

## Editorial

# Comparative discourse analysis and other comparative approaches in language sciences

---

**Daniela Nienkötter Sardá** 

Universidade de São Paulo, São Paulo, Brazil

danielasarda@gmail.com

<http://orcid.org/0000-0002-7128-2469>

---

**Urbano Cavalcante Filho** 

Instituto Federal da Bahia, Ilhéus, Brazil

Universidade Estadual de Santa Cruz, Ilhéus, Brazil

urbanocavalcante@gmail.com

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1429-5300>

---

**Yuri Andrei Batista Santos** 

Universidade de São Paulo, São Paulo, Brazil

Université Paris Cité, Paris, França

batista.yuriandrei@gmail.com

<http://orcid.org/0000-0002-3805-0586>

---

**Paulo Roberto Gonçalves-Segundo** 

Universidade de São Paulo, São Paulo, Brazil

paulosegundo@usp.br

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5592-8098>

---

Comparative discourse analysis is a relatively new field of study in Brazil. Part of the domain of language sciences, it aims at comparing not only different languages but also distinct cultures. It is inspired by the comparative analysis that originated in France and assumes a role of extreme relevance in a contemporary horizon marked by multiculturalism and the constant dissolution of physical distances that used to mark social, cultural, and linguistic borders.

In France, the group Cediscor (*Centre de recherche sur les discours ordinaires et spécialisés*), now Clesthia (*axe sens et discours*<sup>1</sup>) was responsible, in the 2000s, for creating a research group around the comparison of languages and cultures. In the words of Claudel et al. (2013, p. 16),

[The] perspective adopted in the field of contrastive discourse analysis by the doctoral students, Ph.D.s, and teachers/researchers linked to Cediscor led to the

---

<sup>1</sup> For the history of the French laboratory CEDISCOR, see <https://journals.openedition.org/cediscor/1554>. Retrieved June 21, 2022.

formation of a research axis named Comparison, language, and culture in discourse perspectives, and, with it, to the “comparison” group.<sup>2</sup>

Already in the early 1990s, researcher Sophie Moirand – an interviewee of this issue – laid the basis for such a comparison in an article entitled “Des choix méthodologiques pour une linguistique de discours comparative” (“Methodological choices for comparative discourse linguistics”). A topic raised in this article, published in 1992 in the journal *Langages*, was the discussion of the establishment of comparable categories.<sup>3</sup> As the leader of Cediscor, Moirand guided several comparative works:

The comparative work carried out at the Center for Research on Ordinary and Specialized Discourses (Cediscor) at the University of Paris 3 dates to the early 1990s. Since then, several dissertations on genres such as tourist booklets, news broadcasting, reports, and press interviews, in languages as diverse as French, German, Spanish, American English, and Japanese, have been defended under the supervision of Sophie Moirand (F. Mourlhon-Dallies 1995, P. von Münchow 2001, B. Foureau-Facques 2001, Ch. Claudel 2002). Subsequently, other dissertations have adopted a contrastive perspective. This is the case in the study by G. Cislaru (2005) on the names of countries in the French media, referring to English, Romanian and Russian; the study by G. Tréguer-Felten (2009a) on English as a lingua franca in the documents of Chinese, French and North American professionals; and the study by P. Brunner (2011, 2014) on the use of the words “vague” in French and “vage” in German.<sup>4,5</sup> (CLAUDEL et al., 2013, p. 15)

Thus, under Sophie Moirand's supervision, each researcher made progress, in their research, in constructing a theoretical and methodological framework for the comparison of discourses. Chantal Claudel (2002), for instance, develops a methodology for the comparison

<sup>2</sup> “La perspective adoptée dans le champ de l’analyse de discours contrastive par des doctorants, des docteurs et des enseignants-chercheurs rattachés au Cediscor a conduit à la formation d’un axe de recherche intitulé: Comparaison, langue et culture dans des perspectives discursives et ce faisant, au groupe ‘comparaison’”.

<sup>3</sup> For an overview of this discussion, see Sardá (2021).

<sup>4</sup> “Les travaux menés en comparaison au sein du Centre de recherche sur les discours ordinaires et spécialisés (Cediscor) de l’université Paris 3 datent du début des années 1990. Depuis lors différentes thèses sur des genres comme les écrits touristiques, le journal télévisé, le reportage et l’interview de presse dans des langues aussi diversifiées que le français, l’allemand, l’espagnol, l’anglo-américain et le japonais ont été soutenues sous la direction de Sophie Moirand (F. Mourlhon-Dallies 1995, P. von Münchow 2001, B. Foureau-Facques 2001, Ch. Claudel 2002). Par la suite, d’autres thèses ont adopté une perspective contrastive. Il en est ainsi de l’étude effectuée par G. Cislaru (2005) sur les noms de pays dans la presse française avec référence à l’anglais, au roumain et au russe, de celle de G. Tréguer-Felten (2009a) sur l’anglais comme lingua franca dans des documents de professionnels chinois, français et nord-américains et de celle de P. Brunner (2011, 2014) sur l’usage des mots ‘vague’ en français et ‘vage’ en allemand.”

<sup>5</sup> Also under the supervision of Sophie Moirand (in a collaboration between the Université Sorbonne Nouvelle and the University of São Paulo), there is Michele Pordeus Ribeiro’s dissertation, defended in 2015 and named “‘Right’ and ‘left’ in the discourses of an electoral event. A semantic and comparative study of the Brazilian and French press.” Ribeiro’s thesis inaugurates the field of comparisons between Brazilian and French language-cultures. In the same year, Daniela Nienkötter Sardá – whose master thesis was supervised by Sophie Moirand – defended a Ph.D. dissertation at the Université Paris Cité (former Université Paris Descartes) on the comparison of discourses of French and Brazilian philosophy textbooks, under the supervision of Patricia von Münchow. Currently, Yuri Andrei Batista Santos is preparing his Ph.D. dissertation in a collaboration between the University of São Paulo and the Université Paris Cité, supervised by Sheila Grillo and Patricia von Münchow, comparing a corpus of Brazilian and Austrian autobiographies.

of distant languages, such as French and Japanese. Geneviève Tréguer-Felten (2009) discusses in detail, in her dissertation, the concept of culture. Patricia von Münchow, on the other hand – whose recent article is translated in this issue of *Linha D'Água* – has made progress, in her dissertation on television news in France and Germany (2001)<sup>6</sup>, in the construction of a theoretical and methodological framework for what she calls, following Moirand's nomenclature, “comparative discourse linguistics” and, later, “contrastive discourse analysis” (*analyse du discours contrastive*)<sup>7</sup>.

From a theoretical viewpoint, it is discourse analysis, as it originated and is currently performed in France, that unites all the aforementioned research (cf. CLAUDEL et al., 2013, p. 16). From a methodological perspective, a consensual issue among researchers working with comparative/contrastive discourse analysis in France is the fact that the comparison between language-cultures should start from a comparable corpus – from a *tertium comparationis*, that is, from an invariant, which ensures the possibility of comparison. Besides other elements that can be the basis of the common ground for comparison, genre plays a prominent role:

In CDA [contrastive discourse analysis], genre is thus both the starting point for constructing the corpus (in other words, the invariant of comparison) and the “level of representativity,” that is, the (provisional) endpoint of description and interpretation (von Münchow 2010b, p. 2-3) (CLAUDEL et al., 2013, p. 18)<sup>8</sup>

According to von Münchow's perspective, another essential methodological point is paying the attention to the categories of analysis, “because performing a comparative analysis founded on a single category can reinforce prejudices and stereotypes about a given culture” (SARDÁ, 2021, p. 160)<sup>9</sup>. In this line of cultural dimension, one can notice how the concept of discursive cultures plays a vital role in contrastive discourse analysis research, since it allows the visualization, on the one hand, of the different layers of social representations that circulate in a community and, on the other hand, of how these representations are discursively materialized through linguistic and non-linguistic elements. A discursive culture is defined, according to von Münchow (2021), by what can/cannot, should/should not be said in a discourse community; and, above all, by *how* something can/cannot, should/should not be said in that community.

<sup>6</sup> Later published in book format (Presses Sorbonne Nouvelle, 2004).

<sup>7</sup> The name “contrastive discourse analysis” seems predominant in France today, but it is not the only existing comparative approach to language-cultures. Grillo et al. (2021, p. 13) explain that in Brazil the term “comparative” is preferred because the term “contrastive” is linked, in the Brazilian scientific and linguistic community, to structuralism. Researcher Sheila Grillo also comments on this issue in her interview with Vanessa Barbosa in the current issue of *Linha D'Água*.

<sup>8</sup> “En ADC [analyse du discours contrastive], le genre discursif est donc à la fois le point de départ pour la constitution du corpus (autrement dit l'invariant de la comparaison) et le ‘niveau de représentativité’, c'est-à-dire qu'il constitue la fin – du moins provisoire – de la description et de l'interprétation (von Münchow 2010b, p. 2-3).”

<sup>9</sup> For a comprehensive overview of how contrastive discourse analysis is currently worked on in France, cf. von Münchow, 2021.

The way the comparative analysis described above is developed in Brazil, especially by the *Diálogo* group (CNPq/USP), has also been the object of several research projects<sup>10</sup> and academic events. One initiative to bring together French, Brazilian and Russian researchers was the organization, in 2017, of the first Brazilian-French-Russian Colloquium on Discourse Analysis:

[...] [the] colloquium occurs in the context of institutional exchanges between the research group DIÁLOGO (CNPq/University of São Paulo) and CEDISCOR (Centre de recherche sur les discours ordinaires et spécialisés, CLESTHIA, Université Sorbonne Nouvelle - Paris 3). The objective of this partnership [was] to promote a dialogue between different theoretical and methodological approaches in discourse analysis in Brazil, France, and Russia.<sup>11</sup>

As a result of this event, the publication *Analyse du discours et comparaison: enjeux théoriques et méthodologiques* was created; it was published by Peter Lang in 2021 and was reviewed, in this issue, by Michele Pordeus Ribeiro.

The *Diálogo* group (CNPq/USP) is led by Professors Sheila Viera de Camargo Grillo (USP) and Darya Alekseevna Schchukina (Saint Petersburg Mining University), and one of its research axes is comparative discourse analysis. Professor Grillo is also an interviewee on this issue.

In Brazil, comparative discourse analysis is characterized, predominantly, by its association with the theoretical and methodological reflections carried out by Bakhtin and his Circle. The works developed within it often resort to concepts and notions derived from the Bakhtinian theory of language – or, to use the expression coined by Brait (2006), from dialogical discourse analysis – and aims at describing, understanding, and explaining linguistic and discursive phenomena from different languages and cultures.

The first movement toward a connection between these two strands of discourse analysis (comparative and dialogical) occurred in 2016, in a pioneering article by Grillo and Glushkova, who set out to “build the foundations of a Bakhtinian-inspired theoretical-methodological approach for the comparison of discourses in distinct languages and cultures” (GRILLO; GLUSHKOVA, 2016, p. 70). The authors discuss the validity and productivity that Bakhtinian theory can promote in comparative discourse analysis; taking comparison as an attitude present in Bakhtinian thought, such a perspective makes it possible to observe similarities, differences, and varieties in the discursive production of different languages and cultures.

---

<sup>10</sup> Within the scope of post-doctoral research at the University of São Paulo under the supervision of Sheila Grillo, we would like to mention Maria Glushkova’s project, named “O gênero entrevista oral de divulgação científica: uma análise comparativa de discursos em russo e em português”, and Daniela Nienkötter Sardá’s project, named “Análise de revistas de divulgação de filosofia: uma contribuição para a consolidação da análise comparativa de discursos no Brasil,” both supported by the São Paulo Foundation (FAPESP). The idea of editing this issue on comparative discourse analysis emerged from Sardá’s project. We must also mention Urbano Cavalcante Filho’s post-doctoral project, named “Forma composicional e traços de didaticidade no discurso de divulgação científica no Brasil e na França: uma análise dialógico-comparativa de *Ciência Hoje* e *La Recherche*”.

<sup>11</sup> Available at <https://www.neldufpe.org/2017/08/i-coloquio-brasileiro-franco-russo-em.html>. Retrieved June 21st, 2022.

By laying the Bakhtinian theoretical foundations of comparative discourse analysis, that is, by bringing comparative analysis closer to Bakhtinian theory, the authors show that the comparative perspective – analyzing phenomena in different cultures and languages – appears in several texts by the Circle. First, in the 1920s, in “Author and Hero in the Aesthetic Activity,” one can see a comparative perspective when Bakhtin takes authors and works from different cultures to forge the theoretical framework concerning the relationship between the character and its author. Besides that, comparison appears when Bakhtin sets out to build his theory of the novel – it “is based on a broad analysis of the romanesque genre in different European languages and cultures” (GRILLO; GLUSHKOVA, 2016, p. 71), building upon examples of the novels by Dickens, Sterne, Rabelais, Cervantes, and Turguêniev. Third, in the 1970s, and still in the footsteps of a comparative methodology, in a methodological perspective of comparison between cultures, the authors point out that Bakhtin

suggests two tasks for literary studies: first, to understand literature in relation to the contemporary culture of which it is a part – in other words, to study the literary sphere in relation to other cultural spheres (religion, morality, science, journalism, everyday ideology, etc.); second, to study the literary work in the “great time,” seeking its links with works from the near and distant past to identify visions and assimilations of aspects of the world – traditional and innovative – that are revealed favorably through genres (GRILLO; GLUSHKOVA, 2016, p. 72).

Finally, comparison as an omnipresent methodological procedure in Bakhtinian work is a “counterpoint between various spheres of human activity or culture.” To support this thesis, the authors argue that, for Bakhtin, in “The Problem of Content, Material, and Form in Verbal Art” (1993[1924]), each sphere of human communication justifies its existence in its borders with other spheres; in the relations, therefore, established between them. In short, it is in the relationship with the other that we perceive the constitution of the meanings between one and the other.

The specificity and the emphasis of the work in comparative discourse analysis, as it has been done in Brazil, reside in the use of Bakhtinian theory for establishing new links between ideas. It is an approach that is characterized, simultaneously, by a dialogue with the theoretical foundations consolidated in comparative analysis, as done in France, and by a constant effort to link specific methodological assumptions. This is the case, for instance, of the invocation of Bakhtinian metalinguistics in comparative analyses, starting from observations that go beyond the description and explanation of linguistic aspects of language phenomena, to reach extralinguistic aspects, such as social, political, ideological, and cultural issues, which condition and influence the linguistic and discursive production. This, therefore, has been the hallmark of comparative discourse analysis that we may call Brazilian.

This is how a comparative discourse analysis in Brazil has been established, both from the epistemological and theoretical-methodological points of view, in several institutional research projects, from undergraduate studies to post-doctoral research, through masters theses and doctoral dissertations. Such research is dedicated to the study of discourse production in different languages and cultures, in situations of discourse interaction, and is based on the

establishment of a *tertium comparationis* and the principle of comparability in the analysis of various semiotic phenomena.

In performing comparative discourse analysis, whether in France or Brazil, the element of comparability is the first methodological principle of the investigation. As Grillo and Glushkova advocate in the aforementioned essay on comparative discourse analysis in Brazil:

Genre is a key operational concept in the methodology of corpora building and interpretation, as it is the invariant of departure that provides the constant element needed for comparison of cultures and at the same time the “level of representativeness” or purpose of description and interpretation (GRILLO; GLUSHKOVA, 2016, p. 75).

Therefore, research on utterances from different ideological spheres – scientific, corporate, political, and literary, among others –, and materialized through genres of different languages and cultures, have indicated theoretical paths, methodological directions, and analytical possibilities that contribute to the consolidation of this strand of discourse analysis in Brazil. We can mention the “economic forum session” (cf. GLUSHKOVA, 2018) and “linguistics textbooks” (cf. GRILLO, 2020; MESQUITA; GRILLO, 2021), in Brazilian and Russian language-cultures; “cover stories of magazines of scientific and philosophical dissemination” (cf. GRILLO; GLUSHKOVA, 2016; GRILLO; HIGASHI, 2017; SARDÁ, 2020, 2021, 2022; CAVALCANTE FILHO, 2018, 2020, 2021), in Brazilian and Russian language-cultures, on the one hand, and Brazilian and French language-cultures, on the other; “autobiographies” (cf. SANTOS; TORGA; CAVALCANTE FILHO, 2018; SANTOS, in preparation), in Brazilian, Spanish and Austrian language-cultures; “scientific articles” (cf. SILVA; GRILLO, 2021), in Brazilian and Chilean language-cultures; “academic abstracts” (cf. GLUSHKOVA; FERREIRA, 2018) in Brazilian and Russian language-cultures; “scientific curiosities videos” (cf. AZEVEDO E SILVA; GRILLO, 2019), in Brazilian and North American language-cultures; “scientific dissemination blogs” (cf. MACHADO, 2018, 2021), in Brazilian and Portuguese language-cultures; “testimonials” (cf. CUNHA; CORRÊA, 2018), in Brazilian and French language-cultures; and, finally, “argumentative dissertation” (cf. SARDÁ; BARBOSA, 2021), in Brazilian and French language-cultures.

It is not only the Bakhtinian concept of discourse genre that has been valued and claimed for the performance of comparative analyses; other equally important notions derived from dialogical discourse analysis, and often elevated to categories of linguistic, enunciative, and/or discursive analysis (cf. SARDÁ, 2021), are also employed. In the various studies of comparative analysis of genres already mentioned, the concepts of utterance, social/evaluative purview, great time, forms employed for reporting speech, dialogism, heteroglossia, evaluative intonations, dialogical relations, compositional form, style, use and tense of verbal mood, authorship, sphere/field, addressing, among others, appear as categories of analysis. The variety of genres, concepts, and analyses show, on the one hand, the productivity of the interplay of dialogic analysis with comparative discourse analysis; on the other hand, they signal the multiple possibilities that the interplay of the two strands offers. Such interplay has been called

dialogic-comparative analysis (cf. CAVALCANTE FILHO, 2018, 2021), Bakhtinian-inspired comparative discourse analysis, and comparative dialogic discourse analysis (cf. SARDÁ, 2021).

Comparison, however, is not a new theme in language sciences. Approaches anchored in comparison as a method are present in different areas of the field, assuming different characteristics according to the characteristics of the objects of study in each area. In the field of linguistics, strands such as comparative linguistics present a long trajectory of research in which comparison is presented as a path for the study of various linguistic phenomena.

As mentioned by Grillo (2020), the occurrence of different comparative/contrastive processes in language studies was observed as early as the 17th century, and, “since then, a system of analytical procedures was established, which was used for the discovery of common and specific aspects among the languages investigated, whose productivity depended on an adequate delimitation of similar phenomena” (p. 2).

Wilhelm von Humboldt's works were precursors in contributing to the perception of language in its concrete relationship with its uses and external elements (historical, geographical, etc.). Among these works, some present a unique vision of the productivity of comparison, considering the dynamic interrelation of languages, besides contributing to the development of comparative grammar. When he proposes the “study of languages in general,” Humboldt does so through comparisons between languages, generally of very different natures, such as Sanskrit and Chinese (MILANI, 2012).

In the 19th century, the contributions of the German philologist Franz Bopp stand out, thanks to the way he consolidated comparative grammar into a methodological plan to study the genetic relations between Indo-European languages. The work of his contemporary Jacob Grimm on comparative phonetics is another relevant point in the diffusion of a comparative perspective in the construction of knowledge about language. Both scholars gave visibility to comparison as a method for investigating languages, which had an important influence on different works on grammar and, beyond it, Ferdinand de Saussure.

In a line close to the contributions to the philosophy of language by Bakhtin and the Circle, we cannot fail to mention the construction of a sociological method for the language sciences by Valentin Voloshinov. In *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language* (2017[1929]), especially in the third part of the book, one can see the employment of the sociological method in a comparative analysis of the forms used for reporting speech, which highlights the category of free indirect speech. He mentions a relevant quantity of examples of distinct literary works and authors from Russian, French, and German backgrounds, as well as theoretical positions of scholars who investigated similar phenomena in these languages. In this cultural encounter – observable through the composition of Voloshinov's analytical gesture, as well as in the ascertainment of the singular forms of each language in their respective contexts – it is

important to understand the intercultural influence of the exchanges in linguistic studies at that time.

Comparison can be conceived as a natural and legitimate form of human thought, as Franco (2000) suggests, from the viewpoint of the relational capacity that the subject has when facing the unknown, for example. The perception of “One” associated with the “Other” is inherent to human activities. Relational thinking enables us to conceptualize comparison as viable methodological principles in several fields of expertise. We start from a common ground of already constructed relationships between the objects of knowledge to set up other unique relationships.

Comparing, in this sense, requires knowledge of the different realities in contact, which are tied in terms of the questions to be answered by the connections established between the objects, the subjects of knowledge, and the external context. The arrangement of these pieces in the situation of interaction emphasizes the situational aspect and, simultaneously, the inexhaustible character of the comparative possibilities concerning time and the being-as-event (BAKHTIN, 2017).

---

This issue received contributions from researchers from several Brazilian and foreign universities. There are nine papers, as well as a translation of a recent paper published in the French journal *Langage & Société*. Furthermore, this issue includes two interviews and a review of a book recently published abroad on discourse analysis and comparison.

Elaine Anderson-Joseph, a researcher at Université Sorbonne Nouvelle - Paris 3, France, in her article entitled “Comparing English and French for Business Coursebooks: A Cross-Cultural Discourse Analysis”<sup>12</sup>, presents an analysis of business language coursebooks published in France and the United Kingdom, two countries with different languages and cultures, based on the theoretical and methodological apparatus of cross-cultural discourse analysis. As such, the author chooses business language manuals in English and French to analyze the representation of women in these discourses. Through contrastive analysis, based on similar situations but in linguistic contexts of different communities, the research enables observations that, according to the author, might not be noticed in an analysis restricted to a single context. Along these observations, the study reveals that French textbooks impose the representation of a specific type of woman, unlike the English textbooks. These observations show how stereotypes and mental models about what it means to be a man or woman in the business world seem naturalized to such an extent that they go unnoticed by the authors and end up incorporated into pedagogical content.

---

<sup>12</sup> “Cross-Cultural Discourse Analysis” is a translation of *analyse du discours contrastive*.



Martina Ronci, a researcher at the Université Paris Cité in France, in her article “A cross-cultural discourse analysis of the way readers are constructed”, compares foreign language textbooks for teaching French and English in Japanese high schools in 2017–2018. The contrastive analysis employs two analytic categories to investigate “how textbook authors address their readers/learners”.<sup>13</sup> The originality of the study lies in the corpus analyzed – studies on language teaching in Japan through a cross-cultural approach are rare. As the author states in the introduction, the analysis is based on linguistics rather than didactics. Furthermore, the article gives an overview of contrastive discourse analysis –, which is of particular interest in this thematic issue – and shows, in practice, how an analysis of different language-cultures can be implemented following such a theoretical and methodological framework.

Urbano Cavalcante Filho, a researcher at the Federal Institute of Bahia (IFBA) and the State University of Santa Cruz (UESC), in the paper “Dialogism and heterodiscourse in the Brazilian and French scientific dissemination: a dialogical-comparative analysis,” presents an example of comparative discourse analysis as it is currently practiced in Brazil, through a Bakhtinian perspective. This work investigates the different manifestations of the Other in the discursive construction of scientific dissemination in a Brazilian-French corpus composed of issues of science popularization magazines: *Ciência Hoje* and *La recherche*. In parallel to Bakhtin's work on heteroglossia (or *heterodiscourse*) in novels, the analyses highlight the internal dialogization which is characteristic of the discourse in science communication, in both cultures and languages, emphasizing the importance of voices orchestrated and governed by the disseminator when establishing a dialogue between spheres, genres, and subjects in the constitution of his project of speaking.

In a paper entitled “The teaching of argumentation in Argentina and Brazil: similarities and differences in curriculum guidelines,” Yuri Andrei Batista Santos and Sheyla Fabrícia Alves de Lima, researchers at Université Paris Cité and the State University of Santa Cruz (UESC), respectively, also base their analysis of Brazilian and Argentinian language-cultures in comparative discourse analysis. Basing their assertions on two curriculum guideline documents that guide the teaching of argumentation in high school – namely *Núcleos de Aprendizajes Prioritarios* (NAP) in Argentina, and *Base Nacional Comum Curricular* (BNCC) in Brazil, the researchers posit that the discourses concerning the teaching of argumentation in these two countries, although related to argumentation activities and the development of linguistic competencies in contextualized communicative situations, lack a theoretical basis to support and justify their practices, and are therefore limited to the proposition of objectives that do not favor the development of pedagogical practices.

Vanessa Roma da Silva and Élide Paulina Ferreira, researchers at the State University of Santa Cruz (UESC), in the article “Comparative analysis of two translations of Lorca's *Yerma* into Portuguese”, drawing on Derrida's ideas on translation, understood as the regulated

---

<sup>13</sup> “la manière dont les auteurs des manuels s'adressent à leurs lecteurs/apprenants.”

transformation of one language into another, analyzed the translations by Meireles (1963) and Mota (2000) of Frederico García Lorca's *Yerma*. The researchers conclude that the translation choices, manifested in operations such as textual deletions and additions, naming and describing characters, selecting vocabulary, and choosing grammatical and syntactic-semantic structures, “provided different effects of meaning and different readings” of the work. The comparative study of the two translations also showed how the translators' interpretations bestow different representations and new perspectives on *Yerma*.

The paper by Rodrigo Moura Lima de Aragão, a researcher at the University of São Paulo (USP), entitled “96–8–3–2: Signs of lexical priming in academic article introductions,” investigates how functionally similar expressions behave in different languages and academic disciplines. Based on lexical priming theory, the author analyzed occurrences of scope transition expressions in introductions of academic articles in English, Portuguese, and Japanese, considering the areas of pediatrics and management in these different languages and cultures. The proposed comparative paradigm summarizes the trajectory of comparative studies regarding academic and scientific language, presents singularities in the analyzed occurrences according to the respective languages and areas, and contributes to the field of academic translation and the teaching of languages for specific purposes.

Jean Carlos da Silva Gomes, an affiliate researcher at the University of the Air Force (UNIFA) and the Federal University of Rio de Janeiro (UFRJ), in the article “Theoretical considerations on telicity: a comparative approach”, compares how telicity – defined by the author as “semantic aspectual values characterized by a linguistically delimited endpoint in the sentence” – can be realized in different languages, namely, Portuguese, Spanish, English, Bulgarian, Dutch, Karitian, Sateré-mawé, Dâw, and Japanese.<sup>14</sup> Gomes “reviews the literature on how telicity can be expressed linguistically [in these different languages] [...] to develop theoretical considerations about this semantic aspectual category”. The aim is to compare the behavior of a linguistic category – in this case, telicity – in different languages. Such a study contributes to the scientific advancement in the field of semantics: the comparison of the same category in different languages enables the understanding of the commonalities of this category in all of them. Therefore, this study allows the author to conclude that telicity has “a different status from the other aspectual semantic values, which are considered lexical features of the verb.”

Maria Caroline dos Santos Fonseca and Roana Rodrigues, researchers at the Federal University of Sergipe (UFSE), in the article “A typology of verbal fixed expressions in Peninsular Spanish: a preliminary and comparative study”, compare crystallized expressions

---

<sup>14</sup> Here one can note how this paper's approach differs in comparison to the previous papers. Comparing more than three language-cultures within the framework of contrastive discourse analysis is challenging since it requires knowledge of the context (the culture) in which these languages circulate. Of course, none of the approaches can be said to be superior to the other: they have different goals (Gomes' study is strictly linguistic, whereas comparative discourse analysis involves other areas of knowledge – it is, therefore, interdisciplinary, as discourse analysis itself is).

from Peninsular Spanish – such as “*perderse la cabeza*” – and its equivalents in Brazilian Portuguese. The researchers analyzed 20 crystalized verbal expressions and classified them according to “their syntactic-semantic properties.” This study proved to be promising. In the closing remarks, the authors discuss the importance of expanding the corpus of crystallized expressions for an in-depth analysis of “distinct syntactic-semantic phenomena in the two languages, such as reflexive constructions and the selection of specific prepositions in the constitution of base sentences”.

Samah Habachi, from the Université de Carthage, Tunisia, presents in the article “Reduction of constructions of the infinitive complement of verbs marking the course of the action, verbs expressing refusal and saying verbs” a diachronic study of variation in the infinitive complement constructions of verbs in French, based on a corpus from the Frantext database. The study allows us to understand verb constructions of contemporary French, and therefore may contribute to other areas, such as French language teaching.

The article by the Université Paris Cité's researcher Patricia von Münchow, entitled “The Nation and Europe in French and German History Textbooks: A Cross-Cultural Discourse Analysis” is now available in Brazilian Portuguese thanks to the translation by Daniela Nienkötter Sardá (USP) and Guilherme Soares dos Santos (Université Paris-Sorbonne). Originally published in *Langage et Société*, the article consists of a corpus regarding chapters dealing with the First World War in eleven history textbooks recently published in France and Germany, using contrastive discourse analysis as a theoretical and methodological framework. The author shows how the images of the Self and the Other are constructed differently in the textbooks of each language-culture.

Furthermore, the issue includes two interviews that contemplate the origins of comparative discourse analysis in France and Brazil. Sophie Moirand, emeritus researcher at Université Sorbonne Nouvelle - Paris 3, was interviewed by Camila Ribeiro, researcher at La Rochelle Université. Moirand tells us about her personal history, from her beginnings as a researcher of FLE (French as a foreign language) to becoming a reference in discourse analysis in France. She also talks about her relationship with Brazil and other Latin American countries and explores the theme of discourse comparison. Sheila Vieira de Camargo Grillo, a researcher and professor at the University of São Paulo (USP), was interviewed by Vanessa Fonseca Barbosa, also from USP. In the interview, we learn how her research trajectory introduced comparative discourse analysis in Brazil. Furthermore, Sheila Grillo discusses the productivity of Bakhtinian concepts in comparative discourse analysis and highlights paths for comparative studies in language sciences.

To close this issue, researcher Michele Pordeus Ribeiro, from the Université Sorbonne Nouvelle - Paris 3 and the Universidade de São Paulo (USP), presents a review of the book *Analyse du discours et comparaison: enjeux théoriques et méthodologiques* (“Discourse analysis and comparison: theoretical and methodological challenges”), recently issued by Peter Lang. Ribeiro presents a complete and thorough overview of the book, which gathers contributions from twelve researchers from France, Brazil, and Russia.

This issue would not have been possible without the help of numerous reviewers, from Brazilian and foreign institutions: Federal University of Amazonas (UFAM), in the North region; State University of Santa Cruz (UESC), State University of Feira de Santana (UEFS), Federal University of Rio Grande do Norte (UFRN), Federal Institute of Bahia (IFBA) and Catholic University of Pernambuco (UNICAP), in the Northeast region; University of Brasília (UnB), in the Midwest region; Federal University of Espírito Santo (UFES), Federal University of São Carlos (UFSCar), State University of Campinas (UNICAMP), University of Taubaté (UNITAU) and University of São Paulo (USP), in the Southeast region; Federal University of Paraná (UFPR), State University of Maringá (UEM), State University of Paraná (UNESPAR), Federal University of Rio Grande (FURG), Catholic University of Rio Grande do Sul (PUC/RS) and Federal University of Pelotas (UFPel), in the South region; Universidad Complutense de Madrid, in Spain; La Rochelle Université, Université Sorbonne Nouvelle - Paris 3 and Université Paris Nanterre, in France; and Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana, in Mexico. We express, here, our gratitude. We also thank FAPESP (The São Paulo Research Foundation) for funding the research "Autobiography in discursive contrasts: memories, discourses, and dialogues" (process no. 2019/02188-3) and the editorial team of *Linha D'Água*, who was responsible, among other things, for essential tasks such as proofreading, translation, and layout.

We wish you an excellent reading!

São Paulo, July 2022.

## Funding

Yuri Andrei Batista Santos would like to thank FAPESP (The São Paulo Research Foundation) for funding the research "Autobiography in discursive contrasts: memories, discourses, and dialogues" (process no. 2019/02188-3).

## References

AZEVEDO E SILVA, B. A. de; GRILLO, S. V. de C. New Paths for Science: A Contrastive Discourse Analysis of Modifications in Popularizing Science through Digital Media. *Bakhtiniana*, vol. 14, n. 1, p. 51-73, 2019. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1590/2176-457336377>.

BAKHTIN, M. *O problema do conteúdo, do material e da forma na criação literária*. In: *Questões de literatura e de estética. A teoria do romance*. 3. ed. Trad. A. F. Bernadini et al. São Paulo: UNESP/HUCITEC, 1993. p. 13-70.

## LINHA D'ÁGUA

BAKHTIN, M. *Notas sobre literatura, cultura e ciências humanas*. Trad. Paulo Bezerra. São Paulo: Editora 34, 2017.

BRAIT, B. Análise e teoria do discurso. In: BRAIT, B. (org.). *Bakhtin: outros conceitos-chave*. São Paulo: Contexto, 2006. p. 9-31.

CAVALCANTE FILHO, U. Traces de didacticité dans la vulgarisation scientifique: une analyse dialogique-comparative du discours de *Ciência Hoje* et de *La Recherche*. In: GRILLO, S. V. de C.; REBOUL-TOURÉ, S.; GLUSHKOVA, M. (org.). *Analyse du discours et comparaison: enjeux théoriques et méthodologiques*. Bruxelles: Peter Lang, 2021. p. 221-245.

CAVALCANTE FILHO, U. Dialogia e comparação em embate e complementação: anotações metodológicas para uma análise do discurso da divulgação científica. *Polifonia*, v. 27, n° 49, p. 437-454, 2020. Disponível em: <https://periodicoscientificos.ufmt.br/ojs/index.php/polifonia/article/view/10757>. Acesso em: 21 jun. 2022.

CAVALCANTE FILHO, U. A construção composicional em enunciados de divulgação científica: uma análise dialógico-comparativa de *Ciência Hoje* e *La Recherche*. *Linha D'Água*, São Paulo, v. 31, n. 3, p. 99-120, 2018. Disponível em: <http://www.revistas.usp.br/linhadagua/article/view/149667>. Acesso em: 21 jun. 2022.

CLAUDEL, C. *Comparaison du genre interview de presse en français et en japonais: une approche énonciative et pragmatique à travers la notion translangagière de figure*. Tese de doutorado. Université Sorbonne Nouvelle – Paris 3, 2002.

CLAUDEL, C.; MÜNCHOW, P. von; RIBEIRO, M. P.; PUGNIÈRE-SAAVEDRA, F.; TRÉGUER-FELTEN, G. Langue, discours et culture: vingt ans de recherche en comparaison. In: CLAUDEL, C. *et al.* (org.). *Cultures, discours, langues: Nouveaux abordages*. Limoges: Lambert-Lucas, 2013. p. 15-45.

CUNHA, G. X.; CORRÊA, T. E. A construção de imagens de si como um fenômeno enunciativo: estudo comparativo de depoimentos brasileiro e francês publicados na revista *Marie Claire*. *Linha D'Água*, v. 31, n. 3, 2018, p. 142-165. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.11606/issn.2236-4242.v31i3p142-165>.

FRANCO, M. C. Quando nós somos o outro: questões teórico-metodológicas sobre os estudos comparados. *Educação e Sociedade*, Campinas, vol. XXI, n° 72, p. 197-230, 2000. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0101-73302000000300011>.

GLUSHKOVA, M. A comparative analysis of the scientific-political-business discourse in Brazil and Russia. *Alfa*, v. 62, n. 3, 2018, p. 447-468. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1590/1981-5794-1811-1>.

GLUSHKOVA, M.; FERREIRA, R. B. Análise comparativa estilística do gênero resumo: um estudo de caso nas publicações científicas no Brasil e na Rússia. *Linha D'Água*, v. 31, n. 3, 2018, p. 45-72. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.11606/issn.2236-4242.v31i3p45-72>.

GRILLO, S. V. de C. A linguistics in Brazilian and Soviet textbooks. *Alfa*, v. 64, 2020, p. 1-30. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1590/1981-5794-e11752>.

GRILLO, S. V. de C.; GLUSHKOVA, M. Scientific Popularization in Brazil and in Russia: An Essay to a Comparative Analysis of Discourses. *Bakhtiniana*, v. 11, 2016, p. 69-92. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1590/2176-57323556>.

GRILLO, S. V. C.; HIGACHI, A. Enunciados verbo-visuais na divulgação científica no Brasil e na Rússia: as revistas *Scientific American Brasil* e *V Mire Nauki* (No mundo da ciência). In: KOZMA, E. V. B.; PUZZO, M. B. (org.). *Múltiplas linguagens: discurso e efeito de sentido*. Campinas: Pontes, 2017. p. 91-130.

GRILLO, S. V. de C.; REBOUL-TOURÉ, S.; GLUSHKOVA, M.; MACHADO, F. S. Introduction: comparaison, invariance et altérité. In: GRILLO, S. V. de C.; REBOUL-TOURÉ, S.; GLUSHKOVA, M. (Orgs). *Analyse du discours et comparaison: enjeux théoriques et méthodologiques*. Bruxelles: Peter Lang, 2021, p. 13-32.

MACHADO, F. S. Aspects de la divulgation scientifique dans les blogs brésiliens. In: GRILLO, S. V. de C.; REBOUL-TOURÉ, S.; GLUSHKOVA, M. (orgs.). *Analyse du discours et comparaison: enjeux théoriques et méthodologiques*. Bruxelles: Peter Lang, 2021. p. 201-220.

MACHADO, F. S. Análise comparativa de blogs de divulgação científica em português: a descoberta científica em perspectiva. *Linha D'Água*, São Paulo, v. 31, n. 3, 2018, p. 73-97. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.11606/issn.2236-4242.v31i3p73-97>.

MESQUITA, I. B. de.; GRILLO, S. V. de C. Análise comparativa e tradução sob o viés da metalinguística de Bakhtin: Cours de Linguistique Générale nas traduções ao russo e ao português. *Cadernos de Tradução*. v. 41, n. 2, 2021. p. 400-427. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5007/2175-7968.2021.e75124>.

MILANI, S.E. *Historiografia Linguística de Wilhelm von Humboldt: Conceitos e Métodos*. Jundiaí: Paco Editorial, 2012.

MOIRAND, S. Des choix méthodologiques pour une linguistique de discours comparative. *Langages*, n. 105, p. 28-41, 1992. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3406/lgge.1992.1622>.

MÜNCHOW, P. von. *L'analyse du discours contrastive: Théorie, méthodologie, pratique*. Limoges: Éditions Lambert-Lucas, 2021.

MÜNCHOW, P. von. *Les journaux télévisés en France et en Allemagne: Plaisir de voir ou devoir de s'informer*. Paris: Presses Sorbonne Nouvelle, 2004.

MÜNCHOW, P. von. *Contribution à la construction d'une linguistique de discours comparative: entrées dans le genre journal télévisé français et allemand*. Tese de doutorado. Université Sorbonne Nouvelle – Paris 3, 2001.

RIBEIRO, M. P. *“Droite” et “gauche” dans les discours d'un événement électoral*. Une étude sémantique et contrastive des presses brésilienne et française. Tese de doutorado. Université Sorbonne Nouvelle – Paris 3/ Universidade de São Paulo, 2015.

SANTOS, Y. A. B. *A autobiografia em contrastes discursivos: memórias, discursos e diálogos [provisório]*. Tese de doutorado [em preparação]. Université Paris Cité/Universidade de São Paulo.

SANTOS, Y. A. B.; TORGA, V. L. M.; CAVALCANTE FILHO, U. Perspectivas de uma escrita de si: análise comparativa de discursos no gênero autobiografia. *Linha D'Água*, v. 31, p. 191-210, 2018. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.11606/issn.2236-4242.v31i3p191-210>.

SARDÁ, D. N. The discourses on veganism in philosophy popularisation magazines in Brazil and France. *Alfa*, vol. 66, 2022, p. 1-25. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1590/1981-5794-e14037>.

SARDÁ, D. N. Comparative Discourse Analysis in Brazil: A Reflection from the Notion of Category. *Bakhtiniana*, vol. 16, n. 2, 2021, p. 168-193. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1590/2176-457347892>.

SARDÁ, D. N. A divulgação da filosofia nas revistas Philosophie Magazine e Filosofia Ciência & Vida. *Cadernos de Estudos Linguísticos*, Campinas, SP, vol. 62, e020020, 2020, p. 1-15. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.20396/ce.l.v62i0.8660380>.

SARDÁ, D. N. *Les manuels de philosophie en France et au Brésil: une analyse du discours contrastive de la prise en charge énonciative*. Tese de doutorado. Université Paris Cité, 2015.

SARDÁ, D. N.; BARBOSA, V. F. Repertório sociocultural e gênero dissertativo-argumentativo na redação do ENEM e na dissertação de francês do BAC. *Desenredo*, vol. 17, n. 2, p. 273-305, 2021. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5335/rdes.v17i2.12619>.

SILVA, A. L.V.; GRILLO, S. V. de C. Especificidades do gênero artigo científico no Brasil e no Chile. *Macabéa*, v. 10, n. 3, p. 175-198, 2021. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47295/mren.v10i3.3222>.

TRÉGUER-FELTEN, G. *Le Leurre de l'anglais lingua franca*. Une étude comparative de documents professionnels produits en anglais par des locuteurs chinois, français et nord-américains. Tese de doutorado. Université Sorbonne Nouvelle – Paris 3, 2009.

VOLÓCHINOV, V. *Marxismo e filosofia da linguagem*: Problemas fundamentais do método sociológico na ciência da linguagem. Tradução, notas e glossário de Sheila Grillo e Ekaterina V. Américo. Ensaio introdutório de Sheila Grillo. São Paulo: Editora 34, 2017.

## Translated by

---

**André de Oliveira Matumoto** 

University of São Paulo, São Paulo, Brazil  
andrematamoto@usp.br  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3544-3576>

---

**Theodoro Casalotti Farhat** 

University of São Paulo, São Paulo, Brazil  
farhat@usp.br  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9646-6301>

---

**Verônica dos Santos Modolo** 

University of São Paulo, São Paulo, Brazil  
veronicamodolo@usp.br  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9355-136X>

---