining to a social group or a society, quantitatively. A social conscience is permeated by prevalent meanings which are accepted by the participant individuals; so, according to Bakhtin's philosophy, the ideas are established in and for a social conscience. However, a social conscience is subject to the application of a contradictory one.

So, to polemize, according to Bakhtin's perspective, is to set the discourse of the author against the other's discourse through the same object, in order to re-structure it; "naming it, portraying, expressing" (BAKHTIN, 1984, p.195-196). It is named *hidden polemics*:

> In a hidden polemic the author's discourse is directed towards its own referential object, as is any other discourse, but at the same time every statement about the object is constructed in such a way that, apart from its referential meaning, a polemical blow is struck at the other's discourse on the same theme, at the other's statement about the same object. A word, directed toward its referential object, clashes with another's word within the very object itself. The other's discourse is not itself reproduced, it is merely implied, but the entire structure of speech would be completely different if there were not this reaction to another person's implied words. [...] The other person's begins to influence authorial discourse from within. For this reason, hidden polemical discourse is double-voiced, although the interrelationship of the two voices here is special one. The other's thought does not personally make its way inside the discourse, but is only reflect in it, determining its tone and its meaning. One word acutely senses alongside it someone else's word speaking about the same object, and this awareness determines its structure.

The discourse of the consensus, the non-polemics, is into the monologized forces of the society. However, the use of the consensual voice sometimes helps the acceptance of a hypothesis extracted by the argumentative discourse; besides, there is not necessity of contrapositions. Ergo, it is a strategic resource produced by the enunciator. The thematic can obey a sort of social order in certain contexts; thus the consensual category is a persuasive resource that generally causes an argumentative

success. The enunciator causes the illusion which the voice of the producer corroborates the social voice, as if the opinion was validated by all people, without the necessity of controversy.

So the scholarly genre argumentation is built mainly considering two categories that are inherent in the argumentative text: the *category of consensus* and the *category of polemics*. The consensual category refers to the set of contents accepted by a determined social group in a determined historical period. These contents are true, usual and practically irrefutable. The polemical one refers to the critical evaluation of consensual content:

> […] the principle of construction [of the dialogue] is everywhere the same. Everywhere there is an *intersection, consonance, or interruption of rejoinders in the open dialogue by rejoinders in the heroes' internal dialogue*. Everywhere *a specific sum total of ideas, thoughts, and words is passed through several unmerged voices, sounding differently in each*. The object of authorial aspirations is certainly not this sum total of ideas in itself, as something neutral and identical with itself. No, the object is precisely *the passing of a theme through many and various voices*, its rigorous and, so to speak, irrevocable *multi-voicedness* and *varivoicedness*. (BAKHTIN, 1984, p.265, author's italics)

2 The dialogical matrices of the scholarly argumentative genre

The dialogical matrices, centered in producer, interlocutor, social scenery and text-proposal, organize the categories of consensus and polemics. Four subjective positions of the matrices organize basically three dialogical relations which are important for the establishment of the scholarly genre argumentation: the relation between subject-producer and subject-examiner, subject-producer and social and historical scenery, and subject-producer and text-proposal. These dialectic relations are named *dialogical matrices* of the scholarly argumentative text. They do not exclude themselves; on the contrary, they are associated in order to establish some typical properties of the argumentative discourse and text.

2.1 Subject-producer and social-historical voices

Language passes by all the dialogues and is omnipresent socially; refers to ideological threads that serve to the social relations. Therefore, discourse indicates the

transformations of a society, according to Vološinov (1973, p.19). The *subject-producer and social voices matrix* (from now on, producer-social-voice matrix) is a dialogical relation that produces discourses for thematic, hypothesis and arguments. Besides, this matrix causes debates between discourses in the scholarly argumentative genre. So, this is the matrix of the ideological struggle between discourses connected with the subject and inserted by a text-proposal.

According to Vološinov (1973, p.41), "each word, as we know, is a little arena for the clash and criss-crossing of differently oriented social accents. A word in the mouth of a particular individual person is a product of the living interaction of social forces". The contradictory meaning is a logical function which is necessary for the polemics and the maintenance of the consensus.

Rancière (2004) affirms that a discourse of mass media interpellates the subject-producer of any type of verbal or non-verbal expression, manly, by means of the preexistent interpretations. It is not necessarily an event of repercussion by means of mass media which causes a social subject's interpretation, because the interpretation can "wait" for a fact referring to it in order to appear again. So, some interpretations exist before which their events happen:

> It is not the image that is the nucleus of the mass media power, and used by the governments. The nucleus of the information machine is, more exactly, the interpretation. There is the need for events, even false, because their interpretations exist before them and drive to these events. [...] It is necessary that there are always events in order to the machine works. But that does not mean that it is enough the sensational thing to sell news. It is not enough simply to announce. It is necessary to supply material to the interpretative machine. This one does not need only that anything always happens. It needs that happens also certain type of things, the called "phenomena of society": particular events that take place in the society to common persons, but the global sense of a society can be understood through symptoms that are indicated by these events, that attract an interpretation, but an interpretation that preexists them.[1] (RANCIÈRE, 2004, p.3)

---

[1] Original transcription in Portuguese: "Não é a imagem que constitui o núcleo do poder midiático e de sua utilização pelos poderes. O núcleo da máquina de informação é, mais exatamente, a interpretação. Tem-se necessidade de acontecimentos, mesmo falsos, porque suas interpretações já estão aí, porque elas preexistem e chamam esses acontecimentos. [...] É preciso que sempre haja acontecimentos para que a máquina funcione. Mas isso não quer dizer apenas que é preciso o sensacional para vender notícias. Não basta simplesmente noticiar. É preciso fornecer material à máquina interpretativa. Esta não tem necessidade apenas de que aconteça sempre alguma coisa. Tem necessidade de que aconteça também um certo tipo de coisas, os chamados 'fenômenos de sociedade': acontecimentos particulares que ocorrem

2.2 Subject-producer and text-proposal

The purpose of a text-proposal is to present a thematic to the subject-producer extract a hypothesis to produce the argumentation. The text-proposal points the hypothesis which should be analyzed by the producer, in a set of possibilities. This text-proposal type is named *polarized*. Enunciates that determine the polarity are auto-sustainable, because their undertanding is enough for the linkage of a process of production.

The understanding of contents that compose a thematic of a text-proposal favors the indication of a theme which extracts a hypothesis. So, some argumentative strategies are possible in this rhetoric genre par excellence.

Therefore, interpretation is the basis of the *subject-producer and text-proposal matrix* (from now on, producer-proposal matrix).

According to Bakhtin's thought, understanding is a dialogical skill that produces an opposition to a subject-producer's discourse. So, understanding is an embryo of a polemical position:

> To understand another person's utterance means to orient oneself with respect to it, to find the proper place for it in the corresponding context. For each word of the utterance that we are in process of understanding, we, as it were, lay down a set of our own answering words. The greater their number and weight, the deeper and more substantial our understanding will be. [...] *Any true understanding is dialogical in nature*. Understanding is to utterance as one line of a dialogue is to the next. Understanding strives to match the speaker's word with a *counter word*. (VOLOŠINOV, 1973, p.102, author's italics)

2.3 Subject-producer and subject-examiner

The *subject-producer and subject-examiner matrix* (from now on, producer-examiner matrix) is the dialogical relation more important because of the evaluation finality of the argumentative genre. Text-proposal, thematic, hypothesis, at last, the rhetoric exercise must be rigorously orientated for the objective of the activity: the approval in a selection process.

This arrangement can generate incongruity for two reasons:

---

num ponto qualquer da sociedade a pessoas comuns, mas também acontecimentos que constituem sintomas por meio dos quais o sentido global de uma sociedade possa ser lido; acontecimentos que atraem uma interpretação, mas uma interpretação que já está aí antes deles".

a. The subject-enunciator can betray his own opinion to the detriment of another premise that is more convenient to his argumentative claims; besides, he can give preference to the consensual voice in spite of wanting to discuss with it, because there is normally a risk less of rejection of a common sense. Very often, this point of view is defended by the majority of people;

b. The argumentative text is a favorable and fertile place for the legitimation of the discourse, through a debate between social voices that converge and diverge among themselves.

According to Bakhtin's circle, responsive understanding explains the dialogical relation between subject-producer and subject-interlocutor:

> The boundaries of each concrete utterance as a unit of speech communication are determined by a *change of speaking subjects*, that is, a change of speakers. […] Each rejoinder, regardless of how brief and abrupt, has a specific quality of completion that expresses a particular position of the speaker, to which one may respond or may assume, with respect to it, a responsive position. […] These specific relations among rejoinders in a dialogue are only subcategories of specific relations among whole utterances in the process of speech communication. These relations are possible only among utterances of different speech subjects; they presuppose *other* (with respect to the speaker) participants in speech communication. (BAKHTIN, 1986, p. 71-2, author's italics)

Rejoinder consists of predicting what the producer waits from his interlocutor-examiner. This prediction also occurs in the relation between producer and text-proposal, since the proposal demands a producer's responsive understanding.

3 The dialogical properties

The dialogical matrices organize argumentative strategies that are established by *dialogical properties*. They are argumentative resources relating to the scholarly argumentative genre, because social voices cause ideological struggles responsible for polemics and consensus.

The dialogical properties are conceptions organized fundamentally by the rhetoric discourse that consider also the linguistic materiality; mainly, in a genre which appraises linguistic competence and discursive logic. Acording to Bakhtin (1984,

p.181), "metalinguistic research cannot ignore linguistics and must make use of its results. [...] They must complement one another, but they must not be confused. In practice, the boundaries between them are very often violated".

3.1 Thematic reduction

This property consists of a theme, inserted by the subject-producer and extracted from the text-proposal, which does not present other diffusions of meaning that would favor better use of the thematic, and, consequently, make possible a debate. In this case, the arguments are reduced to obviousnesses; there is neither counter-argumentation.

Ergo, there is a reduction of theme which limits the hypothesis defense. The consensual category causes this property. It is a rhetoric resource whose strategy consists of the non-exhibition of the subject-producer, in order to guarantee a least coherent articulation to argumentative reasoning; without submitting to logical inaccuracies, prolixities or contradictions.

Three matrices are present in this property: the text-proposal indicates a hypothesis; certain concepts (discourses) are tied to the prediction that the producer does from the examiner, since the subject-producer is evalued; and the social and historical voices produce concepts for hypothesis and arguments.

3.2 Partial positioning adoption

This property refutes the typical demand of text-proposal: a producer's definite position that must consider necessarily the converging pole or the divergent one. Though there is the adoption of one of the poles, the producer makes an exception to the adopted pole.

Partial adoption is a property of the polemical category, since the subject-producer's opinionated thematic surpasses the text-proposal demands; thus, there is a rupture of the consensus.

In this property, the producer-proposal matrix is determinative for the polemics. A producer's rhetoric necessity characterizes the dialogue between subject-producer and subject-interlocutor: knowledge of suggested thematic, since it is possible only to produce a controversy if the producer knows the especter of thematic and its implications, to the acceptance of a hypothesis. The producer-social-voice dialogue

provides the hypothesis selection and the exception, through a set of discourses that converge for the thematic and disagree with it.

3.3 Breakage of text-proposal

The subject-producer creates a hypothesis averse to the text-proposal demand; neither favorable nor opposite. The producer maintains the proposed theme, however disregards the poles.

It is a demonstration of the polemical category, due to breakage of common sense and the limitation established by the text-proposal.

The dialogical matrices cause relations to nettle the breakage of text-proposal: the producer-proposal dialogue happens through non-acceptance of opposite poles and indication of an alternative hypothesis, but without breakage of demanded theme. The producer-interlocutor dialogue causes the breakage so that the producer occupies the position of subject-analyst and subject-counter-arguer; and the producer-social-voice dialogue provides discourses which make possible the contraposition.

3.4 Paraphrase from the text-proposal

It is a resource whose subject-producer paraphrases passages of text-proposal to creat a meaning effect: inserting the other's voice into the producer's voice. It is an interposition of same contents. The reasons of paraphrastic use: difficulty producing and proving the hypothesis, maintaining the thematic unity, and believing the text-proposal cannot be questioned. However, the subject-producer can use paraphrase for the argumentative exercise, in order to counter-argue the paraphrased passage.

So, this dialogical property refers to consensus and polemics indifferently. Fundamentally, rhetoric exigences order the paraphrastic enunciate status: consensus category (to reuse of discourse but without refute it) or polemical category (to refute it).

The paraphrase refers to the producer-proposal matrix. The producer-examiner matrix guarantees the dialogue between subject-producer and text-proposal, whose finality is to secure the connection between theme of text-proposal, hypothesis and thematic maintenance. The produce-social-voice matrix makes debates among the discourses.

3.5 Logical reasoning at hypothesis-arguments-thesis

It is the adoption of a standardized reasoning: hypothesis-arguments-thesis (introduction, development and conclusion), whose the arrangement in paragraphs is predefined: the first paragraph holds the presentation of hypothesis to be validated, the last paragraph holds the validity of hypothesis (thesis), and each intermediary paragraph (between introduction and conclusion) contains an argument which validates the hypothesis and turns it into thesis.

The use of the hypothesis-arguments-thesis reasoning is an argumentative resource, because the enunciator adopts a secure model of reasoning arrangement; metaphorically, a "cake revenue" that consists in organize the contents in pre-established parts. Therefore, the producer run less risks; there is a smaller possibility of prolixity, contradictions, and, mostly, of the breakage of textual unit.

Nevertheless, the limitation of this rigid method disregards, very often, specific necessities of the argumentation for a textual-discursive production which is also specific. The conventional logical method usage normally is a resource of the consensual category, because the producer does not break the common sense: the obligatoriness of sheltering specific concepts in certain paragraphs. On the contrary, polemical category originates each argumentative discourse which is opposed to the rigid method.

The dialogical matrices cause dialogues that participate of the logical reasoning arrangement of the scholarly argumentative genre. The producer-proposal matrix propitiates the hypothesis that determines the direction of arguments, and, consequently, of other specific rhetoric necessities of the scholarly text. The producer-examiner matrix is the prediction that the producer must establish of the interlocutor. Application or non-application of the hypothesis-arguments-thesis method has resulted in the producer-social-voice matrix.

3.6 Polarization

There are certain enunciates that present a specific semantic event: a logical emptiness in the preparation of a concept. This property happens generally in enunciates which insert a cause and effect reasoning; and the subject-producer omits concepts that justify the passage of cause for effect and vice versa. Non-justifying is relevant for the

argumentation, since this relation can disregard its rhetoric function: legitimating the hypothesis. Logical emptiness can cause a refutation or indicate that the relation cause-effect is inconsistent rhetoricly.

The polarization (adoption of one of the poles, without justifying) is an incident of the consensual category. This ellipse is a resource that uses a common sense discourse whose effect consists in presenting a prelegitimized concept, due to uncritical position. So, justifying can indicate a debate referring to the polemical category.

The producer-proposal relation inserts a hypothesis that maintains the thematic unity, and establishes other logical and rhetoric relations (such as cause-effect arguments), to validate the hypothesis to thesis. The producer-interlocutor relation makes possible the non-justifying as a rhetoric resource, so that there is no damage of the argument on account of a refutation by interlocutor. The producer-social-voice matrix causes a supply of concepts for the logical chain of enunciates.

3.7 Interrogative-rhetoric enunciate

There are interrogative enunciates which try to refute a discourse rhetoricly. This enunciate presents a specific meaning: it loads the answer with itself. This argumentative resource consists of not allowing a contradiction by interlocutor. An interrogative-rhetoric enunciate has an difficult refutation assertion. For example, the enunciate *Do you want that our children go hungry?* produced by a politician who defends a populist act publicly.

This property generally refers to the polemical category. Polemics is established by the contraposition of voices: the polemical voice of the interrogative counter-argument refutes the interlocutor's disapproval consensual one. Thus, a content of interrogative-rhetoric enunciate has a common sense information; an authority argument prevalidated socially which justify the difficult refutation by interlocutor.

The producer-proposal matrix is answerable for the thematic maintenance and, for extension, for arguments, such as rhetoric interrogative enunciates. The producer-interlocutor matrix is also active in this property, since the expectancy that the producer does of the interlocutor is basic for the institution of interrogative-rhetoric. The producer-social-voice matrix provides the interlocutor's refutation and the producer's

counter-argumentation, by means of supply of concepts to the establishment of this property.

3.8 Argumentative-descriptive enunciate

The employment of descriptive enunciates is an argumentative resource whose purpose is expose some characteristics refer to real scenery attributed to the thema of proposal and hypothesis. The subject-producer argues through observations which are generally common sense discourses.

Argumentative-Descriptive enunciates allude to consensual category, because descriptive and narrative discourses are more inclined to common sense contents than thematic ones. Sometimes the producer of this genre use a descriptive enunciate as argument. Descriptive enunciates express obviousnesses commonly, thus repeat text-proposal contents, or produce descriptions known sufficiently by interlocutor. Hence the consensual category arranges this property in an ordinary way. Besides, non-thematic enunciates create an extinguishment effect of debate, because the reports represent situations or characteristics extracted of daily life as if they spoke for themselves, without necessity of counter-argumentation.

The dialogical matrices arrange argumentative-descriptive enunciates: the text-proposal causes hypothesis that organizes the rhetoric necessities; the subject-producer creates a specific meaning effect: transporting the interlocutor to scenery of thematic exhibition; other social voices refer to producer's world knowledge which supplies the argumentation.

3.9 Wholeness enunciate

Wholeness enunciates establish the meaning effect of totality. It is a rhetorical resource which changes peculiar contents for a standard one.

Linguistically, wholeness enunciates present an excessive number of short paragraphs, and a decrease of clausal connectives. Generally there are not linguistic markers of adversity, concession, agreement or other connective that means explanation, expansion; that complements to arguments. Excepting the linguistic markers, whole enunciate presents low informative degree.

Using a totality idea to the detriment of the acceptance of specific other one, to deny an exception that can compromise the argumentative exercise, is a consensual category feature.

However, the arrangement of enunciates which now add up now particularize to rhetoric exercise is a polemical category feature. There are linguistic resources that make possible to not totality of enunciates: adversative and concessive operators.

Strictly, the producer-proposal matrix arranges the argumentative strategies, such as wholeness enunciates. The hyperbolical meaning effect of these incidents refers to the relation producer-interlocutor: exaggeration figure creates a meaning effect of sufficiency, completude, and non-existence of exceptions. The totality creates sufficiency effect as a strategy of adhesion of interlocutor, and, at the same time, in contraposition, establishes a possibility of refutation: there is wholeness argument refutation if the interlocutor knows a case only that contradicts the totality. The matrice producer-social-voice provides the consensual discourses (wholeness) and polemical ones (eventual refutation of interlocutor's discourse).

4 Analysis of consensual and polemical enunciates from a scholarly redaction

There was an entrance examination in a Brazilian university located in São Paulo State. The text-proposal of this examination is in following:

> The penal adulthood reduction of the current eighteen years old for sixteen is a present debate, due to serious incidents wrapping young people, which are authors of barbaric crimes such as a recent episode in São Paulo: juveniles killed a couple that was occupying a house in a farm. The crime shocked for the unimaginable cruelty traces.
> The subject is very controversial. The persons who defend young's responsibility argue that the young person already knows exactly what it does; besides, the penal adulthood reduction would be a way of containing the violence. On the contrary, other people defend the penal adulthood maintenance only for eighteen years old and they justify, among other arguments, which the proposal is unnecessary, besides unconstitutional; so some alterations are enough in the Child and Adolescent Code in order to juvenile's violent acts are contained.
> Write a scholary argumentative redaction regarding the controversy. Expose your point of view and defend it.

The transcription of a redaction written by a student who participated of the admission examination is in following:

> "Delinquents' factory" / (1) There are many reasons that cause the discussion on the penal adulthood reduction. Barbaric crimes whose author is an adolescent happen frequently. But, some modifications in the Child and Adolescent Code are enough so that it is the reduction for sixteen years of age. / (2) The sixteen-year-old age young person has sufficient maturity for discenir on what is certain or wrong. Besides, he even can vote, and knows virtues themselves. So, the society needs to understand them. The crime of Sao Paulo, for example, was very shocking, and what happened with the adolescents who killed the couple? They must not have been punished, but the murdered couple families still hope for justice. / (3) We still have chance to alter the code due to the increase of violence, in order to punish irresponsible adolescents of our society; otherwise we will create a criminals' factory inside our house itself[2].

The analysis searches into the dialogical properties. The text "Delinquents' Factory" presents partial positioning adoption, because the producer accepts the penal adulthood reduction, since there are alterations in the Child and Adolescent Code. It is a polemical category consequence, whereas there is a breakage in the text-proposal polarity. In spite of the hypothesis suggests the disapproval of the penal adulthood reduction, some arguments prompt an adverse position: the discernment of young people to sixteen years old, the legal concession that allows to them to vote, the uncertainty on the punishment of young criminals, and the acclaim for the punishment of "irresponsible adolescents of our society". This polemical discourse pressuposes a partial positioning adoption: the Child and Adolescent Code must be modified so that there is punishment.

---

[2] Original transcription in Portuguese (*ipsis litteris*): "Fábrica de idelinquentes" / (1) Inumeradas razões, discute o fato da maioridade penal seja apartir dos dezesseis anos de idade. Destúrbios bárbaros vem acontecendo com famílias de adolescentes, Mas que para ocorra a maioridade penal aos dezesseis anos, basta fazer algumas modificações bem articuladas no Estatuto da Criança e do Adolescente. / (2) A questão seria que aos dezesseis anos o adolescente já sabe de suas responsabilidades porque apartir desta idade o próprio adolescente que estiver com dezesseis anos pode escolher um indivíduo para governar o seu proprio país, então ele sabe muito bem das suas virtudes, e é por esse fato que temos que compreender. O crime em São Paulo por exemplo, foi muito chocante para nós, e o que aconteceu com aqueles adolescentes que mataram o casal? Se foram punidos ainda não sabemos. Mas acontece que a família do casal ainda espera alguma justiça. / (3) Pelo fato dos crimes serem constantes ainda temos chance de alterar no Estatuto alguma justiça justa para punir adolescentes irresponsaveis dentro da nossa sociedade, senão, estaremos criando uma fabrica de criminosos dentro da nossa propria casa.

The main demonstration of polemical category is the dialogue producer-proposal through paraphrastic enunciates from the text-proposal. The regard of the discourse that defends alteration in the Child and Adolescent Code, extracted of the proposal, suggests the opposite position to the penal adulthood reduction; though the enunciator does not make explicit this positioning. The producer uses the number sixteen at full length, and there is extraction of an argument from the text-proposal referring to the discernment of young people to sixteen years old. Besides, enunciator's comment about the crime also is an intertext from the proposal.

Another demonstration of polemical category is the interrogative-rhetoric usage in the segment "what happened with the adolescents who killed the couple? They must not have been punished". The interrogative-rhetoric enunciate interpellates the interlocutor, because it loads itself the logical answer; a difficult refutation discourse.

There is another dialogical property in this scholarly text: the prearranged logical reasoning at hypothesis-arguments-thesis. The producer inserts an introductory first paragraph which exposes the favorable hypothesis to the penal adulthood reduction. After, he does the argumentation in only one paragraph through an argument basically: young people to sixteen years old have discernment already. The last paragraph contains the thesis: demand for punishment to "irresponsible adolescents". The predetermined reasoning employment is a consensual category demonstration, because this model provides security to the producer.

This text has an argumentative-descriptive enunciate: "The crime of Sao Paulo, for example, was very shocking, and what happened with the adolescents who killed the couple? They must not have been punished, but the murdered couple families still hope for justice", which reports the event quoted by the text-proposal; and mentions what the families of the victims wait. This descriptive enunciate shows the consensual category, because relates characteristics of scenery, and carries out the function of a properly thematic enunciate, since the scenery characterization dispenses a concept; as if it sustains itself and it was convincing more than a thematic enunciate.

This text does not present relevant wholeness enunciates, since the argumentation is based on one argument only, through a thematic enunciate, in spite of retired from the text-propose. There are an exemple which is used for the argument, an interrogative-rhetoric enunciate and a descriptive one, instead of wholeness ones. The

unique adversative connective "but" indicates the polemical category, because represents a condition for adulthood reduction acceptance: changes in the Code.

The polarization, arranged by consensual category, happens in the introductory paragraph: the producer defends the adulthood reduction since there are changes in the Code, but does not indicate which actions would be developed so that was obtained this result; the producer mentions at least what alterations would be in the Code. This property causes an effect of accomplished concept.

Thematic reduction and breakage of the text-proposal do not exist in this scholarly text.

Conclusion

Though these reflections have not the claim of creating a methodology for the teaching of reading and scholarly redaction, they are subsidies that take the Communication and Expression professional to debate on the argumentative strategies of this genre; mainly, what concerns the application of common sense discourses, and consequently the discourses opposite to them. The understanding of argumentative finality of dialogical properties can justify many textual-discursive incidents that might be interpreted like unsuitable; for example, thematic reduction, polarization and notion that generalizes (wholeness enunciate).

This research makes possible a direction for textual evaluation of the scholarly argumentative genre. Evaluation must privilege the capacity of apprentice to produce a critical text: adopting or not the common sense after a conscious evaluation exercise.

This methodology does not allow so rigid structural rules for the argumentative reasoning organization; it is necessary that there is critical exercise of the ideas, from the abilities of reading. The acceptance of a discourse only after its contraposition is an essential condition so that the critical argumentative exercise substantiates the teaching of reading and redaction. At last, the objective of this pedagogic practice cannot be only evaluating, since it is necessary privilege the formation of a socially devoted citizen, who does not yield to unfinished or ideologically corrupted concepts.

The school has an essential function: to promote a writing linguistic-discursive competence. It also must develop a critical producer, and participant of the social,

political and economical scenery. It is a fully satisfactory and complementary skill to the main promise of teaching.

REFERENCES

BAKHTIN, M. M. The problem of speech genres. *Speech genres and other late essays.* Austin: University of Texas Press, 1986.

_____. *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984.

_____. / VOLOŠINOV, V. N., "Discourse in life and discourse in art – concerning sociological poetics". England: The Bakhtin Centre – The University of Sheffield. Disponível em: www.shef.ac.uk/uni/academic/A-C/bakh/bakhtin.html. Acesso em: 2002.

COTRIM, G. Consciência crítica e filosofia. In: *Fundamentos da filosofia:* história e grandes temas. 15.ed. São Paulo: Saraiva, 2000, p. 41-55.

GEERTZ, C. O senso comum como um sistema cultural. In: _____. O saber local. 8.ed. Petrópolis: Ed. Vozes, 2006, p. 111-41.

GUARIGLIA, R. *O consensual e o polêmico no texto argumentativo escolar.* 2008. 195 f. Tese (Doutorado em Linguística e Língua Portuguesa) – Faculdade de Ciências e Letras, Universidade Estadual Paulista – UNESP, Araraquara, 2008.

MAINGUENEAU, D. *Cenas da enunciação.* Curitiba: Criar, 2006.

MARCHEZAN, R. C. Discurso, produção e recepção. *Estudos Linguísticos.* São Paulo: Grupo de Estudos Linguísticos do Estado de São Paulo, 2001.

PERELMAN, C.; OLBRECHTS-TYTECA, L. Tratado da argumentação: a nova retórica. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 1996.

RANCIÈRE, J. As novas razões da mentira. *Folha de S. Paulo,* São Paulo, 22 ago. 2004. Caderno Mais!, p. 3.

VOESE, I. *Análise do discurso e o ensino de língua portuguesa.* São Paulo: Cortez, 2004.

VOLOŠINOV, V. N. *Marxism and philosophy of language.* Trans. Ladislav Matejka and I. R. Titunik. New York: Seminar Press, 1973.