

“Guys, we have a genius here”: the co-construction of linguistic-discursive violence in an interaction on Twitter /

“Gente, temos um gênio aqui”: a coconstrução da violência linguístico-discursiva em uma interação no *Twitter*¹


Rodrigo Albuquerque*

He is an adjunct professor II at the Department of Linguistics, Portuguese and Classical Languages (LIP) at the University of Brasília, accredited to the Postgraduate Program in Linguistics (PPGL) at the same institution.

 <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-5279-4311>

Ana Luiza Nogueira Souza**

He is an adjunct professor II at the Department of Linguistics, Portuguese and Classical Languages (LIP) at the University of Brasília, accredited to the Postgraduate Program in Linguistics (PPGL) at the same institution.

 <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-8824-4197>

Received: 21 aug. 2022. **Approved:** 20 sep. 2022.

ALBUQUERQUE, Rodrigo; SOUSA, Ana Luiza Nogueira. “Guys, we have a genius here”: the co-construction of linguistic-discursive violence in an interaction on Twitter. *Revista Letras Raras*, v. 11, n. 3, p. 376-405, set. 2022. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.8174631>

ABSTRACT

In this work, we aim to analyze how two internet users, based on a post by the Ministry of Health on their Twitter profile, use, in their argumentation, impoliteness strategies to promote mutual linguistic-discursive violence. In the theoretical framework, we articulate the studies of (im)politeness, inscribed in micro/linguistic, macro/sociodiscursive and meso/sociointeractional domains, and the studies of argumentation, focusing on eristic argumentation, considering its intrinsic relationship with linguistic-discursive violence. In the methodological framework, we chose to conduct a netnographic study, inscribed in an exclusively qualitative episteme. We selected and analyzed texts related to an online-mediated interaction on Twitter that had a conflicting character and that discussed hydroxychloroquine as an early treatment strategy in the fight against COVID-19. In the analytical framework, we emphasize that, in general, impoliteness became gradually more intense between the internet users, establishing an eristic argumentation, permeated by ad hominem and

¹ This academic production is part of the project “Online interactions in times of pandemic: linguistic-discursive violence in different textual genres” [*Interações on-line em tempos de pandemia: violência linguístico-discursiva em gêneros textuais diversos*].

*

 rodrigo.albuquerque.unb@gmail.com

**

 assumnogueira@gmail.com

ad personam arguments, in the co-construction of metapragmatics of linguistic-discursive violence. We believe that it is beneficial for institutional profiles to institute policies to moderate such interlocutions, encouraging constructive and aggregating dialogues.

KEYWORDS: Impoliteness; Argumentation; Linguistic-discursive violence; Online-mediated interaction; Netnography.

RESUMO

Neste trabalho, almejamos analisar de que modo dois internautas, a partir de uma postagem do Ministério da Saúde no próprio perfil do *Twitter*, utilizam, em sua argumentação, estratégias de impolidez na promoção de mútua violência linguístico-discursiva. No âmbito teórico, articulamos os estudos de (im)polidez, inscritos em domínios micro/linguístico, macro/sociodiscursivo e meso/sociointeracional, e os estudos da argumentação, com foco na argumentação erística, dada a sua intrínseca relação com a violência linguístico-discursiva. No âmbito metodológico, optamos por conduzir um estudo netnográfico, inscrito em uma episteme exclusivamente qualitativa, na seleção e na análise de textos relacionados a uma interação mediada on-line no *Twitter* que tivesse um caráter conflituoso e que discutisse a hidroxicloroquina como estratégia de tratamento precoce no combate ao COVID-19. No âmbito analítico, salientamos que, de modo geral, a impolidez se tornou gradativamente mais intensa entre o internauta e a internauta, instaurando-se uma argumentação erística, permeada por argumentos *ad hominem* e *ad personam*, na coconstrução de metapragmáticas de violência linguístico-discursiva. Acreditamos ser salutar que perfis institucionais possam instituir políticas de moderação de tais interlocuções, incentivando diálogos construtivos e agregadores.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Impolidez; Argumentação; Violência linguístico-discursiva; Interação mediada on-line; Netnografia.

1 Initial remarks

Linguistic-discursive violence constitutes “a fundamental strategy in the orientation of discursive argumentation” (ALBUQUERQUE *et al.*, 2021, p. 74)², “to mark a position, [...] to mark the belonging to a group with which the user identifies himself/herself” (CABRAL, 2019, p. 430) and, indisputably, attacking the other. The argumentation is constructed through statements that, somehow, are modalized – in a spectrum that ranges from the most mitigated (more polite) to the most intensified (more impolite) –, which situates linguistic-discursive violence and argumentation in a markedly dialectical relationship. We emphasize that violence and impoliteness do not assume a pragmatic synonymy, since violence transcends impoliteness (and impoliteness is, therefore, the baseline for the construction of violence). Violence brings irreparable losses to the subjects and makes vulnerabilities

² We ourselves have translated all citations quotes from this work.

emerge in the field of interpersonal relationships, which can be related to racism, ableism, homophobia, misogyny, xenophobia, fatphobia, etc.

Social networks, such as Twitter, bring their users “important social repercussions, which potentiate collective work processes, affective exchange, production and circulation of information...” (PRIMO, 2007, p. 21). Often, such social networks become “the stage for violent discussions, of strong controversies in which aggressive discourses prevail, whose movements are marked by the disqualification of the other as a way of defending a point of view, therefore also as an argumentative strategy” (CABRAL, 2019, pp. 423-424). Furthermore, they function “as virtual spaces or virtual squares (in the sense of the Roman forum) where relationships are developed, shared and modified in an infinity of connections” (SEARA, 2021, p. 389). In addition, online-mediated interaction (THOMPSON, 2018) collaborates for the emergence of violent scenarios in the intersubjective exchange, as it offers, according to Thompson (2018), extended time and space, reduced range of symbolic cues, dialogic character and many-to-many interaction.

As an example of research in the field of linguistic-discursive violence, the work of Moreira and Romão (2011), entitled *The discourse on Twitter, effects of network extermination [O discurso no Twitter, efeitos de extermínio em rede]*, gathered tweets published at the time of the vote count in the Brazilian elections. At that time, Dilma Rousseff was leading the election in the Northeast, and internet users harassed the Northeasterners, inciting the murder of these Brazilians. Although studies of impoliteness do not fully reach what emerges in data similar to those of the investigation by Moreira and Romão (2011), the (im)politeness theory can be the starting point for mapping such violence and – mainly – for acting against violence.

In addition to personal use, the social media networks have also become a space for legal entities, such as government agencies, through which institutions seek different purposes, such as communicating or disseminating actions. In general, these institutions, such as the Ministry of Health, carry out a kind of monitoring of their digital media. Their aim is to “subsidize the elaboration of public policies, because the monitoring allows a quick and low-cost assessment of people’s opinions, attitudes and feelings, and allows the identification of differences among different groups of citizens and digital opinion leaders” (SANTANA; SOUZA, 2017, p. 103). In this evaluation/opinionated activity, (im)polite

interactions are common, especially in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic, which justifies the proposal of academic works that contribute to the minimization of impolite linguistic-discursive resources, in order to promote less violent and more aggregative debates, especially in digital contexts.

Faced with this undeniably violent scenario, we aim to analyze how two internet users, in the comment section of a post by the Ministry of Health on its Twitter profile, use, in their argumentation, impoliteness strategies to promote mutual linguistic-discursive violence. In the theoretical and methodological scopes, we inscribe this work in the interface of Interactional Sociolinguistics with Pragmatics, anchoring it to the netnographic recommendations, under the umbrella of an exclusively qualitative episteme.

In the next section, we will argue that (im)politeness strategies preserve/damage the face and shape metapragmatics, which mitigate/intensify scenarios of linguistic-discursive violence in online-mediated interactions, through eristic argumentative construction. Next, we will explain our methodological framework – Netnography, with a qualitative approach – and our research procedures. Finally, we will analyze the interaction on Twitter, in convergence with our theoretical-methodological principles.

2 @MNSAUDE: argumentation, impoliteness and violence

As previously announced, we will deal with the imbricated relationship between argumentation and (im)politeness, which permeates online-mediated interactions, from which metapragmatics of linguistic-discursive violence emerge. We will divide this section into three blocks, which aim to present (i) how argumentation is interrelated with (im)politeness; (ii) at what levels of language can (im)politeness manifest itself in the argumentative construction; and (iii) how the (im)politeness strategies, argumentatively oriented, can shape metapragmatics of linguistic-discursive violence in interactions on Twitter.

The act of arguing is associated with rationality and influence, which, respectively, seek an ideal of truth and persuasion (CHARAUDEAU, 2008). Similarly, rationality is associated with sanction (the (non) establishment of the truth of a given utterance); while influence is associated with manipulation (influence related to having to or wanting to do/to be) (FIORIN, 2015). However, arguing should not be conceived in an oversimplified way, as logics of reasoning (in a rational aspect) and as seduction/persuasion strategies (CHARAUDEAU, 2008). In this first block, we will discuss about the *lato sensu* argumentation, but with special attention to the eristic argumentation, which is related to the emergence of scenarios of linguistic-discursive violence.

For Charaudeau (2008), there are three fundamental conditions for establishing the argumentation: (i) a proposal about the world that provokes questioning; (ii) a subject who engages and develops reasoning in the construction of the truth; and (iii) an argumentation *target* – another subject – who will be able to accept or refute the *truth* shared by the other. From this point of view, a questioning proposal that inscribes subjects – speaker and interlocutor – in an intersubjective perspective would be the *sine qua non* condition for the emergence of the argumentative terrain. The (im)politeness would be established in the joint (and undeniably argumentative) construction of meanings in the course of the interaction.

In our view, the dialectic argumentation-(im)politeness is established in the instances of interaction, given that (i) “...the argumentativeness is intrinsic to human language and [...], therefore, all statements are argumentative” (FIORIN, 2015, p. 15); and (ii) (im)politeness strategies are inherent to the language manifestation. In other words, we are, at all times, modalizing language through such strategies, which are present in all utterances (intrinsically argumentative). If “the act of arguing, that is, of guiding what is said towards certain conclusions, constitutes the fundamental linguistic act” (KOCH; ELIAS, 2016, p. 28), the (im)politeness strategies, negotiated in the course of interaction, carry potential meanings, which affect the way in which this (argumentative) orientation takes place.

Therefore, the strong association between (im)politeness and argumentation is undeniable. In this regard, Plantin (2008), referring to the dialogical model, states that it is common for argumentative disagreement to be associated with

attempts by one of the interlocutors to take the floor and the other's refusal to give it up; appearance of overlapping between turns of speech, acceleration of elocution, elevation of voice tone; refusal to issue regulators, or ironic excess of signs of approval; unchallenged, unratified partner behavior ("are you deaf, or what?"); emission of negative regulators, verbal or otherwise (shaking the head negatively, sighs of impatience, agitation) etc. (PLANTIN, 2008, p. 67-68).

From Plantin's point of view (1998 [1996]), the argumentation must be analyzed under the parameters of the object, the language and the interaction, since it manipulates objects and the relationship between such objects; it assumes restrictions of the language in which it takes place; and it is constituted as an interactive process. Concerning the last parameter, we highlight the argumentation about the person (*ad hominem* argument), which emerges when the legitimacy of a given argument is questioned and when the locutor refers to negative attributes of the interlocutor in the refutation process, both to highlight his/her contradiction and to promote personal attack (PLANTIN, 1998 [1996]; WALTON, 1998). In the latter case, also called *ad personam* attack, Plantin (1998 [1996]) assesses that it is an insult, which can range from mocking the interactant to referring to him/her with negative terms, contrary to rules of courtesy.

In this socio-interactive milieu, we place the eristic argumentation, "where the goal is to win a verbal victory by any means" (WALTON, 1998, p. 178) in the construction of a terrain of embarrassment and confusion, so that the interactants have their participation hampered or ridiculed in a given dialogue (BENJAMIN, 1983). Historically, eristic argumentation was dissociated from the concept of argumentation, because "too often, the quarrel is not friends with logic" (WALTON, 1998, p. 178). Contrary to argumentative dialogue, which had a serious purpose and established a game, whose dispute was legitimate and dialectical, eristic dialogue encompassed sporting purpose (mental gymnastics or public exhibition), monetary or psychological rewards, and illegitimate and eristic dispute (BENJAMIN, 1983). Regarding our research context, we assume that,

in contexts of high political polarization, as we are currently experiencing, it is not difficult for an interaction on a sensitive topic, whose discursive opposition is anchored in marked political positions, to slide from a persuasive dialogue to an eristic dialogue. The first is oriented not only to lead the audience to adhere to one

of the positions considering the reasons presented and scrutinized, but also to inform them about the multiple interpretations on a topic (AZEVEDO *et al.*, 2021, p. 2296 - with adaptations).

In a chapter entirely dedicated to eristic dialogue, Walton (1998) summarizes five characteristics of this type of argument: (i) a truculent personal attack with the aim of blaming the other through repeated, sudden or irrelevant use of arguments such as *ad hominem* (WALTON, 1998); (ii) a refusal to admit defeat and search for victory at all costs (WALTON, 1998); (iii) an unfair attempt to make the other's placement look bad (WALTON, 1998); (iv) an escape from the developing conversational topic, through an apparently chaotic argumentative sequence, migrating to marginally relevant topics (WALTON, 1998), and (v) the apparent intention of not promoting conflict, attributing rationality to oneself and the intention of clashing to the other (WALTON, 1998).

Such characteristics often rely on impoliteness strategies that generate the emergence of metadiscursive struggles, which concern clashes/disputes (SILVERSTEIN; URBAN, 1996) capable of shaping a metapragmatic layer in the ongoing interaction. We can shape this layer “[by] the description and [by] the regulation of linguistic uses by groups and individuals differently positioned in structures and social networks of power and authority”, in the linguistic-discursive and political-ideological scope (SIGNORINI, 2008, p. 119). Under the argument that “any linguistic configuration is potentially indexical” (SILVERSTEIN, 1979, p. 206), metapragmatics describe, evaluate, condition and guide the uses of language (SIGNORINI, 2008).

Therefore, when we subscribe to strongly argumentative interactions, as we believe is the case of the interactions on Twitter, we are referring to “a disagreement that [...] is not instantly repaired in the course of the interaction in which it arose; it is thematized in the interaction; it can be taken to a specific argumentative place...” (PLANTIN, 2008, p. 68). In our analysis, this argumentative place is often an argumentative one of personal attack, responsible for establishing a scenario of linguistic-discursive violence (from the use of impoliteness strategies), which comes from interactions recurrently marked by eristic argumentation, generating metapragmatics of embarrassment, confusion and ridicule. For this reason, we will give greater specificity to the debate concerning (im)politeness, accounting for the micro (linguistic), macro (sociodiscursive) and meso (sociointeractional) levels.

With regard to (im)politeness, the topic of our second block, we start with the idea that politeness – and, in our view, impoliteness – is a universal phenomenon, but with a distinct sociocultural manifestation (KERBRAT-ORECCHIONI, 2004, 2017). We assess that the author's thinking, even if without this purpose, marks, at first, (im)politeness studies situated in the first-wave (LAKOFF, 1973; LEECH, 1983; BROWN; LEVINSON, 1987; CULPEPER, 1996), which focus on a linguistic/micro and pan cultural/universal domain. In our assessment, such thinking also includes (im)politeness studies enrolled in the second (EELLEN, 2001; MILLS, 2003; WATTS, 2009 [2003]) and in the third (HAUGH, 2007; GRAINGER, 2011; CULPEPER, 2011; KÁDÁR; HAUGH, 2013) waves, which puts (im)politeness into a sociodiscursive/macro and sociointeractional/meso domain respectively. In our view, the term *wave* gives visibility to three socio-historically motivated epistemic frameworks and, therefore, to three levels of manifestation of (im)politeness.

In the studies of the first-wave, the conflict between being polite and being clear permeates Lakoff's (1973) work, with the proposition of three rules of politeness (don't impose, give options and make a feel good – be friendly). Leech (1983), resuming, to a certain extent, this conflict, proposes six maxims linked to the Principle of Politeness (The Tact, The Generosity, The Approbation, The Modesty, The Agreement and The Sympathy Maxims). Brown and Levinson (1987), using the Goffmanian notion of face – “the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact” (GOFFMAN, 1987, p. 1967, p. 5) – proposed five politeness macro strategies, which range on a major/minor continuum of threat. They are: do the FTA (Face Threatening Act) on record without redressive action, baldly; do the FTA on record with redressive action for positive politeness (actions that value the positive face); do the FTA on record with redressive action for negative politeness (actions that value the negative face); do the FTA off record; and don't do the FTA. Finally, Culpeper (1996) transposed Brown and Levinson's (1987) macro strategies into the territory of impoliteness.

In the studies of the second-wave, there was a desire to combat investigations that were not empirical, with decontextualized examples (GRAINGER, 2011) and the universalist character, with minimal sociocultural and discursive incursion (EELLEN, 2001), that is present perspectives in the studies of the first-wave. These studies were criticized for conceiving analyzes exclusively conducted

by the researchers – without considering the evaluation of the research participant (EELEN, 2001; WATTS, 2009 [2003]; GRAINGER, 2011); and a reductionist view of culture and context (EELEN, 2001; CULPEPER, 2011). In our analysis, the great contribution of the studies of the second-wave comes from the conception of (im)politeness arising from social/discursive struggles (WATTS, 2009 [2003]; CULPEPER, 2011), which are more relevant than assessments of (in)adequacy (HAUGH; CULPEPER, 2018). Despite the undeniable (and salutary) epistemic turn, the sociodiscursive enterprise neglected the micro dimension (HAUGH, 2007; GRAINGER, 2011; BLITVICH; SIFIANOU, 2019); reified the research participants' voice (HAUGH; CULPEPER, 2018) and predicted a coding-decoding communication model (HAUGH, 2007).

In the studies of the third-wave, interaction became the locus of (im)politeness manifestation (HAUGH; CULPEPER, 2018). Such studies not only integrate the linguistic/micro and sociodiscursive/macro domains (GRAINGER, 2011; CULPEPER, 2011), but mainly instantiate (im)politeness in social practices (KÁDÁR; HAUGH, 2013), predicting an implication of (im)politeness negotiated in the course of interaction and based on interlocutory expectations (HAUGH, 2007). In other words, such studies break with dichotomies that would be established by "... micro x macro, universal x cultural, ethical x emic, linguistic x social, co-textual x contextual, phrastic x discursive dimensions..." (ALBUQUERQUE *et al.*, 2021, p. 71); and they bring together [argumentative] (im)politeness strategies, which can generate metapragmatics of devaluation, delegitimation, territorial invasion and linguistic-discursive violence.

Coming to the third (and last) block, we will bring here some findings of this theoretical convergence that we have proposed. Therefore, we aim to emphasize the epistemic proximity between (im)politeness and argumentation in the construction of metapragmatics of linguistic-discursive violence. (Im)politeness works as a strategic resource in the argumentative process, especially as a strategic resource for eristic argumentation, which encompasses *ad hominem* and *ad personam* arguments. These argumentative chains are mobilized on Twitter through comments, which consist of

place for dialogue, suggestion, discussion, exegesis, interpellation, manifestation of points of view and arguments, establishing both convergent and divergent

relationships with the source text or with subsequent comments, or even as a space for enunciative erasure (SEARA, 2021, p. 388).

From the comments, the interactants produce “a co-constructed text, argumentatively oriented, in which they expose points of view, build identities, sometimes approaching other users, sometimes showing the difference in relation to them...”, [...] and, in addition to the manifestation of disagreement, they assume – in this argumentative/discursive game – a group identity (CABRAL, 2019, p. 430). By assuming a given group identity, such users ideologically project themselves on social networks, commonly building metadiscursive disputes that not only give rise to metapragmatics of delegitimization, devaluation, insult and linguistic-discursive violence, but also regiment political-party bipolarization on the web.

3 @MINSAUDE: a netnography on Twitter

Our study has a qualitative approach, which is based “[on] the dynamics between the real world and the subject, [on] the living interdependence between the subject and the object, [on] the inseparable link between the objective world and the subject’s subjectivity” (CHIZZOTTI, 2000, p. 79). We conceive, therefore, that the research collaborator is a subject-observer who interprets the phenomena, attributing meaning to them; and that the object of study is not an inert and neutral datum, but it is full of potential meanings. This episteme also encompasses “a set of interpretive material practices that make the world visible” (DENZIN; LINCOLN, 2013, p. 6), enabling us to understand “the meaning people have constructed” (MERRIAM; TISDELL, 2016, p. 15) in a given investigation.

From this epistemic framework, we are interested in substantiating our affiliation, emphasizing four attributes. The first is the focus on the process, understanding and the senses (MERRIAM; TISDELL, 2016). The second is the “characteristically exploratory, fluid and flexible, data-driven and context-sensitive” perspective (MASON, 2002, p. 24). The third is the possibility of carrying out “... a thick sharing with people, facts and places that constitute objects of research, to extract from this

coexistence the visible and latent meanings that are only perceptible to a sensitive attention...” (CHIZZOTTI, 2003, p. 221). The fourth is the inscription of a researcher who takes a questioning stance, has a high tolerance for ambiguity, is a careful observer, asks good questions, thinks inductively, and takes comfort in a writing that [is] based on words (not numbers) (MERRIAM; TISDELL, 2016). Having access to online-mediated interactions on Twitter means having access to the intersubjective constructions of Internet users, which allows us, to a certain extent, to share the field experience with such social actors/actresses.

Under qualitative epistemic bases, we make use netnography, which, above all, derives from ethnography, by preserving the idea of describing human groups in terms of their institutions, their interpersonal behaviors, their material productions and their beliefs (ANGROSINO, 2009). In addition to constituting “a specialized form of ethnography adapted to the unique computer-mediated contingencies of today’s social worlds” (KOZINETS, 2014, p. 9-10) and combining “thick description, transcription, and inscription” (KOZINETS, 2021, p. 8), we are linked to a political netnography. Like Villegas (2021, p. 104), we view political netnography “as a sub-category of netnography that focuses on the study of political issues affected by or affecting social media”.

In line with the political (n)ethnographic perspective, with a qualitative approach, we adopted eight research procedures. First, (i) we chose the institutional profile of the Ministry of Health on Twitter, as it is the channel that frequently brings information related to public policies to combat the spread of COVID-19. Subsequently, (ii) we established, in line with the objective of our research, the inclusion criterion, which would be the selection of conflicting interactions that discussed hydroxychloroquine as an early treatment strategy against COVID-19; and (iii) we pre-selected, based on the previously established criteria, posts between 2020 and 2021. After that, (iv) we selected, among the pre-selected posts, a single post from the Ministry of Health that triggered an interaction permeated by verbal offense between two users which alluded to their party political affiliations. In addition, (v) we gathered other texts related to the Ministry of Health’s post, such as the transcript of an interview with Nelson Teich (at the time, Minister of Health). With this material, (vi) we generated a Portable Document Format (PDF) with the set of texts to be analyzed in the next section (the post of the Ministry of Health, the transcription of the interview and the interlocution of Internet users). Finally, (vii) we mapped more/less

violent linguistic-discursive resources that permeated this set of texts; and (viii) we analyzed the linguistic-discursive resources in the texts, from the perspective of the presented theoretical framework and the methodological guidelines discussed here.

Although it is possible to understand that our research involves human beings, Kozinets (2010, p. 142) highlights that “analyzing online community or culture communications or their archives is not human subjects research, *if the researcher does not record the identity of the communicators...*”. In any case, this assumption does not exempt us from the task of bringing some ethical clarifications. In the article *(Im)politeness in Digital Communication*, Graham and Hardaker (2017) warn that public discourse is resulting from exposure in public online forums and is open to examination by anyone, including researchers. Myers (2010) considers that we should relativize the issue, given that perhaps we should not analyze public messages from a support network about medical conditions. However, the same restriction would not apply to public messages from Internet users, in which they expect to be read and, in some way, to be evaluated (MYERS, 2010).

In addition to these aspects, Graham and Hardaker (2017) state that social networks, in general, make it possible to build anonymity, in order to guarantee the privacy of users, which supposedly means that researches, such as ours, do not bring risks to the participants, since anonymity protects the data. In short, the authors (2017, p. 803) understand that “the public nature of the discourse and the presence of anonymity offer protection to the individual on a sliding scale, and that each medium must be evaluated separately to assess the degree of public-ness and the degree of anonymity”. Therefore, we assume that the publicity given by the authors of the messages that make up our *corpus* (public and open posts), the context of the interaction (including the subject of the messages) and the complete anonymity of the identities are aspects that underlie our methodological way.

4 @MINSAUDE: impoliteness in the co-construction of violence

In this section, we will analyze the interaction established by @InteractorA and @InteractorB, which comes from a post by the Ministry of Health published in May 2020 and motivated by the interview referenced in the post itself. @InteractorA, in response to the agency's post, provoked other interactions, but we will focus on her exchange of tweets with @InteractorB, as they produced a longer dialogue with more density of impoliteness strategies. Our analysis begins with (i) the post by the Ministry of Health (Figure 1), whose main subject was the early approach to reducing the criticality of COVID-19 and the consequent reduction in the use of the health system. After this step, we examine (ii) the interview in which Nelson Teich advocated the use of high-flow oxygen. Finally, we will analyze (iii) the interaction of Internet users, motivated by @InteractorA's dissonance in relation to the minister's defense, given that she did not recommend increasing the flow of oxygen, but the prescription of medications that, in her view, were effective.

Figure 1: Post from the Ministry of Education³.



Source: Twitter (2020).

Even though a Twitter account can inspire informality and debates with generic opinions, it is undeniable that posts linked to the Ministry of Health account generates an expectation that the content turn around suggestion, advice, warning and, to some extent, injunction (even if mitigated), due to its institutional framework. Although the tone of the post has the purpose of informing, the argumentative construction intends to persuade the interlocutor about a given subject. Based on this line of thought, we expected the use of politeness strategies, given the context of the post. We can see this use (i) in

³ Translation of the post: Anticipating the care of those with #coronavirus can reduce the evolution of the disease to a more critical phase of the disease, in addition to reducing the need for ICUs, mechanical ventilation and relieving health systems, increasing the ability to care for Brazilians. @TeichNelson. Early approach to the disease can reduce its evolution to a more critical phase. "It's the way we approach it. So, a review of how the approach to diagnosis is being made, from the beginning of treatment".

the use of the imperative with a conjugated verb in the infinitive (in *anticipating*) and (ii) in the mitigation with the periphrases in the infinitive (in *can reduce*, *reducing*, *relieving* and *can reduce*).

By using *anticipating* [*antecipar*, in Brazilian Portuguese], rather than the prototypical imperative *anticipating* [*antecipe*, in Brazilian Portuguese], it is likely that the intention was to mitigate the injunction – and therefore to bring a more polite nuance to the post. The direct imperative, which occurs “... when the locutor occupies a socially superior position to the interlocutor...”, can be linguistically manifested by conjugated verbs “... in the gerund or infinitive, used alone or in periphrases...” (CASTILHO, 2012, p. 327). From our perspective, the use of imperative utterances, in its various linguistic forms, integrates a linguistic-discursive demand, given that the choices of the interlocutors are associated with a given discursive genre and occur in interactional instances of language use. In this case, the use of the infinitive brings a tone of warning/suggestion of the public agency to the Internet users.

Regarding mitigated periphrases, we emphasize the explicit mitigations (*can reduce*) and the implicit mitigations (emerged in which the verb *can* was elliptical – *reduce* and *relieve*). In both cases, the verb *can* would assume the role of mitigating the action expressed by the main verb, giving the text an idea of uncertainty, as predicted by Castilho (2012). However, it is not literally about uncertainty, but about relativizing the assertion, inasmuch as generalizing both would be incoherent (since it is not a *guarantee* that anticipating treatment would bring all these developments) and could foment heated debates in an attempt to deconstruct a generalist argument. In other words, the commitment of the speaker – in this case, the Ministry of Health – would be less intensive with such relativization, which would potentially reduce the criticism directed at the agency.

We represented the interaction of @InteractorA and @InteractorB in Figure 2. Subsequently, we will transcribe the posts with adjustments to graphic and morphosyntactic issues, and to abbreviations, to ensure better intelligibility (Chart 1).

Figure 2: @InteractorA and @InteractorB interaction (screenshot).



Source: Twitter (2020).

Chart 1: @InteractorA and @InteractorB interaction.

Comment 1 @InteractorA	1 2 3	No minister @TeichNelson, high volume of O2 doesn't help, it gets worse, because micro coagulation doesn't let the alveoli capture this supply. Treat with early HCQ+Azitromycin+Zinc, if it evolves, use Methylprednisolone. Please minister, let's save lives!!!
Comment 2 @InteractorB	4 5	Guys we have a genius here! Quickly, make this tweet come to WHO! Well, by the way, we only know about this "cure" here.
Comment 3 @InteractorA	6 7 8	Have you ever heard of SCIENTIFIC STUDIES? Well, if you dared to recruit more neurons, in addition to the tic and the tic, if there are more neurons out there, you would know that there is already an effective treatment. Now you just want to seal it, keep going, I really don't care!!
Comment 4 @InteractorB	9 10 11	Why have several places in the world already discarded hydroxychloroquine as a treatment then? Do they want to leave the people suffering? Or do you want it because the "myth" said it is effective?
Comment 5 @InteractorA	12 13	Hey son, don't be ashamed... stop following the trumpet player of the apocalypse and stop retweeting him. See if your two neurons can decipher this study here [link]
Comment 6 @InteractorA	14	Try a little harder and read these articles here! [link]
Comment 7 @InteractorA	15 16 17	If Italy, a while ago, was a model to be followed in isolation, singing on the balconies and such, tell me why today, who undergoes early treatment with hydroxychloroquine, [it] disappeared from the news in Brazil? [link]
Comment 8 @InteractorB	18 19	Mimimi 2 neurons. Bolsonaro cattle only know how to say that. Encourage idiots to take this medicine, suffer heart problems and take the medicine of those who need
Comment 9 @InteractorA	20 21 22	Ahhhh motherfucker, bring arguments. This cattle talk is tired and doesn't stick. Cattle assumed sane, you that being in the path of the abyss out of pure tantrum! Do you know that there are drugs

	23	that treat arrhythmias and that they are not deadly? I'm ashamed of your explicit stupidity! See yourself idiot
Comment 10 @InteractorA	24 25	When it's your turn, I'll wait for the situation to get worse and put you on Mechanical Ventilation with very high tidal volume and low PEEP, so you'll meet the devil faster!!
Comment 11 @InteractorA	26 27 28 29	That's exactly what their communist comrades who call themselves doctors in Amazonas did, when they administered 12 grams of a substance analogous to hydroxychloroquine, with the leaflet referring to 2.5g of maximum dosage. Cool huh? Do you know why? Because of a tantrum, they don't like cattle and Bozogro. I think I can do the same, do you agree?
Comment 12 @InteractorB	30 31	What communist? Lol I voted for Bolsonaro, but I have decency and common sense to see that he is being an imbecile and should have been expelled from the presidency by now
Comment 13 @InteractorA	32 33 34	You can vote for anyone you want, it doesn't concern me. Your words only explicit how shallow you are. Better not throb about what you don't know, you don't understand. With each answer, I am more ashamed of you!!

Source: Twitter (2020).

As the first comment – between lines 1 and 3 – referred to the minister's speech in the video published in the Ministry's post, we will transcribe and analyze his speech below. The video in question corresponds to an excerpt from an interview given by the Minister of Health, Nelson Teich.

What has been happening again, but perhaps even more recently, more important than medication is the way we approach it. Then a review of how the approach to diagnosis is being made, from the beginning of treatment. You classify the person, start treatments with high flow oxygen, and you can try non-invasive ventilation. It is possible that, working, approaching the disease at an earlier time, we reduce the evolution to the most critical phase. With that, we not only save more people, but also manage to reduce the need for ICUs, mechanical ventilation, which would be a great relief for the system, and at the same time you increase the ability to care⁴ (TWITTER, 2020).

Unlike the Ministry of Health's post, in which the mitigation of suggested actions (*Anticipating, can reduce, reduce, relieving and can reduce*) occurs throughout the text, Nelson Teich's statement brought a mix of mitigated actions and intensified actions. At the beginning of his text, the minister

⁴ Original excerpt: O que tem acontecido de novo, mas, talvez até mais novo, mais importante do que os medicamentos, é a forma da gente abordar. Então uma revisão de como está sendo feita a abordagem do diagnóstico, do começo do tratamento. Você classifica a pessoa, começa tratamentos com o oxigênio em alto fluxo, pode tentar a ventilação não-invasiva. É possível que a gente trabalhando, abordando a doença em um momento mais precoce, que a gente reduza a evolução para a fase mais crítica. Com isso, a gente não só salva mais gente, mas, também, consegue diminuir a necessidade de UTIs, ventilação mecânica, o que seria um grande alívio para o sistema, e ao mesmo tempo em que você aumenta a capacidade de cuidar.

prescribed some behaviors, thus intensifying the injunction. In the text, this intensification occurs when it is stated that (i) the way of approaching is more important than the medications; (ii) the approach at the time of assigning the diagnosis should be reviewed; and (iii) healthcare professionals should classify people and titrate oxygen at high flow, with minimal mitigation by the use of *maybe* (in the first line). Subsequently, the minister transposed the argumentation to the field of possibilities (and, for this reason, mitigated and reduced his commitment to what he said), by suggesting (iv) the use of non-invasive ventilation; and (v) a set of possible actions from the structure *é it is possible that*. He assumes, therefore, that work (addressing the disease at an earlier time) could reduce the evolution of the disease, save more people, decrease ICU admissions, reduce the use of mechanical ventilation, relieve the system and increase the capacity to take care. Now, let us move on to the interaction of @InteractorA and @InteractorB.

In the first comment by @InteractorA, we noted that she clearly expressed her disagreement with the actions taken by the Minister of Health. In an imposing way, she started with statements that, in theory, were based on an authority's argument, since her dialogue was permeated with technical terms (between lines 1 and 3); and proposed, using the verb in the imperative mood – *treat* (line 2) – an attitude different from the one adopted by the minister. This imposition was mitigated by the use of *Please*, in line 3, with the probable purpose of preserving the interlocutor's negative face (territoriality), and by the use of *Let's*, in line 3, as an expression of solidarity (interlocutive approach) and as a sharing responsibility with the minister.

Using politeness strategies (mitigation resources), @InteractorA seemed to recognize the asymmetry in the relationship with the Minister of Health. However, this use did not stop her from approaching him, both for the feeling of intimacy that the online-mediated interaction can promote and for the construction of her identity as someone who would probably have training in the health area and, therefore, would have legitimacy to discuss the subject. In addition to bringing an authoritative argument, @InteractorA sought to build an argumentative/persuasive dialogue, as it seemed to be aligned with the purpose of establishing an interlocution on the theme she had just suggested: early treatment by the use of hydroxychloroquine in association with others drugs.

Although this first comment was directed to the Ministry of Health and the minister, @InteractorB reacted. In the second comment, we could identify the use of impoliteness strategies, through the adjective *genius* (in line 4), clearly ironic in the context, in order to ridicule @InteractorA comment and attack her positive face. This action remained in clear alignment with the eristic argumentation and the argumentative disagreement, given the personal/truculent attack and the attempt to ridicule the interlocutor in a place where the interaction is from many to many. The use of the extra-linguistic resource (the quotation marks) brought an explicit indication of this irony, as it is not a literal utterance – if it were, the compliment would function as a resource of positive politeness (praising the face of the interlocutor). In this sense, irony worked as a positive impoliteness strategy, threatening the positive face, with the aim of ridiculing, delegitimizing @InteractorA and, according to Culpeper (1996), promoting social disharmony through this false politeness.

Also, the fake praise exaggeration – *Quickly, make this tweet come to WHO!* (line 4) – strengthened the ironic character of the comment, as it built a false demonstration of solidarity and commitment to InteractorA's idea. Next, the passage *we only know about this "cure" here*, between lines 4 and 5, indicated that the thought expressed by @InteractorA brought, in the @InteractorB's conception, two pseudo-ideas: the post needed to be made known to other people and the sharing of a recipe that would bring cure. In this sense, the text maintained its ironic character, revealing that the information was completely fallacious and that, for this reason, people would not have the cure.

Up to this point, we noticed that there were already signs of impoliteness, which would tend to grow by the configuration of the interaction (comments in sequence around a controversial topic), through *ad hominem* arguments (highlighting @InteractorA's negative attributes) and, even more, *ad personam* (ironizing @InteractorA). Culpeper (1996) warns that irony often acquires a fun/comedy character, which is why he gave preference to the term *sarcasm*, as it clearly marks the opposite of play: the false politeness that promotes social disharmony. We also emphasize that, in the context of our research, irony – in a progressive character (given that the ironic content will gradually increase in the ongoing analysis) – not only promoted social disharmony, but mainly exacerbated metadiscursive struggles and established metapragmatics of linguistic-discursive violence. In other contexts, as in Mills (2003), irony could work to resolve conflicts and minimize intersubjective tension.

We saw, in the third comment, that ironic statements also constructed the counter-argument, intensifying the delegitimization of the other – @InteractorB. As we have already mentioned, the content present in the first comment made us suspect that @InteractorA had a background in the health area. Therefore, when questioning *Have you ever heard of SCIENTIFIC STUDIES*, on line 6, she threatened the @InteractorB's positive face and completely delegitimized his knowledge of the topic under debate. Parallel to this rhetorical question, irony gained even more prominence both with the construction of a terrain of embarrassment, confusion and ridicule and with the insults directed at the intellectual capacity of the other.

That is, in addition to being ironic, @InteractorA refers to @InteractorB through associations of a negative nature, such as *if you dared to recruit more neurons, in addition to the tic and the tic* (between lines 6 and 7) and *Now you just want to seal it* (line 8). As for the first, we emphasize the verb *dared*, which ironically alludes to the idea of courage/challenge; and the expression *recruit more neurons*, which makes explicit mention of @InteractorB's intellectual disability. In addition, we mention the pejorative expression *the tic and the tic*, which refers to a Disney cartoon (Chip 'n' Dale) with two clumsy chipmunks (who were called *Tico and Teco* in the Brazilian version), with a markedly cultural use. As for the second, we emphasize the expression *you just want to seal it*, which would bring the idea that @InteractorB was only interested in being successful on social networks with the controversy created by himself, and not in building a plausible debate in the @InteractorA's opinion. The metadiscursive struggle undertaken turned around (de)legitimacy, which provided the formation of (de)valuing and violent metapragmatics.

In the fourth comment, @InteractorB asked, between lines 9 and 10, three rhetorical questions, whose purpose, as the term itself reveals, would not be to find answers, but to emphasize his own idea, disagreeing with what @InteractorA said previously. The questions illustrate a gradient from more argumentative dialogue (persuasive, informative, legitimate and dialectical) to more eristic dialogue (recreational, delegitimizing dispute, illegitimate and eristic). At first, the interlocutor provoked reflection on the world scenario (first question). In a second moment, he made a question regarding the world scenario and brought an indirect criticism to @InteractorA that perpetuating this thought could potentiate this suffering (second question). In a last moment, he insulted the interlocutor, through a

negative impoliteness strategy, given that the need for the negative face (territorial preservation) would be to impersonalize the interactants.

From this gradation – argumentative/eristic –, we imagine that the last question has consecrated a rejoinder to the linguistic-discursive violence experienced (especially in the third comment) through a personal and truculent attack. This attack aimed both at blaming (even if indirectly) the interlocutor and at her association with terms of a negative nature, as was the case with *the “mith”* (on line 10), an ironic term often used to refer to Jair Bolsonaro. It is noteworthy that the noun was preceded by the definite determiner, with a clear allusion to the current president, and the expression was written in quotation marks, with an explicit (and ironic) insinuation that he was not someone with notoriety (to be considered a myth). Therefore, the co(n)textual sense revealed that @InteractorA was affiliated with the current president’s ideals, who, despite not having any training in the health area, was seen as the main advocate of hydroxychloroquine as a measure to combat COVID-19.

Faced with the questions addressed to someone who would have some experience in the health area and, by the defense made so far, agreed with the current president’s position, @InteractorA impolitely delegitimized @InteractorB’s questions (fifth comment). This can be explained both by the association of his speech with the absolute lack of knowledge on the subject under debate, in the passage *don’t be ashamed* (line 12), and by the explicit alienation by the thoughtless repetition of previous speeches, in *stop following the trumpet player of the apocalypse*⁵. Such statements became more violent in line 13, in the reiteration that @InteractorB would have two neurons and in the provocation that these neurons would (not) be able to decipher the study to which @InteractorA referred in the link provided by her. We consider, at this point, that the interaction reaches one of the peaks of eristic argumentation – *ad hominem* and *ad personam* – through indirect strategies of irony in the construction of metapragmatics of linguistic-discursive violence. In addition to bringing together (de)legitimation, (de)valuation, ridicularization and attacks/insults, we can see in this interaction the characteristics pointed out by Walton (1998) about eristic dialogue: attack/blaming; refusal of defeat and victory at any cost; deconstruction of the other’s thinking; avoidance of conversational topics to

⁵ We understand that this statement refers to Átila Marinho’s Twitter profile.

generate embarrassment/confusion; and attempt to attribute rationality to oneself and struggle to the other (WALTON, 1998).

In the sixth comment, @InteractorA remained using positive impoliteness strategies, while conducting her (eristic) argumentation around the devaluing and delegitimizing idea that @InteractorB would need to make an effort – because he does not have the intellectual capacity to debate – to understand the importance of early treatment (line 14). At the same time, @InteractorA intensified the imposition through the imperative, in *try* and *read* (line 14), as a negative impoliteness strategy; and irony through the diminutive *little* [*pouquinho*, in Portuguese], as an indirect impoliteness strategy (line 14). As the “social practices constituted with the use of the suffix *-inho*⁶ can indicate [...] irony” (BRANDÃO, 2010, p. 74), we assess, in this case, that the effort would not be intense for someone who, in his view, would have only two neurons.

In the seventh comment, @InteractorA suggested that the media had been selective in terms of the information conveyed, given that Italy would have disappeared from the Brazilian media for starting to defend the early treatment. From her perspective, this fact gave the false impression that the world had discarded hydroxychloroquine (between lines 15 and 17). Although @InteractorA shortly interrupted *ad hominem* and *ad personam* arguments, there was a slight thematic fluctuation in the ongoing argumentation and an attempt to delegitimize a social practice from another culture, in *singing on the balconies and such* (line 15). With the use of this expression, her arguments migrated to irrelevant conversational topics (WALTON, 1998) and insinuated that the (other’s) social practice was bad, thus maintaining eristic traits. Even still dealing with hydroxychloroquine, her focus was on the idea that the media manipulated information – conveying the unimportant and omitting the important – , which contributed to some people, including @InteractorB, thinking that the medication was ineffective.

In the eighth comment, @InteractorB used, in his defense, the expression *mimimi 2 neurons* (line 18), with the probable purpose of criticizing the @InteractorA’s insistence on insulting his

⁶ The suffix *-inho* marks the diminutive in Portuguese.

intelligence (third and fifth comments). The term *mimimi*⁷ would be used to “delegitimize a previous or potential speech act – seeking to control the future frame of metapragmatic evaluation or project it from before its performance as illegitimate” (PINTO, 2019, p. 223). In addition, the expression served to insult the interlocutor (and all those who share the same ideals) for her inability to conduct an argumentative/persuasive dialogue (focus on debate), given the predilection for offending and *escaping* from the debate, typical traits of an eristic dialogue (focus on public viewing). This framework was extended to *Bolsonaro cattle only know how to say that* (line 18), with explicit criticism of the insistence on defending the early treatment. It is worth mentioning the use of *cattle*, an insult directed not only at @InteractorA, but also at everyone who supports such a defense.

Regarding the expression *cattle*, crystallized in the online-mediated interactions, we imagine there is an analogy between those who use hydroxychloroquine and an animal that blindly follows the one who guides it, having its life snuffed out in the cattleman’s slaughterhouse. Then, the term *idiots*, in line 18, reinforced the insults, the delegitimization, the impoliteness and, therefore, the linguistic-discursive violence, especially as they are the people who would be encouraged to consume a medication that affects cardiovascular health and would be ineffective (between lines 18 and 19).

As a reaction to the previous comment, the ninth comment added, in line 20, a vowel prolongation (*Ahhhh*) and a curse resulting from her impatience (and disbelief) regarding the argumentation conducted by @InteractorB. The insult marked not only the loss of decorum itself, but also the complete devaluation and delegitimization of @InteractorB’s previous positions, especially when demanding that he brings arguments, in the sense that his comment did not deconstruct her argumentation, nor the content published in the links she had sent. After that, @InteractorA showed indignation with the label *cattle*, in line 20, implying that its use worked as a strategy to escape the debate. Afterwards, she told @InteractorB *Cattle assumed sane, you that being in the path of the abyss out of pure tantrum!*, between lines 20 and 21, transferring the irrationality to the group that would resist the precocious treatment. To this end, @InteractorA used a positive impoliteness strategy (disqualification of the other), *ad hominem* arguments (questioning the arguments used by

⁷ In Brazilian Portuguese, the expression *mimimi* is used when someone decides to judge the opinion and the suffering of others as irrelevant.

@InteractorB) and *ad personam* arguments (insults/attacks directed at @InteractorB). She minimized the danger of arrhythmias (between lines 21 and 22), which, in the eighth comment, was mentioned as one of the adverse effects of the medication, and intensified the insults with the expressions *I'm ashamed of your explicit stupidity!* and *See yourself idiot* (lines 22 and 23).

In the tenth comment, @InteractorA was not impolite, but violent. In fact, it was completely inhuman to suggest that, being a doctor, she would act differently with the patient, using a totally contraindicated treatment, so that @InteractorB will *meet the devil faster!!* (between lines 24 and 25). In her view, an attitude that would be similar to what the @InteractorB's communist comrades would have done in Amazonas (line 26), as we can see in the eleventh comment. Linguistic-discursive violence – promoted by positive impoliteness strategies and, consequently, by eristic argumentation – affected ethical and moral instances. It is a wish that could kill @InteractorB (although, in theory, it was not a literal statement) and a judgment that, if he died, he would necessarily go to hell, whose stigma is that it is a place where bad people go. In both comments (tenth and eleventh), we saw the emergence of metadiscursive struggles that shape, in the ongoing interaction, metapragmatics that transcend devaluation and delegitimization, but incite a crime that – even metaphorically – could be committed against someone who does not agree with the interactant's ideals.

The expression communist comrades (line 26) in the twelfth comment prompted an explicit reaction of surprise, based on the assumption that anyone who took a stand against the prescription of hydroxychloroquine would belong to this group (would fit in this label), as a reflection of a scenario of political polarization established in the country. By saying *I have decency and common sense to see that he is being an imbecile*, between lines 30 and 31, we can see that @InteractorB not only valued his own face, but also offended the @InteractorA's face, given the emerging polarization in the interaction ongoing. By continuing to defend the current president's positions, @InteractorB believes that @InteractorA would not have the same decency and common sense as him. At this point, we assess that the eristic argumentation has reached its peak, as there has been no trace of argumentative dialogue regarding (not) using hydroxychloroquine.

In the thirteenth comment, @InteractorA sought to foster, in line with what Walton (1998) predicted about eristic dialogue, a territory of apparent pretension of not promoting conflict, by

recognizing the @InteractorB's right to vote (line 32). However, she delegitimized him, causing other Internet users to evaluate him in the same way: shallow, uninformed and pitiful (lines 32 to 34). This comment was congruent with all the interaction that we analyzed here, insofar as the objective of threatening the positive and the negative faces of the other was evident, with rare strategies to mitigate impoliteness. On the contrary, the impoliteness gradually became more intense, with the exception of comment 1, in which @InteractorA addressed a request to the minister. We conclude, in this regard, that impoliteness marks both eristic arguments and metapragmatics of linguistic-discursive violence and, for this reason, obscures the debate – argumentative/persuasive dialogue –, by shifting the focus of the subject of the thematic discussion to the scene of offenses.

5 Final remarks

Regarding the theoretical-methodological contributions, we emphasize that (im)politeness and (eristic) argumentation assume a dialectical relationship between themselves, which is instantiated in the linguistic scope, in the sociodiscursive scope and, especially, in the socio-interactional scope. Therefore, it is in sociocultural practices that impoliteness is co-constructed by the interactants, based on their interlocutory purposes (to devalue, to delegitimize, to violate...), which are reflections of linguistic ideologies, indexicalize language actions and construct metapragmatics of linguistic-discursive violence. Netnography, under the lens of qualitative research, allows us to unveil this co-construction and, even more, to perspective ourselves (intersubjectively) in relation to the data (always provisionally) generated.

In the analytical scope, we emphasize that the metadiscursive struggles established by @InteractorA (supporter of early treatment) and by @InteractorB (opposed to early treatment) generated metapragmatics of devaluation, delegitimation and linguistic-discursive violence. Such metapragmatics were conducted through positive and negative impoliteness strategies that, in short, served as a motto for the construction of *ad hominem* and *ad personam* arguments, which negatively evaluate the other, question their legitimacy, attack/insult, taking an eristic function. Therefore, the

argumentative wave was frequently broken with thematic fluctuations, insults, cursing, sending links and even violating the right to life.

Arguably, impoliteness and eristic argumentation acquired greater density as the interaction progressed. This finding encourages us to consider, in other contexts, that controversial issues hardly articulate movements of agreement or, at least, respect for the other. Such themes provide the construction of scenarios of violence that can even reach instances beyond the online and perpetuate other forms of violence. Considering the potential of institutional profiles on social networks, we are in favor of promoting strategies in the virtual environment – perhaps a moderation in more heated debates – that encourage argumentative/persuasive rather than eristic dialogues. Thus, we can favor non-offensive argumentation and, therefore, minimize aggressive interactions, especially at times when solidarity, search for common solutions and science should be indispensable maxims.

CRediT

Acknowledgement: Not applicable.

Financing: Not applicable.

Conflicts of interest: The authors certify that they have no commercial or associative interest that represents a conflict of interest in relation to the manuscript.

Ethical Approval: Not applicable.

Contributor Roles:

Conceptualization, Data curation, Investigation, Methodology, Project administration, Supervision, Visualization, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing : ALBUQUERQUE, Rodrigo ; SOUZA, Ana Luiza Nogueira.

References

ALBUQUERQUE, R.; SEARA, I. R.; SANTOS, L. W.; TOMAZI, M. M. Argumentação e impolidez: o *post* nas instâncias da interação. *(Con)Textos Linguísticos*, v. 15, n. 31, p. 66-84, 2021.

ANGROSINO, M. *Etnografia e Observação Participante*. Tradução de José Fonseca. Porto Alegre: Artmed, 2009.

AZEVEDO, I. C. M.; GONÇALVES-SEGUNDO, P. R.; PIRIS, E. L. Argumentação erística nas interações digitais: uma polêmica médica sobre a cloroquina no Debate 360 da CNN Brasil. *Rev. Estud. Ling.*, v. 29, n. 4, p. 2289-2333, 2021.

BENJAMIN, J. Eristic, Dialectic, and Rhetoric. *Communication Quarterly*, v. 31, n. 1, p. 21-26, 1983.

- BLITVICH, P. G-C.; SIFIANOU, M. Im/politeness and discursive pragmatics. *Journal of Pragmatics*, v. 145, p. 91-101, 2019.
- BRANDÃO, L. V. M. *Uma análise sociodiscursiva do sufixo -inho em materiais didáticos: uma contribuição para a constituição de sentidos no ensino de português para estrangeiros*. 2010. 124f. Dissertação (Mestrado em Linguística) – Programa de Pós-Graduação em Linguística, Universidade de Brasília, Brasília, 2010.
- BROWN, P.; LEVINSON, S. *Politeness: some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- CABRAL, A. L. T. Violência verbal e argumentação nas redes sociais: comentários no Facebook. *Calidoscópico*, v. 17, n. 3, 416-432, 2019.
- CASTILHO, A. T. *Nova Gramática do Português Brasileiro*. São Paulo: Contexto, 2012.
- CHARAUDEAU, P. *Linguagem e discurso: modos de organização*. Tradução coordenada por Ângela M. S. Correa e Ida Lúcia Machado. São Paulo: Contexto, 2008.
- CHIZZOTTI, A. *Pesquisa em ciências humanas e sociais*. 4. ed. São Paulo: Cortez, 2000.
- CHIZZOTTI, A. A pesquisa qualitativa em ciências humanas e sociais: evolução e desafios. *Revista Portuguesa de Educação*, v. 16, n. 2, p. 221-236, 2003.
- CULPEPER, J. Towards an anatomy of impoliteness. *Journal of Pragmatics*, v. 25, p. 349-67, 1996.
- CULPEPER, J. Politeness and impoliteness. In: AJIMER, K.; ANDERSEN, G. (Eds.). *Pragmatics of Society*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2011. p. 393-438.
- DENZIN, N. K.; LINCOLN, Y. S. *Collecting and interpreting qualitative materials*. 4th ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2013.
- EELLEN, G. *A Critique of Politeness Theories*. Manchester: St. Jerome, 2001.
- FIORIN, J. L. *Argumentação*. São Paulo: Contexto, 2015.
- GOFFMAN, E. *Interaction Ritual: essays on face-to-face behavior*. UK: Penguin University Books, 1967.
- GRAHAM, S. L.; HARDAKER, C. (Im)politeness in Digital Communication. In: CULPEPER, J.; HAUGH, M.; KÁDÁR, D. Z. (Eds.). *The Palgrave Handbook of Linguistic (Im)politeness*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017. p. 785-814
- GRAINGER, K. 'First order' and 'second order' politeness: Institutional and intercultural contexts. In: LINGUISTIC POLITENESS RESEARCH GROUP (Org.). *Discursive approaches to politeness*. Walter de Gruyter: Berlin/Boston, 2011. p. 167-188.
- HAUGH, M. The discursive challenge to politeness research: An interactional alternative. *Journal of Politeness Research*, v. 3, n. 2, p. 295-317, 2007.

- HAUGH, M.; CULPEPER, J. Integrative pragmatics and (im)politeness theory. In: ILIE, C.; NORRICK, N. R. (Eds.). *Pragmatics and its Interfaces*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2018. p. 213-239.
- KÁDÁR, D. Z.; HAUGH, M. *Understanding Politeness*. UK: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- KERBRAT-ORECCHIONI, C. ¿Es universal la cortesía? In: BRAVO, D.; BRIZ, A. (Eds.). *Pragmática sociocultural: estudios sobre el discurso de cortesía en español*. Barcelona: Ariel, 2004.
- KERBRAT-ORECCHIONI, C. Abordagem intercultural da polidez linguística: problemas teóricos e estudos de caso. In: CABRAL, A. L. T.; SEARA, I. R.; GUARANHA, M. F. (Orgs.). *Descortesia e cortesía: expressão de culturas*. São Paulo: Cortez, 2017.
- KOCH, I. V.; ELIAS, V. M. *Escrever e argumentar*. São Paulo: Contexto, 2016.
- KOZINETS, R. V. *Netnography: Doing ethnographic research online*. London: Sage Publications, 2010.
- KOZINETS, R. V. *Netnografia: realizando pesquisa etnográfica online*. Porto Alegre: Penso, 2014.
- KOZINETS, R. V. Netnography Today: A Call to Envelope, Embrace, Energize, and Electrify. In: KOZINETS, R. V.; GAMBETTI, R. (Eds.). *Netnography Unlimited: Understanding Technoculture Using Qualitative Social Media Research*. New York/London: Routledge, 2021.
- LAKOFF, R. T. The logic of politeness; or, minding your p's and q's. In: CORUM, C. et al. (Eds.). *Papers from the Ninth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, p. 292-305, 1973.
- LEECH, G. *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman, 1983.
- MASON, J. *Qualitative Researching*. 2nd ed. London, Thousand Oaks & New Delhi: SAGE, 2002.
- MERRIAM, S. B.; TISDELL, E. J. *Qualitative Research: A Guide to Design and Implementation*. 4th ed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2016.
- MILLS, S. *Gender and Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- MOREIRA, V. L.; ROMÃO, L. M. S. O discurso no Twitter, efeitos de extermínio em rede. *Revista Rua*, v. 2, n. 17, p. 77-97, 2011.
- MYERS, G. *The Discourse of Blogs and Wikis*. New York: Continuum Press, 2010.
- PINTO, J. P. É só mimimi? Disputas metapragmáticas em espaços públicos online. *Interdisciplinar*, v. 31, p. 221-236, 2019.
- PLANTIN, C. *La argumentación*. Tradução de Amparo Tusón Valls. Barcelona: Ariel, 1998 [1996].
- PLANTIN, C. *A argumentação: história, teorias, perspectivas*. Tradução de Marcos Marcionilo. São Paulo: Parábola, 2008.
- PRIMO, A. O aspecto relacional das interações na Web 2.0. *E-Compós*, v. 9, p. 1-21, 2007.
- SANTANA, M. B.; SOUZA, C. G. B. Uso das redes sociais por órgãos públicos no Brasil e possibilidades de contribuição do monitoramento para gestão. *Revista Gestão.Org*, v. 15, p. 631-639, 2017.

SEARA, I. R. Ligações vertiginosas: violência verbal em ‘comentários’ nas redes sociais. *Calidoscópico*, v. 19, n. 3, p. 385-397, 2021.

SIGNORINI, I. Metapragmáticas da língua em uso: unidades e níveis de análise. In: SIGNORINI, I. (Org.). *Situar a língua[gem]*. São Paulo: Parábola, 2008.

SILVERSTEIN, M. Language Structure and Linguistic Ideology. In: CLYNE, P. R.; HANKS, W. F.; HOFBAUER, C. L. (Org.). *The Elements: a parasession on linguistic units and levels*. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society, p. 193-247, 1979.

SILVERSTEIN, M.; URBAN, G. *Natural Histories of Discourse*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996.

THOMPSON, J. B. A interação mediada na era digital. *Matriz*, v. 12, n. 13, p. 17-44, 2018.

TWITTER. *Ministério da Saúde*. 2020.

VILLEGAS, D. Political Netnography: A Method for Studying Power and Ideology in Social Media. In: KOZINETS, R. V.; GAMBETTI, R. (Eds.). *Netnography Unlimited: Understanding Technoculture Using Qualitative Social Media Research*. New York/London: Routledge, 2021.

WALTON, D. *The New Dialectic: Conversational Contexts of Argument*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1998.

WATTS, R. J. *Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009 [2003].

Appendix: Interaction on Twitter (original)

Chart 1: @InteractorA and @InteractorB interaction.

Comment 1 @InteractorA	1 2 3	Não min @TeichNelson, volume alto de O2 não adianta, piora, pois a microcoagulação não deixa os alvéolos captarem este aporte. Trata com HCQ+Azitromicina+Zinco precoce, se evoluir Metilprednisolona. Por favor ministro, vamos salvar vidas!!!
Comment 2 @InteractorB	4 5	Gente temos um gênio aqui! Rápido, façam esse tweet chegar à OMS! Pois pelo jeito só aqui sabemos dessa “cura”
Comment 3 @InteractorA	6 7 8	Você já ouviu falar em ESTUDOS CIENTÍFICOS? Pois é, se você ousasse recrutar mais neurônios, além do tico e o teco, se é que há mais neurônios por aí, saberia que já há tratamento eficaz. Agora cê só quer lacrar, keep going, I really don't care!!
Comment 4 @InteractorB	9 10	Por que vários lugares do mundo já descartaram a hidroxiquina como tratamento então? Será que querem deixar o povo sofrendo? Ou você quer porque o “mito” falou que é eficaz?
Comment 5 @InteractorA	11 12	Ô filho, passa vergonha não... deixa de seguir o tocador de trombeta do apocalipse e retuitá-lo. Veja se seus dois neurônios conseguem decifrar este estudo aqui [link]
Comment 6 @InteractorA	13	Se esforce um pouquinho mais e leia estas matérias aqui! [link]
Comment 7 @InteractorA	14 15 16	Se a Itália há um tempo atrás era modelo a ser seguido em isolamento, cantoria nas varandas e tal, me diga porque hoje, que faz o tratamento precoce com hidroxiquina, [ela] sumiu do noticiário no Brasil? [link]

Comment 8 @InteractorB	17 18 19	Mimimi 2 neurônios. Os gado do Bolsonaro só sabem falar isso. Estimulem mesmo os idiotas a tomarem esse remédio e sofrerem problemas cardíacos e tirem o medicamento de quem precisa
Comment 9 @InteractorA	20 21 22 23	Ahhhh puta que pariu, traga argumentos. Esse papo de gado já cansou e não cola. Gado assumido sano, vocês que estando no caminho do abismo por pura birra! Você sabe que existem medicamentos que tratam arritmias e que elas não são mortais? Tô com vergonha da sua burrice explícita! Se enxerga idiota
Comment 10 @InteractorA	24 25 26	Quando chegar a sua vez, vou esperar o agravamento do quadro e te colocar na Ventilação Mecânica com Volume Corrente bem alto e PEEP baixo, assim você vai de encontro ao capeta mais rápido!!
Comment 11 @InteractorA	27 28 29 30	Foi exatamente isso que fizeram seus camaradas comunistas que se dizem médicos no Amazonas, ao administrar 12g de substância análoga à hidroxicloroquina, sendo que a bula referente 2,5g de dosagem máxima. Legal, né? Sabe por quê? Por birra, não gostam do gado e do Bozogro. Acho que posso fazer o mesmo, concorda?
Comment 12 @InteractorB	31 32	Que comunista? Kkkk eu votei no Bolsonaro, mas tenho decência e bom senso de ver que ele tá sendo um imbecil e já deveria ter sido expulso da presidência
Comment 13 @InteractorA	33 34 35	Você pode votar em quem quiser, isso não me diz respeito. Suas palavras só deixam explícito o quão raso você é. Melhor não palpar sobre o que não sabe, não entende. A cada resposta fico com mais vergonha de você!!

Source: Twitter (2020).