# LINGUISTICS IN BRAZILIAN AND SOVIET TEXTBOOKS

Sheila Vieira de Camargo GRILLO*

▪ ABSTRACT: The objective of this article is to present the results of a research in the comparative analysis of Brazilian and Soviet Introductory Linguistics textbooks from the late 1960s to the early 1970s. The selection of the materials being compared was carried out using the *tertium comparationis* method, developed by researchers from the *Clesthia — axe sens et discours* group. The analysis of the textbooks was based on concepts and procedures developed by Bakhtin and the Circle. We conclude that, in the history of the science, in the two languages/cultures, the dialogue with linguistics developed in countries with a stronger tradition in the field and a broader social arena were factors that set limits, exerted pressures and directed meanings in the presentation of linguistics to the future researchers in this field of science. The interaction of these three sociohistorical processes are fundamental in the definition of the schools of linguistics, in the delimitation of the object of study of linguistics, and in the evaluation of its methods.

▪ KEYWORDS: Comparative discourse analysis. Introductory Textbooks on Linguistics. Brazil. The Soviet Union.

The theme of this research arose while writing the introduction to the new Brazilian translation of *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language: Fundamental Problems of the Sociological Method in the Science of Language* (2018 [1929]), in which the dialogue between German and Russian linguists/philosophers and Valentin Voloshinov was approached in order to constitute the sociological method. While carrying out this biographical research, evidence showed that concepts, and the work of prominent Russian linguists[1], were missing or scarcely represented in Brazilian linguistics and, therefore, there was clearly a need to review the Russian introductory textbooks, and those on the history of linguistics, to better situate the constitution of this discipline in Russia and the Soviet Union. The second determining factor in undertaking this investigation was the beginning of a comparative analysis project, that would make viable, on the one hand, researching utterances in the Russian language – language/

---

* Universidade de São Paulo (USP), Faculdade de Filosofia, Letras e Ciências Humanas, São Paulo - SP - Brasil. sheilagrillo@uol.com.br. ORCID: 0000-0003-0480-2660

[1] In Russian there are three designations for linguistics: *iazikoznánie* [knowledge of language], *iazikovedénie* [awareness/knowledge/study of language] and *lingvística* [linguistics]. The majority of Soviet and Russian textbooks use the first term.

culture with which I have worked closely over the past 10 years – and, on the other hand, allowing the establishment of a dialogue with Bakhtinian theory. In this context, this work aims to present the results of a comparative analysis of utterances on the constitution of Linguistics as it appears in Soviet and Brazilian introductory textbooks on this discipline, with the objective of understanding formative and distinctive aspects of Brazilian Linguistics, which only become evident through comparison with an academic sphere from which it is culturally and historically far removed.

From the 17th to the 18th centuries, procedures of contrastive comparison have been used in the analysis of different languages – without necessarily presenting a genetic link among them – with the purpose of creating bilingual dictionaries, general grammars and also creating the basis for foreign language teaching (KODUKHOV, 1974). Since then, a system of analytical procedures has been used to discover specific and shared aspects between the languages investigated, whose productivity depended on an adequate outlining of similar phenomena.

Works of literary analysis by Bakhtin are part of the comparative studies, since Bakhtin's research on the novel, through the works of Dostoyevsky and Rabelais, were always shaped by comparisons between literatures of different languages/cultures. Bakhtinian reflections, on the temporal, spatial and cultural distance of the individual, understood as being in relation to the object of study, are the result of a comparative approach to literature, which allows one to perceive the benefits of the dialogic encounter between cultures. The very basis of the existence of meaning is the encounter between one and the other:

> There can be no "contextual meaning in and of itself" – it exists only in conjunction with it. There cannot be a unified (single) contextual meaning. Therefore, there can be neither a first nor a last meaning; it always exists among other meanings. (BAKHTIN, 1996, p.146).[2]

A key methodological procedure developed by members of the Research Group CLESTHIA – ax sens et discours (Université Sorbonne Nouvelle Paris 3) for the comparison of distinct languages/cultures is the *tertium comparationis* (MÜNCHOW, 2017, 2013, 2011, 2005): a set of criteria of various types (discursive genres, historical moments, themes etc.) that establish the common basis needed for the comparison, or rather, the description and analysis of the prevailing representations of linguistics in the two countries/cultures. For this study, the *tertium comparationis* was carried out based on the following criteria:

---

[2]   Due to the broad dissemination of Bakhtinian theory in Brazil and the need to foreground results of the comparison, we will not designate a specific section to expound this theory, but, during the analysis of the textbooks, we briefly present the concepts needed to understand the article.

1.  The **research object** was delimited to the **discursive genre** "Introductory Textbook of Linguistics", which had been developed, for the most part, in the initial years of the creation of the Language and Literature Major in Brazil and Russia, aiming to present the science of language to students in this major;
2.  **Authorship** of the textbooks was restricted to linguists from one of the two languages/cultures being compared, so that observations of interpretations generated in the two academic spheres were possible, which excluded the analysis of foreign translated textbooks;
3.  The time frame was centered on the **historical moment** in the late 1960s and early 1970s,[3] when Graduate courses in the Language, Literature and Linguistics departments in Brazil were being established.
4.  **Longevity** of the textbooks was also considered, and evidenced in the several reprintings and editions, and by the recognition of their importance by linguists in the two cultures.

Based on this *tertium camparationis,* we selected the following textbooks:

a)  KODUKHOV, V. I[4]. *Óbchee iazikoznánie* [General Linguistics]. Moscou: Víchaia Chkola, 1974. – the most recent edition of the Russian textbook was published in 2017[5]
b)  BORBA, F. da S[6]. *Introdução aos estudos linguísticos.*[Introduction to Linguistic Studies] 2. ed. São Paulo: Companhia Editora Nacional, 1970[1967]. – the textbook is in its 13th edition (2003)[7]

The present study constitutes the first step in the comparison to be continued and completed in a later study, through the comparison of contemporary textbooks from the two language/cultures, aiming to observe changes, if any occur.

The analysis of the textbooks was carried out as follows: our point of departure is the sphere/field of production, reception and circulation of the textbook, with the aim of investigating the particularities of the authors, target audience, editorial market and academic sphere in the two countries/cultures; then, we examine how the history of linguistics is presented in the two compendiums; finally, we verify the definition of linguistics and its object, as well as presenting its different methods.

---

[3] This historical criteria eliminated the selection of "The Principles of General Lingustics" by J. Mattoso Camara Junior published for the first time in 1941.

[4] Full Professor [Doktor Hayk], coordinator of the Department of Russian language at the Belgoródski Pedagogical Institute, at Kazánski University and at the Russian State Pedagogical University A. I. Gértsena (St. Petersburg). He was also a High School Russian language teacher and specialist in lexicography and lexicology, Teaching Russian as a Foreign Language and author of introductory textbooks in linguistics.

[5] Available at: http://www.bgshop.ru/Catalog/GetFullDescription?id=10375858. Accessed on: 25 sept. 2018.

[6] Full Professor of the Universidade de São Paulo and Retired from the Post Graduate Program in Linguistics and Portuguese Language - Faculdade de Ciências e Letras - Araraquara. He was a High School Portuguese language teacher and a specialist in syntactic theory and lexicography.

[7] Available at: http://buscatextual.cnpq.br/buscatextual/visualizacv.do?id=K4780554H7. Accessed on 25 sept. 2018.

## Sphere/field of production, reception and circulation of the textbooks

The sphere or field of discursive communication of the textbooks – understood as the particularities of the ideological products arising from a unique way of reflecting and refracting both natural reality and the demands of the other spheres of culture (GRILLO, 2006; GRILLO; GLUSHKOVA, 2016; GRILLO; HIGACHI, 2017) – presents aspects shared in both the Brazilian and Russian textbooks. Differences motivated, in our view, by the stage of insertion of the science of language in the two academic and scientific communities.[8]

One of the first distinguishing aspects between the Russian and Brazilian academic spheres, is that in Russia, and in the Soviet Union era, there was a greater quantity of authored textbooks designed to carry out a general introduction to Linguistics. A visit to the Linguistics section of commercial and university bookstores in the major Russian cities reveal the diversity of the Russian and Soviet compendiums, which aim to present the discipline of Linguistics through its history, object, and methods. Meanwhile, in Brazilian bookstores, introductory textbooks that approached Linguistics through its component parts – Semantics, Phonology, Syntax etc. predominate.[9] In Brazil, even textbooks of general introduction to the discipline are normally collections written by specialists in these specific linguistic areas (Phonology, Morphology, Syntax, Semantics etc.). These editorial particularities of the two countries seem to indicate that, in Brazil, the discipline of linguistics is represented as being constituted of distinct areas that are guided by various particular epistemologies and methods, which would be impossible for a single author cover, while in Russia, there is still the tendency to perceive as a single science in the style of the "General Linguistics" proposed, for example, by Ferdinand de Saussure, and, therefore, potentially synthesized by only one, two or three authors.

In a second observation of these spheres, we examine the presentations of the textbooks, where the presumed target audience is made explicit, as well as the institutional spaces of production, reception and circulation, and the dialogical relationships of the utterance with the preceding links of this field. Based on these aspects, we observe the following excerpts taken from the opening texts, called "From the Author" (Ot ávotora), in the Russian textbook, and "Initial Note" in the Brazilian textbook:

---

[8]  Inspired by Edmunson's doctoral thesis (2017), we make a distinction between the academic sphere – in which the concepts and methodologies of a science are taught and formed mainly by institutions of higher learning – and the scientific sphere – in which these concepts and methodologies are necessarily produced whether in universities, laboratories, and research institutions where they can be taught.

[9]  Browsing through the Languages-Literatures/Linguistics section of a prominent bookstore in São Paulo, on 07/28/2018, we found three introductory textbooks: "Introdução aos estudos linguísticos [Introduction to Linguistic Studies] by Francisco da Silva Borba; "Introdução à Linguística [Introduction to Linguistics" organized by José Luiz Fiorin (6. ed., Contexto, 2018) and the volumes of "Introdução à Linguística [Introduction to Linguistics]" organized by Fernanda Mussalim and Anna Christina Bentes (2001).

**Table 1** – Presumed addressees

| | |
|---|---|
| BORBA, F. da S. *Introdução aos estudos linguísticos.* [Introduction to Linguistic Studies] 2. ed. São Paulo: Companhia Editora Nacional, 1970 [1967]. | This textbook intends to be a guide for <u>students in the first year of their Language and Literature course in our Colleges. While still unaccustomed to navigating foreign bibliographies and under the impact of an almost entirely new discipline, it is natural that the student is unable to produce sufficiently or, even becomes discouraged.</u> Concerned with giving students the essential <u>elements to understand linguistics and carry out future research in this field, we</u> <u>endeavor to accomplish this small task containing what we judge to be indispensable for an introduction to the Science of language.</u> [...] Aiming to put interested parties up to date with the essentials, <u>we purposefully avoid issues that are widely debatable or debated,</u> while acknowledging their problematics. Thus, this textbook does not entail novelty, as it is a simple work of general compilations, and as such, relies on the authority of great masters such as Saussure, Meillet, Vendryès, Martinet, Sapir, Gray, Matoso Câmara and many others. (p.3-4, our translation)**[10]** |
| KODUKHOV, V. I. *Óbchee iazikoznánie* [Linguística Geral-General Linguistics]. Moscou: Víchaia Chkola, 1974. | The General Linguistics course broadens and deepens the general linguistic preparation of our undergraduate students in the College of Languages and Literatures: it raises their level of theory, presents the main linguistic trends and schools, introduces them to the problematics of contemporary linguistics, providing methodological instruments and methods of linguistic analysis, and better preparation for undergraduates in creative and practical activities in the fields of Education, Culture and Science. (p.3, our translation)[11] <br><br> In the manual, the main stages in the history of linguistics, its main guidelines and schools <u>are presented,</u> the fundamental problems of contemporary linguistic theory <u>are outlined,</u> methods and procedures of linguistic analysis <u>are described. Special attention is given to the contribution of national linguistics to linguistic theory and practice.</u> (p.2, our translation)[12] |

**Source:** Author's elaboration.

---

In the first place, we analyze how these textbooks structure their **address**, which is a concept that involves the following aspects: the utterance has an author anda target audience; the audience can be composed of particular members of a sphere or field of discursive communication; the conception of the audience and the anticipation of its "apperceptive background of understanding" ("special knowledge of a given cultural field of communication", notions, values, prejudices etc.) (BAKHTIN, 2003, p.301-302)[13] determine the thematic content, style and the compositional construction of the genre.

The authors of the textbooks are linguists and university professors, both with didactic experience in teaching High School and in research in lexicology/lexicography, and, for this reason, join together activities in research and teaching in the university, which demand specific competencies and skills: a command of the concepts and methods in the area, as well as the capacity to shape this knowledge didactically and interact with a specific audience. Sharing these common characteristics, the authors appear in their utterances in distinct ways: the Brazilian author asserts him or herself and appears more on utterances in the first person plural both inclusive and exclusive – "our colleges"/ "nossas faculdades", "which we judge indispensable"/ "o que julgamos indispensável" – and on using the diminutive and terms that express modesty and affection – "this little work"/"esse trabalhinho", "simple work of general compilation"/ "simples trabalho de compilação geral"; while the Russian author is stylistically and syntactically considerably less present than the Brazilian authors, as the manual itself assumes the authorship of its ends – "The General Linguistics course broadens and deeps the general linguistic preparation/ *Курс общего языкознания расширяет и углубляет общеязыковедческую подготовку*" - , as the authorial subject is erased by the use of the synthetic passive voice - are presented/apresentam-se/освещаются, are outlined/caracterizam-se/характеризуются, descrevem-se/описываются. In our view, this distinction reflects differences between the Brazilian and Russian scientific and academic spheres: Brazilian linguists feel freer to express their subjectivity, since it is, even disguised, always present (CORACINI, 1991); while the Soviet linguists assume the so-called scientific style, highly developed by the Russian functional style (KÓJINA, 2008), which is characterized as abstract, generalizing and objective.

The audience is clearly defined and nearly identical in the two textbooks. The Brazilian textbook refers to – "students in the first year of the Language and Literature Major at our Colleges"/"*os alunos de primeira série dos cursos de Letras de nossas faculdades*". The Russian textbook refers to – "undergraduates in the College of Language and Literature"/ "*graduandos em Faculdades de Letras*". Therefore, the audience is composed of members of the university sphere majoring in Language and Literature courses in Brazil and in Russia, a space also integrated by the textbook authors.. Nonetheless, we observe differences in the conception of the audience, and

---

13    Original: "*fundo aperceptível de percepção*" ( "*conhecimentos especiais de um dado campo cultural da comunicação*", *concepções, valores, preconceitos etc.*) (BAKHTIN, 2003, p.301-302).

in the anticipation of its apperceptive background of understanding. In the Brazilian textbook, the audience is characterized by a lack of knowledge and skills: "While still unaccustomed to managing foreign bibliographies, and under the impact of an almost entirely new discipline, it is natural that the student would be unable to produce sufficiently or, even become discouraged"/"*Ainda mal habituado ao manejo de bibliografia estrangeira e sob o impacto de uma disciplina quase totalmente nova, é natural que o estudante não produza o suficiente ou, então, desanime*". Meanwhile, in the Russian text, the student is characterized as a subject in the process of improving, "raises his level of theory [...] providing better preparation for undergraduates in practical and creative activities in the field of education, culture and science"/"*eleva o seu nível teórico* [...] *proporciona um melhor preparo dos graduandos para a atividade prática e criativa no campo da educação, cultura e ciência*". The differences relative to the apperceptive background of understanding of the students can be understood because of, as previously mentioned, the stage of insertion of the Science of Language in the two academic and scientific communities. In the Brazilian textbook, Linguistics is a Science that is basically developed abroad ("managing foreign bibliographies") and even recently arrived to national soil ("under the impact of an almost entirely new discipline"), having a single vernacular reference expressed in the figure of Mattoso Câmara, the only previous link in the chain of the sphere of Brazilian Linguistic Science. It is important to note that the first graduate courses in linguistics in Brazil were created at the Federal University of Rio de Janeiro and at the University of São Paulo in 1968,[14] and it is even from this very year that, according to Altman (1998), p.44, our translation):

> [...] a set of intellectual and social factors was concentrated, which allowed for, in various parts of the country, the institutional consolidation of a 'Brazilian Linguistics' and a young group of researchers began, from then on, to recognize themselves as "linguists".[15]

In the Russian textbook, linguistics is introduced as having a history ("In the textbook, the main stages of the history of linguistics are presented"), of which Russian and Soviet linguists participated ("Special attention is given to the contribution of national linguistics to the theory and practice of linguistics") and there is a foundation in the "general theory of knowledge and the development of contemporary sciences". Consequently, Soviet linguistics in the 1970s already had many prior links in the chain of communication in the scientific sphere, of which it is an active member. According to the introductory words by the authors of the textbooks, Brazilian students at the end of the 1960s and Soviet students at the beginning of the 1970s are characterized in very

---

[14]  Available at: http://www.ppglinguistica.letras.ufrj.br/index.php/pt/. Accessed on: 26 sept. 2018.

[15]  Original: "[...] *se concentrou um conjunto de fatores de ordem intelectual e social que permitiu, em vários pontos do país, a solidificação institucional de uma 'Linguística Brasileira' e de um jovem grupo de pesquisadores que começaram, a partir de então a se reconhecer 'lingüistas'*". (ALTMAN, 2002, p.44).

distinct ways and this occurs, in our view, because of the different stages in the Science of language in the academic and scientific spheres of the two countries.

A comparison of the table of contents offers a general view of the similarities and differences in the organization of the two compendiums. We would like to point out that, because they are extensive, we have only transcribed the chapter titles, but we have reproduced the sub-section titles of Chapter 2 of the Brazilia textbook, to foreground the history of linguistics, which is detailed in the Russia textbook chapters.

**Table 2** – Chapters of the Table of Contents

| BORBA, F. da S. *Introdução aos estudos linguísticos.* [Introduction to Linguistic Studies] 2. ed. São Paulo: Companhia Editora Nacional, 1970 [1967]. | **Part I – Generalities**<br>Chapter I –Linguistic Studies: Objectives<br>Chapter II – The History of Linguistics: 1 – Grammatical phase – Greek and Roman grammar, Hindu grammar, Grammar in the Middle Ages; 2 – Philosophical phase; 3- Comparativism phase. The Neogrammarians; 4 – modern linguistics – Indo-European, Roman, German. Slavic philology. General linguistics; 5 – Linguistics and philology.<br>Chapter III – Linguistics<br>Chapter IV –Language<br>Chapter V – The languages of the world<br>Chapter VI – Historical linguistics<br>Chapter VII – Linguistic methods<br>**Part II – The Structure of the language**<br>Chapter I – Phonetics<br>Chapter II – Morphology<br>Chapter III – Syntax<br>Chapter IV – Lexicon<br>Vocabulary of linguistic terms<br>Authors cited<br>Bibliography (our translation) [16] |

<hr>

[16] Original: **Primeira parte – Generalidades**
Capítulo I – Objetivos dos estudos lingüísticos
Capítulo II – História da lingüística: 1 – A fase da gramática – a gramática na Grécia e em Roma, a gramática hindu, a gramática na Idade Média; 2 – A fase da filosofia; 3 – A fase do comparativismo. Os neogramáticos; 4 – A lingüística moderna – indoeuropeística, romanística, germanística. A filolofia eslava. A lingüística geral; 5 – Lingüística e filologia
Capítulo III – A lingüística
Capítulo IV – A língua
Capítulo V – As línguas do mundo
Capítulo VI – A lingüística histórica
Capítulo VII – Métodos lingüísticos
**Segunda parte – Estrutura da linguagem**
Capítulo I – Fonética
Capítulo II – Morfologia
Capítulo III – Sintaxe
Capítulo IV – Léxico
Vocabulário de termos lingüísticos
Relação de autores citados
Bibliografia
(BORBA, 1970 [1967])

| | |
|---|---|
| KODUKHOV, V. I. *Óbchee iazikoznánie* [Linguística Geral]. Moscou: Víchaia Chkola, 1974. | **Part I – The History of Linguistics**<br>Chapter 1 – From classical philology to the linguistics of the 18th century Chapter 2 – Historical-comparative linguistics and the philosophy of language<br>Chapter 3 – Psychological and logical linguistics<br>Chapter 4 – The Sociology of language and the neogrammatic approachr Chapter 5 – Linguistics in the 20th century and structuralism<br>Chapter 6 – Soviet Linguistics<br>**Part II – The theory of language**<br>Chapter 7 – The signifying and non-signifying properties of language Chapter 8 – Language as system (A língua como sistema<br>Chapter 9 – Language and thought )<br>Chapter 10 – Language and Society<br>Chapter 11 – Language and history<br>**Part III – Linguistic Methods**<br>Chapter 12. Forms of knowledge and linguistic methods<br>Chapter 13. Descriptive method<br>Chapter 14. Comparative method (our translation)[17] |

**Source:** Author's elaboration.

On comparing the two table of contents, understood as compositional articulations of the utterances of the textbooks, we identify significant similarities and differences. With regard to the similarities, both compendiums have initial chapters dedicated to the history of Linguistics and present shared evolutionary stages; the concept of language has specific chapters; and, there are sections dedicated to linguistic methods. As for the differences, we highlight the following aspects: the Brazilian textbook has dedicated one of its sections to the structure of the language or levels of linguistic analysis, while the Russian textbook dedicates more space for the presentations of the history of linguistics, which occupies the entire first section; the Russian compendium has a chapter on Soviet linguistics (chapter 6), an aspect that is previously announced by the author and which we have analyzed above; in the section on the history of linguistics,

---

[17] Original: **История языкознания**
От филологии древности до языкознания XVIII в.
Сравнительно-историческое языкознание и философия языка
Логическое и психологическое языкознание
Социология языка и неограматизм
Языкознание XX в. и структурализм
Советское языкознание
**Теория языка**
Знаковые и незнаковые свойства языка
Язык как система
Язык и мышление
Язык и общество
Язык и история
**Методы языкознания**
Способы познания и методы лигвистики
Описательный метод
Сравнительный метод
(KODUKHOV, 1974, summary)

the Russian textbook has a section about the "theory of language", which is integrated in chapters reserved for the relationship between language and thought (chapter 9), language and society (chapter 10) and language and history (chapter 11), under the influence, in our view, of a "general theory of knowledge", according to the author's statement in the presentation previously analyzed.

This brief description of the table of contents signals specificities in the presentation of linguistics to the Brazilian and Soviet students of Language and Literature in the late 1960s and early 1970s. Despite having a chapter designated to the history of the discipline, the Brazilian textbook concentrates more on the constitution of Linguistics and levels of analysis. In the Russian textbook, greater space is dedicated to knowledge of the history of the discipline Linguistics, and points out the role of local studies in the evolution of the area, as well as designating chapters to the relationship of language to thought, society and history. Russian linguistics seems to be constituted on a general philosophical foundation, which puts it in contact with other areas. In our view, these differences are linked to a stronger influence from Saussurean and Chomskian linguistics in Brazil, with its emphasis on the autonomous character of the language, and, although Saussurean linguistics is very influential in the Soviet Union and in Russia, the German philosophy of language of the 19th century exerted a determining role in the formation of Russian and Soviet linguistics with reflexes in the 1970s and, in our experience in universities in Moscow, even to this day. Thus, we perceive that the previous links in the chain of discursive communication of the scientific sphere of Linguistics, and the academic sphere of Language and Literature courses, did not cease to set limits, exert pressures and direct meanings for the presentation of future members of these spheres.

**Linguistics and its history**

The analysis of the textbooks' table of contents has already demonstrated significant differences in the way the history of the discipline of Linguistics is taught in the two countries. Readings of Chapter 2 of the Brazilian compendium, as well as the first section of the Soviet one, continued to reveal specificities. The first aspect that we would like to highlight are the dialogical relations between the sphere of linguistics and the broader sociopolitical contexts of the two cultures/languages. In this respect, Altman (1998), in his work on the history of linguistics in Brazil, has already highlighted that "[…] even though the science of language – as, in fact, any other science – does not have a nationality, as public and social discourse, it ends up imbuing the values of the society that produces and sustains it, and eventually constructs its own traditions." (ALTMAN, 1998, p.36, our translation)[18]. The relationships between the field of linguistic science and Brazilian and Soviet societies in the late 1960s and early 1970s manifest in distinct

---

[18]   Original: *"[…] embora a ciência da linguagem – como, aliás, qualquer outra ciência – não tenha nacionalidade, enquanto discurso público e social, ela termina por se imbuir dos valores da sociedade que a produz e sustenta, e constrói, eventualmente, tradições próprias."* (ALTMAN, 1998, p.36).

valorative emphases (VOLOCHINOV, 1973 [1929]), namely, a special attention to particular aspects of reality that are valoratively appreciated:

**Table 3** – Scientific spheres in Brazil and the Soviet Union

| BORBA, F. da S. *Introdução aos estudos linguísticos.* [Introduction to Linguistic Studies] 2. ed. São Paulo: Companhia Editora Nacional, 1970 [1967]. | It is said that, in a country like Brazil, where almost everything has yet to be done, one must not waste time with teaching (and research?) of disciplines that do not have any immediate practical application and whose only scope is intellectual pleasure. Only countries saturated with civilization can give themselves this luxury. Linguistics would be one such case. (p.7, our translation).[19] |
|---|---|
| KODUKHOV, V. I. *Óbchee iazikoznánie* [Linguística Geral]. Moscou: Víchaia Chkola, 1974. | Each Science has a history, and new knowledges are the accumulation of others already known in the direction of their development and former changes, which are in some cases entirely fundamental. The history of linguistics shows that it cannot be developed isolated from other sciences, that in the linguistic arena, gives rise to the struggle between philosophical materialism and idealism, between the dialectic and the metaphysical. (p.4, our translation).[20] |

**Source:** Author's elaboration.

In the Brazilian utterance, the author, on justifying an introductory textbook of linguistics responds in a controversial way (BAKHTIN, 1984) to a refutable discourse that only grants a place for science if it has an "immediate practical application", or rather, we identify a bi-vocal discourse that approaches its object of meaning – linguistics – and, in this realm, attacks another discourse about this object. The marks of this controversial discourse are scattered in a fragmented style: the use of the "it has been heard" to avoid determining the subject and characterizing the affirmations as belonging to a generalized social discourse, the presence of pronouns of exclusion ("nenhuma" – none) and adjectives ("único" – sole, "só" only) which extends this discourse to its extreme, and the use of the conditional verb tense ("estaria" – would be) to distance the discourse from the author of this generalized social discourse. According to this textbook, Brazilian linguistics was instituted under tense conditions facing a social evaluation[21] that was hostile to it.

---

[19] Original: *Já se tem ouvido dizer que, num país como o Brasil, onde quase tudo está por fazer, não se deve perder tempo com o ensino (e a pesquisa?) de disciplinas sem nenhuma aplicação prática imediata e cujo escopo único é o deleite intelectual. Só os países saturados de civilização podem dar-se a tais luxos. A linguística estaria neste caso.* (BORBA, 1970 [1967], p.7).

[20] Original: *Каждая наука имеет свою историю, и новые знания являются аккумуляцией уже известных, их дальнейшим развитием и видоизменением, в ряде случаев весьма существенным.*
*История лингвистики показывает, что языкознание не может развиваться изолированно от других наук, что на лингвистической арене также проявляется борьба материалистической философии с идеализмом, диалектики с метафизикой.* (KODUKHOV, 1974, p.4).

[21] This is a concept developed by Bakhtin, Voloshinov and Medvedev, to designate one of the constituting elements of the ideological verbal word or sign that understands the valorative and subjective relationship with the object of the meaning expressed in the concrete sign.

In the Soviet utterance, the linguistic trajectory is recounted from the point of view of a history of knowledge that emphasizes its progressive and cumulative character. Subsequently, the linguistic discipline also develops in a space of social tension, represented by metaphors that rely on the universe of shows of combat ("arena" - arena, "luta" – fight/struggle), where a controversy between two philosophical orientations develop: materialism and idealism. As we know, this controversy is at the origin of the installation of the Soviet Union, and the field of linguistics is not immune to its influence, which resurges repeatedly to permeate the Soviet compendium.

However, whether in opposition to a discourse preaching pragmatism in the sciences, or in the tension between idealist and materialist epistemologies, the linguistic field emerges in Brazil, and develops in the Soviet Union within a controversial dialogue with discourses outside of the field of the science of language.

As we previously highlighted, in the analysis of the table of contents, we identified stages of linguistics in the Soviet textbook that are absent in the Brazilian one. Psychological linguistics, developed in the mid-19th century, does not appear in the Brazilian manual; a fact that, in our view, is linked to the role Wilhelm Humboldt (2013 [1859]) plays in the history of linguistics according to the Brazilian and Soviet textbooks.

**Table 4** – Founding Parents of Linguistics in Brazil and the Soviet Union

| BORBA, F. da S. *Introdução aos estudos linguísticos.* [Introduction to Linguistic Studies] 2. ed. São Paulo: Companhia Editora Nacional, 1970 [1967]. | e) **General linguistics** - Beside Bopp, as a precursor of general linguistics we can cite Humboldt who has a concept of language that is both historical and philological. He occupied himself with the origin of language and did not deduce that it had emerged from absolute necessity, albeit a human necessity. He made important considerations with respect to the classification of the languages, as he was versed in extensive linguistic knowledge (Basque, American languages, Malay-Polynesian languages). [...] Humboldt represents an advance in relation to the philosophy of language and general grammar of the former era, but despite broadening our view with the ingenious work of his intelligence, it is, from a purely linguistic point of view, somewhat separated from the empiricism of our time because of its abstractions and even mysticism. (p.32, our translation).[22] |
|---|---|

---

[22] Original: *e) **Linguística geral** – Ao lado de Bopp, podemos citar como precursor da linguística geral, Humboldt que tem um conceito de língua ao mesmo tempo histórico e filológico. Ocupou-se da origem da linguagem e não deduz que ela tenha nascido de absoluta necessidade, embora seja uma necessidade humana. Fez importantes considerações a respeito da classificação das línguas, pois era dono de extensos conhecimentos linguísticos (basco, línguas americanas, línguas malaio-polinésicas). [...] Humboldt representa um progresso em relação à filosofia da linguagem e à gramática geral da época anterior, mas, apesar de ampliar nossa visão com o genial trabalho de sua inteligência, está, do puro ponto de vista linguístico, algum tanto separado do empirismo de nosso tempo por causa de suas abstrações e até misticismo.* (BORBA, 1970 [1967], p.32).

| KODUKHOV, V. I. *Óbchee iazikoznánie* [Linguística Geral]. Moscou: Víchaia Chkola, 1974. | V. Humboldt (1767-1835) released the philosophical fundamentals of historical-comparative and typological linguistics. [...] The importance of Humboldt in linguistics can be compared to the influence of Kant and Hegel in the development of philosophy, although Humboldt is closer to Hegel. Unlike Kant, Humboldt spoke about the logic verbal thought (and not purely logical). He considered that the language functioned as a mark of the objects and as a means of communication. And seeing that language is a complex and contradictory phenomenon, its isolated aspects can only be understood if a methodology of the particular and the general any monies are applied. The fundamental contradictions the researcher of language encounters is the contradiction between the subjective and the objective, language and thought, activity and things, the general (collective) and the particular (individual). [...] Humboldt held that linguistics must have its philosophical base, the philosophy of the language, constructed on the solid basis of the analysis of different languages. (p.25, our translation).[23] The psychological orientation in linguistics arose as a reaction to the study of the representatives of naturalistic and logical orientations. Its origin is found in Humboldt's conception, which emphasized the active and semantic character of the discursive activity. (p.41, our translation).[24] |

**Source:** Author's elaboration.

The previous passage, transcribed from the Brazilian textbook is the only one that cites and discusses Humboldt's place in the history of linguistics. Information is provided about some of his areas of study, about the advances his work represented in relation to the previous period, ending with criticisms about his lack of empiricism and the presence of mysticism. The aspects are approached in a very synthesized way, and seem not to reveal any knowledge of his work and the concepts developed by Humboldt (2013 [1859]), but serve as a summary most likely based on some compendium of foreign linguistics. However, despite the evaluation or positive valoritive emphases ("precursor da linguística geral" – precursor of general linguistics; "*Fez importantes considerações*" – made important considerations; and "*Humboldt representa um progresso*" – Humboldt represents progress), the reader probably will have a representation of Humboldt as an outdated moment in the history of linguistics, and one who developed ideas ("mysticism") contradictory to scientific knowledge.

[23] Original: *Философские основы сравнительно-исторического и типологического языкознания заложил В. Гумбольдт (1767-1835) [...] Значение Гумбольдта для языкознания можно сравнить с влиянием на развитие философии Канта и Гегеля, причём Гумбольдт более похож на Гегеля. В отличие от Канта, Гумбольдт говорил о вербально-логическом (а не чисто логическом) мышлении. Язык, считал он, функционирует как обозначение предметов и как средство общения. И поскольку язык есть сложное и противоречивое явление, постольку отдельные стороны его можно постичь, если применить методику антиномий, частного и общего. Основные противоречия, с которыми встречается исследователь языка, - это противоречия субъективного и объективного, языка и мышления, деятельности и дела, общего (коллективного) и особенного (индивидуального).[...] Гумбольдт считал, что языкознание должно иметь свою философскую базу – философию языка, построенную на прочном фундаменте анализа различных языков.*
*Основными принципами философии языка, по мнению Гумбольдта, являются признание языка и его формы как деятельности и национального сознания народа.* (KODUKHOV, 1974, p.25).

[24] Original: *Психологическое направление в языкознании возникло как реакция на учения представителей натуралистического и логического направлений. Его истоки мы находим в концепции Гумбольдта, который подчеркнул активный и семантический характер речевой деятельности.* (KODUKHOV, 1974, p.41).

In the Soviet textbook, the transcribed fragments represent just some of the moments in which the ideas of Humboldt are mentioned and exposed, and even his name figures, in the onomastic index, with the same number of mentions as Saussure. The German author is presented as having developed the philosophical fundamentals of linguistics, as well as historical-comparative and psychological lines of linguistic theory.

Firstly, Humboldt appears here as the founder of general linguistics[25] as well as in the collection of texts recently translated from Russian – *Kontsiéptsiia óbchego iazikoznániia:* tsiéli, soderjánie, struktúra. Ízbrannie perevódi. [Conception of a general linguistics: objectives, content, structure. Selected translated texts] – in which he does not figure as some outdated character in the history of linguistics, but as the "founder of general linguistics" ("*osnovopolójnik óbchego iazikoznánia*", HUMBOLDT, 2018, p.9), and a linguist in the very contemporary meaning of the word ("*lingvistom v ótchen sovremiénnom smísle*", HUMBOLDT, 2018, p.9).

Subsequently, he proposes the fundamentals of historic-comparative linguistics, which is not a work about the history of the language without the objective of or concern with determining the nature of language, but, based on the concept that language is an activity (*enérgeia*) and at the same time a product (*érgon*), the analysis of the evolution of the language is the most adequate means for the linguist to observe something that, according to Humboldt, is essential in it: "[…] a process of continuous creation never totally achieved, with the purpose of making the articulated sounds an instrument for the expression of thought." (GRILLO, 2017, p.21, our translation)[26] In other terms, only a diachronic work could reveal the activity of the speaking subjects about the expressive resources of the language.

Finally, Humboldt's conception of language gave rise to psychological linguistics which, according to the compendium, attributes some of its most important representatives to those on Russian soil: Alekándr Potiebniá (1835-1891), Liev Chiérba (1880-1944), Liev Vigotski (1896-1934) e Alekséi Leontiev (1936-2004). From this short list, we find that Humboldt's ideas were and continue to be fruitful in the field of linguistics, psycholinguistics and the psychology of language.

In our view, the recognition of Humboldt's importance in the constitution of the modern science of language is an important differential in the Brazilian and Soviet compendiums, with reflexes in the fields of contemporary linguistics in the Brazilian and Russian languages and cultures.

After the historical section, the Brazilian textbook presents a section with the conceptualization of linguistics in which Saussure appears for the first time as the founder of a school of linguistics, while, in the Soviet compendium, Sasussure already appears in the chapter on the history of linguistics:

---

[25]  Russian contemporary textbooks also maintain this same stance, as in the following: Peretrukhin 2016 [1972] and Amírova, Olkhóvikov, Rojdiéstvenskii (2008).

[26]  Original: "[…] *um processo de criação contínuo nunca totalmente atingido, com o propósito de fazer dos sons articulados um instrumento para expressão do pensamento.*" (GRILLO, 2017, p.21).

**Table 5** – Saussure in Brazil and the Soviet Union

| | |
|---|---|
| BORBA, F. da S. *Introdução aos estudos linguísticos*. 2. ed. São Paulo: Companhia Editora Nacional, 1970 [1967]. | **5. Linguistic Schools –** The so-called Linguistic Schools refer to a set of ideas and methods that prevailed in a certain era or group of linguists, at the mercy of the superiority of one over the others that then, seek to follow it [...] From the appearance of linguistics as such, we can consider the following:<br>a) **Comparativist** [...]<br>b) **Neogrammarians** [...]<br>c) **Genebra School** – Founded by Saussure, responsible for an innovative movement that dates from the beginnings of this century. [...] Saussure considers language as an individual creation, but limits it and links it to the need for the relationship of the individual with those around him. Originating from what are currently considered classical concepts. – language, speech, diachrony, synchrony (see p.42, 64). For him, the object of linguistic study is language and not speech. The unfinished work of the master admits criticisms made by Warburg with respect to the separation between the synchronic (descriptive) and the diachronic (historical). (Warburg thinks that the two are interdependent [...] This school has a positivist perspective, just as the neogrammarian ones do, against which, in the end, he reacts. (p.45-46, our translation)<br>d) **Paris School** [...]<br>e) **Idealist School** – Founded by Karl Vossler, opposes the positivism of Saussure. It is based on the aesthetic idealism of Croce. It does not consider language as a natural entity, capable of being studied with scientific criteria and methods, but as a human activity, aware of itself as the object of history. It is a return to the spiritualism of Bopp, Herder and Humboldt [...]<br>f) **Structuralist School** – Strating from these precursors, there are three main lines, that prevail in modern North American linguistics: I- **Transformational Grammar** – [...]<br>II- **Stratificational Grammar** – [...]<br>III- **Tagmemics** (p.47-49).[27] |

---

[27] Original: ***5. Escolas lingüísticas –*** *Chama-se escola lingüística a um conjunto de idéias e métodos que dominaram numa certa época ou num grupo de lingüistas, mercê da superioridade de um sobre outros que então, procuram segui-lo.* [...] *Do aparecimento da lingüística como tal, podemos considerar as seguintes:a)* ***Comparatista*** [...] *b)* ***Neogramáticos*** [...] *c)* ***Escola de Genebra*** *– Fundada por Saussure, responsável por um movimento inovador que data dos princípios deste século.* [...] *Saussure considera a linguagem como criação individual, mas limita-a e vincula-a à necessidade de relação do indivíduo com os que o rodeiam. Parte de conceitos hoje clássicos – língua, fala, diacronia, sincronia (ver p.42, 64). Para ele, o objeto da lingüística é a língua, não a fala. A obra inacabada do mestre admite críticas como as feitas por Wartburg a respeito da separação entre o sincrônico (descritivo) e o diacrônico (histórico). (Warburg acha que os dois interdependem.)* [...] *Esta escola é de orientação positivista, como a dos neogramáticos, contra a qual, no fundo, reagia. (p.45-46) d)* ***Escola de Paris*** [...] *e)* ***Escola idealista*** *– Fundada por Karl Vossler, opõe-se ao positivismo de Saussure. Baseia-se no idealismo estético de Croce. Não considera a língua como entidade natural, possível de ser estudada com critério e métodos científicos, mas como atividade humana, consciente de si e objeto de história. É um retorno ao espiritualismo de Bopp, Herder e Humboldt* [...] *f)* ***Escolas estruturalistas*** *– Partindo desses precursores, há três correntes principais, que dominam a lingüística norte-americana moderna:I-* ***Gramática transformacional*** *– [...] II-* ***Gramática estratificacional*** *– [...] III-* ***Tagmêmica.*** (BORBA, 1970 [1967], p.47-49).

| | |
|---|---|
| KODUKHOV, V. I. *Óbchee iazikoznánie* [Linguística Geral]. Moscou: Víchaia Chkola, 1974. | The Works of F. Saussure (1857-1913) are found in the juncture between different linguistic perspectives and schools: it sustains ideas of psychological and sociological linguistics, of the neogrammaticism, its concepts being continued in the studies of structuralist schools, of the lingosemiotics and the linguistic system. (p.70)[28]. On creating a theory of language, Saussure operated not only in the realm of linguistic traditions, but also in the philosophical works of I. Kant. Count and E. Durkheim, from whose study he took the understanding of the social fact as representations of the collective unconscious, which obliges the individual to subordinate him or herself to the social. The main method of analysis for Saussure is the method of antonyms. He was very well-known by then: W. Humbolt and many linguists from the 19th century used broadly the methods of the antonyms. (p.71).[29] Next, in accordance with Humboldt,the contradictory nature of the discursive activity (langage), Saussure considered the antonymic language (langue) and speech (parole) as its main contradiction. (p.72)[30] |

**Source:** Author's elaboration.

The Brazilian textbook accentuates the "innovative" character of the works of Saussure and links them to a positivist perspective. The Soviet compendium emphasizes the linguistic and philosophical affiliations of the Swiss linguist, as well as its developments in later schools, or rather, Saussure is presented as a link in the chain of the discursive communication of linguistics, that refracts concepts in the sphere of philosophy. A second significant difference is the fact that Humboldt figures as the base of the Idealist School of Vossler in the Brazilian textbook, and as one of the precursors of the antonymic method[31] in the Soviet compendium.

In relation to the presentation of the history of linguistics, we examine the place of Russian/Soviet and Brazilian linguistics in this process. Although the Brazilian textbookl does not retrieve information about linguistic schools in the Brazilian scientific sphere, the historiographic research by Altman (1998) indicates that language studies in Brazil were carried out in two main traditions: on the one hand, a Portuguese philological and

---

[28]    Original: *Работы Ф. де Соссюра (1857-1913) находится на стыке разных лингвистических направлений и школ: он поддерживает идеи психологической и социологической лингвистики, неограмматизма, его концепция будет продолжена в учениях структуралистических школ, лингвосемиотики и системой лингвистики.* (KODUKHOV, 1974, p.70).

[29]    Original: *Создавая теорию языка, де Соссюр опирался не только на лингвистическую традицию, но и на философские труды И. Канта, О. Конта и Э. Дюркгейма, из учения которого он взял понимание социального факта как представления коллективного сознания, принуждающего индивида подчиняться этому социальному.* (KODUKHOV, 1974, p.71).
*Основным методом анализа де Соссюр метод антиномий. Это тоже было уже известно: метод антиномий широко использовал В. Гумбольдт и многие лингвисты XIX в.* (KODUKHOV, 1974, p.71).

[30]    Original: *Исследуя, как и Гумбольдт, противоречивую природу речевой деятельности (langage), её основным противоречием де Соссюр считал антиномию языка (langue) и речи (parole).* (KODUKHOV, 1974, p.72).

[31]    This method is defined as "the contradiction between two excluding positions among each other, recognized as equally demonstrative of logical points of view." Em português: "[…] *a contradição entre duas posições excludentes entre si, reconhecidas como igualmente demonstráveis do ponto de vista lógico.*" (cf. KODUKHOV, 1974, p.71).

dialectological one, and on the other hand, a structuralist linguistic one. The project of the Portuguese-philological tradition was the critical edition of literary texts in Portuguese with the purpose of examining the culture of an author, era or people. In the dialectology, tradition the goal was to collect data of the regional variations of Brazilian Portuguese and develop a regional Brazilian linguistic atlas, according to the precepts of the Linguistic Geography method. Although Mattoso Câmara taught courses in Linguistics at the former College of Philosophy, and Language and Literature at the University of the Federal District (Rio de Janeiro) in 1938 and 1939, the structuralist tradition expanded in the 1960s, an era in which the term linguistics emerged in the Brazilian academic context, and formed a linguistic structuralism of "synchronic description of other modalities of non-literary language" (ALTMAN, 1998, p.112, our translation).[32] These two traditions of linguistic studies in Brazil are not covered in the Brazilian compendium.

The Soviet manual introduces their national linguistics in two ways: firstly, covering the collaboration of Russian authors in supranational linguistic trends (Aleksandr Potiebniá in psychological linguistics; the Polish linguist who made his carreer in Russia, Baudouin de Courtenay in the sociology of language and neogrammatics, and Roman Jakobson in functional linguistics, etc.), and secondly, in covering the approach to a Soviet linguistics. It is from this last that we carry out the following discussion.

In a section named "Soviet Linguistics", we identify various aspects characteristic of the development of linguistics in the post 1917 revolution years:

> Soviet linguistics based on the Marxist-Leninist philosophy joins linguists who work in the Soviet Union, and their theories and practices inherit the best tradition of national linguistics. Meanwhile, Soviet linguistics is strictly linked to world linguistics. (KODUKHOV, 1974, p.99, our translation).[33]

> Work on theory also gains momentum: the philosophical base of Soviet linguistics becomes Marxism. Marxist linguistics is understood as the sociology of language. In a series of works, the methodological knowledge is elucidated for linguists in classic Marxist-Leninist utterances: "Marxism and the Philosophy of Language" (1929) V.N. Voloshinov [...] (KODUKHOV, 1974, p.101, our translation).[34]

---

[32] Original: "*descrição sincrônica de outras modalidades de língua que não a literária*". (ALTMAN, 1998, p.112).

[33] Original: *Советское языкознание, базирующееся на марксистско-ленинской философии, объединяет языковедов, работающих в Советском Союзе, и его теория и практика наследуют лучшие традиции отечественного языкознания. Однако советская лингвистика тесно связана и с мировым языкознанием.* (KODUKHOV, 1974, p.99).

[34] Original: *Оживляется и теоретическая работа; философской основой советского языкознания становится марксизм. Марксистское языкознание понимается как социология языка. В ряде работ разъясняется методологическое знание для языковедов высказываний классиков марксизма-ленинизма: «Марксизм и философия языка» (1929) В. Н. Волошинова* [...] (KODUKHOV, 1974, p.101).

The point of departure for Soviet linguists is the social nature of language – the most important means of human communication. It is precisely this understanding of language, and the practical participation in the construction of the language that motivated, in the first place, the problem of standard language as a form of national culture. (KODUKHOV, 1974, p.101-102, our translation).[35]

The Soviet linguists took and take direct part in the cultural edification. They render great service in the creation of: schools and textbooks for institutions of higher learning, various dictionaries of language of people in the Soviet Union, alphabets for the formerly preliterate languages, and the reform and unification of former alphabets, and orthographies. (KODUKHOV, 1974, p.111, our translation).[36]

We identify, firstly, the affirmation reiterated from a Marxist-leninist philosophical base for the Soviet linguistics. If, on the one hand, this assumption can signify a rupture with the previously produced knowledge in Russia and a polarization with other non-socialist traditions, on the other hand, we verify a concern in connecting Soviet linguistics with the one developed in prior centuries in Russia itself, and with the state of the linguistic science in other countries. In other words, it means marking the specificity of a national and historical disciplinary space in dialogue with the diachronicity of the discipline, and its contemporary international development.

Secondly, we note the statement about the emergence of a linguistic trend under the explicit influence of Marxist materialist theory that acquires the name of sociology of language or, as we find in other materials, the sociological method. The author cites 7 exponents of this theory (V. Volóchinov, R. Chor, E. Polivánov, E. Rit, S. Bikóvski, S. Katsnelson, N. Marr) who were authors of works considered "classics", among which appear ,in the first place, the well-known book by V.N. Voloshinov "Marxism and the Philosophy of Language". Although this work is far from enjoying popularity on Brazilian soil, we perceive that in the beginning of the 1970s it was known by Soviet linguists, and considered an important representative of the sociology of language.

Ultimately, we surmise the concern of the author in highlighting the participation of soviet linguists in diverse activities that, despite their direct relationship to language, extrapolated the scientific sphere of linguistics, strictly speaking, and expanded it, primarily to the educational, social and political sphere, as follows:

---

[35] Original: *Советские языковеды исходят общественной природы языка – важнейшего средства человеческого общения. Именно такое понимание языка и практическое участие в языком строительстве выдвинули на передний план проблему литературного языка как формы национальной культуры.* (KODUKHOV, 1974, p.101-102).

[36] Original: *Советские языковеды принимали и принимают непосредственное участие в культурном строительстве. Велики их заслуги в создании школьных и вузовских учебников, различных словарей языков народов Советского Союза, алфавитов для ранее бесписьменных языков и реформировании и унификации старых алфавитов и орфографий.* (KODUKHOV, 1974, p.111).

- the establishing of a standard norm for a country of immense territorial dimensions and great sociocultural diversity;
- the carrying out of works in lexicography and lexicology that result in the production of dictionaries reedited to this day in Russia;
- the elaboration of systems of writing for languages that until then did nott have them;
- the orthographic reform of the Russian language;
- the creation of schools for Basic Education; the elaboration of textbooks for institutions of higher learning.

In sum, we conclude that, in the Brazilian textbook, linguistics is a young science and, despite Altman's (1998) historiographic studies pointing to a philological-Portuguese and dialectological tradition, these are not treated in the textbook, such that, in the Soviet compendium, Soviet linguistics is a science to be understood in a very complex way: it had inherited a former tradition, and was a participant in the post 1917 Revolution rupture; it was the shaper of its own trends and in sync with world linguistics; it was strictly committed to social projects such as the standardization of the national language, the elaboration of writing for languages until then preliterate and the elaboration of educational policies for Basic and Higher Education.

**Definition of linguistics and its methods**

In this section we analyze how linguistic science is defined in the Brazilian and Soviet compendiums. We begin with the definition of its object in the following excerpts:

Table 6 – The linguistic method in Brazil and the Soviet Union

| BORBA, F. da S. *Introdução aos estudos linguísticos.* [Introduction to Linguistic Studies] 2. ed. São Paulo: Companhia Editora Nacional, 1970 [1967]. | Linguistics is a science that seeks to determine, by its own methods, the structure and the function of human language. Since a human language, that is, the capacity that human beings have to communicate through sounds articulated in themselves, is an abstraction in itself, linguistics seeks the concretization of this language, i.e., the languages. **Objective** – The field of action of linguistics is language, understood as the system of sonorous elements of which human beings use to communicate their feelings, desires and thoughts. It is also through language that members of a social group interact among themselves. To really grasp what it actually is, let's take into consideration its unique features. (p.36, our translation, emphasis added).[37] |
|---|---|

---

[37] Original: *A linguística é uma ciência que procura determinar, com métodos próprios, a estrutura e <u>a função da linguagem humana</u>. Como a linguagem humana, isto é, <u>a capacidade que tem o homem de comunicar-se</u> por meio de sons articulados em si, é uma abstração, a linguística procura a concretização desta linguagem, ou seja, as línguas. **Objetivo** – O campo de ação da linguística é a linguagem, entendendo-se por este termo <u>o sistema de elementos sonoros de que os homens se servem para comunicar seus sentimentos, volições e pensamentos</u>. É também pela linguagem que os membros de um grupo social atuam entre si. Para bem alcançarmos o que realmente ela seja, atentemos para suas características particulares* (BORBA, 1970 [1967], p.36).

| KODUKHOV, V. I. *Óbchee iazikoznánie* [Linguística Geral – General Linguistics]. Moscou: Víchaia Chkola, 1974. | The heavily antonymic conception of the "speech-language" phenomenon has two essential defects: a) in this conception, the complex nature of language as a <u>fundamental means of</u> communication is represented in a simplifed manner; as will be shown ahead, <u>language is a unit composed by the system and by the structure of the language, by the linguistic norm and by the discursive activity</u>; b) the conceptionof "speech-language" is not infrequently interpreted as opposition between the research object (speech-text) and the research subject (metalanguage, research model). (p.120, our translation, emphasis added).[38] Language is a structured (system), language is norms, language is the discursive activity of the speakers; in his time L.V. Chierba [39] wrote convincingly about this triadic object of linguistics. (p. 121)[40] Thus, <u>the object of linguistics is the human language as a concrete-historical norm.</u> (p.123).[41] |

**Source:** Author's elaboration.

We can deduce diverse compositional-stylistic procedures in the exposition of the linguistic object. In the Brazilian textbook, the chapter "Linguistics" begins with two small sections titled "General conceptualization" and "Object", both in bold and highlighted with roman numerals 1 and 2, by which readers can rapidly identify the field and object of linguistics; next, there is discussion on the "unique features" of language: the linguistic signs, language and thought, articulation of human language, auditory system of symbols, arbitrariness, acquisition through learning, universality. In the Soviet manual, the chapter "The Theory of Language" begins with a seven page introduction without being divided into sections, highlighting the importance of defining the nature of language and its object; next, diverse antinomies are presented involving the terms "language" and "speech": constant/changeable, contemporary/historical, logical/psychological, social/individual, discursive activity/its result, system/process, form/content, thing/object; this section ends with a definition of the object of linguistics. The differences in the composition of the compendiums seems to presuppose two distinct target audiences: the Brazilian textbook presupposes a reader with less experience in the field and who needs precise indications of where to find concepts,

---

[38] Original: *Строго антиномическая концепция «язык – речь» имеет два существенных недостатка: а) в этой концепции сложная природа языка как основного средства общения представлена упрощенно; как будет показано ниже (см. с. 121-122), язык представляет единство системы и структуры языка, языковой нормы и речевой деятельности; б) концепция «язык – речь» нередко истолковывается как противопоставление объекта (речи-текста) субъекту исследования (метаязыку, исследовательской модели).* (KODUKHOV, 1974, p.120).

[39] Liev Vladímirovitch Chierba (1880-1944) Russina linguist who studied a poorly known slavic dialect of the time (*восточнолужицк*) located in German territory. Chierba gave much importance to the spoken language and was one of the first to defend that living language existed primarily in the form of dialogue. The trichotomy, system/norm/discursive activity was exposed by Chierba in the work "On the triadic aspect of linguistic phenomena and the experiment in linguistics" (1931).

[40] Original: *Язык – структура (система), язык – норма, язык –речевая деятельность говорящих – таков троякий предмет языкознания, о чём убедительно писал в свое время Л. В. Щерба.* (KODUKHOV, 1974, p.121).

[41] Original: *Итак, предметом языкознания является человеческий язык как конкретно-историческая норма.* (KODUKHOV, 1974, p.123).

or rather, as if the author underlined the central concepts for the reader; whereas the Soviet textbook projects a reader who is more experienced with academic texts and able to locate concepts more autonomously. Following this, the presentation of the object of linguistics – verbal human language – is explored in very distinct ways: in the Brazilian textbook, characteristics that constitute language are presented, and , in the Soviet textbook, there is a defense of the need to begin the discussion with the philosophical categories and dichotomies in the study of language.

With regard to the said definitions, the delimitation of the object of linguistics has a central coincidence in the two textbooks: both indicate verbal human language as this object, and highlight its communicative function. However, we verify important differences in the understanding of the concept of human language. In the Brazilian compendium, language is basically defined as a system of sonorous signs and, thereby based on Saussure's definition in the *Course in General Linguistics* (SAUSSURE, 1959 [1916]) that, due to the complexity of linguistic phenomena, it is necessary to restrict a part of it: the language. In the Soviet textbook, language is a system, a linguistic norm [42] and a discursive activity. [43] Our understanding is that these three "faces" of the language arise from the critical assimilation of the dichotomy of the "Course" (SAUSSURE, 1959 [1916]), through the work of Russian Linguist Liev Chierba "On the triadic aspect of linguistic phenomena and the experiment in linguistics" (1931), and the influence of German linguist, Wilhelm Humboldt. In short, the Soviet and Brazilian linguistics presented in the textbooks have the same empirical object – verbal human language – from which different theoretical objects are constituted.

Finally, we address the presentation of the methods in linguistics. However, we believe it is necessary to elucidate the main trends in the conceptions of method – a traditionally problematic issue. The word 'method' originates from the Greek meta+hodos (in pursuit of+way) and, from the 16th century on, it already has the meaning of scientific investigation (CUNHA, 2010). Furthermore we see two meanings for method:

> **Method** – What is customarily understood by method is a programmed sequence of operations that aims to obtain a result according to the demands of the theory. In this sense, the term method is almost synonymous with procedures; particular, explicit and well defined methods, which have general value, and are instrumental to procedures of discovery. (GREIMAS; COURTÉS, 2010, p.311, our translation).[44]

---

[42] **Norm** – "[…] set of everything that was said and understood in a determined concrete situation, in one or another time of a given social group life." (CHIERBA, 1974 [1931], p.26). In other words, "[…] the social conditioning and limitation of one or another structure, as well as the functioning and historical development of the language." (KODUKHOV, 1974, p.122).

[43] Discursive activity refers to the process of speech and its comprehension, emphasizing that the two aspects are equally active: comprehension is both conditioned by speech and conditions it..

[44] Original: ***Método -*** *Entende-se habitualmente por método uma sequência programada de operações que visa à obtenção de um resultado conforme as exigências da teoria. Nesse sentido, o termo método é quase sinônimo de*

> **Method –** (from the Greek methodos – way of research) in linguistics –1) set of general theoretical directives, procedures, method for research on language, linked to a particular linguistic theory and with a general methodology, also called General Method. 2) Particular procedures, method, operations based on determinate theoretical directives, such as technical means, instruments for research of different aspects of language, - Particular Methods. (IARTSEVA, 1990, p.298, our translation).[45]

Greimas and Courtés (2010) identify the method as a part of the theory, distinguishing it from the latter; while the Russian dictionary of Iartseva admits a broader meaning in which method can be used as synonymous with theory, and a particular meaning, such as procedures of scientific discovery linked to a method, similar to the definition of Greimas and Courtés.

The Brazilian textbook begins the chapter "Linguistic Methods" with the affirmation "The development of linguistics has led to the appearance of various research methods, all of them with fertile results." (BORBA, 1970 [1967], p.143, our translation)[46] and goes on immediately to its enumeration and exposition. The Russian textbook dedicates a chapter to the definition of method of research and philosophical method, or rather, presents the relationship between methods in linguistic science and a general theory of knowledge:

> *Method* [...] is the path to the knowledge of the object, the aspects that constitute it, and how it functions. The knowledge (including scientific thought) is an infinite approximation of the thought in relation to the object, a process of dominion over human nature, the laws of development of society and thought itself. (KODUKHOV, 1974, p.202, our translation).[47]

> Knowledge as process is completed in three stages: research (discovery of the facts or their relationships), systematization (interpretation and

---

*procedimentos; métodos particulares, explicitados e bem definidos, que têm um valor geral, são equiparáveis a procedimentos de descoberta.* (GREIMAS; COURTÉS, 2010, p.311).

[45] Original: *Метод (от греч. méthodos – путь исследования) в языкознании – 1) обобщенные совокупности теоретических установок, приёмов, методик исследования языка, связанные с определенной лингвистической теорией и с общей методологией, - т. наз. Общие М. 2) Отдельные приёмы, методики, операции, опирающиеся на определенные теоретич. установки, как технич. средство, инструмент для исследования того или иного аспекта языка, - частные М.* (ЯРЦЕВА, 1990, p.298).

[46] Original: "*O desenvolvimento da lingüística tem propiciado o aparecimento de vários métodos de pesquisa, todos eles de resultados fecundos.*" (BORBA, 1970 [1967], p.143).

[47] Original: **Метод** [...] *средство познания объекта, его отдельных сторон, его функционирования. Познание (в том числе научное мышление) представляет собой бесконечное приближение мышления в объекту, процесс овладения человека природой, а также законами развития общество и самого мышления.* (KODUKHOV, 1974, p.202).

demonstration) and exposition (description) (KODUKHOV, 1974, p.205, our translation).[48]

*Observation of language* – they are the rules and techniques of what is taken from the text (or the flow of speech) of one or another fact, and of includng it in a category that has been studied (a system). (KODUKHOV, 1974, p.206, our translation).[49]

*Interpretation* consists of the discovery of the meaning of results obtained, and of defining the characteristic contents or through inclusion of them in an existing theory (as a confirmation or complement), or through the creation of a new theory, if the results obtained and their characteristic contents do not enter into the realm of a former theory. (KODUKHOV, 1974, p.210, our translation).[50]

Besides the methods of knowledge, and general scientific methods, there are even specific methods – of scientific research, and of individual sciences [...] the structure of the research method is determined by the interaction between the aspect, the procedure, the research methods and mode of description. (KODUKHOV, 1974, p.213, our translation).[51]

The Russian compendium defines scientific knowledge in general, then describes scientific research methods, and presents the carrying out of these methods in linguistics. Its definition of method includes the methodological procedures of selection, collection, description, and interpretation of data. We can highlight, moreover, the aspectualization of the methods, or rather, the delimitation of the constituent elements of the different concepts (for example, the definition of knowledge as the "process of dominion over human nature, the laws of development of society, and thought itself.") and of the different stages or phases of carrying out the research (for example, "research (discovery of facts or their relationships), systematization (interpretation and demonstration) and exposition (description)"). The exposition of epistemological principles (in the sense of principles of doing science in general) permit the Soviet

---

[48]  Original: *Познание как процесс включает три основных этапа: исследования (открытия фактов или их взаимосвязи), систематизации (интерпретации и доказательства) и изложения (описания).* (KODUKHOV, 1974, p.205).

[49]  Original: *Лингвистическое наблюдение – это правила и техника выделения из текста (или потока речи) того или иного факта и включение его в изучаемую категорию (систему).* (KODUKHOV, 1974, p.206).

[50]  Original: *Интерпретация состоит в раскрытии смысла полученных результатов и определении содержательной характеристики или путём включения их в существующие теории (как подтверждения или дополнения), или путём создания новой теории, если полученные результаты и их содержательные характеристики не укладываются в рамки старой теории.* (KODUKHOV, 1974, p.210).

[51]  Original: *Кроме методов познания и общенаучных методов есть ещё частные методы – научно-исследовательские, методы отдельных наук. [...] структура исследовательского метода определяется взаимодействием аспекта#, приёма#, и методики# исследования и способа# описания.* (KODUKHOV, 1974, p.213).

student of Language and Literature to understand linguistics in relation to a general theory of doing science.

Additionally, in relation to method, in the compendiums, sections are dedicated to the definition of the main methods of linguistics. In the Brazilian textbook five methods are presented: historical, comparative, geographic, of words and things, descriptive and glottochronological. In the Soviet manual, in principle, we find just two – descriptive and comparative – among which are distributed those presented as different from the Brazilian compendium: the geographic and the words and things are described as procedures withing the descriptive method, and the glottochronological, of the historical-comparative. We go now to the analysis of how the two major methods – descriptive and historical-comparative – appear in the two compendiums:

Table 7 – The linguistic method in Brazil and the Soviet Union

| BORBA, F. da S. *Introdução aos estudos linguísticos.* 2. ed. São Paulo: Companhia Editora Nacional, 1970 [1967]. | Descriptive linguistics seeks to comprehend language as form, with the understanding of this last term as the set of elements that serves a particular social group for intercommunication and expression. Describing a language is accounting for its formal completeness, demonstrating everything that is unique and unmistakable to it. The first concern in this sense has to be to rigorously show what is permanent in the language and, therefore, not shared with others. (p.50, our translation)[52] The good description determines with assurance how communication is done, that is, determines all the significant units (originating from the first articulation_ and distinctive (originating from the second articulation). A descriptive study covers [...] external and internal features (p.51, our translation)[53] The external features are in function of the social groups, which determine the extension of the domain of the language, the nature of its functions of relations, its functioning in external varieties. (p.51, our translation)[54] The description of the internal elements of a language can be carried out on four levels: phonological, grammatical, lexical and stylistic. (p.53, our translation)[55] |

---

[52] Original: *A linguística descritiva procura compreender uma língua como forma, entendendo-se por este último termo aquele conjunto de elementos de que se serve um determinado grupo social para a intercomunicação e expressão. Descrever uma língua é dar conta de sua plenitude formal, demonstrando tudo o que lhe é peculiar e inconfundível. O primeiro cuidado neste sentido há de ser o de precisar rigorosamente aquilo que é permanente na língua e, portanto, não comum com outras.* (BORBA, 1970 [1967], p.50).

[53] Original: *A boa descrição determina com segurança como se faz a comunicação, isto é, determina todas as unidades significativas (provenientes da primeira articulação) e distintivas (provenientes da segunda articulação). Um estudo descritivo abrange [...] caracteres externos e internos* (BORBA, 1970 [1967], p.51).

[54] Original: *Os caracteres externos estão em função dos grupos sociais, que determinam a extensão do domínio da língua, a natureza de suas funções de relação, seu funcionamento em variedades externas.* (BORBA, 1970 [1967], p.51).

[55] Original: *A descrição dos elementos internos de uma língua pode ser feita em quatro planos: fonológico, gramatical, léxico e estilístico.* (BORBA, 1970 [1967], p.53).

| KODUKHOV, V. I. *Óbchee iazikoznánie* [-General Linguistics - Linguística Geral]. Moscou: Víchaia Chkola, 1974. | Descriptive Method: <u>it is the oldest and at the same time</u> the most modern method of linguistics. <u>The ancient grammars of Chinese, Indian and Greek were predominately descriptive</u> [...]<br><br>What is refered to as descriptive method is a system of descriptive procedures, applied for the characterization of phenomena of the language in one given stage of its development; this is a <u>synchronic analysis.</u> (p.219, our translation, emphasis added).[56]<br><br>In the first stage of the descriptive analysis words and phrases are extracted from the text, that is, denominative and communicative units of the language. (p.219, our translation).[57]<br><br>The second stage in the descriptive analysis consists in the division of what was extracted from the text in units, that is, the identification of structural units [...] segmented as morpheme and word, syntagm and parts of the phrase.<br><br>The third stage of descriptive analysis is linked with the interpretation of the nominative-comunicative and structural units extracted.<br><br>The structural interpretation (not structuralist!) is carried out above all with the help of an application of categorical and discrete analysis. (p.220, our translation).[58]<br><br><u>The structuralists (and not only them, since similar opinions existed before them) are mistaken, when these units of linguistic analysis and of relations among them reveal the immanent essence of the language. This constitutes, undoubtedly, the rise of neopositivism, which can only be overcome by assuming the principles of dialectical materialism.</u> (p.222, our translation, emphasis added).[59] |

**Source:** Author's elaboration.

Both compendiums present two very distinct descriptive methods. The Brazilian textbook begins with a definition of linguistic form[60] exposing the double articulation

---

[56] Original: *Описательный метод – самый старый и в то же время современный метод лигвистики. Древнейшие китайские, индийские и греческие грамматики были по преимуществу описательными* [...]
*Описательном методом называется система исследовательских приёмов, применяемых для характеристики явлений языка на данном этапе его развития; это синхронного анализа.* (KODUKHOV, 1974, p.219).

[57] Original: *На первом этапе описательного анализя из текста выделяются слова и предложения, т. е. номинативные и коммуникативные единицы языка.* (KODUKHOV, 1974, p.219).

[58] Original: *Второй этап описательного анализа состоит в членении выделеных из текста единиц, т. е. нахождении структурных единиц* [...] *вычленяются морфема и словоформа, словосочетание и член предложения.*
*Третий этап описательного анализа связан с интерпретацией выделеных номинативно-коммуникативных и структурных единиц.*
*Структурная (не структуралическая!) интерпретация осуществляется чаще всего при помощи методик категориального и дискретного анализа.* (KODUKHOV, 1974, p.220).

[59] Original: *Структуралисты (и не только они, так как подобные взгляды существовали и ранее) ошибаются тогда, когда эти единицы лигвистического анализа и отношения между ними объявляют иманентной сущностью языка. Это, несомнено, проявление неопозитивизма, преодолеть которе можно только с принципиальной позиции диалектического материализма.* (KODUKHOV, 1974, p.222).

[60] An ambiguity marks the use of the formal term, which can be understood both as the study of forma (as opposed to the study of content and as the study of the abstract network of structural relations (in this case, it applies both to the study of forms and content). *Uma ambigüidade marca o uso do termo formal, que pode ser entendido tanto como o estudo das formas (em oposição a estudo do conteúdo) quanto como o estudo da rede abstrata das relações estruturais (neste caso, aplica-se tanto ao estudo de formas quanto de conteúdos).*] (ALTMAN, 1998, p.298).

of language, dividing external and internal aspects of language, these latter being composed of four levels of linguistic analysis. The concept of form is presented in a simplified manner, most likely due to the apperceptive background of understanding of the reader of the textbook. It is not very clear what the author understands as "levels", because, with the inclusion of "stylistic", we perceive that he is not speaking of levels of the linguistic analysis of Benveniste (1997 [1962]) which range up to the level of the phrase, while the last level of language is composed of signs.

The Russian compendium highlights the historical antecedents of the descriptive method, delimiting its synchronic nature, and goes on to describe the procedures of identification of the linguistic units and their interpretation (this is understood as the classifying of units in categories), criticizing the assumption of the immanent nature of language (that is, the affirmation of the interiority of its constitutent elements and the denial of external forces on the language, COMTE-SPONVILLE, 2000) – which can only be overcome by dialectical materialism – proletariat and Marxist philosophy.

The historical-comparative method is also described in both the compendiums:

**Table 8** – The historical-comparative method in Brazil and the Soviet Union

| | |
|---|---|
| BORBA, F. da S. *Introdução aos estudos linguísticos.* 2. ed. São Paulo: Companhia Editora Nacional, 1970 [1967]. | **Historical-comparative Method –** The comparative method, developed from the 19th century on, provides the conditions for the teachings inferred from the scientific comparison. [...] The linguists that contributed greatly to the success of the comparative researches (Bopp, for example) had different aims from those pursued by the modern comparativists, since, influenced by the ideas of the 18th century, they seeked to arrive at the beginning of things and account for the genesis of the linguistic forms in their oldest state, according to the most archaic data possible provided by the set of languages considered. (p.144-145, our translation).[61] <br><br>The historical-comparative method allows for the inductive restauration of the original linguistic form from which the various current forms were derived, making possible the fairly faithful reconstruction of any language that has disappeared without a documental trace. It also enables the reconstruction of spoken forms of a language hidden behind the ancient documents, whether literary, epigraphic or critical texts. (p.147, our translation).[62] <br><br>Despite its advantages, this method is subject to several limitations: 1) Conclusions provide probability and not certainty of the existence of a particular linguistic phenomenon. [...] 2) It does not permit the complete reconstruction of a language because there are phenomena that escape comparison. [...] 3) As languages vary in time with great inequality, we have never found a perfect unified state [...] 4) The reconstruction of the vocabulary, which provides valuable subsidies for phonetic, morphological and even syntactic reconstruction, runs the risk of escaping, at times, comparison because many etymologies depend on the history elaborated with the help of testimonies. <br><br>The historical-comparative method used with criterion and rigor, with approximations subject to strict rules, will be efficient when used with supplementary resources, such as texts, epigraphic and grammatical documents. (p. 148)[63] |

---

[61] Original: *Método histórico-comparativo – O método comparativo, elaborado a partir do século XIX, fornece as condições para os ensinamentos depreendidos da comparação científica. [...] Os lingüistas que muito contribuíram para o sucesso das pesquisas comparativas (Bopp, por ex.) tinham finalidades diferentes dos comparatistas modernos, pois, levados pelas idéias do século XVIII, procuravam chegar ao início das coisas e dar conta, de acordo com os dados mais arcaicos possíveis, fornecidos pelo conjunto de línguas consideradas, da gênese das formas lingüísticas em seu estado mais antigo.* (BORBA, 1970 [1967], p.144-145).

[62] Original: *O método histórico-comparativo permite a restauração indutiva da forma lingüística original de que vieram as diferentes formas atuais, possibilitando a reconstrução mais ou menos fiel de uma língua que desapareceu sem deixar documentos. Possibilita a reconstrução de formas faladas de uma língua oculta por trás de documentos antigos, seja textos literários, epigráficos ou críticos.* (BORBA, 1970 [1967], p.147).

[63] Original: *Apesar de suas vantagens, este método está sujeito a várias limitações:*
*1ª) As conclusões a que nos leva dão probabilidade e não certeza da existência de um determinado fenômeno lingüístico.* [...]
*2ª) Não permite a reconstrução completa de uma língua porque há fenômenos que escapam à comparação.* [...]
*3ª) Como as línguas variam no tempo com rapidez desigual, nunca encontramos um estado unitário perfeito* [...]
*4ª) A reconstrução do vocabulário, que fornece subsídios valiosos para a reconstrução fonética, morfológica e até sintática, corre o perigo de escapar, às vezes, à comparação, porque muitas etimologias dependem da história feita com a ajuda de testemunhas.*
*O método histórico-comparativo usado com critério e rigor, com aproximações sujeitas a regras estritas, será eficiente quando usado com recursos suplementares, como textos, documentos epigráficos e gramaticais.* (BORBA, 1970 [1967], p.148).

| KODUKHOV, V. I. *Óbchee iazikoznánie* [Linguística Geral]. Moscou: Víchaia Chkola, 1974. | The comparison of language is based on two types of comparative methods: historical-comparative and constrastive-comparative. [...] The historical-comparative method aims not only to compare languages and their phenomena, but also the discovery of the development of related languages; the objective of the comparative-constrastive method is to characterize phenomena comparable in two or more languages establishing what is common to each, and different in analogous phenomena, abstracting it from history and its origin. (p. 253)[64] <br><br> Historical-comparative linguistics studies related languages, their classification, history and expansion. (p.254, our translation)[65] |
| --- | --- |

**Source:** Author's elaboration.

Both textbooks delimit the evolution of the languages as object of the historical-comparative method, but the Soviet compendium clarifies that it deals with the reconstruction of the common origin of related languages. We observe significant differences in both the evaluation of the method and its composition: in the Brazillian textbook, insufficiencies on the historical-comparative method are pointed out, which can be used given complementary empirical resources; the Soviet textbook presents the "comparative method" that is divided in historical-comparative and contrastive, with the objective of comparing languages among themselves, without the aim of historical reconstruction and without the need to compare them by kinship.

In the presentation of the methods, we identify distinct evaluations in relation to the descriptive and historical-comparative methods. In the Brazilian textbook, the descriptive method is presented synthetically and simplified due to two factors: firstly, the assumption of the apperceptive background of understanding of the presumed addressee according to what we have previously pointed out ("Still unaccustomed to handling foreign bibliographies and under the impact of an almost entirely new discipline, it is natural that the student is unable to produce sufficiently or, even becomes discouraged.") and of the fact that the entire second section is dedicated to the exposition of the structure of the language,[66] a space in which the reader can comprehend, at length, the concept of form. While the Brazilian textbook does not restrict the descriptive method, the historical-comparative method is the object of a series of critiques that indicate insufficiencies in its procedures. In the Soviet compendium, the descriptive method has ancient historical antecedents (its origin is found in Chinese, Indian, and Greek grammars) and critiques are made on the structuralist approach, which defends the immanent character of units of linguistic analysis. This neopositivist

---

[64] Original: *На сравнении языков основаны два вида сравнительного метода – сравнительно-исторический и сравнительно-сопоставительный. [...] Сравнительно-исторический метод имеет целью на только сравнение языков и их явлений, но и обнаружение развития родственных языков; цель сравнетельно-сопоставительного метода – охарактеризовать сопоставляемые явления двух или нескольких языков,установить общее и различное в аналогичных явлениях, отвлекаясь от истории и их происхождения.* (KODUKHOV, 1974, p.253).

[65] Original: *Сравнительно-исторический метод основывается на понятии генетической общности и наличии семей и групп родственных языков.* (KODUKHOV, 1974, p.254).

[66] Cf. summary transcribed at the beginning of the article.

approach can be overcomed by the field of dialectical materialism, since the historical-comparative method is a subdivision within the comparative method divided into historical-comparative and contrastive, and we do not find restrictions on them.

## Final Considerations

The central objective of the comparative analysis of utterances in the two languages/cultures, as we have highlighted in the introduction of this article, is to bring us to the identification of the specificities of both contrasting trends. The path of comparative analysis of the Brazilian and Soviet textbooks reveal significant similarities and differences in the presentation of linguistics to students majoring in Language and Literature in Brazil and in the Soviet Union in the late 1960s and early 1970s.

The choice of the genre "introductory textbook", by vernacular authors, seems relevant to us, as these compendiums allow for the understanding of definitions, concepts, and procedures in the science of language that members in the field encounter, and that shape their "apperceptive background of understanding", marking the path, more or less unconscious, of their trajectory in the sphere of Linguistics. The following table intends to synthesize the main differences found between the two textbooks:

**Table 9** – Comparison overview[67]

| Brazilian Publishing Market | Russian Publishing Market |
|---|---|
| Introductory Textbooks for the disciplines of linguistics (Phonology, Syntax, etc.) | Large quantity of textbooks of general introduction to linguistics. |
| Texts by various authors | Authorial texts |
| **BORBA, F. da S. *Introdução aos estudos linguísticos.* [Introduction to Linguistic Studies] 2. ed. São Paulo: Companhia Editora Nacional, 1970 [1967].** | **KODUKHOV, V. I. *Óbchee iazikoznánie* [Linguística Geral – General Linguistics]. Moscou: Víchaia Chkola, 1974.** |
| Personal style – the questioning of scientific objectivity | Impersonal style – scientific style |

---

67 Text in Portuguese by row: Row 1) **Mercado editorial brasileiro;** Manuais de introdução a disciplinas da linguística (Fonologia, Sintaxe etc.); Textos de diversos autores; **BORBA, F. da S. *Introdução aos estudos linguísticos.* 2. ed. São Paulo: Companhia Editora Nacional, 1970 [1967].;** Estilo pessoal – questionamento da objetividade científica; Graduando de Letras – falta de conhecimentos e habilidades; A linguística é uma ciência elaborada no exterior; Linguística saussureana e chomskiana; Diálogo polêmico com a "aplicação prática imediata"; Humboldt – etapa ultrapassada; Saussure – positivista e inovador; Objeto da linguística: língua; Críticas ao método histórico-comparativo. Row 2) **Mercado editorial russo;** Grande quantidade de manuais de introdução geral à linguística; Textos autorais; **KODUKHOV, V. I. *Óbchee iazikoznánie* [Linguística Geral]. Moscou: Víchaia Chkola, 1974.;** Estilo impessoal – estilo científico; Graduando de Letras – em processo de aprimoramento; Linguistas russos e soviéticos fazem parte da elaboração da linguística, Linguística soviética – autônoma e em conexão com a linguística mundial; Filosofia da linguagem alemã (Humboldt); Diálogo polêmico entre o idealismo e o materialismo; Humboldt – fundador da linguística geral; Saussure – um elo na esfera da linguística; Objeto da linguística: sistema, norma linguística, atividade discursiva; Críticas ao método descritivo.

| Undergraduates in Language and Literature – lack of knowledge and skills | Undergraduates in Language and Literature – in the process of improving |
|---|---|
| Linguistics is a Science developed abroad. | Russian and Soviet linguists play a part in the development of linguistics<br>Soviet linguistics – autonomous and in connection with world linguistics |
| Saussrean and Chomskian linguistics | Philosophy of the German language (Humboldt) |
| Controversial dialogue with the "immediate practical application" | Controversial dialogue between idealism and materialism |
| Humboldt – outdated stage | Humboldt – founder of general linguistics |
| Saussure – positivist and innovative | Saussure – a link in the domain of linguistics |
| The object of study in linguistics: language | The object of study in linguistics: system, linguistic norm, discursive activity |
| Criticism of the historical-comparative method | Criticism of the descriptive method |

**Source:** Author's elaboration.

The history of the science in the two languages/cultures, the dialogue with linguistics developed in countries with greater tradition in the area, and the greater social realm, were factors that set limits, exerted pressures and directed meanings for the presentation of linguistics to future members of this science in the two languages/cultures. The interaction of these three sociohistorical processes were fundamental in the definition of linguistic schools, in the delimitation of the object of linguistics, and in the evaluation of its methods.

GRILLO, S. A Linguística em manuais brasileiro e soviético. **Alfa**, São Paulo, v.64, 2020.

- *RESUMO: O objetivo deste artigo é apresentar os resultados de uma pesquisa em análise comparativa de manuais de introdução à linguística brasileiro e soviético do final dos anos 1960 e início dos anos 1970. A delimitação do material de comparação foi empreendida por meio do procedimento metodológico denominado tertium comparationis, tal como ele foi desenvolvido pelos pesquisadores do Clesthia – axe sens et discours. A análise dos manuais foi orientada pelos conceitos e procedimentos elaborados por Bakhtin e o Círculo. Concluímos que a história da ciência nas duas línguas/culturas, o diálogo com a linguística desenvolvida em países com maior tradição na área e o meio social mais amplo foram fatores que fixaram limites, exerceram pressões e direcionaram sentidos para as apresentações da linguística aos futuros integrantes dessa ciência. A interação desses três processos sociohistóricos são fundamentais na definição das escolas linguísticas, na delimitação do objeto da linguística e na avaliação dos seus métodos.*

- *PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Análise comparativa de discursos. Manuais de Introdução à Linguística. Brasil. União Soviética.*

# REFERENCES

AMÍROVA, T. A.; OLKHÓVIKOV, B. A.; ROJDIÉSTVENSKII, I. V. **Istóriia iazikoznánia** [History of linguistics]. 5.ed. Moscou: Izdátelstkii tséntr "Akadiémiia", 2008.

ALTMAN, C. **A pesquisa linguística no Brasil (1968-1988)**. São Paulo: Humanitas/FFLCH/USP, 1998.

BAKHTIN, M. M. **Problems of Dostoevsky's poetics**. Trans. C. Emerson. Minneapolis; London: University of Minnesota Press, 2003.

BAKHTIN, M. M. **Speech genres and other later essays**. Trans. V. W. McGee. 6[th]ed. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1996.

BAKHTIN, M. M. **Problems of Dostoyevsky's poetics**. Edited and Translated by Caryl Emerson. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984.

BENVENISTE, E. Les niveaux de l'analyse linguistique. *In*: BENVENISTE, E. **Problèmes de linguistique générale I.** Paris: Gallimard, 1997 [1962]. p.119-131.

BORBA, F. da S. **Introdução aos estudos linguísticos**. 2.ed. São Paulo: Cia. Nacional, 1970 [1967].

CAMARA JUNIOR, J. M. **Princípios de linguística geral.** 7.ed. Rio de Janeiro: Padrão Livraria Editoria, 1989 [1941].

COMTE-SPONVILLE, A. (Org.) **Dictionnaire de la philosophie.** Paris: Encyclopaedia Universalis/Albin Michel, 2000.

CORACINI, M. J. **Um fazer persuasivo:** o discurso subjetivo da ciência. São Paulo: Educ; Campinas: Pontes, 1991.

CUNHA, A. G. da. **Dicionário etimológico da língua portuguesa.** 4.ed. Rio de Janeiro: Lexicon, 2010.

EDMUNDSON, M. V. A. da S. **Relações dialógicas no processo de ressignificação do discurso científico em enunciados de notícia de popularização da ciência.** 2017. Thesis (Doctor in Linguistics) - Universidade Federal da Paraíba, João Pessoa, 2017.

FIORIN, J. L. (Org.) **Introdução à Linguística. I.** Objetos teóricos. 6.ed. São Paulo: Contexto, 2018.

GREIMAS, A. J.; COURTÉS, J. **Dicionário de semiótica.** Trad. D. A. D. Lima et al. São Paulo: Contexto, 2010.

GRILLO, S. V. C. Marxismo e filosofia da linguagem: uma resposta à ciência da linguagem do século XIX e início do XX. *In*: VOLOCHINOV, V. N. **Marxismo e**

**filosofia da linguagem:** problemas fundamentais do método sociológico na ciência da linguagem. São Paulo: Ed. 34, 2017. p.7-82.

GRILLO, S. V. C. Esfera e campo. *In*: BRAIT, B. **Bakhtin:** outros conceitos-chave. São Paulo: Contexto, 2006. p.133-160.

GRILLO, S. V. C.; GLUSHKOVA, M . A divulgação científica no Brasil e na Rússia: um ensaio de análise comparativa de discursos. **Bakhtiniana - revista de estudos do discurso**, São Paulo, v.11, p.69-92, 2016.

GRILLO, S. V. C.; HIGACHI, A. Enunciados verbo-visuais na divulgação científica no Brasil e na Rússia: as revistas scientific american brasil e v míre naúki (no mundo da ciência). *In*: KOZMA, E. V. B.; PUZZO, M. B. (org.). **Múltiplas linguagens:** discurso e efeito de sentido. Campinas: Pontes, 2017. v.1, p.91-130.

IARTSEVA, V. N. **Lingvistícheskii Entsiklopedítcheskii Slovar** [Encyclopedic linguistics dictionary]. Moscou: Soviétskaia Entsiklopédiia, 1990.

HUMBOLDT, W. F. **Kontsiéptsiia óbchego iazikoznániia:** tsiéli, soderjánie, struktura. Ízbrannie perevódi. [Conception of a general linguistics: objectives, contente, structure. Selected translated texts]. Trans. L. P. Lobanova. Moscou: Lenand, 2018.

HUMBOLDT, V. F. **O razlítchi organízmov tcheloviétcheskogo iaziká i o vliáni étogo razlítchia na úmstvennoe razvítie tcheloviétcheskogo roda: vvedénie vo vseóbschee iazikoznánie** [On the distinction of human language organisms and the influence of this distinction on the intelectual development of humankind: introduction to general linguistics]. Trans. de P. S. Biliárski. 2.ed. Moscou: Librokom, 2013 [1859].

KODUKHOV, V. I. **Óbchee iazikoznánie** [General linguistics]. Moscou: Víchaia Chkola, 1974.

KÓJINA, M. N. **Stilístika rússkogo iazyká**. [Russian language stylistics]. Moscou: Flinta, 2008.

MÜNCHOW, P. von. L'analyse du discours contrastive, un voyage au cœur du discours. *In*: COLÓQUIO BRASILEIRO-FRANCO-RUSSO EM ANÁLISE DE DISCURSO, 1., 2017, São Paulo. **Análise de Discurso e Comparação**: questões teóricas, metodológicas e empíricas. São Paulo: Universidade de São Paulo, nov. 2017. Communication in I Colóquio Brasileiro-Franco-Russo em Análise de Discurso.

MÜNCHOW, P. von. Cultures, discours, langues: aspects récurrents, idées emergentes. Contextes, représentations et modèles mentaux. *In*: CLAUDEL, C.; MÜNCHOW, P. von; RIBEIRO, M. P.; PUGNIÈRE-SAAVEDRA, F.; TRÉGUER-FELTEN. G. **Cultures, discours, langues:** nouveaux abordages. Limoges: Lambert-Lucas, 2013. p.187-207.

MÜNCHOW, P. von. **Lorsque l'enfant paraît**... Le discours des guides parentaux en France et en Allemagne. Toulouse: PUM, 2011.

MÜNCHOW, P. von. **Les journaux télévisés en France et en Allemagne:** plaisir de voir ou devoir de s'informer. Paris: Presses Sorbonne Nouvelle, 2005.

MUSSALIM, F; BENTES, A. C. (org.). **Introdução à linguística:** domínios e fronteiras. São Paulo: Cortez, 2001. vols. 1 and 2.

PERETRUKHIN, V. N. **Vvediénie v iazikoznánie [**Introduction to linguistics]. Moscou: Librakom, 2016 [1972].

SAUSSURE, F. de. **Course in General Linguistics**. Translated by Wade Baskin. New York: Philosophical Library, 1959.

VOLOCHINOV, V. N. **Marxism and the Philosophy of Language**. Translated by Ladislav Matejka and I.R. Titunik. New York: Seminar Press, 1973 [1929].