

Soundness of the phonetic translation and a protest against the Japanese technique of Bonsai

I.M.R.Pinheiro

Po Box 12396 A'Beckett st Vic Au 8006

mrpprofessional@yahoo.com

www.geocities.com/mrpprofessional

Independent Researcher

Abstract: – In this paper, we define the meaning of PHONETICS SOUNDNESS by similarity to the mathematical soundness. We wish to state that there is some sort of possible relationship in an abstract way once we have proven they are very different in scope and it is impossible to place what is complementary to the World of Maths in terms of Language inside of its scope in it. However, soundness is a higher-order concept and, as such, belongs to the scope of Philosophy, which ultimately could be suitable to Language if it falls still inside of that territory in common between Philosophy and Language. But the main point is really writing against the Japanese Bonsai technique and defending the main Bible's principle (in our opinion): do not do to other beings what you do not wish done to yourself!

*Key-words*¹: Bonsai, Translation, Good, moral, evil, Bible, Mathematics, freedom, plants

¹AMS: 26A51

1 Introduction

BOM SAI could easily be a Brazilian Portuguese allurement to Bonsai, that is, phonetically sound in Portuguese. If phonetically soundness ever counts in translation, there it is a really good one. BOM SAI, in Portuguese, could easily mean ‘Good is gone’, ‘Bom sai’. Interesting enough, it is the only Language of the World which seems to grasp the meaning of it. Apparently, it is scientifically proven that plants do feel hurt and cry, react to our interactions and actions. It is all well mentioned at George Nooris website [Noo06]. Apparently, plants even communicate. With that in mind, don’t you think that all the kindness, goodness, happiness of the plant would be seriously gone with confinement or change of its supposed nature?

With this thought in mind, we proceed to our next section, which defines mathematical soundness and philosophical soundness, explaining its differences and similarities. We then talk a bit about details of tiranes/human beings over other beings and Bonsai technicalities. What follows is a text on phonetic translation and its relevance plus our conclusion: it is an actual truth that the Good is gone out of the plant once someone makes of it a Bonsai. With all respect of the World for the Japanese culture, this is definitely not a good thing for the plant. If we do devote any sort of respect to other beings at all as we should devote to our own species, bonsai is definitely something to be banned from human activities. Let’s save the other beings any sort of extra unnecessary cruelty, please.

2 Soundness of arguments in Philosophy

The reason why Philosophy is an actual Science is because of its foundations. An argumentation in Philosophy must be accepted only if it has got soundness. Soundness basically means that one can easily go from premises to conclusion and the other way around, if that is also stated as a major conclusion², with no mistake. It is easy to see that that could work in a limited

²It is the same thought applied to ‘if...then’ or ‘if and only if’ from Mathematics. In fact, if there is anything in Language compatible with that, even in terms of enthymemes, then one must use this reasoning in Philosophy to prove to have a sound argumentation in terms of convincing people that was an actual inferable conclusion (from the premises presented)

scope of Language, the what could be called by us passive-of-logic-Language. In these terms, Logic, meaning Philosophical Logic, differs substantially from the Computer Logic. Why?

Basically, we believe to have already proved that people can be coherent (an actual evidence is the tribunal or the legal discourse) -in speech- without being able to use any logical symbols or without being able to reduce the whole speech into logical lingo. There is obviously something that is always going to be missed when reducing natural language to logical language, even if there is only argumentation on someone's speech.

It is also easy to see that with humans only lie detectors could tell us, if they were ever 100% accurate, how much a statement from a witness or person can count when making a tribunal decision.

Basically, anything that could count for a tribunal decision may be told to belong to the scope of computer logic. However, any fallacy may be told to belong to Philosophical Logic and has to be proven in its own scope to be wrong by considering the scope of Philosophical Logic, which is not ever reachable via computer lingo.

It would be obviously easy to think of machines measuring veracity of human beings discourse but it must actually be easy to prove that only a person of the same culture with a high IQ could ever be able to even understand well what another person actually states even when their speech is regarded as purely linguistic.

A machine cannot do it.

Still, based on what is making sense (philosophical logic) on that speech, the listener has to decide on its veracity and computer logic utility.

Something might actually be 100% true and be irrelevant to what is being judged so that it is going to be there as data in storage, harming the computer system and it is actually good for absolutely nothing, which infracts the computer scientists best rule: trash always away or 'those who can clean up all the time and keep the mess to as little as possible are always going to beat competition'.

With this in mind, one may easily see what we keep on reinforcing, part of [PIN06e], there are four or five processes always involved with human communication:

- The thought, which belongs solely to the individual and may be as messy as to never be understood not even by the own individual;
- The speech, which is the trial of portraying what the individual has got in his/her head or the opposite of it (if lying) to others;
- The logical speech, which is what may be useful for inferences or deductions by the part of the listener about any sort of issue;
- The computer logic speech, which is all that may be 100% accurately translated into machine language and is useful for something relevant, thought to be relevant by at least one person in the World.

Clarifying things does help, but it is not all that needs to be written or stated.

Mathematics works always in the most reduced level/scope in what regards its writing: computer logic. With that, one only makes use of a set of classical logic symbols, universally known as such, and arithmetic/higher operations, to describe any solution to any mathematical problem. Notice the value of Maths as universal language: there is only one way of going backwards or forwards in what regards understanding a mathematical proof, that is, there is absolutely no room for any doubts in communication in what regards Mathematics at all. If a proof is complete in the sense of containing all logical steps to it according to the solver, it does not matter what language we actually speak as in natural language: if we have ever been to school and learned Mathematics, we will definitely understand and be able to judge a mathematical proof of any sort in terms of its veracity or not. No mistake.

But, with human reasoning/speech...Jesus, only God knows how many got to jail without ever being guilty and the whole tribunal was convinced of the fallacy. Has it ever happened in Mathematics?

There are several stories of people who spent a lifetime sentence almost in jail until justice found out they were not guilty and there was a fallacy in the judgement, that is, the philosophical inferences made at that specific time and date at the courts were actually not correct.

Some may recall Einstein and his challenged theory, so many years after. But is he from Mathematics? Has anyone ever proved that Physics had soundness at all? Or is Physics in its majority based on observations and inferences from observations, that is, same induced mistakes as the Sorites problem (see [PIN06e]).

Still open to get told of mathematical mistakes perpetuated for more than one year in the Mathematics environment. The reader is invited to let us know.

3 Phonetic Translation and soundness

We do not think there is any need of explaining what phonetic translation would mean, it is obviously a dictionary consultation away from any reader, so that we are not going to worry about it much. However, we will only remind the reader that it is about sounds in communication, that is, all we worry about is the actual emission of sound by the speaker (language from which the original text is being ported into its future language, the so-called target-language). With that in mind, one may wish to consult [PIN06d] to read a bit on the Logic behind the translation technique and understand better what we talk about.

Basically, we could define soundness in translation, but it would have to be for phonetic translation only once every sort of translation cannot be said unique not even for a single word couple (origin;target). And it cannot also be told to be the best fit of all in any possible sense (it depends on context, Country, culture of the time, intended readers, etc) so far either. There is absolutely no unique decision about translation at all so far and we actually believe to have proved in [PIN06e] that this is not possible ever.

However, with sounds, it is an actual truth that there is only one best correspondence in the target language for that sound in the origin language once language is based in sound transmission and the alphabet is built (occidental) in terms of sound emissions per se, that is, if the sound emissions did not have a single designation then the alphabet could not ever be unique. But it is. Basically, languages that make use of the same sort of alphabet would be already phonetically translated and best adapted to that sort of mouth movement usual for that population

so that there is no sense in making phonetic translation from most of the American alphabet for instance into the Brazilian alphabet or from the romanized Japanese into the Brazilian alphabet once that is already done if they all make use of the same set of description symbols. However, the American alphabet, for instance, makes use of the letters W and Y, not used in the Portuguese Language at all apart from names of people/places, etc. Also, the letter 'h' in Portuguese is culturally soundless (meaning no sound emission, a companion letter to others) whilst it is very well pronounced in English. With this, there is room for some little phonetic translation between English and Portuguese in what regards the different sound emissions in both cultures, that is, the different alphabet letters or different sound of alphabet letters (h). We can still talk about phonetic translation in those cases only. More mathematically, there is a letter and a specific phonetic sound corresponding to that letter for each culture in the World, once more reinforcing identity of cultures also in terms of sound emission, that is, body limitations or customs. In more mathematical terms, the phonetic alphabet is always unique so that it is as suitable as Mathematics/Classical Logic is to be told to be the universal Language, that is, that sort of Language which everyone knows and, if used by speakers/people of any Country/origin would always mean most effective communication in the sense of best chances of understanding between those different cultures in any hypothesis. That simply creates, once more, a feeling of how useless another derivation of Language Science is: that of the trial of a universal language, Esperanto [edi06h]. Once more we also reinforce the feeling of lots of people wasting time and inducing others to with problems that are already very well solved. Want an universal language? Teach everyone how to use the phonetic alphabet well. All good dictionaries of every possible language bring the phonetics attached, so that there is no mistake. It is easy to understand how if everyone knew the phonetic alphabet well, several useless steps in the trial of communication between cultures would be skipped. In a usual way of trial, the following steps are involved: 1) Learn phonetic translation attached to your own alphabet without knowing the phonetic alphabet at all; 2) Learn language dictionary translation, per word, regarding your language and theirs, both ways; 3) Learn how to say it in the other language without using the phonetic alphabet at all.

ON the other hand, try to: 1) Learn phonetic symbols; 2) Learn their translation in the other language and yours; 3) use a phonetic dictionary with meaning in the other language.

See, in the first step of both, there is more work in the first system once you will need to learn a couple of steps instead of one. In the second step you save again time and work once you are not going to learn word by word but sound by sound like you learned your own language. If you learn the sound, no need to learn how to say it anymore so that a further step is saved in your extenuating work of trying to communicate as native of the other language.

This method includes Chinese people instead of excluding them from the rest of the World once they appreciate sounds better. If they get to learn phonetics then all they need to do is having a phonetic dictionary in every other language to be able to communicate. Instead of writing their so complicated symbols to people who are going to twist their noses at themselves and get out, they will simply make use of phonetic translation themselves and will use the target language straight away. On the other hand, that also skips the difficulty involved in the occidental person learning Chinese.

Japanese culture is a bit more complex once their culture seems to write in symbols [edi06c] which are attached to meanings so that there is no way to really get around that. It is pictorial communication like in Cave times. However, once they speak, the rule might be again applied. It is certainly true that there is no correctness when stating that Bonsai would be spelt any different in Portuguese than Bonsai. We can only talk about words that make sense in Portuguese in the Portuguese dictionary that would produce the same sound. If Bonsai per se makes sense in the romanized Japanese dictionary, it would certainly not make sense in the Portuguese one. But Brazilian culture is one of the few cultures in the World that is so without identity that actually tends to import word from any other languages the way they are so that Bonsai is actually included in a Portuguese dictionary.

However, if we stick to the purists of the Language, Xenophobic purists, [edi06a], then we will not accept it as a Portuguese word and the only possible phonetic translation, so that it makes sense, would have to be the closest one attached to the sound of Bonsai, Bom sai.

It is obvious, however, that Bom sai could have nothing to do with the meaning of Bonsai

at all and different cultures attach also different meanings to words of same sound as others. Example, Bixa in Mozambique and Bixa in Brazil (as sound equivalents, see [PIN06a]); in Mozambique that means cue, in Brazil that means a very feminine male almost immediately identified as homosexual by everyone else.

In this sense, complete soundness of the translation of the morpheme ([edi06d]) is only achieved in our comparison if we actually think the idea expressed by the original Chinese expression (once Bonsai were first made by the Chinese people) has to do with our Bom sai the way we describe in the paper and we actually think we have also proved such to be true.

Weird enough that we need to attach one more step to go into the soundness of phonetic translation. Sound-wise it is sound that we make the translation that way, so that there is no complication in what regards the Mathematics analogue reasoning involved. However, as explained in [PIN06e], Language is human and, therefore, there is far more involved in translation than the soundness of the phonetic translation. It has to also be sound in meaning, that is, that has to also be the best fit meaning-wise transportation of one culture into the other. That is the beauty of human interference in this World. That is precisely the difference. That is what reinforces our views from [PIN06e]: mad are the ones who ever thought of reducing humanity to machines. We are millionaires for existing and being free in this World as long as we are respected as individuals once there is no more beautiful things than the ones that are human and humans are us. It is definitely up to us, and God Himself (see [PIN03] for a history of our credentials to also write about the subject) has awarded us with his Son to tell us that, how beautiful and admirable our creations and interference with this World are. In the Old testament, there is a God who awards us with far more, sees humanity as almost equals, and still finds leaders of His taste to communicate directly. He punishes people in this own World and awards us with knowledge of the punishment, of why, that is, He is worried about telling us directly the truth. With the New Testament, God seems to dislike human interaction with this World so much, He is so damn disgusted, that He decides to never show up anymore in person. He is outraged with what people had already done with His word: He had told men not to masturbate, nothing about women; He had told men to marry as soon as they have

sexual desire; He had told men to respect each other and never do to others what they did not want done to themselves; He had told men to offer sacrifices of their most beloved animals, the sweetest ones, the lambs, whenever they sinned once but noticed and regretted; He had told men to not pollute His offertory place with any sort of sinners or bad energies; He had chosen leaders that supported equity and justice, the wisest ones, to give them all authority on Earth and all money available only because they were still acting righteously...But men had sinned several times and got used to offer sacrifices in exchange for forgiveness they never deserved. Men made of that a habit instead of understanding it was only once that they were allowed to commit a specific mistake. And there were absolutely no more fair and wise men around. Outraged, God sends His son to inhabit with the humblest couple ever, the hard workers: to teach us to work for food, to share the little we had with friends only, hard workers like us, to show that they would become rich in another sense once material wealthiness had proven itself to be a corruptor of human's hearts. Jesus, His Son, would never be by Himself, would be adored and listened to wherever He was, would heal those who were kind at heart or who were willing to be, would choose only those with humble hearts and will to help the World become better to be His companions, etc. With that, God was definitely stating He would never speak directly to humanity anymore once they got it all wrong. He gave us a next chance by telling us in advance what we would do to His son. But we still did it. God never came back to us. Damnation was transferred from this life to after-life, that is, centuries of damnation more than likely for those who have had contact with the spiritual World: very wise choice, we may say! Now God did speak through a few enlightened ones since then: Ghandi, Sister Tereza of Calcutah, Chico Xavier, all deceased. Have we listened, however? The chances are always there.

The wisdom is still only accessible for those who look for enlightenment, however. God always made it clear: the Word should never be taught - it has to be read directly - that is, no lazy person is allowed to go to heavens or to meet God. All this explanation, extensive explanation about God, is to tell the reader that the choice made today about how 'machine-like' our society will be, that is, how many paraconsistent thinkers/acting people, for instance, we will want in

our societies (pls check on [PIN06c]), is the measure of how God will be coming to us and how damnation is likely to be once more removed from after life and given to us right here and now. It is definitely a choice that we have to make. Politics is serious, yeah, so is economy, but how serious are they compared to centuries of damnation?

All we intend to say is that Language is, indeed, scientific the way it stands, but is definitely not and should never be, or tried to be, reduced to Mathematics. We should aim to be far more than Mathematics and that is what would bring God back to us, to honor us directly with His speech.

With that in mind, hoping the reader is convinced, we state further that there is more to translation of ‘signifiers’ than soundness of phonetic translation. There must be soundness of the ‘signifiers’ translation as well in terms of their ‘signifieds’ (see [edi06g]). That is impossible to be reduced to Mathematics proofs or analogues so that it will always be discretionary as much as the Sorites problem solution we presented in [PIN06e]. One could think of establishing measurements such as in Mathematics, with percentages and so on so forth but there is no way it will ever work, just like trying to apply Maths to the Sorites: absurd applying a more reduced scope of Science (in this case, Philosophy) to solve problems in the Universe minus that set containing it, meaning, in good Maths, the complement to the Maths set in Language. It will definitely not work. All we stated with our initial paper on the Sorites is that there is no way of solving it that does not depend on the individual themselves, whoever they are. That basically means it was created to show precisely the human side of things, what is not machine-friendly in its totality and never will be. It was created to show the limits of machines in relation to human beings without having to run a Turing competition ([CAS97]). Now, the relevance of our findings/writings goes from those who defend human labor to those who seek God’s attention.

Most that can be done is already being done: linguistics of the whole World meet every year to discuss how to make languages more similar or with more common places. It is part of a Science (Philosophy) and it is closed in itself given that there are no holes or mistakes and everyone accepts that as such. We wish to tell: Respect is owed to linguistics as well. In that

sense, this paper is useful once there are quite a few logicians trying to pervert/infract that rule (once more, check on [PIN06b]). It is argumentation for them to stop trying, also necessary apparently once they seem to need logical argumentation to get convinced of anything in this World.

It might be the case that there is no phonetic match at all in what regards origin language and target language. In this case there is no need to think of soundness either because there is no assertion of conclusion based on comparisons between alphabet usage in one language and in the other.

If there is no other way to go or come it is just like an if and only if from one to the other, both being conclusions, one in a positive direction and the other in a negative direction. What comes in the middle can be built as the reader wishes as long as it has got logic in its sequence of derived premises and basic premises. We advise to use the alphabet once it bears only one sound per letter in each Language, or unique group of letters sometimes. In splitting the word Bonsai into phonetic particles, one easily gets the same in Portuguese but there is more than one option for Portuguese, ‘m’ or ‘n’, which is going to give us the same sound. Once with ‘n’ there is no word in Portuguese, the only equivalent phonetic translation, following a good Xenophobic purist thought, is ‘Bom sai’. If we go the other way around, the same happens with the romanized Japanese. Now it is Bom sai that is not part of the romanized Japanese set of accepted words so far. This way it is an if and only if sort of soundness proof.

Notice that, in this case, we disregard the fact that a Portuguese Language dictionary does contain the word Bonsai and it was included as an allowance for a Japanese word to be there given its use being so common. If that is regarded as a Portuguese Language word then what we say is obviously not sound. This way, we have to state that when one considers a origin/target Language dictionary with absolutely no accepted foreign insertions, our theory will work. But only this way.

4 Into the detail of it and with Bonsai technicalities

It is odd to notice the will of the evil ones in our species to confine others, to prevent them from growing. A good example was shown in FANTASTICO, this absurd Brazilian TV show on news. In 2003 they found 2 kids living inside of barrels, put there by their own parents, apparently simply because they did not want to have ‘much ado’. The kids were literally growing inside of the barrels and spent years like that, presenting already advanced atrophy in their legs muscular development.

Boring enough for artists like myself, a sort of extra activity always for me, arts, nobody wants to really think of a plant as these kids inside of barrels...it should be Arts!

Basically, we all used to think about how the work demanded care and how much art was involved with the Japanese bonsai. The actual truth, however, reinforced in many spots on the web, like [Lic03], is that plants do have feelings! And, hey, if they feel something must be like the person who got slaved in Saudi Arabia, a woman, because not knowing their rules and going around without a male, they can easily get slaved and start belonging to the harem of one of their locals. Believe it or not, there is no human being alive who can take the woman out of there easily and believe it or not, it is going to be almost impossible for her to even call someone([Gil96], [edi06b]).

How would you feel being taken away from your home-sweet-home where you can grow freely - all over the land, can decide what to do with your roots so that everything is optimized, can remain where you used to bath under the sun, can enjoy the usual companies of your fellows (natural fellows), being, instead, amputated progressively until you fit a small pot which is just going to survive for a few months, if so, in unprofessional hands ([Noo06])?

All the technique involved is described step by step in a careful website dedicated to that sort of information: “<http://www.bonsaisite.com/>”.

Interesting enough, men have just created the latest slavery device. Something that gets into someone’s body without surgery, something they will never know is there until they start hearing voices. You may not believe it, but someone somewhere around you is going to start reporting they are hearing voices and they do not present any signs of mental disease. That is

when you may start worrying about that person being slaved, modernly slaved, unfortunately. Reality is, who really cares about preserving even human's freedom? By the time someone finds out it is usually too late. People do not like those who are free because freedom to a beautiful being or to a blessed being brings shine, happiness, fulfilment. And truth is the vast majority of people in this World live ordinary lives, lives with no meaning, with no real contribution to this World. The vast majority does not ever live like Jesus told us to [PIN03]. And the actual problem with that sight of life is that if everybody behaves the way they do, they think that is normal and they are just one more. However, it suffices noticing that reality of living is far from what they think living is and the 'true image' is not fully revealed until one actually LIVES as Seicho-no-ie ([edi06f]) tells us to ³. Living is loving, is having passion in whatever we do, is being totally free to act as our nature tells us to up to the point we are invading other people's true image, that is, if one learns respect since birth, one is able to be fulfilled without hurting or invading other people's spaces: it is still total freedom in the sense that it is the top freedom one may achieve in their lives, top freedom they are ALLOWED to by the laws, by God, by equity.

The point is that the poor plant is also a being and that has been proved to be so. With that, its true image, as defined by Seicho-no-ie premises, can only be seen if it is left to exist as it wishes. The World of the true image of things has to be the World of God once God does not like pretenders, disrespectful people towards His creations, whatever they are; God likes perfect beings as Seicho-no-ie tells us to present ourselves. Therefore, bonsai can only be translated into Bom Sai in Portuguese and that would reveal, with the best neurolinguistics intentions ([edi06e]), the truth behind the technique, creating the feeling that we would like to be created in the target Language, that is, repulsion for the making of a bonsai, making the target reader understand that that is definitely not a good thing to do to a plant. If with humans we call

³Seicho-no-ie is a Japanese religion now being advertised in Brazil as a religion of a single God and the same God as the God of Jesus, but it is originally an adorer of Amaterazu, the Goddess of the Sun. However, non-withstanding the evil they are doing to Brazil, it is still worth admiring their principles. If the Japanese sayings in their Brazilian books is not read, it is all totally righteous and it does, indeed, follow the Bible in every possible philosophical logic sense. It is actually the religion that seems to point out the first steps, correct first steps, one should take to reach the actual God of Moses, Abraham, Isaac.

it jail, confinement, slavery, why would it ever be different with the plant? It has to bring up a notion of what it is by its own signifier. We have defined what phonetic soundness would be in a concept completely detached from any other concept or concern, so that Bonsai would be soundly translated into Bom sai in Portuguese according to that principle with no mistake. However, we also add a neurolinguistics principle according to which it would also be sound to translate Bonsai into Bom sai in Portuguese. Via comparison between humans and plants we get to the conclusion that in the best neurolinguistics approach our translation is definitely the best choice. In those regards, we make use of bijective correspondence between the universe of brought-up mental images and the actual plant situation when the plant is faced as a being as important, or with most rights allowed in the World, as we are.

Adding to that all, we believe to have empowered the defenders of human employment in such a way as to tell them there is definitely a line and there is no way that ALL HUMANITY could loose their jobs. However, we have also made it clear that were the World ever to behave logically, all machine-like thinkers should definitely be replaced by machines once that was what God never wanted us to be. Therefore, in a sense, we defend human jobs, and that sense is the one where the 'human' is our definition of human as stated clearly in [PIN03]. In another sense, we make it clear that there is a lot of people wasting our time and their time in this World making humanity go backwards or confused with already solved problems whilst they could simply be dedicating themselves to a much higher human need, actual need, such as being good relatives, good hard workers, whatever.

References

- [CAS97] J. CASTI. *Five Golden Rules*. 1997. John Wiley and Sons Ltd.
- [edi06a] Wikipedia editors. *Bonsai*, *Wikipedia online*,. 2006. [http : //en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bonsai](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bonsai).
- [edi06b] Wikipedia editors. *Human trafficking in Saudi Arabia*, *Wikipedia online*. 2006. [http : //en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Human_trafficking_in_Saudi_Arabia](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Human_trafficking_in_Saudi_Arabia).
- [edi06c] Wikipedia editors. *Japanese writing*, *Wikipedia online*. 2006. [http : //en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Japanese_writing](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Japanese_writing).
- [edi06d] Wikipedia editors. *Morpheme*, *Wikipedia online*. 2006. [http : //en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Morpheme](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Morpheme).
- [edi06e] Wikipedia editors. *Neurolinguistics*, *Wikipedia online*. 2006. [http : //en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Neurolinguistics](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Neurolinguistics).
- [edi06f] Wikipedia editors. *Seicho-no-ie*, *Wikipedia online*. 2006. [http : //en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Seicho-no-ie](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Seicho-no-ie).
- [edi06g] Wikipedia editors. *Sign*, *Wikipedia online*. 2006. [http : //en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Signifier](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Signifier).
- [edi06h] Wikipedia editors. *Universal Language*, *Wikipedia online*. 2006. [http : //en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Universal_language](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Universal_language).
- [Gil96] H. Gilliberti. *Personal communications*. 1996. H. Gilliberti is an acquaintance, a female teacher who has traveled most of the World now taking very detailed notes of her adventures containing people to whom she spoke and everything else. She may be found in RJ whilst alive, Heloisa Gilliberti.
- [Lic03] J. Licauco. *Experiments prove plants have feelings; world wide web*. 2003. [http : //www.inq7.net/lif/2003/jun/24/lif2-1.htm](http://www.inq7.net/lif/2003/jun/24/lif2-1.htm).

- [Noo06] G. Noori. *Bonsai; world wide web.* 2006. [http :
//www.coasttocoastam.com/guests/730.html](http://www.coasttocoastam.com/guests/730.html).
- [PIN03] M.R. PINHEIRO. *VOCE JA FEZ ALGO DE BOM POR ALGUEM HOJE?*, Editoras EST. 2003. POA.
- [PIN06a] M.R. PINHEIRO. *Brazilian Portuguese X Portuguese X English.* 2006. [http :
//www.geocities.com/trmsorfiap](http://www.geocities.com/trmsorfiap).
- [PIN06b] M.R. PINHEIRO. *Exploring the concept of non-classical Logic.* 2006. preprint, [http :
//www.geocities.com/mrpprofessional](http://www.geocities.com/mrpprofessional).
- [PIN06c] M.R. PINHEIRO. *A paraconsistent solution to the Sorites paradox.* 2006. preprint, [http :
//www.geocities.com/mrpprofessional](http://www.geocities.com/mrpprofessional).
- [PIN06d] M.R. PINHEIRO. *Samba avec translation.* 2006. preprint, www.geocities.com/mrpprofessional.
- [PIN06e] M.R. PINHEIRO. *A solution to the Sorites Paradox, Semiotica.* 2006. 3/4.