**UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DO PAMPA**

**MÉGUI DOS SANTOS MASCARELO**

**THE CONCEPT OF RECIPROCITY AS A FEATURE OF INTERSUBJECTIVITY IN BENVENISTE'S ENUNCIATION THEORY: UNDERSTANDING TEACHER-STUDENT INTERACTION AS A (COMPLEX) REALM OF RECIPROCITY IN A LANGUAGE SCHOOL IN BAGÉ (BRAZIL)**

**Bagé**
**2015**

**MÉGUI DOS SANTOS MASCARELO**

**THE CONCEPT OF RECIPROCITY AS A FEATURE OF INTERSUBJECTIVITY IN BENVENISTE'S ENUNCIATION THEORY: UNDERSTANDING TEACHER-STUDENT INTERACTION AS A (COMPLEX) REALM OF RECIPROCITY IN A LANGUAGE SCHOOL IN BAGÉ (BRAZIL)**

Trabalho de Conclusão de Curso apresentado ao Curso de Licenciatura em Letras com habilitação em Língua Portuguesa, Língua Inglesa e respectivas literaturas da Universidade Federal do Pampa, como requisito parcial para obtenção do Título de Licenciada em Letras.

Orientadora: Profª. Drª. Kátia Vieira Morais

Co-orientadora: Profª. Drª. Silvana Silva

**Bagé**
**2015**

**MÉGUI DOS SANTOS MASCARELO**

**THE CONCEPT OF RECIPROCITY AS A FEATURE OF INTERSUBJECTIVITY IN BENVENISTE'S ENUNCIATION THEORY: UNDERSTANDING TEACHER-STUDENT INTERACTION AS A (COMPLEX) REALM OF RECIPROCITY IN A LANGUAGE SCHOOL IN BAGÉ (BRAZIL)**

> Trabalho de Conclusão de Curso apresentado ao Curso de Licenciatura em Letras com habilitação em Língua Portuguesa, Língua Inglesa e respectivas literaturas da Universidade Federal do Pampa, como requisito parcial para obtenção do Título de Licenciada em Letras.

Trabalho de Conclusão de Curso defendido e aprovado em: 18 de dezembro de 2015.

Banca examinadora:

_____
Profª. Drª. Katia Vieira Morais
Orientadora
UNIPAMPA

_____
Profª. Drª. Silvana Silva
Co-orientadora
UFRGS

_____
Profª. Drª. Clara Zeni Camargo Dornelles
UNIPAMPA

_____
Profª. Drª. Valesca Brasil Irala
UNIPAMPA

Dedico este trabalho àquele aluno que, em minha experiência como bolsista do PIBID, no ano de 2011, foi recíproco à minha enunciação até à última aula de inglês.

**AGRADECIMENTO**

A Deus, por ser o Mestre Maior da minha enunciação, a Quem devo minha total e sincera reciprocidade.

Aos meus pais, que aceitaram abrir caminho para minha "enuncia-ação" neste mundo.

À Profª. Drª. Silvana Silva, de quem serei sempre orgulhosa pupila, por acreditar em mim, na minha "subjetividade na linguagem", e me conduzir "pela mão" no caminho para o meu crescimento acadêmico.

Aos Professor@s Valesca Brasil Irala, Katia Morais, Eduardo de Oliveira Dutra, Maria Eloá Gehlen, Clara Zeni Camargo Dornelles, Simone Assumpção, Aline Lorandi, Fabiana Lazzaris e demais Professor@s, por me ajudarem a construir, de enunciado a enunciado, de contexto a contexto, o meu "status linguístico" de "pessoa subjetiva".

Às Professoras Rose Soares e Rubya Mara Munhóz de Andrade, por haverem acolhido minhas propostas de estágio, proporcionando, a mim, oportunidades de conhecimento de diferentes contextos e culturas de interação.

A todos os colegas de curso que me acompanharam, em cada momento da graduação, proporcionando-me maravilhosas "intersubjetividades".

Aos familiares, amigos, irmãos na fé, e colegas de trabalho que se fizeram presentes nos momentos bons e, também, naqueles em que nem mesmo o "sujeito" que existe em mim desejava agir na "linguagem".

Às minhas avós Maria de Lourdes P. dos Santos e Catarina Ângela F. Mascarello (*in memorian*), cujas histórias me ajudam a definir meu papel no tempo e no espaço.

Às pessoas especiais que, sendo ou não mais minhas "interlocutoras", terão sempre suas páginas dedicadas na história da minha vida subjetiva, pois me ensinaram a valorizar o que realmente importa.

"Neither a borrower nor a lender be;
For loan oft loses both itself and friend,
And borrowing dulls the edge
of husbandry.
This above all: to thine ownself be true,
And it must follow, as the night the day,
Thou canst not then be false to any man.
Farewell: my blessing season this in
thee!".

**ABSTRACT**

The object of this study is the teacher-student interaction. The mechanism of interaction is perceived, not only through behavioural, and managing actions (organisation), but mainly through linguistic attitudes involving teacher and student. In other words, usual movements of language; the purpose concealed in the class arrangement; the teacher's and student's engagement in the learning process may result in the presence of reciprocity. Based on personal experiences on the learning and teaching of English in different schools, interaction was noticeably different from one context to another. Such aspects may pass unnoticed for the participants at the considered moment, and this happens because these linguistic, behavioural (and/or organisational) records, are unconsciously acquired from and transmitted within their culture. This work aims at tracing the relationships between reciprocity and both subjectivity and intersubjectivity – according to Émile Benveniste (1902-1976). This is a qualitative study founded not only on analysis of audio recording transcriptions, but also on bibliographic research on the Theory of Reciprocity proposed by Marcel Mauss (1872-1950) and Benveniste's Theory of Enunciation. In this perspective, subjectivity and intersubjectivity are respectively understood as the speaker's capacity to turn into 'subject', and the idea of reversibility between subjective person and non-subjective person (*I-you*). For methodological purposes, they are conceived in recorded samples of classroom interaction in a specific teaching context in the City of Bagé: a language school that belongs to a language school franchising (where the acquisition of the English or Spanish language is the main aim of the school's methodology). The sample consisted of a three hour-lesson that was recorded in the first quarter of 2015, from which three excerpts were selected and subdivided in enunciative sessions. Each of these excerpts was related to a particular occurrence of "reciprocity system" between teacher and students characterised by intersubjectivity and indication of subjectivity or subjectivity of the indicator. Based on the analysis that was conducted, it is concluded that the system of reciprocity that resembles interaction in the given context was that of the Melanesian *Potlatch*. This is justified by the presence of challenge, 'incitation' to engagement in the classroom, and attempt of maintenance of authority. Finally, attention is called to the values (linguistic principles and cultural meanings) that lead our enunciation as teachers of

English for speakers of other languages. These subjectivities on stage demand due attention and an approach that helps motivating engagement from both parties, which is always the aim of education itself, independently on the 'target language'.

**Key-words**: Theory of Enunciation; Theory of Reciprocity; Classroom Interaction; English Teaching; Bagé City

**RESUMO**

O objeto deste estudo é a interação professor-aluno. Propõe-se perceber o mecanismo de interação não apenas por registros comportamentais e ações de gerenciamento (organização), mas, principalmente, por meio das atitudes linguísticas envolvendo professor e aluno. Em outras palavras, os movimentos de linguagem costumeiros; o propósito implícito em determinado arranjo de classes, o comprometimento do professor e dos alunos no processo de aprendizagem podem resultar na presença de reciprocidade. Com base em experiências pessoais no aprendizado e no ensino de inglês em diferentes escolas, a interação era perceptivelmente diferente dependendo do contexto. Tais aspectos podem passar despercebidos pelos participantes no dado momento, e isso ocorre porque estes registros linguísticos e comportamentais (e/ou organizacionais) são inconscientemente adquiridos e transmitidos dentro da cultura da qual fazem parte. Este trabalho objetiva traçar as relações entre a reciprocidade e a expressão da subjetividade e da intersubjetividade – de acordo com a concepção de Émile Benveniste (1902-1976). Trata-se de um estudo qualitativo fundamentado não apenas na análise de gravações transcritas, mas, também, em uma pesquisa bibliográfica sobre a Teoria da Reciprocidade proposta por Marcel Mauss (1872-1950) e a Teoria da Enunciação de Benveniste. Nesta perspectiva, a subjetividade e a intersubjetividade correspondem, respectivamente, à capacidade do locutor em se colocar como sujeito e à ideia de reversibilidade entre pessoa subjetiva e pessoa objetiva (*eu-tu*). Para fins metodológicos, esses termos são concebidos em amostras de interação em sala de aula, as quais foram gravadas, em um contexto específico de ensino na cidade de Bagé: uma escola que pertence a uma franquia de institutos de idiomas (onde a aquisição da língua inglesa e/ou espanhola constitui o principal objetivo da metodologia da escola). A amostra consiste na gravação em áudio de uma aula (3h/a) ministrada no primeiro trimestre de 2015, da qual três excertos foram selecionados e subdivididos em sessões enunciativas. Cada um destes excertos foi relacionado a um sistema de reciprocidade entre professor e alunos, podendo ser caracterizado pela intersubjetividade e indicação de subjetividade ou subjetivação do indicador. A partir da análise conduzida, conclui-se que o sistema de reciprocidade que mais se assemelha com a interação no contexto considerado era o do *Potlatch* da Melanésia. Tem-se por justificativa a presença do desafio, incitação

ao comprometimento em sala de aula e a tentativa de manutenção da autoridade. Por conseguinte, a atenção é voltada para os valores (princípios linguísticos e significados culturais) que conduzem a nossa enunciação enquanto professores de língua inglesa para falantes de outras línguas. Estas subjetividades em ação demandam a devida atenção e uma abordagem que motive o engajamento de ambas as partes, conferindo a meta da educação em si, independentemente da língua-alvo.

**Palavras-chave:** Enunciação; Reciprocidade; Interação; Ensino de Inglês; Cidade de Bagé

# CHARTS

# CONTENTS

# 1 INTRODUCTION

Having experienced the teaching of English in public and private schools, either as a student or as a teacher, some aspects in language and behaviour would point to the teacher-student interaction. Such registers - use of pronouns, who and how the teacher address in the class, what is concealed in the class arrangement, teacher's and student's engagement in the process, and so on - were made differently from one context to another. Those pass unnoticed for the teacher and students, owing to the fact that such practises, whether linguistic or behavioural (or even management practises), are acquired from and within their culture.

The human being is conceived as such because language is in the human nature, according to Benveniste (1958/2005). Likewise, in the author's viewpoint, language constitutes a natural feature through which the word repertoire is "updated" for the sake of subjectivity, which is built under several different sources of influence. Among these influencing factors, we can highlight biological, psychological, environmental, social functioning. On the other side – but not totally separate from the other – another aspect which may be one the top of this list: culture. In turn, it is through the language that a culture is sustained. It is by interacting with others, by exchanging subjectivities, that certain principles and values are transmitted. Symbols are preserved and updated through the language.

It would not be any different from educational environments. A good explanation on how language learning and sources of influence are related to one another can be found in *Didactics in Foreign Languages*, by Pierre Martinez.

> The individual, societies and languages are all intermingled in a game of didactical relationship that shall not be exempt from the human communication rules. The teaching of foreign languages, in fact, should only be examined as a form of communicative exchange: teaching is to put in contact, through the act itself, linguistic systems, and the variables of the situation reflect either on the individual psychology as on the social functioning in general. Who begins to learn a language, acquire it and practice it in a biological, biographical and historical contexts.[1] (1948/2003, p. 15, our translation)

---

[1] "*O indivíduo, a sociedade e as línguas entram em jogo em uma relação didática que não escapa às regras da comunicação humana. O ensino de línguas estrangeiras só pode, com efeito, ser examinado como uma forma de troca comunicativa: ensinar é por em contato, pelo próprio ato, sistemas linguísticos, e as variáveis da situação refletem-se tanto sobre a psicologia do indivíduo falante quanto sobre o funcionamento social em geral. Quem*

This work is aimed at tracing the relationships between reciprocity expressions and both subjectivity and intersubjectivity. It also investigates how these concepts work in recorded samples of interaction between teacher and students in a three-hour lesson at a language school. The samples were obtained with the consent of the participants. Then, we will analyse the pieces of recording transcribed - in order to find registers of reciprocity and how they occur from both teacher and student. Such descriptive work will be founded on readings of both Enunciation Linguisitics and Anthropology.

The aforementioned analysis will be based on our findings from studies in the field of Benveniste's Enunciation Theory, since he is an author who had such a great concern towards describing languages and explained specific structures. This included pronouns, verbs and its structures related to subject pronouns, verb tenses, and word origins. Not only that, but he also made connections between linguistic, more precisely, semantic, lexical and syntactical[2] structures to an anthropological comprehension of language. This study will also find support in Mauss' Reciprocity Theory, who is considered the pioneer in the studies of reciprocity. With the forms of reciprocity, reported by him through the description of archaic societies, it will be possible to outline the types mentioned and adequately categorise them from less evolved to more evolved form of reciprocity. These will serve us as a didactical tool for comparing enunciative similarities between specific mechanisms of reciprocity – even though we should consider that they are modified along with time and within a culture[3]. After a reflexive discussion on educational systems and classroom interaction culture in the city of Bagé, it is intended to reach a conclusion on what

---

*começa a aprender uma língua, adquire-a e a pratica em um contexto biológico, biográfico e histórico."* (MARTINEZ, 1948/2003, p. 15)

[2] The author brings into analysis two concepts – *gift* and *exchange* –, testifies their meaning in different languages, considering their roots, the contexts and influence of some Indo-European languages.

[3] We are introduced, in the subhead of the essay *The Gift* (MAUSS, 1954/2002), to the sort of social groups researched: *The form and reason for exchange in archaic societies*. We ought to be careful not to transpose this subhead to modern societies, which would result in "revival" of concepts that may well have been overcome, such as those of taboo and imposition. As the author informs on Fr Schmidt depiction of Andaman islanders, conducted in the early 20th century, the exchanges of gifts would foster hospitality, or, in Schmidt's words: "The goal is above all a moral one, the object being to foster friendly feelings between the two persons in question, and if the exercise failed to do so, everything had failed." (apud MAUSS, 1954/2002, p. 25) According to Schmidt, it is different from "more developed societies", where the purpose is "commerce and exchange".

principles (linguistic and cultural) should lead our enunciation as teachers of English for Brazilian speakers.

.

## 2 ENUNCIATION, ANTHROPOLOGY, AND TEACHER-STUDENT INTERACTION

After some experiences in learning and teaching English in Bagé, after going through some different teaching approaches of English (e.g.: Communicative, English for Specific Purposes) and different contexts of teaching, certain factors led us to conclude that in these approaches, the interaction can be analysed from the point of view of Enunciation and Anthropology. The present analysis will be made by highlighting the cultural and linguistic experiences of both parties: teacher and student within a teaching environment, purpose and educational system. All of these apply influences on classroom interaction[4].

In order to account for our theoretical choices, the linguistic experiences will be, later in this work, described and analysed in the light of Enunciation Linguistics, more precisely from the point of view of Émile Benveniste found in three of his articles compiled in Problems in General Linguistics I[5]: "*Relationships of person in the verb*" (1946/2005), "*Subjectivity in the language*" (1958/2005)*,* and "*The Gift and Exchange in the Indo-European vocabulary*" (1951/2005). This author discusses the important aspects of language nature, the treatment that linguistic categories receive in several languages from different roots, the subjectivity as a feature of language use, as well as the categories of tense and person that help us understand man as a result of successive linguistic experiences. Last but not the least, he outlines the linguistic marks of subjectivity and how culture is implied in them. These marks,

---

[4] An excerpt taken from Duranti's *Linguistic Anthropology* (1997, p. 275) has also motivated us to seek for an approach that explored a situation that comprised a common interaction. Besides that, it is intended to embrace a setting of conversation where observation does not frequently occur for academic purposes: "One of the problems with the empirical validation of conversation analystis' findings and claims and the extension of their work to a wider range of speech communities has been the relatively small number of studies of conversational interaction carried out by linguistic anthropologists outside the US (or the UK). This is partly due to the fact that many linguistic anthropologists tend to concentrate on ritual and political speech and they rarely record casual conversational exchanges. This has made it difficult to have comparable data for cross-cultural analysis. Unfortunately, some of the earlier refutations of the universality of the English turn taking system were not based on actual recordings (Godard, 1977; Reisman, 1974, *apud* DURANTI, 1997, p. 275). We are proposing, in this study, a focus on the culture of interaction, in a casual setting in a language school, that demonstrates the importance of an apprehension of featuring distinctions (for instance, how to approach speaking to a beginner student in contrast to an intermediate student, how to approach cultural conflicts to a group of students coming from downtown in contrast to a group of students living in the countryside, etc.) that may be determining for the teacher's decisions on how to adapt the methodologies found in language teaching guidebooks. We are provoked to think on to what extent they work out on diverse cultural groups.

[5] *Relationships of person in the verb* and *The Gift and the Exchange in the Indo-European vocabulary* will have a section devoted to the explanation of the theory applied to each of these chapters. *Subjectivity in the language* should also have its own section. However, that would demand the reference to other disciplines, authors etc., possibly causing the research to lose its focus. The theme of subjectivity appears in through this work within the chapters because it serves as one of the basis for the understanding of the object of study in Enunciation.

according to Benveniste, are the treatment the subject [6]gives to the pronouns in one's own enunciation, whether these pronouns refer to subjective or objective persons, which are included in the category of person in opposition to that of non-person. The referred proposition was made by Benveniste in response to the traditional Greek grammar classification of persons that are enumerated in agreement to verb conjugation. (BENVENISTE, 1946/2005, p.247)

Before going through these two aspects of language – an enunciative approach by Émile Benveniste –, and an anthropological approach on semantic specificities[7] of the terms *gift* and *exchange*, by Marcel Mauss (1954/2002), it is pivotal to clarify what constitutes language and subjectivity, from the point of view of Benveniste. In other words, the author, by pointing out the distinctions of relationship between "person" and verb in very particular languages, gives us a deeper comprehension, in *The subjectivity in the language,* of how the gaps provided by language – as a human nature – are filled in for the sake of subjectivity.

> Language is accordingly the possibility of subjectivity because it always contains the linguistic forms appropriate to the expression of subjectivity, and discourse provokes the emergence of subjectivity because it consists of discrete instances. In some way language puts fourth "empty" forms which each speaker, in the exercise of discourse, appropriates to himself and which he relates to his "person", at the same time defining as *I* and a partner as *you.* The instance of discourse is thus constitutive of all the coordinates that define the subject and of which we have briefly pointed out only the most obvious. (BENVENISTE, 1958/1971, p. 227)

Bearing in mind that these "empty" forms which are possible to any *língua* are the features of language that allow the speaker to imprint subjectivity to his (or her) enunciation, it is the social and cultural constructions of the speaker that will decide on how these gaps shall be filled. As a matter of fact, was not it for these blank spaces, language could not play its role.

---

[6] Here, subject is understood as the status that the speaker attains by referring to oneself as "I", according to one of the definitions proposed by Benveniste. More specifically, this meaning is represented in the author's article named "Subjectivity in the language" (1958/1971): "The 'subjectivity' we are discussing here is the capacity of the speaker to posit himself as a 'subject'." (p. 224) and "Language is possible only because each speaker sets himself up as a *subject* by referring himself as *I* in his discourse." (p. 225, author's italics)

[7] Provided by Benveniste in "*The Gift and the Exchange in the Indo-European vocabulary*" (1951/2005), and Mauss (1954/2002) in The Gift.

> The importance of their use can be compared to the nature of the problem they (pronominal forms) come to solve, which is nothing but that of the intersubjective communication. The language has solved the problem by creating a set of 'empty' signals, non-referencing towards the 'reality', ever available, which also become 'full' as soon as a speaker owns them in each instance of his discourse). (...) Their role consists of providing with the tool to a conversion, the so to speak conversion of language into discourse. (BENVENISTE, 1956/2005, p. 280, our translation)[8]

Therefore, language is in the nature of man because this "empty" forms embrace the structures that allow man to represent himself, his listener and others – the object of his enunciation –, in and through the '*língua*'[9] he deploys within a context of interaction, which also includes the instances of time and place. Thus, such features cannot be analysed in disregard of their users, that is to say, the men and the context in which they are based. In Benveniste's words, it is clear that language should not be considered an instrument, or rather, be explored without its credits to its human willingness to symbolise:

> All features of language, its immaterial nature, its symbolic functioning, its articulated organisation, and the fact that it is constituted of *content*, are enough to make the association to an instrument suspecting, for it tends to dissociate the man from his property of language." (BENVENISTE, 1958/2005, p. 285, our translation, author's italics)[10]

Another concept that has been linked to the production of utterance is the subjectivity. Going back to *Subjectivity in the language*, we come across the explanation of how a speaker becomes a subject in and through the language. Subjectivity is understood as the ability of the man to put himself, his perspectives, an expression of a given reality from his point of view, and this is possible by saying *I*,

---

[8] *"A importância da sua função se comparará à natureza do problema que servem para resolver, e que não é senão o da comunicação intersubjetiva. A linguagem resolveu esse problema criando um conjunto de signos 'vazios', não referenciais com relação à 'realidade', sempre disponíveis, e que se tornam 'plenos' assim que um locutor os assume em cada instância do seu discurso."* (BENVENISTE, 1956/2005, p. 280)

[9] We chose to represent the language one speaks by '*língua*', and 'language' by that human nature in which and through which the man becomes a subject, as Benveniste proposes, by filling the enunciative "gaps" it makes available. This choice regards the research identity, represented by a teaching context observed in Brazil, where the native '*língua*' is Brazilian Portuguese. In addition to that, as a consequence of the distinction made in Benveniste's theory, and given that the same word "language" stands for both meaning, the Portuguese term '*língua*' will be preserved.

[10] *"Todos os caracteres da linguagem, a sua natureza imaterial, o seu funcionamento simbólico, a sua organização articulada, o fato de que tem um conteúdo, já são suficientes para tornar suspeita essa assimilação a um instrumento, que tende a dissociar do homem a propriedade da linguagem."* (BENVENISTE, 1958/2005, p.280)

which will be determined, as Benveniste adds, "by his linguistic status of 'person'." (BENVENISTE, 1958, p. 286.)[11]. In similar terms, José Luiz Fiorin (2010, p. 33) asserts that cultural influences over one's utterance correspond to his discursive competence, which Fiorin defines as the knowledge one has on the circumstances where he communicates with someone else, who is also to be known. The author, referring to competences, adds that:

> The speaker takes into account, in the production of an utterance, a 'deontological code' (KERBRAT-ORECCHIONI, 1980, p. 210 apud FIORIN, 2010, p. 33), which rules what culture would consider an honest verbal exchange. This code is constituted of conversational maximums, which mean discursive injunctions. Hence, either are they followed, or broken. Although its existence cannot be denied, as long as it is noticeable that they mark out the exchange of information, its statute is not quite clear, because they seem to depend, at the same time, on ethics, linguistics, sociology and anthropology. (KERBRAT-ORECCHIONI, 1980, p. 210 apud FIORIN, 2010, p. 33)

Thus, it is noticeable how context interferes in the product of enunciation: at the very moment I enunciate *I*, I am not only saying it to myself, or rather, this is not all about being "egocentric" towards the object of my enunciation when addressing the listener. In other words, I do not only give or share something of my own when I speak, I am also dealing with the "person" of the listener. By person, one could understand the personality, an objectivity that this one puts in one's disposal in a practice of interaction. It is in this correlation of person, both subjective and objective persons, that discourse is to be shaped differently according to the culture and how it conceives social interaction, reciprocity, morality, contract, and institutions, which are concepts addressed in BENVENISTE (1951/2005) and MAUSS (1954/2002).

> As *gift*, one might refer to any sort of exchange between individuals or groups, caused to happen due to its supposed 'naivety' or 'unpretentiousness'. However, this term is defined within a set of social and cultural rules, that is to say, that (rites) structure the discourses, the exchange of subjectivity, that is, intersubjectivity, that designs a form of reciprocity of goods.

---

[11] In a lesson on subjectivity from Benveniste's perspective, in a class of Theories of Discourse at Universidade Federal do Pampa (2015), a question about what defines this linguistic status was posed. In response, Doctor Silvana Silva brought up the analogy to contexts of speech in which the history and the social references of the speaker influence the effect of his enunciation upon the listener.

This work suggests that these cultural, economical, religious and social rules that structure and support the way people interact also feature reciprocity cultures among individuals, and groups likewise. This is, in effect, true for the context of education, whichever the area of knowledge it is to be considered. Then, according to the level of complexity in the social interaction and its form of exchange, language will adapt its "empty" spaces to suit that culture.

From the point of view of Kerbrat-Orecchioni (1980, p. 208, in FIORIN, 2010, p. 33), Fiorin traces the point of dependence between the production of an utterance and morality:

> The speaker takes into account that, in the production of an utterance, a 'deontological code' (KERBRAT-ORECCHIONI, 1980, p. 210), which rules what culture would consider an honest verbal exchange. This code is constituted by conversational maximums, which are discursive injunctions. Consequently, they can be both followed or infringed. Although its existence cannot be denied, since it is evident that they mark out the exchange of information, its status is not clear, for they seem to depend on ethics, linguistics, sociology and anthropology. All at the same time. (KERBRAT-ORECCHIONI, 1980, p. 2010). (FIORIN, 2010, p. 33, our translation)[12]

Observing these assumptions, it is possible to affirm that enunciation, taken as an act, is included in human attitudes, which in turn comprises verbal and behavioural acts. As a result, it could be posed that enunciation has an intersection with other expressions of attitudes, as well as a cause and/or effect of them. Within interactional communication, one is always subject provoke facial, body and verbal attitudes in return to an utterance.

This is where we attempt to relate our object of study, the verbal and behavioural representation in teacher-student interaction, referring to what could be informally named "enunciaction", to the Anthropology of reciprocity proposed by Marcel Mauss (1954/2002), who correlates forms of exchange to differently evolved cultures.

---

[12] *"O falante leva em conta, na produção de um enunciado, um 'código deontológico' (Kerbrat-Orecchioni, 1980, p. 210), que rege o que a cultura consideraria uma troca vernal honesta. Esse código é constituído de máximas conversacionais, que são injunções discursivas. Portanto, ora são seguidas, ora violadas. Embora sua existência não possa ser negada, pois é evidente que elas balizam a troca de informações, seu estatuto não é bem nítido, pois elas parecem depender, ao mesmo tempo, da ética, da linguística, da sociologia e da antropologia"* (KERBRAT-ORECCHIONI, 1980, p. 2010). (FIORIN, 2010, p. 33)

In the next chapters, we will go further on each of the theories. Before we go through Enunciation Linguistics itself, we intend to provide a brief history of Linguistics to show how its scope has changed in terms of conceptions (or goals) of language as an object of study until the development of Enunciation Linguistics. Subjects, such as the origin of linguistic studies and what it means to study and analyse a language, will be considered. Then, a focus will be given to some of linguistic works in the perspective of Enunciation conducted by Benveniste, shedding light upon linguistic and cultural aspects in interpersonal interaction.

Finally, it is imperative that a discussion on the relevance of Mauss' theory proposed in *The Gift* (1950/1990) is given its due space in this study, for it was devoted not only to mapping the forms of reciprocity in very particular and archaic societies, but also to showing that no matter what this "gift" is represented by, whether it is by an object, a favour, a talent, a knowledge – since it is something one externalises towards another person –, it is strongly linked to the giver in a way that the recipient shall feel charged to  compensate it. A break in this rule would mean a taboo.

We will examine Mauss' reports on different societies to identify different forms of reciprocity among archaic societies and recognise their level of complexity and challenge (of power and honour). A semantic comprehension was presented by Émile Benveniste on his *Problems in General Linguistics*, in which he points out how certain verbs and nouns have been regarded, in a different way, along with time and across different social groups. Throughout his analysis of the concept of "gift" and "exchange", the author suggested that culture shapes the meaning of a signal, as this meaning may differ according to the syntactical construction that comprises this signal, or rather, the word. That is the case of the word *gift* and the verb "to give" (and its opposite, "to take"), which occur within more or less reciprocal interaction.

The purpose of such analysis leads us to the following aim: to consider that knowledge and skill can be conceived as a gift for someone who acquires it after a more or less long process of learning and qualification. Some questions may spring to mind in this moment of the research: What is made of this gift? Is it a possession that is shared, lent and borrowed, sold and bought, given and rewarded or given away? These questions make us reflect on the object of reciprocity – skills in the target-*"língua"* – and what linguist strategies are put to work to lead interaction to a more effective one. It is suggested that the teacher not only pays attention to the

feelings of the student, the motivation of the students, and the level of proficiency in the "*língua*" alone. It is also important to consider all of them shaping student's enunciation; in other words, the movements of language that characterise his (or her) attitudes towards reciprocity, so that this teacher sets out a more intersubjective interaction with this student.

# 3 A BRIEF HISTORY OF LINGUISTICS: FROM NORMATIVE TO SYSTEMATIC APPROACH TO LANGUAGE AND WHEN IT BECAME A SCIENCE

After normative studies by the Greeks, or the criticism by the philologists in Alexandria, the comparison among languages in the late 1700's, and the philosophical studies on the nature and mechanisms of language, Linguistics, as a science, was born to historical studies of language in the 18th century. Until then, such studies would aim at discovering the origin of a group of languages through its development in a timeline[13]. Thus, after going through several stages of development, the actual object of study could be defined: the "*língua*" itself.

As we can see, Linguistics came from historical studies. This is confirmed by Mattoso Câmara Jr. in the first chapter of *The History of Linguistics* (6th ed.), where he establishes stages of development of related studies that eventually turned out to constitute what is called the field of Linguistics:

> "Linguistics is quite a new science. It was originated in Europe in the early 19th Century as an aspect of a historical study. Before that, we had what can be called the *pre-linguistics* and the *paralinguistics* in the Western culture. There is no such thing as linguistics in the Eastern culture, even in those more evolved cultures, that is, the Old China and Old India. The philological and the philosophical studies of the language were offered in these two countries, with some frequency, with a brilliant effectiveness. There must have naturally been *The Study of the Right and Wrong*. The Linguistics, nevertheless, has not evolved from these efforts." (CAMARA JR., 1975/2006, p. 20, our translation)[14]

Linguistics has gone through several approaches. It has begun with the goal of determining the proper structures of language, giving distance from the owner (man) to its nature (language), relating each other as user and instrument. Then, things started to change when language became an object of philosophical studies – here, we should regard the work of Wilhelm von Humboldt, who observed several

---

[13] *Investigation on the Origin of the Old Nordic or Icelandic*, by the Danish philologist Rasmus Rask (cf. MATTOSO CAMARA JR. 1975/2006, p.41)

[14] "A linguistica *é uma ciência muito nova. Começou a existir na Europa em princípios do século XIX sob o aspecto de um estudo histórico, como veremos mais tarde. Antes dessa época encontramos apenas a* pré-linguística *e a* paralinguística *na cultura ocidental. Não há qualquer tipo de linguística na cultura oriental, mesmo nos países mais adiantados então, ou seja, a China e a Índia antigas. O estudo filológico e o estudo filosófico da linguagem foram lá oferecidos, algumas vezes, com eficiência brilhante. Devia ter havido, naturalmente,* O Estudo do Certo e Errado. *A linguística, porém, não evoluiu desses esforços."* (CAMARA JR., 1975/2006, p. 20)

exotic "*línguas*" –, for they would point to the linguistic phenomena, to the nature and mechanisms of language, as well as describe very peculiar languages. These efforts, which were not enough to turn Linguistic into a science once it was restricted to reasoning and reflection on language in general, built the basis for the constitution of language as a science (CAMARA JUNIOR, 1975/2006, p. 37). It has only been accepted as a science after the Historical Linguistics, due to the fact that it takes language as a living constituent that is subject to evolution, changing according to the humans' needs. As Robert Martin (2002/2003, p.135), "as long as a '*língua'* stays alive, it will not stop undergoing changes, adapting itself to an ever changing community, as well as reflecting on a viewpoint of the things which is constantly changing."

And what might have led Linguistics to turn into a science through the Historical Linguistics? It is supposed to be the genealogical approach and studies on roots, on language influences, its movements and what they mean in terms of social and cultural awareness. (MARTIN, 2002/2003, p. 136)

After this summary on what has been found about the origin of Linguistics should we move on to the main source of descriptive methodological analysis, a very important contribution to the development and spread of Linguistics. This was given by the Swiss Ferdinand de Saussure, who immerged into the study of 'language' (and '*línguas*' as well).

This contribution may have been that of not considering language only as an aspect of history; instead, as a part of social organisation and functioning. Saussure would face Linguistics as part of a more general science, the so called science of signals, or rather, *"Semasiology".* That was what he did when he established the difference between "*langue*" and "*parole*": the former is developed within a society, and the latter, an individual realisation. The notion of *língua*, as it suggests, of being an abstract good is justified by the relationship it has with community: a means of raising links between "complex vocal sounds and other concepts". Therefore, *língua* constitutes a relationship between 'signifie' and 'significant'.

> Saussure proposed this idea distinguishing, on one hand, what he called 'significant' (*le signifiant*) and, on the other hand, 'signifie' (*le signifié*). A phonetic form, or rather, 'significant', refers to a concept or a bundle of ideas,

that is, the 'signifie'. It is from that relationship that linguistics results. (CAMARA JR, 1975/2006, p. 129, our translation)[15]

That is, therefore, the basis for Saussure's concept of language as a system. A system of oppositions represented by what has been called "dichotomies": 'Signifie'/'Significant', Langue[16]/Parole, Synchrony/Diachrony, Paradigmatic/Syntagmatic. Nevertheless, this conception met some inconsistencies in regard to "Langue/Parole", which was then perceived, to a certain extent, rigid and not considerate towards the subjectivity in "Parole". In his successful attempt to clarify the aforementioned opposition, he introduced four important terms: the "act of speech", "psychophysical mechanism", "objective" and "discourse" (CAMARA JR., 1975/2006, p 130-1).

In Saussure's point of view, '*língua*' is a system because it rules one's performance, or rather, the use of that '*língua*'. Thus, he proposes the concept of parole as an individual feature of 'language', whereas '*língua*' is social. However, they are intermingled, since the latter is ruled by the former, while the former cannot be described without its materialisation. Flores et al. (2009), brings some important considerations on such thesis presented by Saussure and his intention in establishing a science of 'language' and defining the object of this science, which Saussure claims to be the '*língua*' itself. In this regard, Flores refers:

> In the chapter entitled "The Object of Linguistics", Saussure assumes the fact that, unlikely other sciences, whose objects are previously established, it does not occur in Linguistics, given that the language is introduced to the researcher with different facets, such as a sound, idea, syntactic structure etc. For Linguistics, the object does not pre-exists to the theory by which it is analysed. On the contrary, it is in the light of a perspective that the object shall be constructed." (FLORES *et al.*, 2009, p. 18, our translation)[17]

---

[15] *"Saussure propôs esta ideia distinguindo, de um lado, o que ele chamou de 'significante' (le signifiant) e, de outro, de 'significado' (Le signifié). Uma forma fonética, ou significante, relaciona-se a um conceito ou feixe de ideias, o significado, e desta relação resulta a forma linguística."* (CAMARA JR, 1975/2006, p. 129)

[16] Flores (*et al.*, 2009, p. 18) identifies Saussure's understanding of '*língua*' in the following arguments: "the '*língua*' has an autonomous definition, it is seen as a system, it is a norm for all realisations of 'language' (as a type of expression, according to Cambridge Dictionaries Online), and therefore, may be considered an object of scientific study. The '*língua*' is just a part of the 'language', it is its social product and, as such, it is shared within its speech community through a 'contract' that is established among its members; (...) it is defined by its concrete nature." On the other hand, Benveniste's concept of '*língua*' (which stands for language in Portuguese, e.g.: English language, Portuguese language, Spanish, German, and so on), in the present monograph, corresponds to the system of distinctive and referential values that depends upon the form and context of enunciation, in accordance with Flores (*et al.*, 2009, p. 150)

[17] *"No capítulo intitulado 'Objeto da Linguística', Saussure parte do fato de que, diferentemente de outras ciências, que tem objetos previamente estabelecidos, na linguística isso não ocorre, já que a linguagem se apresenta ao pesquisador com faces diferentes como som, como ideia, como estrutura sintática etc. Na*

To go throughout an in-depth history of Linguistics, it would demand an extended chapter. This might not be the purpose here as this work comprises Linguistics and an anthropological view of the concept of reciprocity. Thus, exchange in 'language' is considered among different cultural groups, as well as what implications such knowledge has over the teaching of English in the observed context.

---

*linguística, o objeto não preexiste à teoria com a qual ele vai ser analisado. Ao contrário, é à luz de um ponto de vista que o objeto deve ser construído.''* (FLORES *et al.,* 2009, p. 18)

## 4 THE ENUNCIATION CONCEIVED BY ÉMILE BENVENISTE: A BROADER UNDERSTANDING ON 'LANGUAGE'

Willing to go further on Saussure's studies and his proposed relations – more precisely, relations of opposition –, Benveniste attempts to fulfill the 'gaps' left by his 'ancestor' in his explanation on the nature of '*língua*' – relating it to the idea of signal (FLORES, 2009, p19, our italics). He also suggests that 'language' presumes subjectivity (FLORES, 2013, p. 44).

The object of Enunciation, whatever its line of thought and how it is related to Saussurean General Linguistics is the enunciation. Enunciation, for Benveniste, as a field of study, embraces the idea of individual use of '*língua*', the people involved, the non-person, the time and space, the history, culture, society, subjectivity (although this one is usually barely accessed), and belief. Throughout these elements, this perspective is concerned towards the meaning in variations of structure, phonology, intonation, among others, in the actualisation of '*língua*'.

An interesting fact about Benveniste's theory is that the author does not discard Saussure's theory[18]. Instead, he assumes that '*língua*' is (also) something else than a system of signals. On one hand, we have the signal as a semiotic unit, on the other, the phrase, as a discourse unit "subordinate to the semantic order". (FLORES, 2013, p. 79). In summary, the "Saussure's notion of signal as the only principal"[19] for '*língua*' structure and functioning is 'unfolded'[20].

Benveniste's ideas, then, give us a broader understanding of the concepts of 'language', '*língua*' and subjectivity. This is 'language' the 'means' of (partial) subjectivity expression. When he says the "man within '*língua*", he means that the 'language' of this human being, the more or less explicit expression of his subjectivity, is ruled by a complex group of surrounding norms, laws, social prescriptions, psychological conditions, as well as cultural and religious prescriptions. Despite these more or less fixed norms, 'language' is the natural part of ourselves through which we can share or disguise our thoughts, feelings and intentions.

---

[18] In this respect, Flores (2013, p. 78-9) concludes that Benveniste stretches his view of signal to its semiotic and semantic understanding. He does not refuses Saussure's distinction between '*língua*' and *parole*. "*In short and only to affirm my reading on the occurrence of 'going beyond' in 'The form and meaning in the language': Beveniste indeed goes beyond Saussure; he reaches the realm of* phrase, *of* semantics, *but he can only do that by including Saussure, and the realm of signal.*" (p. 79, our translation)

[19] "*a noção saussuriana do signo como princípio único*". (FLORES, 2013, p. 80)

[20] We shall not refer this procedure as an overtaking regarding Saussure's notion of signal system. Rather, the "second generation semiology" (FLORES, 2013, p. 81) is 'based' on the first generation.

Benveniste shows us in his *Problems in General Linguistics* what kind of bond there is between 'language' and communication. As we will see, 'language' is assumed to be a part of human nature in which our essence and external influences play their roles.

> A word, in order to assure 'communication', needs to be enabled to this 'communication' through the language of which it is an actualisation. In fact, it is in the language that we ought to look after the condition for this aptitude, for it seems to dwell in a feature of language which is little plain under the obviousness that disguises it. Thus, we may still not be able to distinguish it. (BENVENISTE, 1958/2005, p.285-6, our translation)[21]

Enunciation theory is mainly interested in analysing the meaning, whether it is embedded in phonological, morphological, or syntactical construction. Meaning is a key feature of 'language' that mostly raises problems among cultures that somehow interact, because there is not anything such as a correspondent form for all the words, nor all idioms, or linguistic structures in two *'línguas'* or more. This is nedless to say that this interaction occurs in the use of 'language', a natural feature of humans.

Also, according to Flores (2009, p. 21) the mechanism of meaning production varies within the theories, whereas it is the link between "saying" and what is indeed "said", between enunciation and utterance, as well as the production process of an utterance and its product that remains as a mutual character of enunciation theories. Meaning, as it was mentioned above, is not only a linguistic aspect, but also a cultural product, since it is within a culture that "verbal signals" (this term was chosen simply in order to give a very plain example) become representation of the ideological images built inside this cultural territory, and these are inherited and updated through the generations. It is interesting to note that Benveniste also points that in certain cultures, as those of the far East, where conventions of politeness are appropriated, deliberated modifications in the discourse are made in order to suit the situation.

'*Língua*' is not only a cultural expression formed by signals. It is for the sake of "subjectivity in the 'language'" – a phrase coined by Benveniste (1958) – that '*língua*' propitiates an update of these linguistic signals, such as "pronouns, verbal

---

[21] "*Para que a palavra assegure a 'comunicação', é preciso que esteja habilitada a isso pela linguagem, da qual é apenas a atualização. De fato, é na linguagem que devemos procurar a condição dessa aptidão. Ela reside, parece-nos, numa propriedade da linguagem, pouco visível sob a evidência que a dissimula, e que não podemos ainda caracterizar a não ser sumariamente.*" (BENVENISTE, 1958/2005, p. 285-6)

tenses, speech verbs, adverbs of time and place, syntactical functions of interrogation, call or assertion, modalisation" (FLORES, 2009, p. 22, our tanslation)[22]. An example of such actualisation is the switching use of the pronouns "I", "you", "he" and their intralinguistic (I, we; *eu, nós* in Brazilian Portuguese). Subjectivity is a concept widely described by theorists and used as being one of the linguistic mechanisms of meaning production, besides those of society and culture.

Those and other "linguistic mechanisms allow us to study what Fuchs (1985) generically named 'inscription of subject in its own linguistic system core.'" (FLORES, 2009, p.22, our translation)[23]. This 'language' feature is therefore the "essential part of the linguistic description" (FLORES, 2009, p. 22, our translation)[24]. Nonetheless, the effect on the utterance addressee also matters in the linguistic analysis of our object, for subjectivity is a very instant constituent in the use of '*língua*'. It is present at the very moment of the enunciation, after which the subjectivity is made available to the recipient.

This is why interaction is a result of the enunciation produced by one person (one of the three Benveniste's instances of discourse: subject, person, man[25]) speaking to another. This is when reciprocity may be established in linguistic attitudes occurring in 'language teaching' – as  the teaching of writing in S. Silva (2013), for example, where the relationship between culture and 'transmission of knowledge' is defined by attitudes in "the process of the student's symbolic entrance in the writing". (SILVA, 2013, p. 16)

In the next section, we will attempt to determine the relationship between the idea of "gift" and instance of discourse. To do so, we will go through some important concepts developed by Benveniste in his *Problems in General Linguistics*: person and non-person and instance of discourse, indication of subjectivity, subjectivity of the indicator, reciprocity and reversibility, the enunciation apparatus and co-reference; finally, the enunciative concepts in "gift" and "exchange". This option was made based on the idea of person and non-person to understand what enunciation,

---

[22] "*os pronomes, os tempos verbais, os verbos de fala, os advérbios de tempo e de lugar, as funções sintáticas de interrogação, de intimação ou de asserção, as modalidades*". (FLORES, 2009, p. 22)

[23] "*Enfim, integram o escopo de análise das teorias da enunciação todos os mecanismos linguísticos que permitam estudar o que Fuchs (1985) nomeou genericamente de 'inscrição do sujeito no próprio âmago do sistema linguístico'(...).*"(FLORES, 2009, p. 22)

[24] "*parte essencial da descrição linguística.*" (FLORES, 2009, p. 22)

[25] It is understood that "the 'man' is the central term which 'subject' and 'person' surround". (SILVA; MASCARELO, 2012, p. 5, our translation)

subjectivity and discourse, and the social and cultural influences on the construction of intersubjectivity.

It is worth recalling on a broader object of study in the Theory of Enunciation referred by FLORES (2009, p. 20) as he states that the Theories of Enunciation share a mutual aim: the examination of meaning. This, he asserts, is not as though the target would be recognised as the Semantics of Enunciation because these theories are not conceived as a specific level of linguistic analysis, since any of these levels is object of study for the referred theory. This helps us understand that enunciation should not be studied, no matter in which level of linguistic analysis, outside a meaningful context, that is, the features of time, space and subjectivity that compose the meaning of a given utterance.

## 4.1 Understanding the constitution of discourse persons and non-person: identifying the participants of interlocution and their representation in reciprocity

Since the first years of the elementary school and high school, we are taught a metalinguistic analysis of verbs and morphological distinctions that occur in agreement with verbs. This is due to the influence of the Greek grammar that classifies the verbal persons into three categories, they are: the first, the second and the third person. They are unfolded, in certain '*línguas*', into three classifications: those of singular, plural, and dual, although in very few languages, this number can stretch to five classifications of number – besides the three mentioned, there are also paucal numbers. This is the case of the *Lihir* (CORBETT, 2000, p. 25). These persons (singular or plural etc.) are claimed to be used accordingly to their respective nouns or subject in contrast to the object case (as the *English* "*me*", "*you*", "*him*", "*us*").

For Benveniste (1946/2005, p. 248), however, this method of classification does not consider the linguistic role of person in the enunciation. He says that the traditional enumeration of person is the transference of a lexical concept to what a linguistic – to be more precise, discursive – issue. By discursive, we mean that there is value or values implied in each act of enunciation performed by a 'subject'. As Flores (2009, p. 84) defines from Benveniste's perspective, we have that "the forms of the '*língua*', when they are owned by a subject, turn out to constitute the discourse.

In this process, the proper distinctive value of the '*língua*' now also expresses an enunciative value[26]." Therefore it is necessary that a different approach is given to the role of person in the discourse taking into account its "enunciative value".

Another aspect questioned by Benveniste (1946/2005, p. 248) is that regarding to the representation of person in the verbs of all 'languages'. He claims that it is possible to notice the absence of explicit indication of person, as it may happen in the Korean grammar. On the other hand, it is known that the main distinctions in the forms of verbs occur according to the social status of the subject and the interlocutor. Benveniste justifies this structure by relating the nullity to a form of the subject to put himself in the discourse. Whether explicit or tacit, every '*língua*' has pronouns. (BENVENISTE, 1946/2005, p. 248-249)

It is interesting to notice that the author compares the method of classification of person according to its role in the enunciation: the Indian grammar proposes an enumeration not so different from that of the Greek grammar, the only difference is that the former occurs the other way round (BENVENISTE, 1946/2005, p. 247). Such opposition suggests a social and cultural analysis of person. In other '*línguas*', nonetheless, this category is organised differently.

Benveniste, in *Relationship of person in the verb,* demonstrates in several particular '*línguas'* that the persons that partake directly in the enunciation, that is, the person who enunciates and the person who receives the utterance (speaker and listener/recipient) have got different features from those present in the object of the utterance (the one a person talks about). That is the case of the classification or person proposed by Arabian specialists in the grammar of the "*língua",* in which

> the first person is *al-mutakallimu,* 'the one who speaks'; the second is '*al-muhatabu',* 'the one whom one talks to'; and the third is *'al-ya'ibu',* 'the one who is absent'. In these denominations, it is found, although quite implicit, a fair notion of the relationships between persons. It is fair once it reveals the disparity between the third person and the two first persons. (BENVENISTE, 1946/2005, p. 250, our translation)[27]

---

[26] As enunciative value, here we refer to the "meaning", or "sense" (according to Cambridge Dictionaries Online on the definitions of "sense"), that is the perspective through which "language*"* is studied. Above all, this "meaning", based on Flores' (*et al.*) discussion on Dicionário de Linguística da Enunciação (2009, p. 20), is not strictly associated with the semantic level of linguistic analysis; rather, it may also comprise the morphological, syntactic, phonological levels etc.. All of them elucidated through the value (dimension, proportion, meaning) that a given utterance takes as it is produced.

[27] "*a primeira pessoa é* al-mukallimu*, 'aquele que fala'; a segunda,* al-muhāṭabu*, 'aquele a quem nos dirigimos'; mas a terceira é* al-yā'ibu*, 'aquele que está ausente'. Nessas denominações, encontra-se implícita uma noção justa das relações entre as pessoas; justa sobretudo por revelar a disparidade entre a terceira*

The point the author is raising here is related to the fact that not only is there a lexical difference between the persons of the verb, but also a semantic difference for they cannot occupy the same positions in the enunciation. The first two pronouns are unique and owned at a time by individuals who can change places in a conversation, except the third, who is does not take part in the moment of enunciation. In this regard, Benveniste says that

> '*I*' designates the one who speaks and implies an utterance about '*I*' at the same time; when one says '*I*', it is impossible not to be speaking of oneself. In the second person, "*you*" is necessarily designated by '*I*' and must not be conceived out of a situation proposed by '*I*'; and, at the same time, "*I*" enunciate something as a predicate of "*you*". Nevertheless, in the third person, a predicate is indeed stated just in case this is out of "*I-you*"; this form is, therefore, an exception of the relationship through which "*I*" and "*you*" are specified. (BENVENISTE, 1946/2005, p. 250, our translation)[28]

In addition to that, it has been noticed, in a certain classroom context, that the use of "I" by the subject sometimes meant a model utterance that should be reproduced by the interlocutor. In such situation of interaction, one may say "I play the piano. What do you do in your free time?", instead of "What do you do in your free time?", to elicit the answer from the interlocutor who may deduce that the speaker is seeking for his pastime activity, thus replying using the same structure used by the first speaker. Therefore, not always "*I*" say something about "*I*", depending on the intention of the speaker. Going back to the opposition between "I-you" and "he/it/she", Benveniste establishes a correlation of person, naming the former "person", and the latter "non-person".

The author also shows, through the description of the Eskimo that although the pronoun corresponding to "I" goes through an ordinary process of pluralisation to form the pronoun corresponding to "we", it is unacceptable, due to the uniqueness and inaccessibility of the subjectivity, to multiply subjects in an utterance. Therefore, as the linguist claims, there are two denominations of the first person in the plural

---

pessoa e as duas primeiras. *Contrariamente ao que faria crer a nossa terminologia, elas não são homogêneas.* (BENVENISTE, 1946/2005, p. 250)

[28] "Eu *designa aquele que fala e implica ao mesmo tempo um enunciado sobre o 'eu': dizendo* eu, *não posso deixar de falar de mim. Na segunda pessoa, 'tu' é necessariamente designado por* eu *e não pode ser pensado fora de uma situação proposta a partir do 'eu'; e, ao mesmo tempo,* eu *enuncia algo como um predicado de 'tu'. Da terceira pessoa, porém, um predicado é bem enunciado somente fora do 'eu-tu'; essa forma é assim exceptuada da relação pela qual 'eu' e 'tu' se especificam.*" (BENVENISTE, 1946/2005, p. 250)

form: the exclusive plural and the inclusive plural. Firstly, we have the exclusive plural I+they forming the correlation of person, because they represent, respectively, person and non-person; and, secondly, the inclusive, correspond to the junction of "I" and "you", because they are related to each other by the correlation of subjectivity (subjective person and objective person, respectively). In the chart, presented by Flores (2013, p. 92), these concepts are listed according to the type of correlation they correspond to in the study of the relationships of pronoun in the production of an utterance:

**Chart 1 Correlation of personhood/correlation of subjectivity**

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Correlation of personhood | Person | I | Correlation of subjectivity | Subjective person | I |
| | Person | You | | Objective person | You |
| | Non-person | He | | | |

Both inclusive and exclusive plural may occur in the classroom, depending if the speaker wishes to include the interlocutor. In this sense, it is interesting to think about the frequency in which each of the forms occurs within the interaction.

Correlation of subjectivity refers to the opposition of subject and object, once each person is comparable to a place assumed by individuals involved in the enunciation, one (or more) at a time. This correlation determines the exchange of subjectivity, defined by Benveniste (1958/2005, p. 286) as the possibility for the speaker to refer to himself in the enunciation, to engage himself in this process, to refer to himself and, consequently, to talk about himself, although it is impossible to completely express subjectivity. This exchange implies the balance of subjectivity and objectivity so that both speaker and listener feel involved in the enunciation. That was another concept introduced by Benveniste that will support our discussion: the reversibility. This is directly related to the correlation of personhood, since it is only the persons that can play the role of the speaker and the listener.

Considering what has been shown, it is the human experience in the 'language' that builds one's own personal references and knowledge, which occurs by putting oneself as a subject of one's discourse, by exchanging experiences – which were, in turn, constructed from an exchange with an object of knowledge: what the individual assimilates from the object and what this individual decides to do or how he behaves towards this object. This is another very complex proposition, but worthy the attempts to actually comprehend it. To do so, it is needed to describe into depth the concepts of human experience and formal apparatus of enunciation.

An important feature of enunciation is its formal apparatus, and we shall see that it is one of the chief constitutions of 'language' that is linked to the idea of personhood. To begin with, Benveniste (in FLORES, 2009, p. 48) defines it as the linguistic "device that allows the speaker to change '*língua*' into discourse." That would lead us to think about the action and the reaction in verbal interaction. Once we turn our utterances into an intention, or rather, a discursive instance (which is different from instance of enunciation), we expect a response from the listener, even if it does not involve any verbal response at all. Besides that, it is known that the instance of enunciation embraces three characteristics, ever-renewing, such as the subject, the time and the space. Those featuring gaps provided by the 'language' give speakers the chance of taking their turns within interaction, turning themselves into subjects of their own utterances. This is indeed difficult, in the very moment the teacher enunciates, to identify if the student is reflecting on or assimilating what was said or, rather, if he does not want to participate in the discussion or simply did not pay attention to what had been said. Henceforth, the man builds his personal references – co-reference, or parasubjectivity – through his subjectivity, and this is also explained by what Benveniste (1965, p. 70), in his *Problems of General Linguistics II*, names the human experience. By co-reference, Silvana Silva (2013, p. 93) here refers to the idea of a second subjectivity, which is produced at the moment when the locutor (speaker) becomes a subject, recreating references that compose the pragmatic status of this locutor (speaker).

"The dialecticism, understood here as the movement of the intersubjective time that bounds and diferenciates 'I' and *I*, is linked to the term of the movement, the world reference, when the time is crystalised within a representation, in a 'pragmatic consensus that makes each locutor a co-

locutor' (BENVENISTE, 1989, 84). We will call the time movement term co-reference, for lack of a better term." (Our translation)[29]

Going back to the topic of the human experience in the 'language', it is bonded to the update of the man's appropriation of the word that gives this individual the responsibility over what is being said, a personal position before his interlocutor, as well as the renovation of his discourse as a person towards his object and recipient. A man is the result of a sequence of human experience in the 'language', since it composes his history. It is this experience our object of analysis, to be more precise, the exchange of subjectivity (the very moment when a locutor turns into a subject, enunciating "*I*", automatically telling someone else about themselves. By identifying when interaction [30]takes place between teacher and student in a given classroom, it is possible to trace the typical form of exchange: exchange of subjectivity, similarly to what happens with the intersubjectivity; the latter consisting of a relationship between the subject and the partner marked in a dialogic interaction, in which both are engaged. Both take their turns in the process of subjectivity. (BENVENISTE, 1989, 1995, *in* FLORES, 2009, p. 146)

Such process, when approached from the operational perspective, comprises two important concepts to the study of enunciation. Such perspective conceives the *subjectivity indication* [31], and the *indicator's subjectivity* [32]as a converse procedure of the former in which the "dominant pole" (S. SILVA, 2013, p. 65, our translation) is the 'objective person' 'you' converted in 'subjective person', as intersubjective attitudes within enunciation. By understanding this aspect of enunciation, more precisely, the exchange of subjectivity, the "structure" of interaction between teacher and student can be described more precisely, once "the enunciation of the teacher installs, before himself, an image of the student under the global form of indication of subjectivity."[33]

---

[29] *A dialeticidade, entendida aqui como movimento do tempo intersubjetivo que une e diferencia 'eu' e* eu*, está vinculada ao termo do movimento, à referenciação ao mundo, quando o tempo se cristaliza em uma representação, em um "consenso pragmático que faz de cada locutor um co-locutor" (Benveniste, 1989, p. 84). Chamaremos o termo do movimento temporal de correferencialidade, por falta de um melhor.* (S.SILVA, 2013, p. 93)

[30] From Enunciation perspective, this is understood as interlocution, intersubjectivity or interpersonality. By these terms, we mean that reversibility occurs while enunciating.

[31] "*Emphasis in relationship of conjunction between 'I'-'you' expressed in the personality relationship represented by* I-you/he. *(...) the dominant pole is 'I'.*" (S.SILVA, 2013, p. 65)

[32] "*(...) converse idea of subjectivity of indicator, expressed in the subjectivity relationship represented by I/you/he. (...) the dominant pole is 'you converted in 'I'.*" (S.SILVA, 2013, p. 65)

[33] "*A enunciação do professor implanta uma imagem de aluno diante de si marcada sob a forma global de indicação de subjetividade*" (S.SILVA, 2013, p. 87)

(SILVA, 2013, p. 87, our translation) This structure hosts the several "distinctive aspects 'language' use", which is put to work at each utterance production when teacher and student take their turns as the subject of enunciation. The same occurs when instead of indication of subjectivity, the interlocutor responds by making use of the opposite attitude, as the production of utterances more or less conditioned to the subjectivity of the indicator[34].

In agreement with Silvana Silva (2013, p. 90) in her doctorate thesis, which contains the following proposition,

> (...) the linearity 'saves' the process of learning because it enables the teacher to highlight the distinctive aspects of the use of *'língua*', but, at the same time, it does not assure the learning itself, for it relies on the listening from the student who may intersect such linearity in a different way.[35] (Our translation)

It is in this "intersect such linearity in a different way" that occurs the update of the formal apparatus of 'language', a process that is as cognitive as subjective and cultural, because it is these factors that shape the 'language' and, since it is a situation of verbalisation, the use of *'língua'* likewise.

## 4.2 An enunciative interpretation of the lexical comprehension of benveniste's "*Gift and exchange in the Indo-European lexis*"

Benveniste engaged in defining the nature of 'language', of enunciation, of person, subject and man, and so he applied his concepts to understanding culture, as well as other aspects of human interaction, focusing on the role of 'language' to the functioning and maintenance of culture and society. By the way, the latter is considered to be quite a polemical theme in Benveniste's theory, according to Flores (2013, p.120). This author notes that "there is no doubt in here: Benveniste does not oppose the individual and society. On the contrary, it is in the dialectics that embraces them that we can find the linguist basis of subjectivity." (FLORES, 2013, p.

---

[34] It is intended, for coherence purposes, to refer to this process simply as "subjectivity of the indicator" so as to avoid comprehension problems and misinterpretation regarding its 'root procedure', the indication of subjectivity.

[35] "(...) a linearidade 'salva' a aprendizagem, pois possibilita que o professor destaque aspectos distintos do uso da língua, mas, ao mesmo tempo, não assegura a aprendizagem, pois esta depende da 'escuta' do aluno, que pode segmentar tal linearidade de outra forma." (S.SILVA, 2013, p. 90)

120)[36] This is what he does when he writes about "The relationship of person in the verb", "The gift and exchange in the Indo-European vocabulary" as he relates categories of enunciation, such as person and intersubjectivity to cultural concepts, as it is the case of reciprocity, economical, religious and juridical relationship.

As the title suggests, this section is devoted to outlining some considerations around the lexical comprehension that Benveniste provides us with regarding the subject of gift and exchange explained by Marcel Mauss in his essay entitled "*The Gift*". We will start by noting two terms that Benveniste brings into reflection: "offered gifts" and "compensating gifts" which compose a type of exchange that is not free of intention, on the contrary, they are full of it as they are rooted in societies' culture. Besides that, it is not only an individual attitude, but also collective, in which the giver(s) puts his (or their) subjectivity on the gift, making it important and linked to the giver, and consequently, an object of responsibility to the recipient, an action of receiving that demands a compensation.

Benveniste (1951/2005, p. 348) highlights that Mauss limited his description to archaic societies which provided him with data that lead him to produce his reflection on the forms of "gift". The term "gift", for Mauss (1954/2002, p. VII), represents something that "is made and reciprocated with interest". Hence, in this action, there is 'language', there is enunciation, or why not to say, "enunciaction"? Furthermore, as Mary Douglas notes, in the preface of "*The Gift*", that this misunderstanding regarding the "free gift" is not only a cultural fact related to societies in "Melanesia or Chicago for instance" (1954/2002, p. IX). They occur in so many groups – which she includes charity institutions –, ranging from the nuclear family to tribes and communities.

Appart from that, what Benveniste comes to discuss is how words related to giving or exchanging something may play different enunciative roles, or even opposite roles, depending on the syntactic or syntagmatic position the word takes. Such interpretation shall be drawn from the examples that Benvenist himself gives "in order to acknowledge the pre-history of the notions of gift and exchange" (BENVENISTE, 1951/2005, p. 349, our translation).[37]

---

[36] *"Não há dúvidas aqui: Benveniste não opõe indivíduo e sociedade. Pelo contrário, é na dialética que os engloba que se pode achar o fundamento linguístico da subjetividade."* (FLORES, 2013, p. 120)

[37] *"(...) para o conhecimento que deles se pode tirar sobre a pré-história das noções de dom e de troca."* (BENVENISTE, 1951/2005, p. 349)

Benveniste (p. 349) starts by describing the structures and meaning of the verb "to give" in Indo-European '*línguas*'. He initially demonstrates that such corresponding meaning to the verb expressed by "*\*dō-*" used to be unswerving, unquestionable. This was so until it was established that the Hittite, which is also an Indo-European '*língua*', and – according to the website *Ancient Scripts*' – spoken in the region of Anatolia, although extinct (1700 BCE – 1100 BCE), had in one of its verbal lexicon the "*dā-*", which does not mean, as Benvenistes points out, "to give", instead, it meant "to take". Well, we have a problem here – similar verbal forms with opposite meanings in languages from the same language family.

Benveniste (p. 349, 350-1), proposed some "solutions" to this case. He tried to relate the action of giving to the action of taking, which would probably constitute the same movement: from the former possessor to the latter possessor. He concluded, then, that "to give" and "to receive" would be different in meaning, or rather, opposites, according to the syntactical position the verb takes. This leads us to think that - when it is not a matter of restrictions from the linguistic system - the syntactical position one gives to a certain verb also makes part of one's subjectivity, when it is an option, or rather, a paradigmatic choice in the utterance construction. The interest and intention, brought into by Mauss in his essay, plays such a determining role at last. Thus, Benveniste (1951/2005, p. 350) asserts:

> Equally, *\*dō-* indicated the act of "taking"; only the syntax of the utterance would differ 'taking to oneself'" (or, in Benveniste's words, "taking to put away") "and "taking to offer (= to give). Each '*língua'* made one of these senses to prevail over the other, so as to form antithetical and distinct expressions of 'taking' and 'giving'. This is how, in the Hittite, *dā-* means 'to take' and opposes to *pai-, 'to give'.* Whereas in most of other '*línguas'*, it is *\*dō-* that means 'to give' and a different verb takes on the meaning of 'to take'.[38]

In the next paragraph, an interesting consideration made by Benveniste is the comparison between the lexical presentation and representation of goods exchanging. They seem, superficially, to reproduce the same movement: a good is transferred from one possessor to the next. Looking deep inside this linguistic representation, we are taken to interpret it the following way: there are structural and

---

[38] *Igualmente \*dō- indicava somente o fato de pegar; só a sintaxe do enunciado o diferenciava em "pegar para guardar ( = tomar)" e "pegar para oferecer ( = dar)". Cada língua fez prevalecer uma dessas acepções à custa da outra, para constituir expressões antitéticas e distintas de "tomar" e de "dar". É assim que, no hitita, dā- significa "tomar" e se opõe a* pai-, *"dar", enquanto na maioria das outras línguas, é *\*dō- *que quer dizer "dar" e um verbo diferente assume o sentido de "tomar".* (BENVENISTE, 1951/2005, p. 350)

syntactical gaps in the 'language', as Benveniste had mentioned in his *Subjectivity in the language* (1958, p. 289), motivated by the speaker's or the doer's subjectivity. This decides the function of a given verb that verbally represents the movement of transfer of a good from the former possessor to the latter possessor. For this reason, this good, as Mauss (1954/2002, p. 14) explains (and we shall go through that later in this work), has a "spiritual" tie to the first possessor, since this good's transference has his subjectivity embedded. Therefore, once again, subjectivity is in the 'language'.

Benveniste (1951/2005, p. 350) also mentions some problems of comparison raised by other experts. This problems, however, demands, as the author assumes, a deeper look at the meanings that certain verbs in some Germanic '*línguas*' may resemble to those in the Greek. This analysis, again, requires taking account of the occurrences of these verbs, their probable meanings with or without accessorial particles that may come attached. That is what occurs to a verb in the Gothic whose meaning – one of its meanings – is to receive something as a heritage. This verb only assumes this meaning when coming with a given particle attached to it. Benveniste (p.351) concludes that the link between these two lexical representations is not at all faded away. Additionally, the author states that, again, the ambiguity in their original forms, or roots, indicating a legal attribution of something given or received, is decided in the morphological and syntactical structure of the utterance, which is motivated by the subjectivity of the speaker or the doer.

In respect to the "gift" itself, Benveniste (p. 351) drives us not only to consider the morphological formation or the word derivations, but also, and chiefly, the specificity in each meaning. Benveniste (1951/2005) reminds us that

> For 'gift', there are not less than five distinct and parallel words in the Greek, which our translation dictionaries identically present as 'talent, present': (...). It is needed to define what each of them has in particular due to their formation. (p. 351)[39]

The author's description can be briefly outlined as it is shown in the chart below. Note that it is not intended to explore such analysis in depth, for our intention is not to

---

[39] *Para "dom", o grego antigo tem nada menos de cinco palavras distintas e paralelas, que os nossos dicionários de traduções traduzem identicamente como "dom, presente" (...). É preciso tentar definir o que cada uma delas tem de específico em virtude da sua formação.* (BENVENISTE, 1951/2005, p. 351)

show their written forms in Greek, rather, it is intended to analyse their meanings and intentions involved:

**Chart 2 The meanings of 'gift' presented by Benveniste in *Gift and Exchange in the Indo-European vocabulary***

| | |
|---|---|
| Example: "*to give is good, to take is evil.*"(Hesiod, *Opera 356*) | Hesíod[40]: expression that is closer in meaning to object, present. |
| Effective accomplishment. Example: "who dedicates oneself will be given a valued gift"[41]. | "the act of giving, likely to happen with a gift" (reward). "In this case, the gift is promised beforehand". |
| "Gift of generosity, of merit or honour, which is incorporated in the object offered". | This form of gift is, according to Benveniste, analysed in conjunction with the next form of gift, which is an object given as a present in gratuity. |
| "'Provision of gifts' (cf Her., III, 97) or the 'set of gifts'". | When used as an adverbial feature, it means "as a free gift, in gratuity". Aristotle defines it as a gift free of obligation of retribution. |
| The most meaningful term, according to Benveniste, is a gift that is given to someone ones intends to pay honour. | It is said to be a different form of gift. It is the one which one is obliged to give in exchange to a valued object, service or gift: a person[42] or an object. |

This last meaning of gift is of a peculiar characteristic, because it demands reciprocity, that movement of going and returning of goods or services that we have discussed about. Such movement, here considered to be found in 'language' as well, motivates our anthropological approach in parallel with the enunciative one. The reason why we highlight the last of the aforementioned meanings in relation to the others, in the chart, is that as we can see later in Benvenistes' *Gift and exchange in the Indo-European vocabulary*, this reciprocity does not occur only by exchanging objects, but also favours, generosities, persons and so on. All that depends on the meaning, that has changed along with time and space, given the importance

---

[40] Ancient Greek Poet

[41] According to BENVENISTE, E. *Noms d'agent e noms d'action em indo-europén, 1948, p. 76.*

[42] In Benveniste (1951/2005, p. 352) we can find meaning provided by Herodoto.

Benveniste devoted to tracing the pre-history of "gift" and "exchange" in the Indo-European 'linguas'.

The author first provides us with the five meanings of gift in the Greek language (leaving aside one of them, according to a footnote on the page 351), and restrains his next paragraphs to defining reciprocity, hospitality and how it has changed over time and in different languages. We can note that special attention is given to the Greek 'lingua' when Benveniste declares that "the mechanism of reciprocity of the gift is revealed by its own signification, and then it is put in relationship with a system of honour and hospitality renderings" (1951/2005, p. 353, our translation).[43]

In Greece, the culture of reciprocity and honour renderings is still a strong feature of the people. Searching further information on the Internet on how foreigners see and conceive Greek culture from what they have experienced, very interesting descriptions and stories were found at *Explore Crete*: *Greek customs and habits from a foreigner's point of view*, by Birgit Smidt Sneftrup and Bo Transbol. Such collection of experiences, as the authors themselves affirm, were taken from "a review of a Danish book named "*Graeske maend og andre mennesker*" (Greek men and other humans) by Lone Spanheimer". In almost every category of its culture, one can see the importance of reciprocity and the sacralisation of the hospitality in there. On the other hand, if such cultural laws are broken, even if one is a tourist in that area, an extremely embarrassing and humiliating situation can be brought forth for either native or foreigner. It is worthy acknowledging one of these experiences and notice that even a matter of honour or dispute may be put in question:

> Even if it says everywhere that tips are included in the price, it is common to give tips if you're satisfied with the service. About 10% would be appropriate. But remember not to "over-tip", something that this little story explains well: Some friends wanted to tip the waiter at the hotel where they had stayed for 2 weeks, so they left 30 Euro the last evening. When they were 10 steps away from their table the waiter stood in front of them saying that they had mistaken the Greek money. They explained that they hadn't. The waiter then joined them in the bar, where they had coffee and Metaxa, and later, drinks and ouzos. When they called the barman for the bill, they found out that the bill, which was much higher than 30 euros, was already paid by the waiter they had tipped before. (SNEFTRUP; TRANSBOL, *online*)

---

[43] *"O mecanismo da reciprocidade do dom é revelado pela própria significação, e posto e relação com um sistema de prestações de homenagem ou de hospitalidade."* (BENVENISTE, 1951/2005, p. 353)

Differently, as Benveniste (p. 355) shows that in the notion of hospitality in the Latin societies through the archaic Latin the key word is compensation to reach reciprocity, while, in the Greek one, it is the "honours rendering" due to a favour, a service, a generosity or even a person. Regarding the Latin societies, Benveniste notes that:

> Through *hostis* and the related terms in the archaic Latin we can catch a sort of *compensatory services* which is the foundation of the notion of 'hospitality' in the Latin, Germanic, and Slavic societies: the equality of conditions should result in the parity that is assured among people through reciprocal gifts. (1951/2005, p. 355, our translation)[44]

These semantic comprehensions developed by Benveniste, which was summed up above, help us understand that the meaning of gift should vary according to the circumstances, or rather, the enunciation instance (subject, time and space) within a given culture. Some reports above might seem strange, others, familiar to a reader. These contrasts that we try to draw aim at reflecting on how culture, religion/mystical, juridical and economical, but chiefly culture (for this is the factor that maintains the others, mainly through the '*língua'*) model the meaning, the practice and the understanding of the idea of gift. Likewise, reciprocity, or exchange, when verbally represented, because of the culture, history and syntax, differs from '*língua*' to '*língua*'.

A fact to which we would like to refer here, without any theological or evangelisation goals, is the parable of the "*Three Talents*" that is found in the Holy Bible. It is quite interesting to notice how the idea of reciprocity is in there and why not to think that such lessons that this and other parables have influenced Christian institutions, groups, societies in the sense that what one receive one has to return with good willing. Churches, in some cases, preach this reciprocity in order to "maintain the evangelisation work", or "to maintain the Home of God". Another example are the charity institutions – most of them does not work without financial help – seeking out for contributions, which is not, in general, a purely voluntary "gift", since the donors are convinced to get in a state of pride, happiness, well-being, recognition, and even vanity.

---

[44] *"Através de* hostis *e dos termos aparentados no latim arcaico podemos captar um certo tipo de* prestação compensatória *que é o fundamento da noção de "hospitalidade" nas sociedades latina, germânica e eslava: a igualdade de condição transpõe para o direito a paridade assegurada entre as pessoas por mio de dons recíprocos"* (BENVENISTE, 1951/2005, p. 355)

Later, we will transcribe the twentieth and the twenty-first verses of the twenty-fifth chapter of St. Mathew, contained in the King James Version of the Holy Bible (1979/2010): "[20]And so he that had received five talents came and brought other five talents, saying, Lord, thou deliveredst unto me five talents: behold, I have gained beside them five talents more.", and the enunciative reciprocity takes place in the form of honour and trust: "[21]His lord said unto him, Well done, *thou* good and faithful servant: thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things: enter thou into the joy of thy lord." (p. 1232)

For the sake of the existing tie between the lord and the talent trusted the servant, this devoted his service, his subjectivity, his *self*, in order to accomplish the task of making that money (because a talent corresponded to a certain amount of money) yield twice the original amount – five talents. As a servant that succeeded in such attribution, the lord rewards his servant with more than what he had initially trusted him. We can see that the exchange comes in the form of a promise: "I will make thee ruler over many things.", and this is very subjective as well, since the speaker enunciates and engages himself in his own utterance: I promise you that you will be the ruler over many things. Then, a cycle of reciprocal services and rewards is established. Such parable is preached to persuade people that they were born with a gift[45] (a talent, not money, as it is referred in the text, but an ability, a special characteristic) that is given by God and people should make these gifts yield in return for the sake of the believed existing tie between God and the creature and the gift. We can also perceive that, in the preaching of the Gospel, a promise is frequently made, motivating people to be reciprocal and faithful.

A second fact that called our attention was that in this parable, the lord distributes different amounts of talents to three of his servants. He could have given them the same amount of talents, instead, he gave five to the first, two to the second and one to the third. As one tries to understand this difference, one may conclude

---

[45] According to Oxford Dictionaries (2015, Online), there are two main definitions for the term 'gift', and we will restrict this explanation only to the first meaning presented in more details on the address provided in 'References': "**Noun:** 1. A thing given willingly to someone without payment; a present. 1.1. An act of giving something as a present. 1.2 *informal*: A very easy task or unmissable opportunity. 2. A natural ability or talent. **Verb:** 1. Give (something) as a gift, especially formally or as a donation or bequest. 1.1 Present (someone) with a gift or gifts. 1.2. (gift someone with) Endow with (something). 1.3. *informal*: Inadvertently allow (an opponent) to have something." The second meaning, as briefly indicated by the same dictionary, correspond to a "mass noun" in Medicine.

that, in this parable, Jesus wanted to illustrate that God gives people a talent they are capable to handle with and make it bear fruit.

Now, thinking in terms of enunciation, we propose to question ourselves on how the distribution of our gifts – as teachers, chiefly, as teachers of English, or of any other additional '*língua*' or foreign '*língua*' –, and by "our gifts" we mean knowledge, abilities, competencies, experiences and so on. We propose to reflect on how it works in a teaching context, where one faces and deal with few or many "servants", or rather, students.

It seems that the management of these gifts in a classroom with twenty, thirty or forty students, taking into consideration all the peculiarities each one possesses, does not happen for the sake of parity. It is quite noticeable that the teacher tends to exchange knowledge, and all this gifts that one possesses after a long time of formal and informal education, differently to his or her students. The teacher looks at certain students' eyes, motivates some of the students more than the others, share personal experiences with few of them, shows interest in some students, or in one in particular due to affinity (frequent reciprocal interaction within the classroom), or uses one of the students as an example. This is absolutely natural, for we humans tend to enunciate according to our subjectivity. Nevertheless, the point is that the focus here is an additional '*língua*' that is being acquired, and students expect compensation for their presence, participation, and this demand an interpersonal interlocution at least. In some moments, though, intersubjectivity is the ideal form of interlocution, especially when a student faces difficulties in catching up with the whole group. Consequently, English teachers, for example, tend to think that it is easier to teach in 'language schools'[46], where it is private, and the interest of the target public tends to be higher, as well as their efforts.

After that, we conclude this chapter by suggesting one of the possible ways to understand reciprocity in the English classroom. We will study the anthropological work proposed by Mauss (1954/2002), and analyse the use of three prepositions in our culture within a intersubjective enunciation, they are: 'to speak to', 'to talk to', and 'to speak for' in mechanisms that define what characterises a specific teacher-student reciprocity in a 'language school' in Bagé, believing that such enunciative characteristic is a result of culture.

---

[46] We prefer to maintain this form, given that it is a widely spread term that not only defines a practice, as in 'language teaching', but it also defines methodologies and approaches for its teaching.

Silva (2013) suggests that the method of analysis embraces "alternative movements of opening and closure, that is, 'endless' opening in '*língua*' analysis (…), meaning and culture taken into an anthropological study" (NORMAND, 1996, apud SILVA, 2013, p. 113) is the "presence of the human instance in the '*língua*'" (NORMAND, 1996, apud SILVA, 2013, p. 113, our translation)[47]. A very plain example of this presence in the classroom interaction can be found in Silvana Silva (2013) when she refers to the way how a learner understands and enunciate (back) to the guiding notes as an appreciation of his own subjectivity or as an appreciation of the teacher's subjectivity.

In the next chapter, therefore, a theoretical description and comparison of reciprocity, proposed by Mauss (1954/2002), will be provided. Thus, such reflection brought through the identification of the linguistic and behavioural elements related to each form of exchange (i.e.: potlatch, total service, exchange of gifts), it will be possible to elaborate an association – by raising similarities – of a form of reciprocity to the enunciations occurring in the recordings. A concession should bear in mind: the fact that reciprocity happens, in similar or different ways, either in a public or a private school. Only then, a conclusion on how complex a culture of English teaching is and how important it is for the teachers of English or of any other additional language to build up his (or her) own identity as a teacher of English bearing in mind that more than teaching a '*língua*', cultures are in shock, cultures are being taught, cultures are being learnt in behalf of a culture of reciprocity.

---

[47] "'presença do homem na língua'" (NORMAND, 1996, apud SILVA, 2013, p. 113)

## 5 MAUSS: THE THEORY OF RECIPROCITY

In the former sections, we had a brief look at some of the meanings of gift, as well as those of exchange, and we could understand how the features of '*língua*', such as its semantics, determine the meaning of an utterance. This is a matter of '*língua*' and subjectivity in the 'language'. This has helped us read the following anthropological work by Mauss from an enunciative perspective before the observation and transcription were carried out.

Before an 'anthropologic-like study', although focused on linguistic attitudes, is conducted in the classroom, it is of a great importance that the theory of Marcel Mauss becomes familiar to the researchers. By understanding the mechanisms of reciprocity described in his work and realising that they differ from culture to culture, it is possible to trace the important features in linguistic records of teacher-learner interaction, and distinguish how reciprocity can be conceived in such environments. Hence, teachers of English (or any other '*língua*', following the norms regarding the existing "system" of '*língua*') may be able to discover what characterises interaction among the participants.

By being aware of what enunciative feature is related to each participant, it is basic that this knowledge is applied to the English 'language teaching'. We suppose that this research demands a focus on the reversibility between the subjective and objective persons[48], so as to know if reciprocity between teacher and student resembles exchange, a give-away or a loan in the classroom setting observed. As a result, such enunciative analysis can be thought in other situations where services of English teaching as an 'additional language' are provided to a heterogeneous group.

To begin with, Mauss introduces his work by portraying the regions investigated and what kinds of exchange were found over there. So, we initially have 'total services' in Polinesia, and Potlatch in Melanesia and the American Northwest. This anthropologist studied such peculiar and archaic societies and form of economical, juridical, moral, religious, and family phenomena within these societies (MAUSS, 1954/2002, p. 3), in order to understand the "nature of human transactions

---

[48] Considering Benveniste's (1958/2005, p. 289) understanding of language as a human nature and its 'empty spaces' left hanging over enunciation instance, reversibility consists in a property of language in which enunciation turn is taken by the interlocutor through those 'empty spaces' left by the speaker.

around us"[49] (p. 4). Although he mentions more modern societies, where other forms of contract ("said to be modern") take place in "Semitic, Hellenic, Hellenistic, and Roman" societies, we agree with what Mauss (p. 5) asserts,

> (…) the phenomena of exchange and contract in those societies that are not, as has been claimed, devoid of economic markets—since the market is a human phenomenon that, in our view, is not foreign to any known society— but whose system of exchange is different from ours.

The author argues that the "total services" (Polinesia) are manifested by a "pure system of contractual offering" – a system of exchange of gifts, services, favours etc, between families, clans and tribes. This type of institution would build ties – "permanent contracts", in Mauss (1954/2002, p. 10) words – between clans, especially between men, women, their children and the rites they would be part of (MAUSS, 1954/2002, p. 10).

As a total service, the fact that a family receives offerings[50] (for a child's birth, for instance) does not make them free of returning this "generosity" in such similar occasions in the families that took part in this gifting. In addition to that, another curious fact is that the child (tonga, a property that never loses connection to its origin) serves as a means of goods exchanging between the mother's family and her sibling's family, more precisely, the mother's brother. As the author describes:

> (…) these gifts can be obligatory and permanent, with no total counter-service in return except the legal status that entails them. Thus the child whom the sister, and consequently the brother-in-law, who is the maternal uncle, receive from their brother and brother-in-law to bring up, is himself termed a *tonga,* a possession on the mother's side. (MAUSS, 1954/2002, p. 11)

---

[49] A reflection and a thorough research on the relationship between the nature of transactions in the archaic and modern societies is suggested. It is believed that if, in early days, rules of transactions were part of a social and cultural organization that was tacitly or explicitly imposed; nowadays people tend to adhere to it. A worth reading study on aware identity construction of tribal identity in modern times was developed by Morag McKerron (2003). He argues that the "tribe" (Highland Thais) – especially the young members – consciously impose their scenario over the tourists ("neotribe") for the sake of their sustainability. (p. 17) It is asserted that the interaction between the host and the tourists were compounded by the former's values and 'people sensitivity' (the idea that all the listeners are "human") (p.13-14).

[50] Turner (apud Mauss, p.11) reports that, in this form of service and counter-service, after receiving gifts on the occasion of a child's birth, the parents would not feel "richer", as (p. 11). Rather, they felt proud for such recognition. In other times, like 'ours', this is not as though we felt "richer" with the gifts we get on the occasion of a child's birth, or birthday, for example. We feel happy because we are somehow being told "I invested my time and my money to please you and to thank you for having invited me".

On the other hand, in Melanesia and American Northwest, there is something more than the offering and the return between clans, the difference, as Mauss explains, is that the *Potlatch* also incorporates the rivalry, destruction and combat. The author decided, in the essay, to name *Potlatch* the following form of reciprocity, which involves rivalry, economical and political power:

> Yet what is noteworthy about these tribes is the principle of rivalry and hostility that prevails in all these practices. They go as far as to fight and kill chiefs and nobles. Moreover, they even go as far as the purely sumptuary destruction of wealth that has been accumulated in order to outdo the rival chief as well as his associate (normally a grandfather, father-in-law, or son-in-law). There is total service in the sense that it is indeed the whole clan that contracts on behalf of all, for all that it possesses and for all that it does, through the person of its chief. But this act of 'service' on the part of the chief takes on an extremely marked agonistic character. It is essentially usurious and sumptuary. It is a struggle between nobles to establish a hierarchy amongst themselves from which their clan will benefit at a later date. (MAUSS, 1954/2002, p. 8)

Reaffirming what the author himself noted regarding these systems is that they demand and only work out in a collective way. This is due to the fact that reciprocity and gift carry meanings that are performed in the '*língua*' in behalf of a subject towards the recipient subject. In this terms, Mauss observes the use of both words: *oloa* and *tonga*. Needless to go deep into his disagreements on some conceptions towards these nouns, our interest is to show how he himself understands the semantic function of the aforementioned terms. Regarding to "*oloa*", Mauss notes that it is in majority instruments, objects that are aimed at men's possession and use. *Tonga*, in turn, a possession obtained by nature (birth or feminine roots – mother, for example).

Previously in Mauss' description of "*tonga*", the child serves as a channel through which gifts are exchanged and properties that were owned by the family (child's tutor) to be given to the biological family as a compensation. Here, again, we have other features attached to the term "gift" and how this "gift" is supposed to be obligatorily exchanged. They are not free of intentions and interests at all, instead, they bring along morality, honour, justice, beliefs, apart from economical and juridical characters. Thus, we have a reference of a more intersubjective enunciation in the more elementary form of total service, rather than that of "*Potlatch*", where we might see less intersubjective relationships, once the destruction surreptitiously means "*I*" take the power over "*you*" (we can find a distinct co-reference in here). Later in the

author's descriptions, more precisely, in the page 20, he justifies the act of destruction and sacrifice, which seems, at a first sight, for us, a post-modern South American society, enigmatic. As Mauss claims, "The purpose of destruction by sacrifice is precisely that it is an act of giving that is necessarily reciprocated. All the forms of potlatch in the American Northwest and in Northeast Asia know this theme of destruction." (1954/2002)

In the Maori society, the *taonga* is said to detach a spirit from the giver, and that this spirit remains with the "*taonga"* ruling over the possessor of it, as believed by the Maori people. For instance, as Hertz (MAUSS, 1954/2002, p. 13) reports from the point of view of a native. It is interesting, from an enunciative perspective, that when *I* give a taonga to a *you*, *my* spiritual ties to the "*taonga"* stays with it even in the receiver's possession. If this receiver becomes the *I* of this "*taonga"* towards *you* – in this moment, the former *I* becomes a reference, a non-person (*he/she/it*), from an enunciative perspective -, when this "*you"* return gifts in exchange, these gifts are the compensation to the first giver. These gifts represent, all in all, the value of the first giver's "*hau"* (or spirit).

In other words, the "*hau"* of the possessor remaining along with his "*taonga"*, when it is given to the recipient, this "*hau"* represents the giver's co-reference – that is, what *I* express of *I* when I enunciate – or rather, act, give a gift. In turn, when a third person is involved in this exchange of gifts and receives the same referred "*taonga"* (from the first receiver), the gifts given in return can be interpreted as an indication of subjectivity towards the first giver. When these gifts are of a greater value compared to the first "*taonga",* then, the latter brings forth a debt for which the former is liable.

When it comes to talking about the nature and the obligation of reciprocating in both total service and "*potlatch"*, Mauss (1954/2002, p. 17) raises two other important aspects to be discussed: the obligation to give, and the obligation to receive. Everything seems to be justified by the fact that we live in society, that it would be impossible not to need someone else. In Maori's terms, the "*hau"* of someone else. The giving and receiving compose the "communion" between persons, according to MAUSS (1954/2002, p. 17). Hence, when one of the "services" (offering or acceptance) does not happen, then a feeling of hostility is posed. There seem to be an "obligation" of affirm a social status that is challenged.

Mauss (1954/2002, p. 17-8) comes up with an interesting conclusion, where "personhood" takes over "subjectivity" in the donor's attitude: "Also, one gives because one is *compelled* to do so, because the recipient possesses some kind of right of property over anything that belongs to the donor." (Our italics). By this we understand he suggests that such transactions reflect a lack of subjectivity. This is possibly a question worthy coming up with a solution in a following research. Accordingly,

> In all this there is a succession of rights and duties to consume and reciprocate, corresponding to rights and duties to offer and accept. Yet this intricate mingling of symmetrical and contrary rights and duties ceases to appear contradictory if, above all, one grasps that mixture of spiritual ties between things that to some degree appertain to the soul, and individuals, and groups that to some extent treat one another as things. (MAUSS, 1954/2002, p. 17-8)

Moving on to the Eskimos, the *Potlatch* does not only embraces persons in the transaction, but also beings that could be enunciatively considered non-person, since they do not participate effectively, concretely in the exchange: "souls of the dead who are present and take part in it, and whose names have been assumed by men, but even upon nature" (MAUSS, 1954/2002, p. 18). In this way, these souls become persons through the ones (the so called 'name-sakes') that evoke these souls. Henceforth, it is unquestionable the presence of a mystical feature in the action of giving and returning, once giver and returner bring forth a taboo, a notion of honour, pride, virtue and spiritual rewarding. That can be seen in other archaic (and chiefly Eskimo) groups that carry out "voluntary and mandatory" exchanges of gifts – as in the Thanksgiving Ceremonies –, besides sacrifices to divinities, because they act in behalf of these "sacred" beings. (MAUSS, 1954/2002, p. 19)

Referring to Mauss's perception (1954/2002, p. 20) on the Eskimo groups, it is worth taking into account Benveniste's concepts of subjectivity, person and non-person. By that, we mean that these linguistic concepts are not only a verbal feature, but also anthropological, in the sense that people, according to the way they manifest reciprocity in their attitudes, they also make use of '*língua*', formerly presented, theorised by Benveniste.

> The relationships that exist between these contracts and exchanges among humans and those between men and the gods throw light on a whole aspect

of the theory of sacrifice. First, they are perfectly understood, particularly in those societies in which, although contractual and economic rituals are practised between men, these men are the masked incarnations, often Shaman priest-sorcerers, possessed by the spirit whose name they bear. In reality, they merely act as representatives of the spirits, because these exchanges and contracts not only bear people and things along in their wake, but also the sacred beings that, to a greater or lesser extent, are associated with them. This is very clearly the case in the Tlingit potlatch, in one of the two kinds of Haïda potlatch, and in the Eskimo potlatch. (MAUSS, 1954/2002, p. 20)

Mauss (1954/2002, p. 21) complements his portrait of such form of *Potlatch*, in Toradja of Celebes Island, where such relationship with spirits is even stronger to the extent that these islanders are obligated to

'purchase' from the spirits the right to carry out certain actions on "his" 'property', which is really theirs. Before cutting "his" wood, before even tilling "his" soil or planting the upright post of "his" house, the gods must be paid. Whereas the idea of purchase even seems very little developed in the civil and commercial usage of the Toradja, on the contrary this idea of purchase from the spirits and the gods is utterly constant.

An interesting point here is that the interaction involves a person and another "person" that does not materially exist. Such a sacred "*you*" is mystical, originated from beliefs and conscience, a conscience of if it is done otherwise, a contract is broken, which means a serious "transgression". An analysis of the verb "to believe" was done in a previous research, entitled *Forms of subjectivity and intersubjectivity of the English Language and Its Effects to Teaching* (SILVA; MASCARELO, 2013, p 7), where the fifth and the last meaning of "to believe", taken from the 6th Edition of Oxford Dictionary for Advanced Learners, was not explored by then, turned out to be the most 'significant' in the situation depicted above: 5. [intransitive] to have a religious faith. *The god only appears to those who believe*. Again, it is from a lexical and semantic finding that we have a piece of the whole subside to represent the instance of enunciation within an interaction between two persons, even though one of the participants are not an existing being to the eyes of those who do not have such belief.

Within a contract firmed between an islander and a spiritual entity as it was represented in "*The Gift*", the given contract is reciprocal. However, the contract cannot occur without the belief in that god or spirit, leading to an idea that the subjectivity of a believed being is more accounted than the subjectivity of the existing

and living being. It is not a criticism, indeed. Rather, our intention is to find the enunciative features of such forms of reciprocity in order to draw our own conclusions on what it means to be reciprocal, if it is possible to find reciprocity and their expressions within teaching contexts, and more specifically, the teaching of 'English for speakers of other languages'[51]. In our scenario, we account the speaking of Brazilian Portuguese.

A more civilised group, at the other end of Melanesia, Malinowski provides Mauss (1954/2002, p. 27) with a description of a more developed form of *Potlatch*, since it is characterised by intertribal trade (the *Potlatch* itself) and intra-tribal (the *Kula*). The *Potlatch*, here, is understood as system of fosterage among tribes across Trobriand, Entrecasteaux, and Amphlett islands. This is mainly aimed at all tribes and great tribes over there, and it embraces precious objects, treasures, utilities, men and women, all kinds of tasks and services, which also include sexual services. As Mauss reports, they are all "caught" in a "circle" of receiving and rewarding. The only difference from this kind of *Potlatch* is that it is performed exclusively by the noble ones. Moreover, they perform this interaction in an interpersonal approach. The reason why we are using the term interpersonal instead of intersubjective is the presence of a linguistic status and a lower level of subjectivity itself for they "pretend to receive". Mauss distinguishes the *Kula* and the *Potlatch* and how a different attitude towards the gift can modify his social ('personal') status, due to a cultural structure:

> *Kula* trade is of a noble kind. It seems to be reserved for the chiefs. The latter are at one and the same time the leaders of fleets of ships and boats. They are the traders, and also the recipients of gifts from their vassals, who are in fact also their children and brothers-in-law, their subjects, and at the same time the chiefs of various vassal villages. Trade is carried on in a noble fashion, apparently in a disinterested and modest way. It is distinguished carefully from the mere economic exchange of useful goods, which is called *gimwali*. (…) It is marked by very hard bargaining between the two parties, a practice unworthy of the *kula*. Of an individual who does not proceed in the *kula* with the necessary greatness of soul, it is said that he is 'conducting it like a *gimwali*.' (MAUSS, 1954/2002, p. 28)

In Trobriand, these treasures are referred as money, probably, it is the first time when such objects of exchange are related to means of wealth by themselves.

---

[51] It was chosen to maintain the original name of an educational approach, because it is already an institutionalised name.

Besides, these "money" are produced, traded, and expedited also to serve as spiritual tools, once the author reports:

> It is not possible to say whether they are really the object of a cult, for the Trobriand people are, after their fashion, positivists. Yet one cannot fail to acknowledge the eminent and sacred nature of the objects. To possess one is 'exhilarating, strengthening, and calming in itself.' Their owners fondle and look at them for hours. Mere contact with them passes on their virtues. *Vaygu'a* are placed on the forehead, on the chest of a dying person, they are rubbed on his stomach, and dangled before his nose. They are his supreme comfort. (MAUSS, 1954/2002, p. 31)

Thus, we may now see that these systems of exchange differ from one another not only in how the "locutor" (speaker), or rather, the "doer" becomes a subject, but also by how they play their roles as social persons, which differs from subject once the former constitutes a more superficial layer of the linguistic status of the speaker. The person is visible and reachable and stands for an interpersonal (more social) function whenever he becomes the subject of his own enunciation (or 'enunciaction'). More than that, the object, whichever its nature is, does not merely exist in a showcase. Due to the fact that objects are modelled and put into a contract or exchange according to their aesthetical, functional, cultural, as well as economical features – although it is dangerous to affirm the following –, it is quite impossible not to perceive the spiritual value, the intentional value, the heart of the producer, the buyer, and the giver of this object. This aspect seems to be so strong that one could take this "rule" to go for everyone. It also includes the object of teaching and learning. That is not by accident that, as quoted before, "mere contact with them (the objects) passes on their virtues" (MAUSS, 1954/2002, p. 31).

Mauss (1954/2002, p. 34), resorting to Malinowski's considerations, proves the importance of this system of exchange, the so called "*Kula*", to represent in Trobriand's islanders' lives: the system of exchanged gifts is embedded in their economical and juridical lives. The author recognises the awareness in the practise of the "*Kula*",

> Yet from another viewpoint the system is typical. Except for ancient Germanic law that we shall be discussing later, in the present state of our observations and historical, juridical, and economic knowledge, it would be difficult to come across a custom of gift-through-exchange more clear-cut, complete, and consciously performed, and, moreover, better understood by the observer recording it than the one Malinowski found among the Trobriand people. (p. 34)

Then the author adds:

> The *kula,* its essential form, is itself only one element, the most solemn one, in a vast system of services rendered and reciprocated, which indeed seems to embrace the whole of Trobriand economic and civil life. The *kula* seems to be merely the culminating point of that life, particularly the *kula* between nations and tribes. It is certainly one of the purposes of existence and for undertaking long voyages. (p. 34)

Through the Marcel Mauss's essay, we will find similar and different descriptions of *"Potlatch", "Kula", "Total Services",* and others. In these three systems, according to what we have outlined so far, we can point out three main differences – although, in the book, they are not limited to these, as the author goes deeper in portraying them: exchanges of goods through marriages and childbirth in the Polinesian "Total Service", the matter of honour, dispute and destruction, mainly in the Melanesian in the "Potlatch", and the "Kula", which is "noble" and "apparently free of interest and modest" (MAUSS, 1954/2002, p. 28). They occur because people depend on one another, and this human reliance generates the need of producing ties, "friendship", as the author says, and, as long as it is a matter of morality, ties are kept by the inhibition of refusing receiving and returning gifts.

We could also perceive that these three systems, from the "*Total Service*", through the "*Potlatch*" to the "*Kula*", there is a development, they evolve in terms of process of exchange, conception towards the objects, even though the presence of the spiritual constitution of the object given and returned is always there. Having in mind that some descriptions could not be completely provided, at the same time that others were thoroughly given, the information above – although far from being enough – constitutes a considerable subside for the following outlines that we intend to summarise into a chart of the main systems of reciprocity containing their names, where they occur, what they consist of and how enunciative concepts can be applied to them.

Despite these differences between the forms of exchange in Polinesia and Melanesia, the act of giving is considered to be a virtue, a virtue that embraces the object given, and which becomes "the warranty" of the return, accordingly to Mauss (1954/2002, p.45). What is more, it is pointed out that the "time", the hiatus of time between giving and reciprocating is important and a determining factor of respect

between the participants. (MAUSS, 1954/2002, p.45-6) In this regard, he declares that:

> Gifts circulate, as we have seen in Melanesia and Polynesia, with the certainty that they will be reciprocated. Their 'surety' lies in the quality of the thing given, which is itself that surety. But in every possible form of society it is in the nature of a gift to impose an obligatory time limit. By their very definition, a meal shared in common, a distribution of *kava,* or a talisman that one takes away, cannot be reciprocated immediately. Time is needed in order to perform any counter-service. The notion of a time limit is thus logically involved when there is question of returning visits, contracting marriages and alliances, establishing peace, attending games or regulated combats, celebrating alternative festivals, rendering ritual services of honour, or 'displaying reciprocal respect'(…).

Likewise, time, in education, is an instance of interaction that, when well managed according to the collective and the individual styles of learning, given that the learning itself is a gift, is an expression of respect between the participants. Nonetheless, it is only an actual aspect of reciprocity in teaching contexts when both teacher and students are aware of the importance of the timing within the idealised reciprocal interaction. It was noticed during an English lesson focused on written production of two students (SILVA; MASCARELO, 2013, p.) that their timing for accomplishing the task was different: one would think too much; the other, however, quickly finished the text requested. In a first glance, the teacher would not recognise that such time and silence from the former was his time of reciprocity. The time and the silence were the elements he needed to "return" the gift of assistance, examples and chance of choosing the theme for their production. Hence, time should also be taken as an important factor for intersubjectivity and reciprocal interaction between teacher and student(s).

In the third chapter, Mauss talks over the principles and economies in the primitive institutions, as the Greek and Roman. He justifies that the vestiges of the "moral and the exchanges practised" (1954/2002, p. 60-1) by these societies still remain in our societies. Thus, he believes that our law and our economies came from similar institutions. We will focus on the Roman and German law over the gift. Mauss presents some questions on the possibility of distinction between these systems (free gift and non-free gift), noted to be a recent assumption, to be part of great civilisations. As the author suggests:

> We live in societies that draw a strict distinction (the contrast is now criticized by jurists themselves) between real rights and personal rights, things and persons. (…) Now, this is foreign to the system of law we have been studying. Likewise our civilizations, ever since the Semitic, Greek, and Roman civilizations, draw a strong distinction between obligations and services that are not given free, on the one hand, and gifts, on the other. Yet are not such distinctions fairly recent in the legal systems of our great civilizations? (…) Have they not in fact practised these customs of the gift that is exchanged, in which persons and things merge? (…) In Rome we shall find traces of this. In India and ancient Germany it will be the laws themselves, still very much alive, that we shall still see functioning in a comparatively recent era. (MAUSS, 1954/2002, p. 61)

When the anthropologist mentions some kinds of exchanges that are more familiar to our post-modernist societies, they remind us of how usual the laws of reciprocity are fixed in our intersubjective and interpersonal relationships. Much more than we can suppose, since we frequently get into contracts, loans, exchanges of favours, of objects of generosities and so on.

## 5.1 The antique Roman Law: the personal and the real law according to Mauss

Mauss provides us with very clear notions of the Roman Law, in which he explains the Theory of *Nexum*. To do so, he even resorts to Huvelin, who compares the Roman and the German Law. He introduces the term 'pledge', which is a form of warranty of reciprocity, return, or payment. The mystical feature of the object, according to the author is identified in two ways: the power in the first possessor over the object while it is under the possessor of the contractor, and the spiritual character of the object.

Mauss (1954/2002, p. 61-2) also makes a parallel between the pledge in the Roman and the German societies, in which he clarifies that it embraced valueless objects, although it constituted evolved forms of contract. For example, "sticks are exchanged, the *stips* in the 'stipulation' of Roman law and the *festuca notata* in the German 'stipulation'; even the pledges given on account, of Semitic origin, are more than advances." (MAUSS, 1954/2002, p. 62) In the same paragraph, the author concludes that these ties produced by the this law, which comes from both men and object is what result in a "coming and going" of souls.

Mauss also presents the oldest form of the Roman Law contract, the *"Nexum"*, which although "separated from the substance of collective contracts and also from the ancient system of gifts that commit one." (1954/2002, p. 63) In fact

there is a link between the things, as the author says. However, they go beyond the magical and religious ones, as in the former types of contract; here, the link between the thing and the owner is also established by "words and actions of juridical formalism." (1954/2002, p.63)

In the Roman form of contract, the most striking aspect compared to the others briefly described before, is the register, the evidence and the solemnity of the transference: always solemn, pleasing, and reciprocal. By the way, the Roman family, at first, would comprise not only the household, but also the cattle belonging to the people in this family. Therefore, animal or any other belonging was of a noticeable importance for the family. When one of the res was given to another family, the evidence of the "gift" and debt was expressed in the family's symbol stamped in the animal.

In addition to the giving and the reciprocating of gifts, in the Roman society we are introduced to the concepts of "borrowing, deposit, pledge, and *commodate"*, and that of sale (MAUSS, 1954/2002, p. 65), which is a more developed form of exchange, since it is not a retribution, it is to pay what it is worth paying, being the price stipulated by the seller. On these forms of contract, the author explains:

> The *re* contracts constitute four of the most important legal contracts: borrowing, deposit, pledge, and *commodate*. A certain number of *innominate* contracts also—particularly those we believe to have been, with the contract of sale, at the origin of contract itself: gift and exchange—are likewise said to be *re* ones. But this was inevitable. Indeed, even in our present legal systems, as in Roman law, here it is not possible to circumvent the most ancient rules of law: there must be a thing or service for there to be a gift, and the thing or service must place one under an obligation. For example, it is evident that the cancelling of a gift made on grounds of ingratitude, which occurs in late Roman law, but which is a constant factor in our legal systems, is a normal, perhaps even natural, legal institution. (MAUSS, 1954/2002, p. 65)

Following these systems, Mauss also talks about the commitment implied in the Roman Law that are not free of the spiritual tie. However, we understand that this spirit is much more linked to the interpersonal relationship engaged in the contract than to a mystical being influencing the contract between two families. It seems to be the juridical spirit. If we look over our shoulders, we can notice that things are not that different from our society, once a contract is signed, it is a duty to accomplish being determined in there, and when it does not occur, from both parties, a very unpleasant relationship can rise between them.

## 5.2 The German Law: pledge and gift

The German Law, as described by Mauss based on Huvelin, integrates a society that is said to have existed without markets for a very long time. Thus, the type of exchange present by that time was the Potlatch and, chiefly, the system of gifts. (MAUSS, 1954/2002, p. 77) This was due to the fact that the German culture was remarked by the external relationship among tribes and families.

The contract in the German society was not so different from that in the Roman society, because the "*nexum*" could be recognised in the pledge, which is an obligation in the purchase, borrowing or deposit. This pledge is usually represented by an object of very personal use, although of little value, like a glove or a coin. For this reason, he approached this fact to the theme of "pledge of life". (MAUSS, 1954/2002, p. 79)

This is so strong in the German Law that the "*nexum*" is not only present in magical acts and solemnities of the contract, nor only in the words, oaths or handshaking, it is also "in it, as it is in the documents, the 'acts' of magical value, and the 'tallies' that each contracting party retains, the meals taken in common, in which everyone partakes of the substance of everybody else." (MAUSS, 1954/2002, p. 80). Also, the power implied in the contract is not necessarily in the individuality of the people involved, but especially in the thing that is given or exchanged. The obligation of the pledge is, indeed, a challenge for the honour of the debtor, putting him in a humiliating situation, for he feels slighted as a debtor, obliged to pay back.

Mauss also resorts to Richard Meyer to refer to the system of gifts and offers, which are typical and important in the tradition and folklore of the German society. They are, likewise, obligatory in exchange, in offer, in acceptance, and retribution. For instance, in the occasion of a wedding, the guests give the couple gifts of great value, in some cases, trusting the bride and the groom vows of fertility.

A point that Mauss discusses, which goes for our society likewise, is that the guests bless the hosts, and the ones who were not invited are expected to cast a spell on the host. This still happens to us when we forget or do not intend to invite a certain person, even though this person has some familiarity with us. In a teaching context, it may happen when we forget or do not intend to interact with a certain student, or this student does not intend to interact with the teacher and the other

students; or even when we make a mistake while checking out a student's exam. He feels subjectively harmed and feels like blaming the teacher for such "injustice", particularly when the teacher does not recognise his (or her) own mistake.

## 6  ARCHAIC SOCIETIES, RECIPROCITY, AND ENUNCIATION

Benveniste acclaims Mauss for his descriptions, references and analysis of some exotic and archaic societies in a way that they are placed in "The Gift" in an increasing order according to the development and complexity of what constitutes their economical, juridical, religious and moral organisation. Based on the previous discussion, we can now summarise some of the systems listed in the following chart relating them to the sort of enunciation (or 'enunciaction') prevailing in each of them.

**Chart 3 Relationship between forms of reciprocity and enunciative concepts**

| Main Region/Society | System of Exchange | Main characteristics | Enunciative interpretation |
|---|---|---|---|
| Polinesia | Total Service | Occurs among families, neighbours, child is channel of goods exchange | Intersubjective enunciaction |
| Melanesia; Tinglit and Haïda | Potlatch | Exchange of goods, festivals, dispute for power, destruction | Exchange of arguments, justification, subjectivity indication |
| Eskimos | Kula – Potlatch | Diplomacy in exchanging goods | Interpersonal enunciation; indicator's subjectivity |
| Rome | Roman Law | "*Nexum*" (social mobility), pledge, spiritual character of the given thing, obligatory gifts, formalism, witness, word, | Intersubjective (a pleasing gift) and interpersonal (inter *persona*) (formal, also involve social roles played by |

| | | registration. | the people involved) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Germany | German Law | Obligation to exchange, sale and borrowing under pledge. Honour is challenged. | Interpersonal; the object of interaction holds the power of reciprocity, the contract may affect participants through a "humiliating situation" (in the sense that the debtor feels obliged to exchange). |

Having listed some of the societies in Mauss' essay, we point out three main forms of reciprocity between individuals, families, or tribes. Although they show some particularities within each category pair, as in *Potlatch*, as well as in the other two classifications – total service and law –, we can notice that they go from 'simpler' to 'more complex' expressions of 'subjectivity in the 'language''. Such expressions are built out of relationships of belief, economy, values, and juridical principles that are organised in different ways in different societies, more or less evolved if we examine the main characteristics of each form of reciprocity. These distinct features are also reflected in the *'língua'* as a social/individual process and ever changing 'product'.

When thinking about classroom interaction, some movements of 'language' also reproduce the influence of belief, economy, values, and juridical principles over the realisation of 'subjectivity in the 'language''. These are important issues when it comes down to outlining the methodology and attitudes – or "teaching choices", as Harmer (1983/2015, p. vi) calls them – used in class: a certain practice may work in a culture of learning/interaction, but it may not work for another culture of learning/interaction. This point led me to reflect on two parts of Harmer's *The Practice of English Language Teaching* (1983/2015). The first is regarded to some points

raised by the author in relation to the classes he recorded and analysed in different countries in order to elicit, from the reader, decision on the following subjects:

> A. *Friend or foe?*
> In this activity, one viewer is a 'friend' and should say what is good about what they are seeing. The other is a 'foe' and should (pretend to) identify as many 'hole' as he or she can find in what is on show. Who 'wins' the discussion?
> B. *Same or different?*
> How different are you from the teachers you watch? In what ways is the situation that you teach in similar to, or different from, what you see in the videos? What does this make you think about a) your teaching and b) your teaching situation?
> C. How would I do it?
> If you had to teach the same students and you were doing the same kind of lesson, how would *you* do it?
> D.      *What can I steal?*
> What techniques and activities can you 'steal' from the teachers on the video to use in your lessons?

In this reflection proposed by the author, the reader, an experienced or inexperienced teacher of English, should remember, before answering themselves these questions, what culture(s) of interaction and expression of subjectivity compose their classroom reality. Are their students more subjective? Are they more objective? Is the language the main target in teaching and learning? Or is it just one in an ample curriculum? Then, here we have an evidence that answering such questions is both a necessary and painstaking task supposing the reader is to apply the concept of reciprocal interaction. Indeed, these factors are very subtle and present within the '*língua'*, as well as in its surrounding contexts.

Secondly, the author discusses on how determining an intervention is to "the whole class in terms of their future adherence to the group norms to which they have agreed" (HARMER, 1983/2015, p. 173). As the author reports, one of the participant teachers reported that "she came to class to find that someone had put up a photo of her taken from the internet and some of her high school students had written silly comments on it." Now, we can observe a more practical case of attempt to establish a reciprocal enunciation between a teacher and a student and for what purpose reciprocity was conceived in this context. The questions are: Is reciprocity conceived and occurring in a city like ours? Do people behave this way outside or in the classroom this way? This is how a teacher dealt with a problem in classroom, denoting that the attitude was different from what is usually expected:

I pulled down and told the class I did **not like it. Rather than cry or scream**, I just **got on and taught as usual**, and **gave them much more homework than planned**. They were suspiciously quiet during the entire lesson. Later I talked to the head teacher, who luckily gave me 100 percent support, and promised to investigate. She found the four pupils responsible, made them **write me an apologetic letter**, a **thank you note**, and **buy me a box of chocolate**. (PFANNER, 2013, *apud* HARMER, 1983/2015, P.173, bolded emphasis added)

In the next stages of this work, we shall consider the following forms of reciprocity and their particularities. Undoubtedly, there are social particularities of a space and time where each of the following groups is found that should not apply to analyse a reciprocity construction in teacher-student interaction: 'Total Service', 'Potlatch', Roman Law, and German Law. The purpose, however, considers that this construction suggests a gathering of linguistic and behavioural attitudes that may be compared to these systems. They are taken to be primitive to Westerners, but they are not completely left aside. Their principles still rule certain linguistic exchanges between people, since these exchanges contribute to the construction of communities and societies even nowadays.

In the next chapter, we will present the methodology used to conduct this work.

# 7  METHODOLOGY

Having concluded this reflection over the different forms of reciprocity and their relationship with enunciation, we shall go through a brief reflection on transcription methodologies and their purposes. Later on, we will approach description and transcription and an enunciative analysis of our recordings. These recordings, carried out in an 'English language' school, will be our object of assessment. In the English school, the sample consists of 3-hour lesson taught to an group of teenagers in the last course module. Teacher and students speak in English most part of time. There were 3 students in that class.

The criteria chosen for identifying the characteristics of reciprocity in the context mentioned will be of those systems listed in the chart number 3. It is possible that there may be found a wide variety of  enunciation procedures, in the corpus that can be associated with some of the forms of reciprocity, such as "to speak to" (as a more formal/serious enunciation), "to talk to" (as a less formal enunciation in which both participants are engaged in the conversation), "to speak for" (as one may anticipate or deduce what the other's enunciation is), "to say" (enunciation that may destruct or not the object of interaction; a starter or response utterance ;"to speak or tell somebody something, using words", according to Oxford Learner's Dictionary Online). Another enunciation 'mechanism' that frequently occurs in classroom interaction – most of the time from teacher to student – is "to tell" (to say something to someone, often giving an information or directions/instructions, according to Cambridge Dictionaries Online). Nevertheless, we shall enlighten the occurrence of "to speak to", "to talk to", and "to speak for", as it can be seen in the section 7.2, as well as their connection to reciprocity in an English classroom from the perspective of Enunciation theory.

Finally, we believe we will have brought in enough evidences to show that such complexities in 'enunciaction' consist of an unrevealed power and cultural shock that is essential for teachers of English to consider when building up their identity before the background, identity, culture and needs of their students. If reciprocity in an interaction between teacher and student helps enhancing teaching and learning, it is an asset for the teacher, as well as for the school, to recognise what composes his (or her) identity as a teacher of English in a given scenario.

Following to this brief introduction to the methodology, which is put to use for the proposed analysis, we shall go on to the method of data collection, a discussion on works founded on transcription, and the justification for the choice of the written representation format. Later, we will present the research context.

## 7.1 On transcription

Given that this consists in a qualitative study of enunciative approach founded on a very specific situation in which interaction between interlocutors is evident and constant along with the whole English lesson time, it is taken to be indispensable that the transcription of the relevant pieces of the recordings should be executed as thoroughly as possible.[52]

Then, in the beginning of the referred lesson, recorded using an audio recording software only, as in agreement with the students, all the participants had access to the presentation letter and the Informed Consent Form, which were both signed by them. Only then did the recording start. Selected pieces of the resulting files will consist in the corpus of analysis.

For an enunciative analysis of a situation of interaction between a teacher of English and students, the transcription of a recorded three-hour lesson sample is the object in which we intend to identify, in certain selected movements of 'language', what kind of reciprocity occurs in there.

In order to understand what conception of transcription of speech samples we chose, why it was chosen, and what it comprises we shall discuss on some methodologies of transcription used for Enunciation studies. These transcriptions, different in the procedures and in research contexts, as well as goals, prove that the point of view of the observer, the transcription process itself should be thought and defined so as to justify what is it that calls the researcher's attention. In short, for a theory, for an aim, a convention of transcription needs to serve its purposes.

Thus, we need to refer, once again, to the methodologies discussed by S. Silva (2013, p.135). In the meantime, she mentions and characterises three studies that also made use of transcription to serve them as their object of linguistic study. Accordingly, these works correspond to "C. Silva (2009), in a study on the acquisition of 'language' and mother '*língua*'; Dalpiaz (2012), on temporality in a speech therapy

---

[52] Due to the method of data collection, there were inaudible utterances. These were represented by "(???)".

clinic; Flores and Surreaux (2012) whose work introduces a concept of voice in Enunciation" (S. SILVA, 2013, p. 135). The author considers such productions as meaningful examples of reflection on Benveniste's Enunciation theory.

In C. Silva (2009), the '*corpus'* consists of an audio and video recording, in which, besides speech, "body movements, laughs, objects that participate in the child's speech in his (or her) relationship with adults" (in S. SILVA, 2013, p. 135) are also focused. In the process of transcribing the given sample, the author resorted to a "script, with speeches attributed to 'participants', respecting the pragmatic notions of 'turn', 'turn taking', and a detailed description of the phonological form of 'saying'. Here, the transcription highlighted the 'word' and its attribution to an individual responsible for the 'word'. These procedures happens as in the following transcription excerpt:

> Participantes: EDU (irmão de 6 anos); PAI, MÃE (filmando) e BET (irmão de 15
> anos) Idade da criança: 1;2.22
> Situação: FRA está na frente de sua casa, sentada inicialmente com EDU e seu pai.
> Em seguida, BET senta-se a seu lado. Com: FRA e EDU brincam de assustarem-se
> dentro de casa. Por isso, ambos gritam. Após FRA engatinha até a área, onde estão
> seu PAI e sua MÃE.
> FRA: Ah (= engatinhando e aproximando-se de Edu)
> EDU: Ai (=pula como se estivesse assustado)
> Mãe: Francisca, assusta o Dudu, assusta.
> Pai: Assim, ó (=mostra como FRA deve assustar o irmão)ãh (=faz o som de assustar) @XXX@XXX aqui ó (= pega EDU pelo braço) ó @ assusta o Dudu.
> @ARRR (=som para assustar)
> EDU: XXX
> Com: O irmão BET também senta na área, ao lado de FRA. Silêncio.
> FRA: AAH (=olha para o PAI e grita, assustando-o)
> BET: (risos)
> FRA: AAH (= olha para BET e grita, assustando-o)
> BET: AI (= vai pra trás, como se estivesse assustado)
> FRA: (risos) ah (grita com BET, assustando-o)
> BET: AAI (= encolhe-se, como se estivesse assustado)
>    (excerto inicial da transcrição de Silva, 2009b, p. 40-41, in S.SILVA, 2013, p. 136)

In turn, Dalpiaz (2012, in S.Silva, 2013, p. 136) describes a situation which S. Silva (2013, p. 136) calls "present linguistic moment", which is the 'interspace' between a relevant fact that initiates an intersubjective communication and its resolution. The context in which these facts occurred was that of a speech therapy

clinic, where the main aim, whether it is explicit or tacit, is to 're-adequate' an individual's speech. Therefore, the 'word' is highlighted in the transcription of the 'scene' only when it is the 'key' to the communication between the participants. Such considerations, noted by S. Silva (2013, p. 136), were founded in the following transcription excerpt:

> Cena clínica: um dia, ao entrar na sala, um menino de 3 anos me pergunta: 'Tu tem
> difomi?' 'Difomi?', perguntei. A partir desse momento, fiz várias tentativas, sem sucesso, de compreender o que ele dizia. Falei: "quero entender muito o que tu tá dizendo, mas não tô conseguindo". Ele estendeu a mão e disse 'Péli' [espera aí] Ajoelhou-se no chão, baixou a cabeça, fazendo uma bola com o corpo. Aos poucos, foi se levantando, abrindo braços e pernas numa posição que parecia de um herói forte. 'Transformers?' perguntei. 'Tanformis!', falou, mostrando-se contente e aliviado. (Dalpiaz, 2012, p. 59, in S. Silva, 2013, p. 136)

Flores and Surreaux (2012, apud Silva, 2013, p. 137-138), differently, reproduces an enunciation context where not only does the authors focus on the ("*linguistic*") surrounding context but they also point the "*ante-linguistic*" fact, in other words, what occurs "within the *'língua'/'language'*". Nonetheless, there is not a great emphasis on phonetic-phonological aspects of the speech, for the point here is the relationship between grammar-voice-intonation and linguistic movements concretised in the analysed speech. The situation transcribed, as shown in the excerpt below, comprises an (attempt to) interaction between mother and baby:

> M. – Tá brabo!? Antônio! Que foi, olha pra mamãe
> *Comentários contextuais ou entonacionais. Fala em tom suave e em manhês.*
> A.Ele se mexe e resmuga.
> M. – Vamo acoda meu veio. Hein! Vamo acodá!
> A. Ele resmunga
> M. – Hein! Bebezinho!
> *Comentários contextuais ou entonacionais: A.. faz um chorinho. Observa-se que A.*
> *está respondendo ao chamado da mãe.*
> M. – Ah! Tá soninho?!? Vamo acodá! Abre o olhinho pra mamãe te vê.
> A. – Arhaaaa
> *Comentários contextuais e entonacionais. O bebê geme.*
> (Flores e Surreaux, 2012, p. 87-8, in S. Silva, 2013, p. 137)

The researchers point out the speaking particularities and make notes on the context and intonation, in this sample, after which the observers conclude that the act of mumbling "is not transcribed as a locution (speech), or rather, as a refusal to

locution (refusal to speaking)". This is an interesting perspective to analyse reciprocity. However, the corpus of this work also comprises the phonetic-phonological features that are relevant in teacher-student interaction in case they initiate an interaction.

Finally, in S. Silva (2013, p. 151), the pattern of transcription used is that of emphasis on the object of interaction, or rather, object of intersubjective relationship. Such convention does not concentrate its procedures on "phonetic-phonological" aspects (SILVA, 2013, p. 151), as stated. This is due to the fact that it is not a determining point in the author's aim for raising samples of the movements of language that compose her own understanding and application of the concepts of "scene" in addition to the concepts of "archive" and "testimonial"[53] for characterising interaction between teacher and student in a Reading and Writing lesson for a class of the first semester of 2012:

**Interstício 5 00:59:35- 01:15:02**
**Professora**: pessoal.. vocês já escreveram o parágrafo sobre o texto do colega...
então eu vou pedir que vocês voltem a sentar em semi-círculo pra gente conversar... peguem o texto de vocês de voool.ta... deem uma lida.. que a gente vai começar a conversar... (2 minutos).. tá .. então vamos conversar um pouco gente.. primeira pergunta.. queria que vocês lessem a avaliação que os colegas escreveram.. e se vocês concord/ se a leitura que os colegas fizeram é a mesma que vocês fizeram.... bom... vocês acharam que a opinião de vocês é discreta e os colegas acharam escrachada... não houve...
**Aluna Bea:** Aqui...
**Professora**: teve discrepância
**Aluna Bea**: sim.
**Professora**: ... fala.. pessoal vamos escuta...
**Aluna Bea**: a gente lê ou não lê?
**Professora**: lê, por favor !
**Aluna Bea**: ah**.. (**interrompida pela professora)
**Professora:** lê a resenha e lê a opinião
**Aluna Bea**: tá (risos).. a gente pegou O Código da Vinci... daí assim. Ó... Você tem
convicção.. convicções sobre o que sabe? (lendo) Não... Você tem convicção sobre o que sabe sobre Cristo?... O livro Código da Vinci traz o contexto desses questionamentos e incita o leitor a responder a esse questionamento negativamente ou positivamente. Apresenta argumentos fictícios que o leitor que não tem conhecimento bíblico poderá mudar sua opinião, mudará sua ideia de quem é Cristo (lendo).... Daí o colega achou.. acharam rígido.. eu não achei rígido...
**Aluno Ger**: é que tu tá afirmando que o leitor vai mudar opinião
**Aluna Bea**: mas é que qualquer pessoa que não tenha o conhecimento bíblico

---

[53] In S. Silva (2012), it corresponds to the first draft produced by the students, final version and self-evaluation and evaluation of the course of study, based on Agamben (2005; 2008), Dufour (2000), Dessons (2006), and Benveniste (1988; 1989).

acreditou.... é a mesma coisa que eu fala pra vocês que.. sei lá.. a chapeuzinho vermelho matou a vovó.. sei la.... se vocês não sabem que foi o lobo.. vocês vão acreditar... quem não conhece a história acredita no que o livro tá falando (S.SILVA, 2012, p. 177-8)

In these terms, a study as the present one, based on verbal and behavioural records that indicate the occurrence of any of the described forms of reciprocity, founded in Mauss (1954/2002), requires the perspective from a subjectively "foreigner" one to be transcribed and analysed.

S. Silva (2013, p. 138, our translation) refers to other transcription works that made use of an enunciative approach. These are attributed to Surreaux, as in Surreaux and Oliveira (2010), and Surreaux and Silva (2011), in which the gestures, the non-verbal 'language' can also help develop hypothesis towards the way the 'language' works in a given context. As S. Silva asserts:

> For Surreaux *et al* (2010; 2011), it is supposed to be considered, in a transcription of an Enunciation approach, the 'sound data' not simply as a 'phonological' or a 'phonetic and phonological' data for they presuppose the use of the IPA (International Phonetic Alphabet) transcription conventions, which is a reading that lays emphasis on segmental aspects of the *'língua'* whose application applies to a wide variety of speakers. Instead, it is a transcription that reveals the audio perception of the analyst, describes the vocalised content, as well as gestures and glances that shall help out in the development of hypothesis on the functioning of the 'language', and specially highlight the effects of the relationship among I-you/he.[54]

The following issue put by S. Silva (2013, p. 142) substantiates the pertinence of transcription, the update and 're-update' of a unique and unrepeatable action for tracing a culture of interaction:

> How to think a methodology of enunciative analysis of data? Is it necessary to consider, as a fundamental principle, Benveniste's idea that 'language is used to live' or, in other words, to give it existence? How to reveal the existence of these agents of the *language* without misrepresenting their nature nor stopping them from participating in culture?

---

[54] *"A dimensão da escuta para o analista é enfatizada em vários trabalhos de Surreaux, tais como Surreaux e Oliveira (2010) e Surreaux e Silva (2011). Para Surreaux e outros autores (2010, 2011), em uma transcrição de viés enunciativo, há que se considerar o 'dado sonoro' não simplesmente como dado 'fonológico' ou 'fonético-fonológico', eis que este supõe uma padronização internacional de transcrição (IPA), leitura que enfatiza aspectos segmentais da língua cuja aplicação se realiza para uma ampla gama de falantes, e sim uma transcrição que releve da escuta do analista, descreva o conteúdo vocalizado e também gestos e olhares, auxilie na elaboração de hipóteses sobre o funcionamento da linguagem e, especialmente, destaque efeitos da relação eu-tu/ele."* (SILVA, 2013, p. 138)

Some considerations on this enquiry can be made in order to build up a dialogue with the author. It is convenient that we clarify some aspects raised in the questions above, beginning with the representation of agents in a given culture. With a proper set of criteria in hands, an observer may characterise a group in an ethnical research: an enunciative methodology should not be applied if one stands for the belief that in a cultural group, people think, enunciate, act similarly, know quite the same things or that they share the same opinions (KAWACHI *apud* COX and ASSIS-PETERSON, 2007, *in* BARBOSA, 2014, p.95).

Secondly, when it comes down to 'language' functioning, as a human nature and the root of subjectivity, problems of 'language' identified in the description of utterances within a specific '*língua*' are not always a matter of lack in '*língua*' development and proficiency in classroom. Instead, it is a problem in certain criteria used to represent what one holds to be reality or not based on one's own experiences, interaction, education, values. Hence, it is possible to say that reciprocity forms are not always perfectly structured within a community, although it consists in just a few of the influencing factors. Reflecting on that, we can draw the meaning of destructing an object, which is an integrant procedure of the Potlatch, as described by Mauss. We suggest that this destruction occurs when one of the parties really shows resistance towards the interlocutor's enunciation. Reciprocally or not, it is indeed through the 'language' that one makes oneself "visible". Thus, once a reality is represented or misrepresented through the 'language', it is there to be accepted or to be refused. These considerations lead us to suggest that there may not be a way how to reveal the existence of agents of 'language' without misrepresenting their nature nor stopping them from participating in culture. "Stopping" (avoiding interaction, for example) should not be the only way out, but, rather, 'manipulating' their participation in culture, given that interaction as a means of reciprocity realisation is a place of power dispute. In short, a complex process.

Finally, due to the fact that C. Silva (2009) presents a more pragmatic method of transcription that comprises the phonetic-phonological aspects, intonation and participants of communication, with explicit indication of turn taking, it is ample and covers as many enunciative features as possible. Here, only the most relevant movements of 'language' as an expression of subjectivity, and intersubjectivity will be weighed. Besides, in this method, the enunciation is quite segmented and, thus, it

demands attention from the researcher to use this 'resource' without leaving aside the relationships among such aspects.

For a thorough view that the mentioned method provides, we will adapt the author's principles to our '*corpus*' and transcription, for we believe that both aspects, whether they are within 'language' or within the surrounding context, may cause the participants to engage in a more or less reciprocal interaction, in some cases, an interaction that sometimes reflect participants' home culture, depending on their backgrounds. In addition, we believe that this method of transcription is proper to provide us with the features that were listed in the chart 3. To sum up, both particularities in speech, body communication (even though the method of recording does not embrace visual resource) and environment will be part of our transcription. Thus, we can organise the sample in the following way:

**Recording duration**: Three-hour lesson, covering approximately two hours and thirty minutes.

**Context of interaction**: Advanced English lesson. The last lesson before the final exam. The class is concluding the last course module.

**Age of the participants**: young adult learners; teacher's age not informed

**Number of students in class**: 3

**Object of interaction**: casual topics, vocabulary build-up; listening, reading, students' opinions and experiences, teacher's opinions and experiences.

**Time of speech**: This is to be indicated in the transcription

**Identification**: utterances produced in which participants change roles as subjective and objective persons (as in Chart 1. Correlation of personhood/correlation of subjectivity).

@: pause

(???): inaudible

(): notes on the context of speech

CAPITAL LETTERS: raise on intonation

WOR-: interruption of a word

WORD: indication of emphasis

Next, we will go on the contextualisation of the recording and transcription, as well as on the explanation of the methodology used to analyse the most common form of reciprocity in teacher-student interaction in the environment observed at very specific moments of the lesson taught.

## 7.2 A situation of reciprocity

Given that this consists in a qualitative study founded on a very specific situation in which interaction between interlocutors is evident and constant along with the whole English lesson time, I evaluate as indispensable that the transcription of the relevant pieces of the recordings should be executed as thoroughly as possible. Although, for this to be actually called cultural study, we would need to record more samples, here we strive to highlight the movements of 'language' that I could notice in a three-hour lesson that occurred more than once.

The recorded lessons took place in a 'language school' in Bagé in February 19th, 2015, from 2 pm till 4:30 pm. The class consisted of three-hour lessons taught by an English teacher who has been working in the field of 'language teaching' since the end of the 90's. Among the three students, two of them were in the high school, and the third, in the under-graduation course. They were around eighteen and twenty years old. The school's methodology involves students' exposition to the target *'língua'* from the very first lesson through audio and visual stimulation using corresponding input resources. This school, where both English and Spanish lessons are offered, is located in the centre of the city.

Before the lesson started, an Informed Consent Form was signed (in Attachment A). The school's headmaster and the teacher had already been contacted by then. As soon as the purposes of the observation and recording of the lesson were explained, the teacher accepted the terms exposed. The headmaster notified the students in advance, so that no embarrassing circumstance might be caused.

Then, in the beginning of the referred lesson, recorded through audio recording software, as in agreement with the students, all the participants had access to the presentation letter and the Informed Consent Form, which were both signed by them. Only then did the recording start. The resulting files will consist in the corpus of analysis.

The process of recording transcription, to serve its purposes, did not emphasise the interruptions, stammers, speaking rhythm. In contrast, the present work sees enunciation more into depth, considering both utterances and actions that lead to following up utterances and actions part of the reciprocity we intend to demonstrate.

This is true that there is a discourse of common sense that prevails when it comes down to evaluating the reciprocity in a 'language school': that in which the teaching/learning of the 'English language' is the main goal of both teacher and student; that the student's *'hau'* is the investment in terms of payment, attendance, and participation. As a counterpart, the teacher's *'hau'* is represented by his (or her) investment in knowledge, experience in the *'língua'* and in the communities where this *'língua'* is officially used in spoken or written communication, and so on.

Notwithstanding this undeniable fact, we also say that reciprocity forms may vary within the interaction itself. In terms of enunciation, we propose to shed light on to the three following phrases: *speak to*[55] someone (in this case, a sample of *'Potlatch'* with destruction of the object may be found, in other words, a resistance may be offered by the listener); *talk to*[56] someone/talk to each other (this is, comparing to 'total service' in Polinesia – see chart 3, pages 43-4 –, when the enunciation established causes the participants to produce constant utterances to the extent that the object of interaction becomes somehow 'pointless' for the teacher or for the student – the latter is more usual than the former); and, finally, *speak for someone* [57](similar to "Roman Law" or "German Law" – chart 3, pages 43-4 – when the teacher changes the object of interlocution as it is no longer interesting for the students, or the teacher corrects a student by repeating the word correctly after it was said by the student so that he [or she] realises it).

That justifies the choice of presenting a single lesson in an English school context, where the group is usually small. As a linguistic work with anthropological issues, it would be interesting if other teaching spheres recognised the contribution such approach may offer. In other words, it is to be admitted that the teaching of English – or the teaching of any other 'additional language' – is a 'place' to value, but also to "narrow distances among cultures", interests, and identities. This is what reciprocity stands for here.

In the following chapter, we will move on to the transcription of the recordings and its analysis to demonstrate how enunciation and reciprocity are conceived

---

[55] According to Cambridge Dictionaries Online, "speak to" corresponds to formal situations or when the speaker has something serious or important to say.

[56] According to Cambridge Dictionaries Online, "talk to" corresponds to less formal situations, as when the speaker is a friend, or when he/she is not acquainted but the subject is not a serious one.

[57] According to Cambridge Dictionaries Online, "speak for someone" corresponds to expressing the opinions or wishes of someone.

bearing in mind what has been said so far. The transcription will be presented in blocks, and each of them will be related to a category of reciprocity.

# 8 ANALYSING RECIPROCITY IN CLASSROOM INTERACTION FROM ENUNCIATION PERSPECTIVE

In the present study, it is intended to carry out an analysis on how reciprocity occurs while teacher and student interact and enunciate to each other and how movements of 'language' may be seen as attitudes of fostering reciprocity, refusing reciprocity or providing with smokescreen towards reciprocity. These attitudes are rooted in three essential 'rules' of '*Potlatch'*, which occurred in societies such as Melanesia, Tinglit, Haida, and others. Here, we suggest that classroom interaction can be compared to this system, despite the distance in time and space between the settings where it occurs in its varied forms. It is believed so due to the three featuring 'obligations' – to give, to receive, and to reciprocate – that revolve around an interesting position being disputed – that of authority[58]. This is neither conditioned to exchanges of goods, as in total service, nor to explicit contracts that do not comprise the abstract legitimacy of power/authority and intersubjectivity.

Secondly, based on discussion and comprehension by Mauss (1954/2002) on these societies, we can highlight another integrating factor in these systems, including *Potlatch*: their behaviour is very much subjected to norms. In the classroom observed, we could also find it to be true for reciprocity, as it is effective or not depending on norms explicitly or tacitly built or consciously owned[59] by the participants. In enunciative terms, we found this effectiveness to be reached through considerable movements of 'language': 'speak to', 'talk to' and 'speak for'; giving justifications and arguments, questioning, repeating, laughter, silence, as well as indication of subjectivity and subjectivity of the indicator. In other words, this effectiveness depends on the legitimacy of both teacher and students concerning their own roles in the process of learning the target '*língua'*.

---

[58] By authority, in the given context, we prefer to resort to the definition provided by Elmore (1987, p.69, translation by PAULA E SILVA, 2001, apud PAULA E SILVA, 2001): "A autoridade é uma relação recíproca, a aceitação da legitimidade baseada em uma reconhecida desigualdade. A aceitação pode ser baseada em um trato ou represália, tradição, respeito pelo conhecimento ou competência, ou regras formais. Nós podemos revogar ou consentir se nós percebemos que essa autoridade estiver em desacordo com o combinado." ("Authority is a reciprocal relationship, the acceptance of legitimacy based on a recognised inequality. Acceptance may be based on a deal or reprisal, tradition, respect for one's knowledge or competence, or formal rules. We may revoke or consent if we realize that this authority does not comply with what is settled." Our translation.)

[59] In Maffesoli's point of view on the relationship between the subject (individual) and the object is a result of a semantic interpretation the subject gives the object based on the culture this individual is inserted (SILVA; GUARESCHI; WENDT, 2010, p 445)

There is such an evidence of an existing dispute for power in classroom interaction, in this case, 'English language', between the parties involved, to show authority by demanding reciprocity from the 'listener' that the destruction of the object 'authority', in a very specific situation, is made by compensation. To illustrate a form of challenge offered by students to the teacher in classroom, Harmer cites an example of how to deal with problems, provided by Inthisone Pfanner (2013, p. 11, apud HARMER, 2015, p. 173), which is now recaptured here:

> I pulled it down and told the class I did not like it. Rather than cry or scream, I just got on and taught as usual, and gave them much more homework than planned. They were suspiciously quiet during the entire lesson. Later I talked to the head teacher, who luckily gave me 100 percent support, and promised to investigate. She found the four pupils responsible, made them write me an apologetic letter, a thank you note, and buy me a box of chocolates.

As we can notice in the report above, the teacher made use of an enunciation in which she *spoke to* the class, challenged their position of students, offered a *'Potlatch'* to be reciprocated. This was, in turn, reciprocated with a more considerable compensation, which included a letter of apology and a note of thankfulness – whether they were willing to write this letter or not. That may not be enough for us to say that there was maintenance of authority, as we are not given a continuation of the 'scene' (though the 'power' possessed by the students seemed to be challenged). Even so, it is still perceivable that enunciation plays a determining role in the dispute and maintenance of authority from both teacher and student. In summary, the means, the context and cultural setting were different, but the goal is the same as in the setting in which the observation took place.

As follows, we will go through the transcriptions and their analysis. The structure of the transcription as a corpus of study will be structured similarly to that procedure in C. Silva's thesis (2009). Basically, the transcriptions will be divided into 'analysis focus' (title), 'enunciation excerpts', 'sessions', 'scene information', 'turns' and 'featured utterances'.

In addition, the excerpts are taken from the transcription made on the recordings produced on the occasion of the lesson taught on February 19th, 2015. For this analysis, we will show, as referred earlier in this chapter, three main moments in which both teacher's and student's power is challenged or evoked.

## 8.1 *Evoking* reciprocity through subjectivity indication; student's '*getting round*' on reciprocity through indicator's subjectivity

It is usually expected from the teacher, in specific contexts, that he or she raises some level pf interest or engagement in the student regarding the continuity of the lesson when this student has missed it. Now, the strategies the teacher comes to use with that student may vary according to several factors: reason why the student missed class, how many classes were missed, empathy, student's motivation, self-esteem and so on. In this respect, the teacher may want to demonstrate his (or her) power through providing student with arguments and justifications for why it is important that the student catches up with the whole class.

As both engage in an intersubjective interaction (enunciative excerpt 01, session 01), teacher challenges student's subjectivity and argues in favour of his own position of an authority in class. This is initially so as the teacher mainly 'speaks to' the student on a relatively more serious topic and tone, exposing recommendations and instructions to do the activities for the review lesson, the one before the final exam which was to take place the following day. The name of the students was substituted by letters. They are: A, B, C, and T (teacher).

**Chart 4 Enunciative excerpt 01; Session 01**

Enunciative excerpt 01

Session 01

Participants: teacher; student 'C'

Date of recording: Feb. 19th, 2015

Scene: Teacher calls student's attention to the lesson missed. Student tries to argue and justify herself to the teacher. The teacher speaks to her about it and tells her what she is supposed to do for the review lesson before the final exam.

1.T**: C-C, sua matona. @ Sexta-feira. Hoje é... Que dia é hoje? Terça-feira**...

2.C: Hoje é quinta.

3.T: Hoje é quinta? **Quarta-feira tu estava aí, né?**

4.C: **Não... Eu cheguei de tarde.**

5.T: **Nah-não... Sei... Muito conveniente, ah?**

6.C: **Qual lição nós estamos?**

7.T: A gente tá na lição sete. **Tamo terminando a sete**. **Então, o teu dever de casa é... fazer**

8.**o seguinte – para amanhã –: dá uma lida no texto da lição seis, que é um texto sobre**

9.**Nova York, e amanhã vamos dar uma revisada contigo, tá?**

10.C: **Tá**.

11.(Com.: Teacher points at the pages in the girl's book)

12.T: (???) **Tudo o que tu tiver (???) A gente vê direitinho... essa parte...** Aqui tu já estava

13.no Cassino. Antes de sair, a gente já fez a revisão. **Então, a gente já tá com o tempo**

14.**contado. A gente só vai ter que dar uma revisada nela**.

15.(Com: Teacher returns to the pulpit)

16.T: **Ok, people**. **Do you remember at what number we stopped last class**? We were

17.reading *Inside the English Language*? It was on page one hundred and six. Remember,

18.'A'? 'Amy'? **When are we gonna meet in our last class?**

This moment is marked by two main movements of language: subjectivity indication – when the teacher challenges student's subjectivity not only by using a qualitative of someone who skip classes (line 1), but also by demanding, or rather, evoking reciprocity from her as he tells her what to do for the next class–, as in line 7-8 ("*Então, o teu dever de casa é...*": "*so, your homework is...*"; "*dá uma lida...*": "*read...[60]*". Our translation.), indicator's subjectivity– at the moment when student [61]responds to the teacher manifesting certain degree of resignation enough to ease the '*Potlatch*'[62] offered by the teacher. The latter, in turn, maintains his authority through the arguments and justification for the '*Potlatch'* (here, consisting in the catching up of contents approached in the lesson missed), according to the lines 7, 13-4 *("Tamo terminando a sete": "We are finishing lesson seven."* Our translation.). This '*Potlatch'* is also expressed in the last turn of the teacher, when he returns to the pulpit, which is itself a place that turns the figure of the teacher an authority, asked students where they had stopped in the lesson before, according to lines 16. He also called students' attention to the next meeting, as in line 18.

---

[60] Imperative form of the verb "to read".

[61] She also tries to justify herself before the teacher (line 4). If we take into consideration that dispute of power, a little similar to the *'Potlatch'*, is consisted of arguing, showing justification and arguments a form of reciprocity, even for that student, in which interaction was not as strong as expected, we conclude that the dispute was not more explored deeply.

[62] The presence of colon in *Potlatch, in this section, is justified by an actualisation in the use of this term, which, now, attained a more enunciative meaning.*

In the meantime, it is possible to view this interaction as a laconic one from the student's 'person', when, for example, she made a question on the point which the class had reached when she was travelling. The concern raised here is that she (the student) asked this question right after the teacher had said to suppose (whether jokingly or not) that it was a convenient situation for the student (line 5). In relation to this attitude towards reciprocity, there are some links that can be settled to the following feature of '*Potlatch*' that is avoided (in the moment of interaction, which is not associated to the attitude after the class, although the teacher informed the observer that she presented the homework completed as she got in the last class before the final exam):

> *The obligation to accept* is no less constraining. One has no right to refuse a gift, or to refuse to attend the potlatch. To act in this way is to show that one is afraid of having to reciprocate, to fear being 'flattened' [i.e. losing one's name] until one has reciprocated. In reality this is already to be 'flattened'. It is to 'lose the weight' attached to one's name. It is either to admit oneself beaten in advance or, on the contrary, in certain cases, to proclaim oneself the victor and invincible. (MAUSS, 1954/2002, p. 52)

Having said that, we compare this enunciative attitude to a cultural behaviour in communication, a cultural attitude in language, which embraces a form of resignation (line 6) that is used for the sake of the student's subjectivity. This is, however, reinforced in second moment that is presented in the following excerpt:

**Chart 5 Enunciative excerpt 01; Session 02**

Enunciative excerpt 01

Session 02

Participants: teacher; student 'C'

Date of recording: Feb. 19th, 2015

Scene: Teacher reinforces instructions for the following class; intonation suffers alteration in the utterance that is enunciated to remind student of what text she is supposed to read. Teacher asks student to come earlier in the following day.

**19.T: C**?

20.C: Uhm?

**21.T: You know your homework?**

22.(Com: **silence**)

23.(Com: Teacher slightly increases intonation in the sentence)

24.T: **I just told you, you have to read text six, Ok? And tomorrow we check it out. Can**
25.**you come early tomorrow?**

26.C: Yes!

27.**T: Yes? Can…? If you come earlier, we can start checking out the lessons that you**
28.**missed. Ok?**

29.**C:** What page?

30.T: One-oh-six. Inside the English language. **Remember we saw the grammar we had**
31.**last class?**

32.**C: Uhum.**

33.**T: And then we have to do the Inside the English language.**

34.(Com: Silence)

35.T: I hope the beach was good.

36.C: Uh?

37.T: I hope your vacation was good… the beach was good. Did you see the crocodile?

38.C: No, no.

39.T: Ah. … A trip to Cassino is incomplete if you don't see the crocodile.

40.C: Ye…

Again, we perceive that the teacher reaffirms his authority by questioning the student 'C' (lines 21, 24-5, 31, and 33). However, now, the student inserts another attitude towards the '*Potlatch*' offered by the teacher: she is silent. This silence is not as easy to evaluate as one might think. Nonetheless, an explanation on the object (the lesson missed; homework) is not being properly reciprocated in the moment of this interaction, as if she was avoiding it (line 22) for some reason that might be: distraction, unwillingness, mood etc. This posture led the teacher to frequently make questions, so that he proves his authority over the person of the student 'C'.

Lastly, in the excerpt above, we notice a change in the object of interaction after a moment of silence (lines 34-40): from 'speaking to' the student about her homework, the teacher goes to a trivial topic that is more subjective to the student – her trip to Cassino Beach. The tone of the conversation changes, so that the function of interaction also changes. As the teacher changes the course of the conversation and raises a more 'pleasant' topic, the '*Potlatch'* becomes eased, turning this interaction into a more complex form of reciprocity. It is supposed that by making the student feel safe and valued, the "original object" is expected to be rescued and

reciprocated. Relying on the fact that this kind of interaction occurs among friends, trustworthy acquaintances, this would be a convenient communication strategy towards a shy or undemonstrative person.

As we move on to another interaction setting, we shall see that the teacher uses a considerable frequency of questions and justifications to get the student involved in the conversation, and it reaches a point in which the student does not have any more arguments and, thus, destroys the object of reciprocity: the topic being discussed. This student, in turn, challenges teacher's subjectivity and authority, resulting in a productive conversation between teacher and student. In other words, this student, in the end, leads the teacher to change the subject of their dialogue.

## 8.2    *Evoking* reciprocity by engaging student in conversation; '*destruction* of the reciprocity object' by the student

Likely the situation above, the scene to be analysed in this section involves authority demonstration and maintenance. However, the expression of 'rivalry' is much stronger here, for there are questions, turnouts (in the sense that one of the speakers seems to revert the direction of the enquiry). There is also insistence, arguments, justification, indication of subjectivity, dispute, and conversation (as participants talk to each other).

The following excerpt consists of a dialogue between teacher and student about fast food restaurant, choices on consumption of fast food, pros and cons of eating in the restaurant or taking the order somewhere else. The teacher has a point, the student, in turn, thinks differently in some aspects raised by the teacher. Nevertheless, the attempt of authority maintenance lays on the repetitions (questions, arguments).

While the participants *talk to* each other, the teacher enunciates through subjectivity indication (teacher shows his point and makes the student a question on that), and so does the student, who sometimes agree with the teacher, but keeps standing for a divergent understanding of the object of interaction in other moments). The '*Potlatch'*, here is more intense, as the teacher strives for a conversation on the topic about which each of them seems to have a different point of view most of the time. However, this intense interaction in form of a '*Potlatch'* does not lead any of the parties to get into an agreement, the student carries out what may be called

'destruction of the object' as she refuses to argue, laughs or stays silently. This makes the teacher change the focus of the conversation as he concludes the discussion on the theme, and goes back to another topic, which had already been raised.

Going on to the transcription analysis, it is necessary, as in the excerpts above, to pay attention to the highlights in the utterances, behaviour and sequence of speech, as, in the last part of the following excerpt, it can be interpreted as a result of a break in reciprocity by the student. The teacher realises that the object is not reciprocated any longer, and thus he 'concludes' the dialogue.

**Chart 6 Enunciative excerpt 02; Session 01**

Enunciative excerpt 02

Session 01

Participants: teacher; student 'B'; *in few occasions student 'A'.*

Scene: teacher introduces a new topic before going on to the next lesson – lesson 8 –, and establishes a conversation with student 'B', who 'accepts' the object of interaction. Teacher insists in going further in the topic to the extent that the student is willing or is able to give arguments. Student resorts to refusal, laughs and silence moments to indicate subjectivity in this intersubjective process.

41.T: Well, so... Before we get to lesson 8, people, **we're gonna talk a little bit about the**

42.**fast food restaurants.** (@) Uhm… On page one hundred nine. Let's suppose you are at a

43.fast food restaurant in the United States, after you give your order, the person work… **the**

**44.person working in the counter will usually be asking you for here or to go. What does**

**45.that mean?**

(Com: *Silence*)

**46.B: He is asking you if you want to eat there or ???**

47.T: Or take it home.

48.B: Yeah.

**49.T: Which do you prefer? To eat in the restaurant, or fast food restaurant, or take it**

**50.home?**

51.B: Eat there.

52.(Com: *Teacher repeats student's answer*)

**53.T: Eat there. Why?**

54.B: Uhmm... Because I don't like to do the dishes.

**55.(C:** *Teacher laughs*)

**56.T: Ok. Ah, but suppose it is a hamburger, you don't have to do the dishes, you just**
**57.eat it the way it is: open and bite it.**

58.B? Oh, you have to… clean the glass…

59.T: Uh?

60.B: clean the glass…

**61.T: Ok… and you buy a coke.**

62.(Com: *Student laughs as the teacher keeps on questioning her on the same subject*)

**63.T: A a a a cardboard… a bottle of glass… of coke.**

64.(Com: *Silence*)

**65.B: Then I don't know.**

**66.T: And then you have one more thing that is basic: if you take a hamburger home,**
**67.when you get home, the hamburger is getting cold**

**68.(Com:** *Student agrees*)

69.T: or the CHEESE, it is not the same thing,  even if you re-heat it, it's not the same. It's
70.like pizza: you order a pizza in… in the restaurant… ??? to your tables… delicious… but
71.after ten minutes ??? You get home, re-heat it, and… it's not the same. (@) ??? **But the**
**72.other thing that is good is that** you can walk, ??? you have to get out, **you ask to get**
**73.home…** Or you just order and…

**74.B: You don't like to see people?**

75.T: No, I like to see people, **but I prefer to stay home wearing pajamas, watching TV on**
**76.bed eating my hamburger.**

77.(Com: *Students laugh*)

78.(Com: *Student enunciates with sarcasm*)

**79.B: Aaai... Old people...**

80.T: **Not old people… It's tired people.** (@)

81.(Com: teacher turns to another student)

82.T: Thank you very much.

83.(Com: *Teacher goes back to the previous topic*.)

**84.You will be old someday.**

**85.(Com:** *Silence*)

86.T: Uhm… So, for here or to go? Here you have the choices: eating your meal ??? in which
87.case you say for here. (*Student yawns*) Or you could have your food ??? so you can eat
88.elsewhere, in which case you say to go. (*Teacher reads an example provided by the*

89.*coursebook*) Take a look at ??? ordering lunch: "I'll have Five hamburgers, Five large ???
90.of french fries and two large cokes to go, please." Wow. **Ok guys. This is the end of**
91.**lesson seven**, and  you are able to do the exercises for to...
92.(Com: *Silence*)
93.T:Exercises of lesson seven for to…
94.A: Tomorrow?
95.T: Tomorrow.

There is, now, as indicated in the highlighted lines above, some different movements of language. The teacher still resorts to enquiry. However, the student B interacts with the teacher in a more challenging way. The exchange of rivalry seems to be more evident here than in the former enunciative excerpts. Student B shows to be reciprocal, even so. However this changes as she has no more arguments to provide to the teacher after his questions. Consequently, she interrupts reciprocity by refusing to go further into the discussion.

This was a 'take-down' towards the blazon of authority in the teacher, and this is eased by giving arguments and counterarguments, and leading the discussion to its end. In order to clarify how this 'potlatch' occurs in the teacher and student 'B's interlocution, we shall structure a summary focusing on the interaction sequences indicated according to the lines they occur on an attempt to clarify our point in comparing teacher-student interlocution, as it follows bellow:

Lines 41-2: teacher introduces the topic for discussion;

Lines 44-5: teacher offers *'Potlatch'*: here, the object of discussion is the main object of reciprocity, for this is the motivation for interaction, though the teacher also strives to cause the students to communicate, since this setting refers to a language class;

Line 46: 'B' accepts the '*Potlatch'* by showing that she knows the answer, or attempts to answer teacher's question correctly;

Lines 49-50, 53, 56-7, 61, 63: teacher endeavours to keep his strength before the student in terms of argumentation and the practice of usage of the phrases learnt ('for here'; 'to go'). The teacher makes questions to reach his goal of maintaining his linguistic status;

Line 55: teacher laughs right after student 'B' gives a clever answer;

Line 65: student 'B' tries to interrupt the 'potlatch' (the constant exchange of questions and arguments to reach reciprocal communication and the practise of the target-language);

Line 66: teacher wants to reassume his posture of conversation leader on the purpose of getting students to speak and practise the language, more precisely the vocabulary studied;

Line 66-7: teacher resorts to his subjectivity to resume the conversation before it was too late in terms of enunciation time[63];

Line 68: student 'B' accepts the potlatch offered by the teacher again;

Lines 71-3: teacher challenges student B again by showing his own counterargument;

Line 74: student 'B' argues with the teacher;

Lines 75-6: teacher stays firmly on his opinion and presents more arguments;

Line 79: student 'B' challenges teacher's subjectivity;

Line 84: teacher returns student's challenge;

Line 85: as no one seems willing to offer an object of reciprocity, the teacher concludes the discussion by reviewing the content in the book (Lines 90-1).

To conclude this excerpt, we attempt to demonstrate this intense and constant 'potlatch' offering that serves its purposes to each of the parties. For the teacher, it is the moment to stimulate students' participation and learning, whereas for the student it might be connected to the wish of showing some power that sometimes even the student seems not to know they have in their subjectivities. The following two excerpts reinforce our understanding of how interaction between teacher and student is organised depending on their linguistic and non-linguistic attitudes towards teacher's efforts to accomplish the lesson goals.

**Chart 7 Enunciative excerpt 02; Session 02**

| |
|---|
| Enunciative excerpt 02 |
| Session 02 |
| Participants: Teacher; student 'B'; *in few occasions student 'A'.* |
| Date of recording: Feb. 19th, 2015 |

---

[63] According to FLORES(2009) on the definition of enunciation from Benveniste's perspective, the condition for subjectivity lays on three instances, they are those of personhood ('I' or 'you', that is, the act of 'saying'), and situation – as it is strictly defined by the time and space in which the update of language takes place in enunciation.

Scene: teacher continues discussion on the subject of 'ghosts'; teacher talks to 'B' about it; teacher enquires 'B'; student 'B' eventually challenges teacher's opinion.

96.Do you believe in ghosts? (*To student 'A'*)

**97.A**: No.

98.T: No? **Do you 'B'?**

99.B: No.

**100.T: Ah. What would you do if you saw a ghost?**

**101.B: Maybe change my…**

102.(Com: *teacher laughs and another student starts speaking at the same time*).

103.T: Maybe stop drinking.

104.(Com: laughers)

105.T: Stop drinking, I am starting… I am starting to see ghosts. **Really? So, you are not**

**106.scared of horror movies.**

107.B: No.

**108.T: No? Really?**

109.(Com: *Student 'B' does not reply. Student 'A' interrupts.*)

110.A: I pass out when I see one ghost.

111.T: You what?

112.A: PASS-OUT!

113.T: Ah, you WOULD pass out?

114.A: Yeah.

115.T: I would ask: are you really a ghost? Is there life after death? What are the numbers in

116.the lottery next week? Ah… do you know…

117.(Com: *student interrupts.*)

118.(Com: *student 'B' laughs*)

119.B: The ghost… (???)

120.T: Ah… Go back to where you are from or (???) and ask your friends about the future.

121.**Ah… Do you know anyone who has ever seen a ghost?**

122.B: I think my friend. Yeah… She believe.

123.T: She believes. **She has seen a gost?**

124.B: Yeah.

**125.T: Where?**

126.B: At her house.

**127.T: At night?**

128.B: Yeah, and she felt it.

129.(Com: *student laughs*)

**130.T: Ah, she felt it?**

131.(Com: *teacher and student start speaking at the same time*)

132.B: She felt like he was strang[ju]ling-

133.(T: Strangling her?)

134.B: her… Strangling her. She couldn't breathe. (@) She started to pray.

135.(Com: S*tudent laughs*)

**136.T: And then? She woke up?**

137.B: She… No, no… She ??? started to pray.

**138.T: Ah, started to pray?**

139.B: Yeah. She prayed to God…

**140.T: And then the ghost left?**

141.B: Yeah.

**142.T: I don't know what if someone were strangling me… The last thing I'm going to**

**143.start is praying. I start shouting, running, shaking... Do anything but praying.**

**144.B: And if you aren't seeing anything?**

**145.T: I don't know. I'm just certain like that… ??? Can you imagine? I… I'm going to**

**146.kill you and you don't do anything, just pray: "Hail Mary…"-**

147.(Com: *Student and teacher start laughing*)

148.T: At the end of the pray you'll be dead. (@) Name some INCURABLE diseases.

**149.(Com: *The teacher throws the ball to 'B'.*)**

**150. T: Name some INCURABLE diseases.**

**151. B: Uhm... AI... AIDS – I don't know how to say...**

152. T: AIDS?

153. B: Uhm... Some kinds of cancer.

154. (*Teacher repeats...*)

155. T: Some kinds of cancer... Diabetes...

156. B: Yeah... I think so.

As we could notice in the session above, the teacher goes back to student 'B' as student 'A' denies to believe in ghosts. The former ('B') also denies it, but the teacher decides to explore an interaction with the student by offering another 'Potlatch' to make her express her opinion on the issue by using a different

grammatical structure: "What *would* you *do if* you *saw* a ghost?" (Our italics). Then, he resumes the object being discussed with student 'B' by asking her about any acquaintance's experience regarding ghosts. This can be analysed as a 'Potlatch' as the teacher guides this student to communicate and have her make use of vocabulary, grammar, speaking and listening skills as much as possible. Later on the session 2, after teacher and student *talked* about the student's friend's experience *to each other*, the teacher starts giving his own opinion, so that he shows his knowledge on the *'língua'*, and his point of view on the object of interaction as well.

An interesting action that the teacher takes later on reminds us of one of the reciprocity system depicted by Mauss (1954/2002) in the German society: German Law. Comparing to the Total Service and to *'Potlatch'*, this is a more complex system, for it is based not only in a link between people, but also between objects. The teacher's attitude towards student B, at the end of the session, consisted of transferring an object that symbolises a "pledge", that in the German Law was recognised as an obligation in a purchase, borrowing or deposit. The referred action taken by the teacher can be seen as an expression of 'German Law' when he throws the ball to the student that was selected to answer the challenge "name some incurable diseases" (line 150). This student, in turn, is more than expected to answer it, mainly because she got the object representing the 'pledge' in this context. Yet, it is the *'Potlatch'* that seems to take over interaction in the excerpts so far.

Although in the following session, the interaction is also compared to the system of '*Potlatch*', the particularity is that it occurs from the student to the teacher, as the former challenges the latter to prove that he (teacher) is right before student's assumption that there is just one program advertised rather than two in the video exhibited by the teacher.

**Chart 8 Enunciative excerpt 02; Session 03**

| |
|---|
| Enunciative excerpt 02 |
| Session 03 |
| Participants: teacher; student 'B'. |
| Date of recording: Feb. 19th, 2015 |
| Scene: teacher plays a video, and asks questions on oral comprehension; a conflict of arguments is raised due to different understandings of the content of the video; student challenges teacher's authority; teacher argues and resort to the video to prove he is correct. |

**157.T: Uhmm... So, what are... do you remember the programs in ???**

158.B: Yeah.

**159.T: What are the programs that… uhm… What are the two programs advertised in**
**160.the commercial? Remember their NAMES?**

161.A: No. (@) I don't remember.

162.B: There were two?

**163.T: They were two! One was at eight… and the other was at eight thirty. They were**
**164.so interesting that you don't remember the name of the programs.**

**165.B: I thought there was just one.**

**166.T: Oh, no, they were two!**

**167.B: Ohh, there … uh-uh… one.**

168.(Com: *The teacher insists*.)

**169.T: Two!**

170.(Com: *The student insists*.)

**171.B: One!**

**172.T: Two!**

173.(Com: *Teacher insists and plays the video once more. The teacher stops somewhere in*
174.*the video where one of the programs is advertised*)

**175.T: Mysterious Worlds… First program.**

176.(Com: *Teacher continues the video until the name of the second program is revealed*.)

**177.T: At eight o'clock, Mysterious Worlds. At eight-thirty, Terra-X.**

178.(Com: *Silence. Teacher continues the video until the end.*)

Maintaining this approach, we shall see another different reciprocity expression occurring in the same context of interaction. Now, the student – student 'A' – enunciates with a different intention towards teacher's 'potlatch', as she is willing to foster it most part of the time during the lesson. In turn, to suppress the student's anxiety to answering as she stammers and speaks slowly. In the meantime, we shall see that the teacher utilises another movement of language: he *speaks for* the student.

**8.3 'Fostering' reciprocity through subjectivity indication and indicator's subjectivity; when student 'talks to' and teacher 'speaks for'**

As we compare 8.1 and 8.2 situations, we point out that, in both sections, the teacher is the one who frequently takes the first step and offers '*Potlatch*'. But if we compare these two settings with the one to be transcribed below, we may find a difference in the way the student participates in the class and replies to the teacher – the student even offers object for reciprocity, as we will see in the enunciative excerpt 03. Unlike the former contexts, here, the teacher is the one who reciprocates the most.

**Chart 9 Enunciative excerpt 03; Session 01**

Enunciative excerpt 03

Session 01

Participants: teacher; student 'A'.

Date of recording: Feb. 19th, 2015.

Scene: teacher and student 'A' discuss on a topic; student 'A' talk to the teacher about what she thinks that those people who decide to be homeless should do; teacher asks her questions in order to make student realise the correct pronunciation of a phrase.

179.A: Yeah… **probably the homeless ... ah... ah… take a … no, take not… study and**

**180.after got a work?**

181.(Com.: *Teacher uses the correct form of the phrase within conversation in order to make*

182.*student realise it.*)

183.T: **Get a job, you mean? They study and, then, get a job?**

184.A: No. **First, study. Second, got a work.**

185.T: **They are homeless. They don't have a job.**

186.A: **Yeeeeeaaah!!!**

187.(Com.: The teacher seems to "finally understand what the student meant", although it is

188.possible to assume that he knew it beforehand)

189.T: Aaah, Ok… **Tell the homeless**… Ah, Ok… **Tell them to study and get a job!?**

**190.A: Yeah!!!**

**191.T: And the Guy is gonna ask you: "who gives me the money and the food while I**

**192.study?"**

**193.A: I don't know. (haha)**

**194.T: Ah, you tell him "Oh, go home… go to my house!"**

**195.A: No. (haha)**

196.T: Why do you think some people…

197.(Com.: *Student interrupts*)
**198.A: The government**
199.(Com.:*Teacher repeats*)
**200.T: The government**

Based on the transcription above, it is possible to view this case as that in which the '*Potlatch'* comes from the student rather than the teacher. That can be explained, indeed, once we grasp what occurs in the interlocution between the participants of the scene above: the student shows some difficulty to keep a fluent conversation (as we can see in lines 179-80 and 184– and also some misunderstanding from the student, line 184-6, 189-90). Hence, she counts on the reciprocity of the teacher, who, in turn, is expected to give support to the student who is facing some trouble.

Two points are worth raising here in this analysis. Firstly, it is that the conversation between the teacher and student 'A' does not progress in the topic, nor in the inferences and interpretation from both parties (student paraphrase, line 184). Secondly, and as a consequence, by acting on the indicator's subjectivity, the teacher finds in it a strategy to suppress this anxiety and willingness to reciprocate. In this occasion, then, as one of the parties speaks for the other, or in clear terms, borrows student's subjectivity and help student make herself understood and integrated to the lesson.

As we went through the transcription, we realise that it comprises a student who makes some effort to get herself understood, as in lines 179 and 180, and the teacher speaks for the student as well. The teacher tries to reciprocate this '*Potlatch'*, now offered by the student through utterances in which he applies indicator's subjectivity, while the student, after giving hints, frequently demonstrate relief for the reciprocity of the teacher, fostered by herself.

A reason why we may assume that this situation is also different in terms of the origin of the potlatch was that the teacher perceived what student 'A' needed, who also showed willingness to communicate. A second session on this enunciative excerpt is necessary to show that there are some movements of language that works for student 'A', in which she offers the object to be reciprocated. As she has a little bit more of initiative to get involved, interrupt, and so on, the questions do not come only from the teacher. Student 'A' also interacts by demanding realisation of a reciprocity

that the teacher shall correspond because he has the teaching role and authority in the classroom.

**Chart 10 Enunciative excerpt 03; Session 02**

Enunciative excerpt 03

Session 02

Participants: teacher; student 'A'

Scene:

195.T: Do you like to watch cable TV?

196.A: Yes.

**197.T: What's your favorite channel?**

198.A: Universal…

**199.T: Universal? (???) What are the programs you like to watch?**

200.A: I like Bis, too.

201.T: Oh… Bis is about music.

202. A.:Yeah.

203.T: I norm- I norm- I have never been attached to this channel, Bis…

204. (…)

**205. I don't know… Last week… uhmm I… see…**

**206. (Com.:*Teacher interrupts the student*) I saw.**

207. (**Com.: *Student repeats***)

**208. A: I saw one movie about Foo Fighters.**

**209. T: Oh… A documentary?**

210. A: Yes.

Before we go to the next chapter, a general view on the analysis carried out is worth sharing. It was a very meaningful task where it was possible to have an insight on different forms and degrees of reciprocity, according to participants' needs, interests and situation of interaction they go through. It is pivotal that teachers start tracing the interaction culture in classroom, since it guides us through a teaching enunciation that makes them feel praised for the efforts they make. On the other hand, the researcher ought to realise what culture of interaction takes over in these environments, and reflect upon whether it is a more subjective, intersubjective or interpersonal interaction that effectively works in the classroom as well. Those

aspects should be considered for the sake of the student's evolvement in the learning process.

We could not assume that these forms of interaction mentioned are related to the participants' degree of relationship out of the classroom, as the observation covered exclusively classroom interaction. On the other hand, we can say that they are not the only forms of interaction occurring in this space, nor with the three students involved. Based on that, an oscillation between two (or among the whole group) of them can be traced through the three excerpts: a) an interaction in which the speaker's subjectivity takes over (the teacher's or the student's, as Teacher-Student 'C' excerpt); b) an interaction where both of them exchange points of view, feelings and beliefs about the object (as frequently occurred between teacher and student 'B'); and c) an interaction in which the exchange is mainly based on facts (the nonperson), or the listener's subjectivity is more valued (as in the dialogue involving the teacher and student 'A').

Due to this variation in 'interaction patterns', we understand that the teacher adopted different strategies to communicate with each of the students. This diversity produced utterances that demanded both leading attitudes from the teacher and engagement from the students to produce interaction. In student 'C''s case, to be more specific, she had to catch up with her classmates and the teacher, as well as do the homework for the following day. The fulfilment of the task was indeed confirmed by the teacher in occasion of a post-transcription conversation. Thus, considering that intersubjectivity[64] is a condition for communication (BENVENISTE, 1958/2005, p. 293), it took an important part in reciprocity within the observed context[65].

In summary, we believe it is important to portray culture of interaction in the classroom by making use of the resources provided by the theory of Enunciation and Reciprocity. Firstly, because it allows us to reflect on methodology of transcription and analysis of the setting selected. Secondly, because the materialisation of the *'língua'* and its influences on the partnership between both theories (Enunciation and Reciprocity) lead us to consider that interaction between teacher and student

---

[64] "(…) 'intersubjectivity has its temporality, its term, its dimensions' (BEN 89:90). He adds: 'thus, the *lingual* reflects the experience of a prime, constant, indefinitely reversible relationship between the speaker and his listener'." (FLORES, et al., 2009, p. 146) Within the context of interaction observed, we understand 'intersubjectivity' as a form of reciprocity. It refers to a balance between indication of subjectivity and indicator's subjectivity, the 'talking to', the offering of a challenging 'Potlatch' that calls for arguments.

[65] That was so, because the teacher would call for the students and produce utterances that needed reversibility. This need was implied in the questions, requests, comments, provoking inquiry, as well as in his own answers.

happens according to the following factors: a) *the linguistic status of person* (and possible linguistic statuses: postures of authority); b) *time* (moment, duration and break); c) *space* (the institution, for example, which exert a great influence on the message and how it is being enunciated then, including the effectiveness of the teacher's authority), and c) *the willingness/unwillingness of the student* to reciprocate, and to keep learning. Last but not the least, it is important also because "the theme of subjectivity" is associated "to the anthropological reflection from which it sets out", and "the first great axis of *Subjectivity in the language*: the anthropological (...) starting point", as Flores refers in his *Introduction to Benveniste's Enunciation Theory*, (2013, p. 97, our translation)[66].

---

[66] "(...) o tema da subjetividade (…); a reflexão antropológica da qual parete; (...). (...) o primeiro grande eixo de *Da subjetividade na lingugem*: o ponto de partida, (...), antropológico." (FLORES, 2013, p. 97, our translation)

# 9 CONCLUSIONS

All the way through the theoretical discussions as well as the analysis conducted, it is proposed that a reciprocal interaction (or rather, interlocution) between teacher and student may be described as we view the relationship between 'language', intersubjectivity and reciprocity and how this relationship works in the assessed settings. The reason why there is a basic relationship between intersubjectivity and reciprocity is that the first supposes the human natural feature of "language", and the second acknowledge that "language" and human organisation are intermingled.

By reviewing this relationship and the results obtained, we suggest that the realisation of reversibility, in a reciprocity based on intersubjectivity, occurs with movements of 'language' that differ from those occurring in reciprocity contexts based on subjectivity indication and indicator's subjectivity. In the first one (excerpt 02), the subject poses him (or herself) in enunciation for the sake of reversibility ('you' becoming 'I' within an interaction moment). The Enunciation perspective helps us understand some movements of 'language' that occurs in this intersubjectivity (inquiry, exposing oneself, evoking the listener to interact, insisting in some aspect of the object). In the other two exerpts (01, and 03), the intention, or meaning, that takes over the other two interaction samples characterises a form of reciprocity where questions related to the student's improvement, engagement, fluency or proficiency are more evident. It was perhaps because these students were shy, or were not in frequent touch with the practise of speaking out of the classroom, or they may have felt uncomfortable in the presence of an observer. On the other hand, in the first case (excerpt 02) the object of exchange usually embraced subjects' points of view, opinions and experiences with the 'língua' or regarding the theme being debated.

From this portrait of the setting observed, and after reviewing the bibliography presented in the earlier sections, we conclude that each of the reciprocity "systems" serves its purposes within different contexts, and the 'Potlatch' takes over the enunciative sessions. It is explained due to the incidence of enunciative 'dispute' and a necessary conflict for the sake of intersubjectivity. The meaning and values that a teaching space imprints in the communication between two or more people, along with the meaning and values that are imprinted in the

linguistic status of the teacher along with those present in the person of the students build a necessary 'conflict' of parties for the sake of interaction, resulting in a more intersubjective, subjective or subjected interlocution. Thus, it is suggested that reciprocity is analysed by considering if it is wholly, dodged, avoided or 'interrupted' in order to reflect on the effectiveness of its 'system', or method. The criteria, here, is if the reciprocity system used is giving the teacher the answers (or attitudes) expected to assess students' development or not.

The answers we consider to be fundamental for reciprocity here are not necessarily utterances with an accurate information to a question or inquiry. They are, indeed, the utterances and attitudes that correspond to the expectations of the teacher, whose utterances and attitudes (that more or less represent the school's 'principles' for teaching) live up to students' expectations on the methodology considered.

In this sense, a matter that has caught my eyes, as an aspirant teacher of English, is how these systems of reciprocity are to be evaluated and shaped when the teaching of English as an 'additional language' (additional '*língua*') is aimed at people with disabilities: what movements of 'language' help teacher and student really engage and evolve in this interactional process towards their goal? How do '*língua*' and 'language' work when the values, and/or meanings, are also attached to the participants' cognitive conditions? What does it mean to shape the approach of teaching chosen to the rhythm of the student? Is Enunciation, as a theory, a perspective capable of providing us with a broader comprehension on the effectiveness of 'additional language' teaching for inclusion?[67]

Regarding the influence of this moment in my education, I can say it has encouraged me to become more sensible to figure out what effective interaction is about. This has helped me think reciprocity between people, especially in educational contexts, should be comprehended by recognising intersubjectivity between teacher and student, for language is always there for the sake of subjectivity. These subjectivities on stage demand due attention and an approach that helps motivating

---

[67] Such was the encouragement Werner's words exerted in this respect, that it is undeniable that Enunciation Theory gives important contributions to us, appreciators of the complexity of enunciation in teacher-student interaction: "We believe that the notions of '*língua*'/'language', subjectivity and meaning help these professionals in their pedagogical practise." (WERNER, 2004, our translation): "*Acreditamos que noções de língua/linguagem, subjetividade e sentido podem ajudar a esses profissionais na sua prática pedagógica.*" (WERNER, 2004)

engagement from both parties, which is always the aim of education itself, no matter what target-*língua* is taught.

In terms of experience, the long journey across the understanding of Enunciation and Reciprocity that resulted in this study has enriched my academic life, mentality, sensibility and criticism in respect of one of the most interesting, intercultural and opinion-raising 'office' under which humanities and languages serve as a basement, in my point of view. Besides, on the run, I believe that the contact with these theories influenced my view on 'culture' and 'subjectivity' as concepts we find ourselves constructing, deconstructing and reconstructing each time we affront situations where culture and the idea of 'self' are some of the determining factors associated with people's attitudes. Consequently, interests on future research projects will be influenced by such ever-renewing important acknowledgements.

# REFERENCES

ANCIENT SCRIPT. *Hitite.* Available from: http://www.ancientscripts.com/hittite.html

AMORA, Antônio Soares. *Minidicionário Soares Amora da língua portuguesa* / Antônio Soares Amora. – 18th Edition – São Paulo: Saraiva, 2008.

BARBOSA, Lúcia Maria de Assunção. (Org.) (*Inter)faces (inter)culturais no ensino-aprendizagem de línguas*. / Lúcia Maria de Assunção Barbosa. Campinas, SP: Pontes Editores, 2014.

BENVENISTE, Émile. *Problemas de Linguística Geral*; translation by Maria da Glória Novak and Maria Luisa Neri; revision by Professor Isaac Nicolau Salum – 5th edition – Campinas, SP: Pontes Editores, 2005.

_____., Da subjetividade na linguagem (1958). In: *Problemas de linguística geral I*; translation by Maria da Glória Novak and Maria Luisa Neri: revision by Professor Isaac Nicolau Salum – 5th Edition – Campinas, SP: Pontes Editores, 2005.

_____., Dom e troca no vocabulário hindo-europeu (1951). In: *Problemas de linguística geral I*; translation by Maria da Glória Novak and Maria Luisa Neri: revision by Professor Isaac Nicolau Salum – 5th Edition – Campinas, SP: Pontes Editores, 2005.

_____., Estrutura das relações de pessoa no verbo (1946). In: *Problemas de linguística geral I*; translation by Maria da Glória Novak and Maria Luisa Neri: revision by Professor Isaac Nicolau Salum – 5th Edition – Campinas, SP: Pontes Editores, 2005.

_____., *Problemas de Linguistica General II*; translation by Juan Almela – 15th Edition – Mexico: Siglo XXI Editores S.A. de C.V., 1999.

_____., El aparato formal de la enunciación (1970). In *Problemas de Linguistica General II*; translation by Juan Almela – 15th Edition – Mexico: Siglo XXI Editores S.A. de C.V., 1999.

_____., El lengua y la experiencia humana (1965). In *Problemas de Linguistica General II*; translation by Juan Almela – 15th Edition – Mexico: Siglo XXI Editores S.A. de C.V., 1999.

_____., A natureza dos pronomes (1956). In *Problemas de Lingüística Geral I*; translation by Maria da Glória Novak and Maria Luisa Neri: revision by Professor Isaac Nicolau Salum – 5th Edition – Campinas, SP: Pontes Editores, 2005.

_____., Subjectivity in the language (1958). In *Problems in General Liguistics*; translation by Mary Elizabeth Meek. United States of America: Miami University Press, 1971

CAMARA JR, Joaquim Mattoso. *História da Linguística*: translation by Maria do Amparo B. de Azevedo. (PUCSP) – 6th Edition – Petrópolis, RJ: Editora Vozes, 1975.

CAMBRIDGE DICTIONARIES ONLINE. *Definition of the word 'language'*. Available from: http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/language

CAMBRIDGE DICTIONARIES ONLINE. *Definition of the word 'tell'*. Available from: http://dictionary.cambridge.org/pt/dicionario/ingles/tell

CAMBRIDGE ACADEMIC CONTENT DICTIONARY. *Definition of "speak for someone"*. Cambridge University Press. in CAMBRIDGE DICTIONARIES ONLINE. Available from: http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/speak-for-someone

CAMBRIDGE ACADEMIC CONTENT DICTIONARY. *Definition of "sense"*. Cambridge University Press. in CAMBRIDGE DICTIONARIES ONLINE. Available from: http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/sense

CORBET, Greville G. *Number* / Greville G. Corbett. UK: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

DURANTI, Alessandro. *Linguistic Anthropology*. / Alessandro Duranti. UK: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

ENGLISH GRAMMAR TODAY. *Speak or talk*. In Cambridge Dictonaries Online. Available from: http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/grammar/british-grammar/speak-or-talk

EXPLORE CRETE. *Greek customs and habits from a foreigner's point of view*. / Birgit Smidt Sneftrup and Bo Transbol. – Denmark. Available from: http://www.explorecrete.com/mycrete/customs/greek-customs.html

FIORIN, José Luiz. *As Astúcias da Enunciação: as categorias de pessoa, espaço e tempo*; revision by Fátima de Carvalho M. de Souza and Samir Thomaz. São Paulo: Editora Ática, 2010.

FLORES, Valdir do Nascimento. *Introdução à teoria enunciativa de Benveniste* / Valdir do Nascimento Flores – 1st Edition – São Paulo: Parábola, 2013.

_____., BARBISAN, L., FINATTO, M. J., TEIXEIRA, M. (orgs.), *Dicionário de linguística da enunciação.* São Paulo: Editora Contexto, 2009.

HARMER, Jeremy. *The practice of English Language Teaching.* – 5th Edition – England: Pearson, 2015.

MAINGUENEAU, Dominique. 1981. *Approache de l'énonciation em linguistique française.* Paris, Hachette. In FIORIN, José Luiz. *As Astúcias da Enunciação: as categorias de pessoa, espaço e tempo*: revision by Fátima de Carvalho M. de Souza and Samir Thomaz. São Paulo: Editora Ática, 2010.

MARTIN, Robert, 2002. *Para entender a linguística:epistemologia elementar de uma disciplina* / Robert Martin; translation by Marcos Bagno. – São Paulo: Parábola Editorial, 2003.

MARTINEZ, Pierre, 1948. *Didática de línguas estrangeiras*/ Pierre Martinez. *La didactique dês langues étrangères*: translation by Marco Marcionilo – São Paulo: Parábola Editorial, 2009.

MAUSS, Marcel, 1950. *The Gift.* / Marcel Mauss: English edition first published in 1954 by Cohen & West: this translation first published in 1990 by Routledge: first published in 2002 by Routledge – e-Book edition published by Taylor & Francis e-Library, 2002.

MCKERRON, MORAG. *Neo-Tribes and Traditional Tribes: Identity Construction and Interaction of Tourists and Highland People in a Village in Northern Thailand*. Digital Library of the Commons. Indiana University, 2003. Available from http://dlc.dlib.indiana.edu/dlc/bitstream/handle/10535/1619/Morag_McKerron.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y

OXFORD ADVANCED LEARNER'S DICTIONARY. *Definition of the word 'believe'*. 6th edition. Oxford University Press, 2000

OXFORD DICTIONARIES. *Definition of the word 'gift'*. Available from: http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/us/definition/english/gift#GIFT

OXFORD. Learner's Dictionaries Online. *Definition of the word 'say'*. Available from: http://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/us/definition/english/say_1?q=say

PAULA E SILVA, Joyce Mary Adam de. *Cultura escolar, autoridade, hierarquia e participação: alguns elementos para reflexão*. Cad. Pesqui. Nº 112, março. São Paulo, 2001.

SILVA, Marli Appel da; GUARESCHI, Pedrinho Arcides; WENDT, Guilherme Welter. Existe sujeito em Michel Maffesoli?. **Psicol. USP**,  São Paulo ,  v. 21, n. 2, p. 439-455, June       2010        .                  Available           from <http://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0103-65642010000200011&lng=en&nrm=iso>.    2016.    http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S0103-65642010000200011.

SILVA, Silvana. *O Homem na Língua: uma visão antropológica da enunciação para o ensino de escrita*. Tese (Doutorado em Estudos da Linguagem). Instituto de Letras. UFRGS, 2013. Available from: sabi.ufrgs.br

_____., MASCARELO, Mégui. Formas de subjetividade e intersubjetividade da língua inglesa e efeitos para o ensino*. Letras & Letras,* v. 29 n. 1, 2013. Available from: http://www.seer.ufu.br/index.php/letraseletras/article/view/25923/14253

THE HOLY BIBLE. *The Talents* / St. Mattheew; chapter 25; verses 14-30; translated out of the original tongues: and with the former translation diligently compared and revised by His Majesty's special command – Authorised King James Version – Salt Lake City, Utah, USA: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 2010.

WERNER, Kelly. C. Granzotto. *Os estudos da Enunciação e a formação do professor de línguas.* Universidade Federal de Santa Maria, 2004. Revista Linguagens      e       Cidadania.       N.12/04.       Available       from: http://coral.ufsm.br/lec/02_04/Kelly.htm

## ATTACHMENT – INFORMED CONSENT FORM
## TERMO DE CONSENTIMENTO LIVRE E ESCLARECIDO

Prezado(a) participante:

Sou estudante do curso de graduação em Licenciatura em Letras na Fundação Universidade Federal do Pampa. Estou realizando uma pesquisa sob supervisão do(a) professor(a) Silvana Silva, cujo objetivo é analisar as trocas enunciativas, dentre as quais tencionamos identificar marcas linguísticas de reciprocidade, na interação em sala de aula de língua inglesa, considerando o contexto cultural de Bagé. Sua participação envolve três aulas, que serão gravadas se assim você permitir, e que tem a duração aproximada de 1 hora/aula, totalizando três horas.

A participação nesse estudo é voluntária e se você decidir não participar ou quiser desistir de continuar em qualquer momento, tem absoluta liberdade de fazê-lo.

Na publicação dos resultados desta pesquisa, sua identidade será mantida no mais rigoroso sigilo. Serão omitidas todas as informações que permitam identificá-lo(a).

Mesmo não tendo benefícios diretos em participar, indiretamente você estará contribuindo para a compreensão do fenômeno estudado e para a produção de conhecimento científico.

Quaisquer dúvidas relativas à pesquisa poderão ser esclarecidas pelo(s) pesquisador(es) fone (53)99-42-xx-xx (Mégui Mascarelo).

Atenciosamente

_____          _____
  Nome e assinatura do(a) estudante                    Local e data
   Matrícula: xxxxxxxxx


_____
  Nome e assinatura do(a) professor(a) supervisor(a)/orientador(a)
  Matrícula:

**Consinto em participar deste estudo e declaro ter recebido uma cópia deste termo de consentimento.**

_____          _____
  Nome e assinatura do participante                    Local e data