

DEBATES / DEBATES

1.1/2, 1985: 107-20

A COMPLEMENTARIDADE DOS POSSESSIVOS E DAS CONSTRUÇÕES GENITIVAS NO PORTUGUÊS COLOQUIAL: RÉPLICA A PERINI (1985)

**(The Complementarity between the Possessives and the Genitive
Constructions in Colloquial Portuguese - a Reply to Perini (1985))**

Mary A. KATO (*Pontifícia Universidade Católica
de São Paulo*)

Perini (this volume) analyses the uneven distribution of possessives in Brazilian colloquial Portuguese and postulates some functional principles to account for it. My claim in this paper is that the facts analysed by the author as a grammatical problem should be viewed as a matter of use. The principles proposed in the article should not therefore be treated as constraints on the form of grammar but rather as restrictions on its output.

2.2, 1986: 249-64

A INTERPRETAÇÃO “REFLEXIVA” DO PRONOME NO PORTUGUÊS DO BRASIL (The “Reflexive” Interpretation of Pronouns in Brazilian Portuguese)

Charlotte GALVES (*Instituto de Estudos da Linguagem - Universidade
Estadual de Campinas*)

The aim of this paper is to show that the possible “reflexive” interpretation of the pronoun *ele* in Mineiro dialect of Brazilian

Portuguese (BP) - for example in (1) "João vê ele no espelho": John sees himself in the mirror" - is not relatable, in this dialect, to its character of anaphora, in the sense of Chomsky (1981), as claimed by Lemle (1984). I claim that it remains a pronoun and I show that in other dialects of BP that do not allow (1), the reflexive interpretation of the pronoun is available too, in sentences where the apparent violation of Chomsky's Binding Principle B is weaker than in (1). This behaviour of the pronoun *ele* in BP is related to the fact that this language is "discourse oriented", the pronoun being bound by the topic, which can also be the subject. I argue that there is no violation of the principle B because the possible co-reference between the object pronoun and the subject in (1) is not a relation of dependency. My analysis, therefore, supports Higginbotham's "linking" analysis of binding. Further comments about *ele* in BP are related to the Overt Pronoun Constraint proposed by Montalbetti (1984).

3.1, 1987: 85-95

**LINGÜISTAS OU CAMALEÕES? UMA RESPOSTA A
TARALLO
(Linguistics or Chameleons?
A Reply to Tarallo)**

José BORGES NETO (*Universidade Federal
do Paraná*)

Ana Lúcia PAULA MILLER (*Universidade Federal do
Paraná*)

The section DEBATE of this journal has recently published an intriguing article by Fernando Tarallo (1986), in which a certain detachment of the linguistic from the theory he usually follows is recommended as a means of enriching linguistic analysis. Sensible as it may look at first sight - nothing may seem wiser than being aware of the limitations of a theory and of being capable of taking into consideration the data - Tarallo's recommendation may have extremely harmful results if certain general traits of scientific theories and of Brazilian culture are taken into account.

3.1, 1987: 97-109

**DIALOGUE: ON TAKING THE BULL BY THE
HORNS IF ONLY
TO SALVAGE THE CHINA SHOP
(Diálogo: Pegando o Touro a Unha nem
que Seja para Salvar a Loja de Louças)**

Kanavillil RAJAGOPLAN (*Pontifícia Universidade Católica de
São Paulo & Universidade Estadual de Campinas*)

A partir da leitura crítica dos ensaios contidos no volume *Dialogue: An Interdisciplinary Approach*, conclui-se que as preocupações no campo da pesquisa sobre diálogo são de ordem conceitual e epistemológica. Esta resenha procura mostrar as profundas divergências ideológicas nesse nível.

3.2, 1987: 237-41

**LEITURA, ORTOGRAFIA E FONOLOGIA
E SUA RESENHA EQUIVOCADA
(A Misguided Review)**

Myrian BARBOSA DA SILVA (*Universidade
Federal da Bahia*)

Hoyos-Andrade agrees with the focus on one of the dialects of the Portuguese language in the book *Leitura, ortografia e fonologia*. However, he argues against the author's theoretical decision of not using the phoneme and archiphoneme concepts. He also claims for the simplification of the complex relationship between the orthographic and phonological entities. The goal of this work is to make some of the reviewer's mistakes clear to the public that don't know that book.

4.1, 1988: 115-20

**LEITURA, ORTOGRAFIA E FONOLOGIA:
TRÉPLICA A MYRIAM BARBOSA DA SILVA
(Reading, Orthography and Phonology:
Rejoinder to Barbosa da Silva)**

Rafael Eugenio HOYOS - ANDRADE (*Instituto de Letras, História e Psicologia de Assis - Universidade do Estado de São Paulo*)

Although Barbosa da Silva in her reply to Hoyos-Andrade's review explicitly declares the discussion closed, we think an answer to be indispensable in order to: (1) point out the incongruities of the Author's attitudes and assumptions in her reply, (2) clarify our prospective readers with respect to the categorical assertions made about our review (too categorical for being acceptable) and (3) emphasize one aspect of da Silva's reply which we consider definitively wrong, namely her statement that letters cannot be compared with phonemes and/or archiphonemes.

4.2, 1988: 265-72

**UMA ESTÓRIA MUITO MAL CONTADA
(A Story to Forget)**

Fernando TARALLO (*Universidade Estadual de Campinas*)

This is not a reply to Borges Neto & Müller in the true sense of the word. There is absolutely nothing worth responding to in the two authors' paper except the simple fact that they have misused and abused my own text as a way to pursue and do some kind of "homework" they classify as epistemological. In what follows then I will close the discussion, at least from my part, simply by showing the readers all the misunderstandings and misconceptions present in their paper which have, as I claim, emerged from an ill-guided, erroneous as well as equivocated reading of my 1986 paper. Still worse, I will show that reading errors were purposefully caused by an insane desire to misread my piece of work. I will clear this misunderstandings as well as I can, declaring myself at the same time utterly uninterested in a further reply

to the present paper by the two authors, at least not along the lines of their 1987 reply. The debate that I had raised in 1986 with Braga (1984) though, is still open and will remain as such for I do believe it is high time variationists should become aware of an undeniable fact: variable rule analyses are getting closer and closer to work done within the perspective of inter-language variation studies.

5.1, 1989: 71-99

**RESGATANDO A CONTRIBUIÇÃO DA SOCIOLINGÜÍSTICA
LABOVIANA**

(Recovering the Contribution of Labovian Sociolinguistics)

Guido de ALMEIDA (*Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais*)

In this article I attempt to reconsider the contribution of sociolinguistics to the knowledge and teaching about and of language. The article focusses specifically upon the labovian paradigm and was inspired mainly by the Romaine's (also a sociolinguist) criticism to that theoretical model. It is argued that sociolinguistics as a research area not only is justifiable; it is also indispensable to acquiring and accumulating knowledge about language.

5.2, 1898: 225-40

**SOBRE A INDISSOCIABILIDADE DO HISTORAR DA
LINGÜÍSTICA DO PRÓPRIO FAZER DA LINGÜÍSTICA**

**(On the Indissociability of Writing the History of
Linguistic from the Doing of Linguistics Proper)**

Kanavillil RAJAGOPALAN (*Universidade Estadual de Campinas*)

Shlieben-Lange (1989)'s claim that the history of science is, alongside of being history, also writing about that history, is argued to be in order as far as it goes, but also grossly inadequate. The history of science, it is held, is above all a part and parcel of science itself. It is, however, further shown that this idea, innocuous as it might indeed appear at first blush and, upon careful inspection, nothing but a

consequence of her own admission that scientific texts - those in linguistics included - are exercises in argumentation, turns out, sooner or later, to be incompatible with a number of other claims the author makes elsewhere in her article.

6.1, 1990: 83-98

**TEORIA GRAMATICAL E “MECANISMOS FUNCIONAIS DO
USO DA LÍNGUA”
(Grammatical Theory and “Functional
Mechanisms in Language Use”)**

Milton do NASCIMENTO (*Universidade Federal de
Minas Gerais*)

Votre and Naro (1989) claim that their functional perspective is a preferable alternative to a formal approach, namely Generative Grammar. My aim in this paper is to discuss the ideas contained in their paper. Starting with a brief outline of the research program in current Generative Grammar I intend to show that the two perspectives put forward as competing models in the study of language cannot be compared as they try to answer different questions and deal with different objects.

6.2, 1990: 223-54

**DOS DIZERES DIVERSOS EM TORNO DO FAZER
(Of the Diverse Saying about Doing)**

Kanavilil RAJAGOPALAN (*Universidade Estadual de Campinas*)

This review article applauds the long-awaited publication of a Portuguese translation of J.L. Austin's celebrated masterpiece *How to do things with words*. Random comments are made on the multivarious problems that beset the task undertaken (and in this case, meticulously executed), with special emphasis on the terminological snares everywhere and the exasperatingly frequent moments of joviality and banter with which the English philosopher is wont to mark his rambling

discussion of age-old philosophical issues. A sizeable part of the ensuing discussion is devoted to an examination of how differently Austin's insights have been taken up and further developed by authors as varied as Searle, Derrida, Lyotard and Habermas, among others.

7.1, 1991: 377-93

DEBATE A OLIVEIRA SILVA E VOTRE
(A Debate with Oliveira Silva e Votre)

Fernando TARALLO (*Universidade Estadual de Campinas*)

In the present text which was read during the 42nd Annual Meeting of the Brazilian Society for the Advancement of Sciences (SBPC), I comment and discuss some of the issues raised by Oliveira e Silva, Votre et alii at the plenary session promoted by ABRALIN in conjunction with the aforementioned meeting. In particular, in section 1., I draw attention to the indisputable contribution of the UFRJ (Federal University of Rio de Janeiro) Sociolinguistics research group to the development of the area and publicly first at the plenary session and now in printed form I give thanks to the group for the quantity and high quality of work done to date. The remaining two sections of the text then proceed to general counterarguments which were formulated to the members of the group concerning their general theoretical assumptions and orientation.

7.1, 1991: 395-407

FORMA E FUNÇÃO NA LINGÜÍSTICA
(Form and Function in Linguistics)

Mike DILLINGER (*Fundação de Ensino Superior de São João Del Rei- FUNREI*)

The debate between Votre and Naro (1989) and Nascimento (1990) raises important issues about the relations between alternative theoretical frameworks. The questions of whether one can and should

choose between formalism and functionalism, and whether they deal with the same object of study are discussed in relation to the broader problem of lack of an overarching framework that would provide the sciences of language with much-needed metatheoretical coherence.

7.2, 1991: 521-8

**ENFOQUES SOBRE AMOSTRAGEM
EM SOCIOLIGÜÍSTICA**
(Approaches to Samples in Sociolinguistics)

Cecília MOLLICA (*Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro*)
Cláudia RONCARATI (*Universidade Federal Fluminense*)

Sociolinguistic research depends on real data of the language produced in the heart of the speech community. In this analysis the scientist is very often faced with some crucial problems related with the linguistic raw material. In this paper, we describe some properties of random stratified samples, in order to raise some related problems and to offer some methodological alternatives for enriching the researcher's work.

8.1, 1992: 135-57

**ACERCA DOS GESTOS TEMPORAIS E DAS MIGRAÇÕES NA
TEORIA DE LABOV**
(On Migration and Temporal
Gestures in Labov's Theory)

Maria Tereza CELADA (*Universidade Estadual de Campinas*)

My central purpose in this paper focuses on a careful examination of the main points which define the latest changes in the development of Willian Labov's theory. I therefore revisit his very initial assumptions in an attempt to relate them with those of 87 and 89. I shall not discuss epistemological foundations. As an outsider in Sociolinguistics, I have tried hard to remain within the study of the main points mentioned above - my interest is not pointing out my own point of

view but putting forward the considerations this analysis has led me through.

8.2, 1992: 285-90

**MECANISMOS FUNCIONAIS DO USO DA LÍNGUA:
FUNÇÃO E FORMA**
(Functional Mechanisms of Language Use: Function and Form)

Anthony J. NARO (*Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro*)
Sebastião Josué VOTRE (*Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro*)

Functionalist and generative linguistics seem to be concerned with the same sort of phenomena, but nonetheless have distinct, although not totally independent, objects of study. The functionalism we propose studies language use in its social context, while generativists study their own intuitions about language and linguistic regularities. The two schools use different criteria for analysis and generalization: functionalists analyze linguistic forms in accord with the functions they are used to perform; the generativist criteria are strictly formal. The schools also differ as to the causality relationship between function and form (grammar): functionalists view form as the dependent variable and function as the independent variable; generativists invert this relationship. Functionalists attempt to explain form by reference to extra linguistic factors; generativists remain within linguistic structure itself, attempting to create increasingly inclusive formal generalizations that they see as explaining lower level generalizations. We argue for the superiority of the functionalist position.

9.1, 1993: 105-11

POR UMA SOCIOLINGÜÍSTICA APLICADA
(For an Applied Sociolinguistics)

Maria Cecília MOLICA (*Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro*)

Pode-se afirmar que, no Brasil, a Sociolinguística está consolidada como área de pesquisa. Há pelo menos vinte anos vem-se acumulando um enorme volume de estudos descritivos do português

(sobretudo falado) sob a perspectiva sociolinguística e conseqüente experiência sólida com relação aos diferentes instrumentos teórico-metodológicos (cf. Naro, 1986; Tarallo, 1989; Mollica, 1992). Este texto objetiva a constituição de argumentação em favor de estimulação de projetos aplicados na área da sociolinguística. Sem negar a importância fundamental no prosseguimento de estudos que reflitam as questões teóricas cruciais, advoga-se a pertinência e contribuição de trabalhos que se coloquem nas interfaces da Linguística e que tenham função social clara, tendo em vista dois aspectos: (a) a interdisciplinaridade crescente e necessária em pesquisa linguística; (b) a permanência de soluções uma vez consideradas as carências da realidade sócio-cultural brasileira.

9.2, 1993: 275-94

UMA CIÊNCIA DA HISTÓRIA? (A Science of History?)

David LIGHTFOOT (*Universidade de Maryland*)

The text claims that it is possible to have a partially scientific approach to language change in its ability to make predictions, as long as historian linguistics work in partnership with their synchronic colleagues, who will provide them with a theory of grammar which can account for how the grammar of any natural language is attained under normal childhood experience.

10.1, 1994: 73-81

QUEM TEM MEDO DO HOLISMO? (Who is Affraid of Holism?)

Kanavillil RAJAGOPALAN (*Universidade Estadual de Campinas e Visiting Scholar, Universidade da Califórnia, Berkeley*)

As a metaphysical stance, holism has more often than not been simply taken for granted. Philosophers as diverse as Frege (at least, on one interpretation, due mainly to Quine), Wittgenstein, Austin, Quine, Davidson, Lewis, Dennett, Block, Devitt, Putnam, Rorty and Sellars, as

well as those working in the areas of A.I. and Cognitive Psychology, Structuralist Linguists and the French literary theorists are generally regarded as having, in one way or another, subscribed to holistic forms of thought. Given the awe-inspiring hegemony of holism in today's academic world - especially after the disintegration of the Vienna Circle and logical positivism, the recent appearance on the market of a book by J. Fodor and E. LePore, with the modest title *Holism: A Shopper's Guide*, deserves to be seen as most timely and welcome - if only for the reason that it promises to stir up some fresh controversy. The present review article is an attempt to survey the scenario, estimate what the stakes are and hazard some guesses as to what we may expect to see by way of possible reactions to the challenge posed by the book.
