

**GRILLO, S. V. C.; REBOUL-TOURE, S. (Org.); GLUSHKOVA, Maria (Org.). *Analyse du discours et comparaison: enjeux théoriques et méthodologiques* [*Discourse Analysis and Comparison: Theoretical and Methodological Questions*]. Bruxells: Peter Lang, 2021. 350 p.**

*Vanessa Fonseca Barbosa\**



---

\* Postdoctoral researcher in Languages at Faculdade de Filosofia, Letras e Ciências Humanas, Departamento de Letras Clássicas e Vernáculas, Campus Butantã, Universidade de São Paulo – USP, São Paulo, São Paulo, Brazil; CAPES Process n.2019-446; <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2901-015X>; [vanessafonbar@usp.br](mailto:vanessafonbar@usp.br)

*Analyse du discours et comparaison: enjeux théoriques et méthodologiques* [Discourse Analysis and Comparison: Theoretical and Methodological Questions], henceforth *ADC*, published by Peter Lang, a renowned French Publishing House, is comprised of 12 articles written by scholars who carry out research in the large academic field of Discourse Analysis. They are affiliated to well-known higher education institutions from three countries, namely, France, Brazil, and Russia. The articles are the result of a rewarding partnership between members of the research group called *Diálogo* [Dialogue] (CNPq/USP), led by Professors Sheila Grillo (University of São Paulo) and Dária Shchukina (Mining University, Saint Petersburg), and members of *Cediscor*, the *Centre de recherche sur les discours ordinaires et spécialisés* [Research Center on Ordinary and Specialized Discourses] (*Clesthia*, Université Sorbonne Nouvelle – Paris 3).

At the end of 2017 this group of researchers organized the 1st Brazilian-French-Russian Colloquium on Discourse Analysis at the University of São Paulo. The colloquium focused on the theoretical and methodological tenets of Comparative or Contrastive Analysis of Discourse (henceforth, CAD)<sup>1</sup> as well as the place and role of comparison in studies done in France, Brazil, and Russia. *ADC*, then, brings some of the discussions done during the 2017 International Colloquium. According to the book editors, the selected research in the wide field of discourse studies “(...) are theoretically addressed through three perspectives: contrastive/comparative analysis of discourse, Bakhtin, Medvedev, Vološinov’s dialogism, and Russian linguoculture” (p.13).<sup>2</sup>

This is a relevant work, especially to Brazilians who are interested in discourse studies. *ADC* represents a milestone in the understanding and dissemination of studies done by researchers with solid scientific activity in the field of comparative analysis of discourse, which is relatively new in Brazil. It is noteworthy that the establishment of this dialogue does not disregard traditional studies in the field of Comparison, as Sheila Vieira de Camargo Grillo (University of São Paulo), Sandrine Reboul-Touré (Université

---

<sup>1</sup> We find the use of the terms *comparative* and *contrastive* throughout the book. In France scholars name it *Contrastive Analysis of Discourse*, whereas in Brazil the preferred name is *Comparative Analysis of Discourse*, as the term *contrastive* is usually associated with studies carried out in the area of linguistic structuralism.

<sup>2</sup> In French: “(...) s’inscrivent, sur le plan théorique, dans une triple perspective : l’analyse des discours contrastive/comparative, le dialogisme de Bakhtine, Medvedev, Volóchinov et la linguoculturologie russe.”

Sorbonne Nouvelle – Paris 3), Maria Glushkova (University of São Paulo), and Flávia Silvia Machado (Université Paris Nanterre) clearly state in their introduction to the book.

Besides, as the reader gets to know the research presented in each chapter, he/she has the opportunity not only to understand the points of contact between the main theoretical and methodological principles of CAD, but also to glimpse the plurality of approaches and feasible interrelationships that can be established in academic works done in the area. The main objective of this epistemological approach is to, “integrating language sciences, (...) compare not only languages but also different cultures” (Sardá *et al.*, 2022; to be published).<sup>3</sup> In this vein, the articles evince the relevance “of the concept of culture and the relationship between language, discourse and culture [as] central points of contrastive analysis” (Grillo; Glushkova, 2016, p.75).<sup>4</sup>

In the introduction Grillo, Reboul-Touré, Glushkova and Machado make it clear that *ADC* aims to address a specific challenge, that is, “on the one hand, to investigate the role of comparison to describe, understand and interpret discourses, and, on the other, to bring together research around comparison, done in diversified corpora” (pp.13-14)<sup>5</sup> by Brazilian, French and Russian scientists. To accomplish this goal, besides the Introduction, the book is divided into four main sections, each one bringing related articles. The titles of the sections are: 1) Análise Comparativa/Contrastiva do Discurso: elementos de disposição teórica [Comparative/Contrastive Analysis of Discourse: Elements of a Theoretical Framework]; 2) A articulação entre Língua e Cultura [Articulation between Language and Culture]; 3) Comparação e Gêneros do Discurso: a produção de conhecimentos [Comparison and Discourse Genres: Knowledge Production]; and 4) Comparação: abertura teórica [Comparison: Theoretical Openness].

Subsequently, each article that belongs to the aforementioned sections will be briefly discussed. By selecting some of the diverse and relevant aspects of the texts, we seek to highlight to the readers of this review the wealth of the epistemological principles that are placed in dialogue, the plurality of corpora, and the multiplicity of possible

---

<sup>3</sup> In Portuguese: “integrando as ciências da linguagem, (...) comparar não somente diferentes línguas, mas também diferentes culturas.”

<sup>4</sup> In Portuguese: “(d)o conceito de cultura e da relação entre língua, discurso e cultura [como] pontos centrais da análise contrastiva.”

<sup>5</sup> In French: “d’une part, examiner le rôle de la comparaison pour la description, la compréhension et l’interprétation des discours, et, d’autre part, rassembler autour de la comparaison des recherches sur des corpus diversifiés.”

analyses – based on the research carried out in Brazil, France, and Russia. We also aim to disseminate the importance of the study and work material that is made available in this collection of articles.

The first section – *Análise Comparativa/Contrastiva do Discurso: elementos de disposição teórica* [Comparative/Contrastive Analysis of Discourse: Elements of a Theoretical Framework] – is comprised of three articles: i) “A análise do discurso Contrastiva: uma viagem ao centro do discurso” [Contrastive Analysis of Discourse: a Journey to the Center of discourse] by Patricia von Münchow; ii) “Fundamentos teórico-metodológicos para análises comparativas/contrastivas dos discursos: os documentos oficiais da educação básica no Brasil e na Rússia” [Theoretical and Methodological Foundations of Comparative/Contrastive Analysis of Discourses: Government Education Documents Related to Basic Education in Brazil and Russia] by Sheila Vieira de Camargo Grillo; iii) “Comparar gêneros discursivos em francês e em japonês: questionamentos teóricos e metodológicos” [Comparing Discourse Genres in French and Japanese: Theoretical and Methodological Questioning] by Chantal Claudel.

By reading these three articles, the reader is able to identify and understand the theoretical and methodological principles that are fundamental to comparative analysis of discourse, such as discursive culture, heterogeneity, and *tertium comparationis*. This understanding is possible not only because of the acuity with which the approach’s key concepts are presented by the scholars, but also due to the development of the concepts used in the analyses of the different real situations in which comparison occurs (see von Münchow; Rakotonoelina, 2006).

As to the first article, written by Patricia von Münchow (Université Paris Descartes), it is important to underscore the author’s pioneering role in CAD. Since her research done in the beginning of 2000, von Münchow has developed the approach which was first called Linguistics of Comparative Discourse. Later on, she calls it Contrastive Analysis of Discourse, as it is currently known in France (see von Münchow, 2009 [2004]). In “A análise do discurso Contrastiva: uma viagem ao centro do discurso” [Contrastive Analysis of Discourse: a Journey to the Center of Discourse], after a brief review of the main points on how CAD was established, von Münchow analyzes a set of history textbooks used in France and Germany. She aimed to showcase the importance that discursive heterogeneity has taken on over the years until it currently became a

fundamental question in the descriptive and interpretative planes of the area as well as in its theoretical and methodological planes.

The second article, written by Sheila Vieira de Camargo Grillo, titled “Fundamentos teórico-metodológicos para análises comparativas/contrastivas dos discursos: os documentos oficiais da educação básica no Brasil e na Rússia” [Theoretical and Methodological Fundamentals of Comparative/Contrastive Analysis of Discourses: Government Education Documents Related to Basic Education in Brazil and Russia], is structured based on the following objectives: delimit the concept of culture to which Grillo refers in order to base her study and compare Brazilian and Russian culture by analyzing government education documents. According to Grillo, the research stems from the assumption that a comparative analysis of discourse necessarily demands a take on culture and its relation with discourse and language. Therefore, as she discusses the concept of *discursive culture* (von Münchow, 2013) and places it in dialogue with the concept of *culture* as approached by the Bakhtin Circle, she evinces points of approximation and distancing between Russia and Brazil.

In the third article of this section, that is, “Comparar gêneros discursivos em francês e em japonês: questionamentos teóricos e metodológicos” [Comparing Discourse Genres in French and Japanese: Theoretical and Methodological Questioning], Chantal Claudel (Université Paris Nanterre) describes a comparative analysis of two different genres: interviews in print media and personal e-mail in Japanese and French. Claudel selects the concept of discourse genre as the *tertium comparationis* (element of comparison); in other words, discourse genre becomes the appropriate element to conduct comparative analysis in two linguistic communities in which the level of heterogeneity is highly relevant. According to Grillo e Glushkova (2016, p.77), “discourse genres appear as the main element of comparison used in Cediscor’s research due to its ability to show what is different not through that which is identical, but that which is close, comparable.”<sup>6</sup> This is the case of the research carried out by Claudel and other authors of this article collection.

The second section of this book, titled A articulação entre Língua e Cultura [Articulation Between Language and Culture] brings two articles: i) “A análise do

---

<sup>6</sup> In Portuguese: “o gênero discursivo figura como o principal elemento de comparação das pesquisas do Cediscor, por sua capacidade de fazer aparecer o diferente não por meio do que é idêntico, mas sim do que é próximo, comparável.”

discurso contrastiva e os discursos profissionais” [Contrastive Analysis of Discourse and Professional Discourse] by Geneviève Tréguer-Felten (Université Sorbonne Nouvelle) and ii) “Linguoculturologia: a comparação entre linguagens e culturas” [Linguoculturology: a Comparison Between Languages and Cultures] by Darya Alekseevna Shchukina (Saint-Petersburg Mining University).

In her studies, Tréguer-Felten argues that “there are close links between language and discourse. Culture is a deep and slowly evolving substrate that leaves its marks on language through discourse” (Grillo; Glushkova, 2016, p.76).<sup>7</sup> This premise is also confirmed in this article, which focuses on the use of English as a *lingua franca* in some documents of multinational companies and their translation into French. Specifically, Tréguer-Felten examines texts that comprise the companies’ code of ethics and some other official statements that are distributed to their internal and external public. In most cases, these companies do not use English as their native language, but do so to highlight the merit of their activities. Through CAD’s theoretical presuppositions placed in dialogue with interpretative analysis of culture, Tréguer-Felten showcases how discourses produced in different work situations contribute to the crystallization of specific relations between languages, cultures, and societies.

Darya Shchukina’s study, titled “Linguoculturologia: a comparação entre linguagens e culturas” [Linguoculturology: a Comparison Between Languages and Cultures], focuses on the work currently done by Russian researchers in the discipline area called Linguoculturology. Having been in Russia for around ten years, Linguoculturology is characterized by its interdisciplinarity as it is rooted in the interconnection between communication, linguistics, culturology, and psychology. Its main objective is to study the impact of culture on language and *vice-versa*. According to Shchukina, as she demonstrates it through the analysis of discourses related to the foundation anniversaries of Riga and Saint Petersburg, Linguoculturology explores the ways a people’s material and spiritual culture is represented through their language(s).

In general it is possible to state that both articles stand out due to, among other aspects, the richness of the linguistic, discursive, and cultural information provided from different enunciative situations taken place in those countries. It is important to confirm

---

<sup>7</sup> In Portuguese: “há laços estreitos entre língua e discurso, sendo a cultura um substrato profundo e de evolução lenta que, por meio do discurso, deixa suas marcas na língua.”

that the cultural dimension plays a fundamental role in their research in the area of CAD as it “allows one to see, on the one hand, the different layers of social representations disseminated within a community, and on the other, how these representations are discursively materialized by linguistic and nonlinguistic markers” (Sardá *et al.*, 2022; to be published).<sup>8</sup>

The third and largest section of the book, titled *Comparação e Gêneros do Discurso: a produção de conhecimentos* [Comparison and Discourse Genres: Knowledge Production], is comprised of five articles: i) “Comparação e categorias para a análise do discurso – O exemplo dos blogs de vulgarização científica” [Comparison and Categories for Discourse Analysis – an Example of Blogs of Scientific Popularization] by Sandrine Reboul-Touré (Université Sorbonne Nouvelle – Paris 3); ii) “Aspectos da divulgação científica em blogs brasileiros” [Aspects of Scientific Popularization in Brazilian Blogs] by Flávia Machado (Université Paris Nanterre); iii) “Traços de didaticidade na divulgação científica: uma análise dialógico-comparativa do discurso de *Ciência Hoje* e *La Recherche*” [Didactic Marks in Scientific Popularization: a Comparative-Dialogical analysis of *Ciência Hoje*’s [Science Today] and *La Recherche*’s [The Research] Discourse] by Urbano Cavalcante Filho (University of São Paulo); iv) “Philosophie Magazine e Filosofia Ciência & Vida: um suporte pedagógico e uma ferramenta para a interpretação da atualidade midiática” [Philosophie Magazine and Filosofia Ciência & Vida [Philosophy Science and Life]: a Teaching Aid and a Tool to Interpret the Mediatic Present] by Daniele Sardá (Universidade de São Paulo); and v) “Uma análise comparativa das conversações midiáticas com cientistas: a falta de água no Brasil e na Rússia” [A Comparative Analysis of Mediatic Interactions with Scientists: the Lack of Water in Brazil and Russia] by Maria Glushkova (University of São Paulo).

Reboul-Touré’s and Machado’s articles are in close dialogue as both researchers compare the same genre – scientific popularization/dissemination in French (Reboul-Touré) and in Portuguese (Machado) – and focus on linguistic and discursive categories to investigate the specific contexts of their corpora. The very use of the terms scientific popularization and dissemination reveals their research findings in CAD in two different cultural contexts: France and Brazil.

---

<sup>8</sup> In Portuguese: “permite a visualização, por um lado, das diferentes camadas de representações sociais que circulam em uma comunidade e, por outro, como essas representações se materializam discursivamente por meio de marcadores linguísticos e não-linguísticos.”

The following three articles present the findings of the research carried out by members of the research group called *Diálogo* [Dialogue] (CNPq/USP). Based on the selection of different corpora, they exemplify the quality and depth of the analyses that have been conducted by members of this Group, taking into account that “in Brazil, comparative analysis of discourse is marked mostly by its articulation with the theoretical and methodological reflections done by Bakhtin and the Circle” (Sardá *et al.*, 2022; to be published).<sup>9</sup> In 2016, as Grillo e Glushkova proposed a comparative analysis of discourses related to scientific dissemination in Brazil and Russia, they drew a parallel between Bakhtin and the Circle’s theoretical output and the fundamentals of CAD. They demonstrated that “In the set of texts on which this language theory [dialogical analysis of discourse] is formulated, we repeatedly find the comparison of phenomena from different cultures and languages” (Grillo; Glushkova, 2016, p.70).<sup>10</sup>

In this perspective Urbano Cavalcante Filho’s research – “Traços de didaticidade na divulgação científica: uma análise dialógico-comparativa do discurso de *Ciência Hoje* e *La Recherche*” [Didactic Marks in Scientific Dissemination: a Comparative-Dialogical Analysis of *Ciência Hoje*’s and *La Recherche*’s Discourse] – analyzes didactic marks in scientific dissemination discourse in the Brazilian magazine *Ciência Hoje* and the French magazine *La Recherche*. It thus points to meaningful similarities and differences between both languages/cultures. In the article “Philosophie Magazine e Filosofia Ciência & Vida: um suporte pedagógico e uma ferramenta para a interpretação da atualidade midiática” [Philosophie Magazine and Filosofia Ciência & Vida: a Teaching Aid and a Tool to Interpret the Mediatic Present], Daniela Sardá selects two magazines that are among the most popular in terms of French and Brazilian scientific dissemination in order to discuss scientific dissemination “as an activity that reformulates or translates scientific discourse as a secondary discourse” (Grillo; Giering; Motta-Roth, 2016).<sup>11</sup> She also proves that these magazines play a double social role in the different linguistic communities she analyzed. Maria Glushkova’s article, titled “Uma análise comparativa das conversações

---

<sup>9</sup> In Portuguese: “no Brasil, a análise de discursos comparativa é marcada, preponderantemente, pela articulação com as reflexões teórico-metodológicas levadas a cabo por Bakhtin e o Círculo.”

<sup>10</sup> In Portuguese: “No conjunto de textos por meio dos quais essa teoria da linguagem [a análise dialógica do discurso] é formulada, encontramos reiteradamente a comparação de fenômenos em culturas e línguas distintas.”

<sup>11</sup> In Portuguese: “como uma prática de reformulação ou de tradução do discurso científico como um discurso secundário.”



mediáticas com cientistas: a falta de água no Brasil e na Rússia” [A Comparative Analysis of Mediatic Interactions with Scientists: the Lack of Water in Brazil and Russia] by Maria Glushkova (University of São Paulo), closes this section. Its main objective is to conduct a comparative analysis of discourses from two recorded oral interviews done with Brazilian and Russian scientists about the same theme, that is, the lack of water. Thus, Glushkova points to considerable differences between both languages/cultures as to the relation between society and science in Brazil and Russia as well as to the role of science as it is understood in each country.

The book’s last section – Comparação: abertura teórica [Comparison: Theoretical Openness] – is comprised of two articles by researchers from the French university Université Sorbonne Nouvelle. They are titled: i) “Das exigências teóricas da comparação às contingências de um corpus particular: ‘immigrationniste’ em um discurso político de vocação polêmica” [From Theoretical Demands of Comparison to the Constraints of a Specific Corpus: ‘Immigrationniste’ in a Political Discourse with a Polemical Vocation] by Sophie Moirand, and ii) “Comparar para compreender a comunicação institucional: análises discursivas das lógicas comunicacionais das campanhas de informação e educação” [Comparing to Understand Institutional Communication: Discourse Analysis of the Communication Logic of Informational and Educational Campaigns] by Florimond Rakotonoelina. These texts invite us to “question comparison from a theoretical and a methodological perspective and to better identify the demands around this understanding in the field of language sciences and in the field of sciences whose epistemological focus is open” (p.28).<sup>12</sup>

Moirand’s article focuses on the path that led a linguistics of comparative discourse, based on intra and interlanguage data, to the establishment of comparison between statements daily represented in the French press during the 2017 presidential campaign. Moirand evinces different elements of a political discourse that is situated in the border between politics and the media and shows how fragments of “represented discourses,” outside their contexts, acquire different meanings and values in relation to the same events. As to Rakotonoelina’s article, based on a discourse analysis that relates Anglo-Saxon enunciation and indexical enunciation, she compares institutions’

---

<sup>12</sup> In Portuguese: “questionar a comparação tanto do ponto de vista teórico quanto do ponto de vista metodológico e a identificar melhor as exigências em torno dessa compreensão no campo das ciências da linguagem e no campo das com foco epistemológico em aberto.”

informational and educational campaigns available on the internet in order to understand, regarding their logical and pragmatic constitution, social issues involved in this type of communication. The research shows that a website, for example, is not characterized by a specific discourse, nor is it identified as a specific genre; however, it is logically organized according to a combination of different discourses and genres.

These brief observations about the texts that comprise *Analyse du discours et comparaison: enjeux théoriques et méthodologiques* [Discourse Analysis and Comparison: Theoretical and Methodological Questions] bear witness to the relevance of these works to those who study Discourse Analysis and to future research around a linguistic approach to comparative studies. In this vein, it is important to highlight that, based on such perspective, the comparative posture adopted by the researcher in this context “requires that he/she know the different realities he/she approaches, approximated by a question to be answered in a specific way through the links established between objects, subjects of knowledge, and the contexts that are external to them” (Sardá *et al.*, 2022; to be published).<sup>13</sup> Furthermore, it is also important to underscore the acuity with which the researchers focus on the corpora analyzed in the articles that comprise this book, seeking to better understand the discursive cultures or the “places” “where the social representations of communities are discursively manifest” (Cavalcante Filho, 2018, p.106).<sup>14</sup>

## REFERENCES

CAVALCANTE FILHO, U. A construção composicional em enunciados de divulgação científica: uma análise dialógico-comparativa de *Ciência Hoje e La Recherche*. *Linha D'Água*, [S. l.], v. 31, n. 3, p.99-120, 2018. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.11606/issn.2236-4242.v31i3p99-120>.

GRILLO, S. V. de C.; GLUSHKOVA, M. A divulgação científica no Brasil e na Rússia: um ensaio de análise comparativa de discursos. *Bakhtiniana*, v. 11, 2016, p.69-92. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1590/2176-457323556>.

GRILLO, S. V. de C.; GIERING, M. E.; MOTTA-ROTH, D. Perspectivas discursivas da divulgação/popularização da ciência. *Bakhtiniana*, v. 11, n. 2, São Paulo, p.3-13, 2016. <https://doi.org/10.1590/2176-457327166>.

---

<sup>13</sup> In Portuguese: “requer o conhecimento das diferentes realidades em contato, aproximadas por um questionamento a ser respondido de maneira específica pelos vínculos estabelecidos entre os objetos, os sujeitos do conhecimento e os contextos externos a eles.”

<sup>14</sup> In Portuguese: “onde as representações sociais das comunidades manifestam[-se] discursivamente.”

SARDÁ, D.; CAVALCANTE FILHO, U; SANTOS, Y. A. B; GONÇALVES-SEGUNDO, P. R. A análise de discursos comparativa e outras abordagens comparativistas em ciências da linguagem. *Linha D'Água*, 35 (2), 2022, p.1-15. DOI: <http://doi.org/10.11606/issn.2236-4242.v35i2p1-15>.

VON MÜNCHOW, P. *Les journaux télévisés en France et en Allemagne : Plaisir de voir ou devoir de s'informer*. Paris: Presses Sorbonne Nouvelle, 2009 [2004].

VON MÜNCHOW P.; RAKOTONOELINA, F. Discours, cultures, comparaisons. *Les carnets du Cediscor*, Paris, n. 9, 2006. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4000/cediscor.106>.

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

Translated by *Orison Marden Bandeira de Melo Júnior* – [junori36@gmail.com](mailto:junori36@gmail.com)

*Received July 29, 2022*

*Accepted August 29, 2022*

### **Reviews**

Due to the commitment assumed by *Bakhtiniana*. Revista de Estudos do Discurso [*Bakhtiniana*. Journal of Discourse Studies] to Open Science, this journal only publishes reviews that have been authorized by all involved.

### **Research Data and Other Materials Availability**

The contents are already available.