On dialogic speech:

Convergences and Divergences between Jakubinskij, Bakhtin and Voloshinov

Dóris de Arruda C. da Cunha[1]

Resumo: Este trabalho se propõe a discutir as ideias de Lev Jakubinskij em *Sobre a fala dialogal* (edição russa, 1923, tradução brasileira, 2015), as convergências com o pensamento de Bakhtin e Volochinov, bem como as divergências. Os estudos sobre o diálogo não têm uma origem teórica única, mas aparecem ligados aos problemas da prática linguística e cultural russas (ROMASHKO, 2000: 84). Uma parte importante dos trabalhos foi dedicada à dialetologia, ou seja, à fala dialetal, concebida como uma fala dialogal. No entanto, segundo Volochinov, (1992: 147), só existia, em 1929, uma obra, *Sobre a fala dialogal*, consagrada ao problema do diálogo na linguística russa. Alguns estudiosos de Jakubinskij consideram que esse ensaio serviu de referência para Volochinov e Bakhtin, ou foi a fonte direta de inspiração para o primeiro e através dele para a teoria bakhtiniana. O estudo das ideias linguística do fim do século XIX e início do século XX permite concluir que Volochinov e Bakhtin adotaram temas, problemáticas e noções da filosofia e das ciências humanas nascentes, porém transformaram o *dado* no *novo*.
Palavras-chave: diálogo; Jakubinskij; Bakhtin; Volochinov.

Abstract: This article aims to discuss Lev Jakubinsky's ideas presented in his 1923 essay *On Dialogic Speech* (Brazilian translation 2015), and its convergences and divergences with the thought of Bakhtin and Voloshinov. Studies on dialogue do not come from a unique theoretical source, but they appear connected to questions of linguistic and cultural practices in Russia (ROMASHKO, 2000: 84). An important part of this research was dedicated to dialectology, that is, to the dialectic speech, conceived then as dialogic speech. However, according to Voloshinov (1992: 147), in 1929 there was only one study devoted to the dialogue in Russian linguistics, the essay *On Dialogic Speech*. Some researchers on Jakubinsky contend that this essay was a reference to Voloshinov and Bakhtin, or that it was the direct inspiration source to the former and, through it, to Bakhtinian theory. The investigation of linguistic ideas at the end of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth century allows us to conclude that Voloshinov and Bakhtin adopted themes, problems and notions from the burgeoning philosophy and social sciences, nevertheless transforming what was given into something new.
Keywords: Dialogue; Jakubinsky; Bahktin; Voloshinov.

---

1 Professor at Federal University of Pernambuco. Professor at Postgraduate Studies of Linguistics at Catholic University of Pernambuco.Researcher of CNPq. Coordinator of the Project 'The Dialogic Construction of 'perspective' in genders of discourse: academic and media. Coordinator of the Project 'Representing the other's Discourse and Written Discourse- CAPES-COFECUB Program.

Introduction

Several scholars of Jakubinsky (Ageeva, 2009[2]; Airchambault, 2000, 2009; Brandist, 2012; Ivanova, 2000, 2003, 2011, 2015a, 2015b; Lähteenmäki, 2005; Kyeng 2003; Romashko, 2000) consider the essay *On Dialogic Speech*, written in 1923, as the source of some of Bakhtin and Voloshinov's[3] notions of dialogue and dialogism. However, this position is not unanimous. Tylkowski (2013) disagrees with the theory that Jakubinsky had been the main source of Voloshinov's concept of dialogue, arguing that the theoretical bases of the two authors do not match.

Voloshinov was a student of Jakubinsky and cites *On Dialogic Speech* in footnotes in *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*[4] and in the article *The Construction of the Utterance*[5] (2012: 63)[6], which does not seem to be the case with Bakhtin, at least in Brazilian translations, despite the issue of dialogue being fundamental and widely discussed in his work. Lähteenmäki (2005: 52) ensures that there are no references to Jakubinsky by Bakhtin in *The Theory of the Novel* as it was originally published, which is the subject of his article in which he analyses "the nature of the possible influences of Jakubinsky on the concepts of Bakhtin." However, in the summary of *Dialogues II*, written in 1952 but first translated into Portuguese recently (Bakhtin, 2016), Lähteenmäki states that there is an explicit reference to the Jakubinsky article, *On Dialogic Speech*, that "clearly suggests that it was also included in the original manuscript, but was editorially removed from the published version of the essay" (Lähteenmäki, 2005: 53).[7]

Considering Seriot's argument that "it is by a comparative method [...] that it is possible to illuminate an author, a time, in contrast to the contemporary authors and neighboring theories" (2006: 61), this article will make a brief presentation of Jakubinsky's academic path and the Russian linguistic context, to better understand his theoretical trajectory, the context of his thought and ideas that are considered important for understanding the dialogic theory. This article also points out parallels with the thought of

---

2   Ageeva, Tylowski-Ageeva or Tylowski are the same author.

3   This paper will not discuss the question of authorship, widely debated by many Bakhtin and Voloshinov scholars. It will share the view of Gardin (1978), Tylkowski (2012), Seriot (2015), among others, that the texts signed by Voloshinov are his own. For this reason, the article has Voloshinov, when it refers to *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language* in the text, and (Bakhtin /Voloshinov) in the citation references.

4   In the first footnote of *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*, Voloshinov (VOLOSHINOV, 1986: 116) writes: "In Russian scholarship, only one study devoted to the problem of dialogue from the linguistic point of view has appeared: L. P. Jakubinskij, "O dialogičeskoj reči" [On Dialogic Speech], *Russkaja reč'* (Petrograd, 1923). Interesting comments of a semilinguistic nature on the problem of dialogue are contained in V. Vinogradov, *Poèzija Anny Axmatovoj* [The Poetry of Anna Axmatova] (Leningrad, 1925); see the chapter "Grimasy diaoga" [Dialogue Gesticulations]. In German scholarship, the problem is currently under intensive treatment by the Vossler school. See, especially, Gertraud Lerch, "Die uneigentliche direkte Rede", *Festschrift für Karl Vossler* (1922)." The second footnote of the same book refers to the fisrt one: "On mediated and unmediated forms of verbal interaction, see the already cited study by L. P. Jakubinskij." (VOLOSHINOV, 1986:145)

5   In the essay *The Construction of the Utterance*, the footnote says: "See article by L. P. Jakubinskij (somewhat difficult, it is true, for a new writer), in the collection Russkaaja rech', I, 192, under the title 'O dialogicheskoj rechi' (Do discurso dialógico) (Volochinov, 2012:163).

6   T.N. Title was translated from the Portuguese *A construção da enunciação*.

7   Lähteenmäkï (2005:53) points out a relevant fact for Bakhtin's scholars: "the editorial comments about the notes of Bakhtin's work (19896) (sic), published in volume 5 of 'Collected Works', reveal that certain excerpts were taken from the version of 'The Discourse in the Novel', in 1975 [...]. Bakhtin's footnotes entitled *Dialogues II* [...] contain his point of view on the essay."

Bakhtin and Voloshinov, thus showing convergences and divergences, since many researchers say Jakubinsky exerted influence on Voloshinov and, through him, on Bakhtin, while also arguing that the essay is the primary source of dialogue and dialogism theories in Russian linguistics (IVANOVA, 2015a). Given that the author of this article does not read Russian and that her research is located within the dialogic theory and not in the field of the history of ideas, this article will rely on the inevitably incomplete and partial reading of the aforementioned scholars, with the modest aim of contributing a little more[8] to the knowledge of Jakubinsky's ideas about dialogue and epistemological context of dialogical theory. For these reasons, the article will not assess whether the common ideas of these three authors derive from the fact that the essay was arguably the main source of ideas about the workings of dialogic speech in Soviet linguistics.

1. Lev Jakubinsky's trajectory

Jakubinsky made a heterogeneous trajectory, but was a man of his time, according to the biography of the Ukrainian linguist, born in Kiev in 1892, according to Ivanova (2015), from which some information has been taken. In his early work, he addressed the question of form and content unity, the procedures that contribute to the poetic nature of the text, as well as studying the theoretical work of Russian language and literature. As a student of the Department of Russian and Slavonic Studies in the Faculty of Philology and History at the University of St. Petersburg, in 1911 Jakubinsky wrote the essay *The Psychophonetic Zeros in Russian Language Thought[9]*, which was awarded silver medal and praised by Baudouin de Courtenay for its scientific acuity and the author's rigor of thought (IVANOVA, 2015a). At this university, philosophers, psychologists, physicists and sociologists, that is "scientists of liberal orientation" mingled together.

Moreover, according to Ivanova (2015), Jakubinsky had good knowledge of the work of German and Russian psychologists, the fundamentals of behaviorism, pragmatics, psychoanalysis, social psychology and reflexology. He attended the OPOJAZ (Society for Poetic Language Studies) and published in his collections three articles on poetic language and practical language, cited by Russian formalists. As a teacher of the Pedagogical Institute, from 1918 he lectured on the evolution of language and semantics. That same year, he organized the Institute of Live Speech. From 1919 to 1923 he was also devoted to secondary school teaching and became a member of the board of a school (1918-1919); then he became principal at Peterhof school, teacher at the Department of Popular Education in the Peterhof region (1920-1921), and educator in an orphanage (1921-1922).

Despite the diversity of his professional activities, Jakubinsky continued his work on poetic language and practical language while maintaining his contacts with OPOJAZ, having republished his first articles with echoes of the discussions undertaken by the Russian formalists about poetic language. He was also a scientific collaborator at ILJaZV (Institute of Comparative Studies of Eastern and Western Languages and Literatures), whose goal was to create accurate methods of comparative analysis of works of world literature.[10]

---

8 I translated the text from French into Portuguese with Suzana Leite Cortez.

9 T.N. This has been translated from the Portuguese title *Os zeros psicofonéticos no pensamento linguageiro russo*.

10 Brandist (2012: 120-122) writes that Jakubinsky was Shakhmatov's student, who was a linguist that used the historical-comparative method in dialectological studies. Afterwards, he turned to sociolinguistics and wrote about the centripetal and centrifugal forces. As other scholars of the Institute for Comparative Studies of Western and Eastern Literatures and Languages (ILIaZV), Jakubinsky resorted to Marx and Lenin's texts.

In 1923, Jakubinsky was appointed professor at the University of Petrograd where he taught general linguistics. During this period, he became interested in the phonetic aspect of poetic language, for reasons of sociolinguistics and historical linguistics, stylistics, and theory of poetic language.

From 1923 to 1927, he taught technical courses on speech, he was dedicated to the scientific and educational work, and to the scientific research organization activity in Leningrad (Petrograd until January 26, 1924), having exercised some influence and been responsible for new directions of research. One of his biographers notes that he and other Baudouin de Courtenay students were never "academic scientists" themselves (Leont'ev, 1986, p. 4-12, cited IVANOVA 2015a).

Following that, Jakubinsky studied the oratorical style, mentored novice writers, and continued writing in the field of historical and comparative grammar. He sought new perspectives for linguistics to go beyond the Indo-European problem, which led him to collaborate with Nicholas Marr (1864-1934). He was particularly interested in the semantic paleontology and shared the idea that the evolution of society leads to the evolution of thought and hence of language. From Ivanova's perspective (2015), Jakubinsky's enthusiasm for Marrism may have been derived from his interest in social psychology and reflexology, which articulate situation, thought and verbal expression, as well as in language conceived as activity and the relationship between language and society proposed by Marr.

In the thirties, Jakubinsky continued his educational, scientific and administrative activities. In 1930, he published articles with the intention of forming a linguistic culture among budding writers, as well as sociolinguistics papers. In 1931, he published *F. de Saussure sur l'impossible d'une politique linguistique* (*Ferdinand de Saussure on the impossibility of a language policy*) and, in 1932, *Contre le "danilovisme"* (*Against "Danilovism"*). The former essay "attacks Saussure virulently", as stated by Alpatov (2003: 14), and is a criticism of "one of the currents of Marxist linguistics at the time that Jakubinsky was becoming more involved with Marrism".[11] For Ivanova (2015a), at that time, issues of linguistic policy were extremely prevalent for Soviet linguists, because of the need to create alphabets for non-written languages, develop dictionaries, grammars and manuals, code languages, and teach large masses of illiterate people to read and write, all of this with a theoretical basis. Thus, notions of literary and practical language were very necessary. Jakubinsky returned to historical and comparative linguistics, in parallel to his sociolinguistic research, and devoted himself to the history of the Russian language and moved gradually away from the Marrist problematic towards the end of that decade. For him, the historical approach explained the structure of the then current language and the particular traits of that language (JAKUBINSKIJ, 1932: 51 cited in IVANOVA, 2012). Ivanova notes that the study of the evolution of Russian language may explain the return of the linguist to the history of the language in the late 1930s. Jakubinsky died in 1945 at only 53 years of age.

Hence, until 1923, which is the publication year of *On Dialogic Speech*, Jakubinsky, a founder of formalism, worked on the comparative-historical approach. He published studies on phonetics, poetic and practical language, ancient Russian, organic processes of oral speech, among other works. This diversity of areas, far from the dialogue or dialogism, meant that the publication caused surprise for its innovative character and its proposal to create a new linguistics.Ivanova(2015a).

---

11 Article published in a volume entitled *Contre la contrebande bourgeoise en linguistique* (*Against Bourgeois Contraband in Linguistics*). At the time, two groups were attempting to prove that their theory alone was Marxist, whilst the rival one was "mechanicist": that of N. Marr, E. Polivanov, e L. Jakubinsky and the other group led by G. Danilov. (IVANOVA, 2012: 217-218)

2. The Russian Linguistic and Epistemological Context

Although *On Dialogic Speech* is considered an original proposal, Jakubinsky is not a "mythical Adam", in the words of Bakhtin himself (1987: 279), as the essay raises themes already discussed by Russian, Soviet and European theorists. To return to the authors mentioned in the introduction[12], especially those interested in linguistic studies from the nineteenth century and early twentieth century, Ivanova (2000; 2003; 2005; 2009a; 2009b; 2012; 2013; 2015) and Romashko (2000), discuss the concepts and notions of language and, according to Ivanova (2009a: 2), "the Russian language is constituted as a science and the questions about the nature of language are deeply discussed by intellectuals."

During this period, philosophy of language was based on the relationship between language and thought, with two distinct approaches: the first one was that of the Slavophiles and was formed under the influence of Orthodox theology, based on the idea of the divine origin of language; and the second one was based on a notion of language taken from natural sciences. The first approach defended the originality of cultural and historical development in Russia and rejected Western dependence, influenced by German Idealism and the Hegelian dialectics. The second developed under the influence of different Western theorists. In the orthodox tradition, according to Ivanova (2000), language is inseparable from the notion of reason as a spiritual creative energy and of knowledge, which distinguishes humans from animals. Therefore, language, thought and the process of acquiring knowledge are seen as a dynamic whole. This idea is present in the first grammars of the Old Slavonic language as well as in the first Russian grammars. In Slavophile philosophy, language was considered as a form of the people's consciousness, a means of expression of the people's spirit, "reflecting the changes in people's lives as much as the process of development of thought" (IVANOVA, 2000: 84).

Among "formalist" linguists who experienced the influence of Slavist philosophy, there is a tendency to emphasize the social nature of language, to consider that it contributes to the socialization of man and postulates the interdependence between language and thought (Fortunatov cited IVANOVA, 2009a). For this group, language is a means of national identification and is linked to the history of its people and culture, and is hence a means of mental development. According to Ivanova (2000), due to the popularity of this first trend, a universal logical grammar did not appear in Russian, such as the Port-Royal, for instance.

The second trend of the philosophy of Russian language, according to Ivanova (2009a), was formed on the basis of the linguistic theories of A. Potebnia and Baudouin de Courtenay. Potebnia relied on the relationship between language and thought, between the word and the notion, between the nature of the linguistic sign and the inner form of the word from a psychological point of view (IVANOVA, 2009a). Some of the Russian linguist's views postulated in the 1862 study *Thought and language* draw our attention: language as an activity and not as a reflection of the conception of the world; the role of perception in the constitution of an idea; the role of language in the process of objectification of the latter and knowledge, conceived as a continuing work of the spirit; and the idea of the word as a symbol and as a work of art (Ivanova 2000). Ivanova also states that Potebnia connected linguistics to the psychology of artistic creativity and to the study of the arts, having inspired

---

12 Brait (2013) investigated how the concept of dialogue came to integrate language studies in the twentieth century, gaining consistency and diversity in different tendencies. That purpose is outside the scope of this article, since the author seeks to locate some epistemological landmarks that guide the studies of enunciation, text and discourse, based on the idea of dialogue and its transition to *dialogism*.

Jakubinsky, Vygotsky, Jakobson, among others. From Potebnia's ideas, the OPOJAZ members studied the literary text as a verbal art, as they were interested in language as a material of verbal creativity, thus performing literary and linguistic analysis (IVANOVA, 2013).

B. de Courtenay's idea of language moved from a physiological to psychological and sociological approach. It should be noted that, for the author, even in his first approach, language cannot exist independently from humans. Later, B. de Courtenay postulates that the base of language is psychological and social, and is interested in the "language activity" that includes the following aspects: the external side which includes phonation, hearing and perception; and the internal side which includes the language thought (IVANOVA, 2009: 91). In the early twentieth century, the author distinguishes an "external" component, the phonetic, linked to physiology and physics; an extralinguistic component with semantic representations, which would not be the object of linguistics; and a third component, the morphological, which the author defines as properly linguistic, reducing the notion of language to its morphological structure (IVANOVA, 2009: 92). However, this structuralist approach does not separate language from humans, and serves as the basis of Russian and Soviet structuralism and psycholinguistics.

The conception of language as activity is taken up by Baudouin de Courtenay's students: Lev Ščerba (1880-1944), Lev Jakubinsky (1892-1945), Evgenij Polivanov (1891-1938), Boris Larin (1893-1964); by the Russian psychology that develops especially in the 1920 and 1930; and by Russian sociology. Thus, these three fields of knowledge—linguistics, psychology and sociology—formed a "common space" (IVANOVA, 2009a: 8), with strong emphasis on social factors, which favored a functional approach and language behavior.[13]

This epistemological context favored the study on dialogue in Russia. Ivanova (2009a) summarizes what is important to understand the essay *On Dialogic Speech* and the philosophy of the Russian language: (1) the advent of linguistics in Russia was associated with the natural and social sciences, in particular psychology and sociology, therefore the main issues were the nature of language, its relations with thought, which resulted in the inseparability between language, the human and their activity. The object of linguistics was the living language that was linked to the history of the people, their experience, their world view, etc; (2) the distinction between external and internal components without dichotomizing them, the consideration of the whole language-speech and the rejection of Saussure's dichotomy; (3) the study of the relationship between language and the speaking subject; (4) the role of language in mental development, i.e., in thought.

Ivanova's research (2003) on the origin of Russian dialogical studies shows similarities to Romashko's approach (2000), but differences exist. The Russian researcher and translator attributes this origin to the linguists of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, as well as to the Russian linguistic and cultural practice, historically marked by diglossia, of the coexistence of the Slavonic church language as "literary language" and the spoken Russian language (Romashko, 2000). He considers that this dualism triggered the search for a "living language" as the basis for the literary language, based on the notions of idealist philology in its different variants, dating back to the nineteenth century. One of the trends of this thought was the post-romantic philology, which paid great attention to folklore studies, poetry and popular language and whose radical form was the aforementioned Slavophilia.

---

13 According to Ivanova (2012), the interest in the social aspect of language occurs at the same time as the propagation of the idea that Marxist philosophy should be the scientific and theoretical basis of the new socialist State. Marxist philosophy and methodology became thus the pillar of the new linguistics.

Romashko (2000) indicates some pioneers: first, Vladimir Ivanovich Dal (1801-1872), known for his philological activities and his ethnographic style narratives. His *Proverbs of the Russian people* (1862) and his *Explanatory Dictionary of the Living Great Russian Language* (1863-1866), became an integral part of Russian cultural heritage. Dal collected huge archives of conversations, an activity that he considered as a field of "life" and language, as opposed to written language, which he considered an artificial language. For the Russian lexicographer and writer, dialogue was a source of linguistic data of great value, a place where the spirit of the language materialized and could be renewed. It can be noted that the vision of speech or dialogue as natural, and of writing or monologue as artificial, dates back to the mid-nineteenth century, as we shall see in Jakubinsky and Ščerba.

In another line of research (the Philological and Psychological Schools), Romashko (2000), similarly to Ivanova (2000), identifies Potebnia to be among the forerunners of dialogue studies. Romashko (2000) highlights two important aspects of this linguist's thought: first, the development of a theory of linguistic creativity, especially in poetry, whose base is the spoken language, the dialogic language, the "live" conversation. Second, the need for "real listeners" in the real speech and the need for conversation to precede writing and keep this as a norm during the writing process so that it is as light and clear as is the "spoken language" (Romashko, 2000: 86). This relationship with the auditory, as it is known, is present in the work of Jakubinsky, Voloshinov and Bakhtin as will be shown in the next section.

In Romashko's view (2000), the development of field research in the second half of the nineteenth century gave rise to a vast area of philological and ethnographic investigations into the diversity of Russian dialects. The dialectologists thought that the analysis of a dialect was not only an examination "technique", with the description of its constitutive elements and features, but also an examination of the essence of language. In this context, the dialogue was seen as a key discursive phenomenon. Romashko (2000) also cites Ščerba, whom in the early twentieth century states that speaking a dialect is primarily a dialogic speech. Ivanova (2005: 120) considers that Ščerba's thesis "is distinguished from other dialectologist studies and constitutes a new approach to the Russian language", thereby expanding the notion of linguistic material for all that is said and understood in a situation and at a specific moment.

It is important to note that Jakubinsky's works from 1916 to 1923 were focused on the phonetic analysis. The linguist took part in the constitution of Russian formalism, although he mainly approached linguistic issues. Moreover, he followed Baudouin de Courtenay's ideas more than those of Potebnia, which gradually pulled him away from the formalists (IVANOVA, 2013). The notion of language as activity led Jakubinsky to consider the interdependence between the purpose, the conditions and the linguistic forms, and to show that functional language variants are manifested not only in phonetics, but also in the morphology, syntax and semantics. In Ivanova's view (2013), this set of ideas also led him to reflect on dialogic speech, in spite of the fact that he had read and quoted Gabriel Tarde, the French sociologist who analyzed the conversation in relation to the social conditions that determine the organization of dialogue in *The Opinion and the Masses* (IVANOVA, 2003).

Published in the journal *Russkaya reč'* [The Russian Language], edited by L. Ščerba (1880-1944), *On Dialogic Speech* discusses a series of questions on the prospects of the development of linguistics, more precisely a linguistics that should be separate from a comparative history of languages and deal with live speech, that is,

language in action. Many scholars (Ivanova, 2002, 2003; Airchambault, 2000; Romashko, 2000; Kyeng, 2003 Berteau, 2008) highlight the essay's foundational character for the study of dialogic linguistics. The studies generated by the knowledge of parts of the essay (CUNHA, 2006) and of the full text presented and edited by Ivanova (2012), was very stimulating due to its antecedent nature , not only in relation to the Russian dialogic studies but also to the analysis of conversation, dialogue and interaction, which began forty years later in the United States, Europe and Brazil.

3. On Dialogic Speech

The essay is divided into seven chapters: I. On the functional diversity of speech; II. On the forms of verbal statement; III. On unmediated form; IV. On the natural feature of dialogue and artificial monologue; V. Observations on the dialogue in comparison with oral and written monologue; VI. The apperception on speech perception; VII. Everyday stereotypes and dialogue; VIII. Dialogue and automation of speech. This article will not discuss each of these items, but will focus only on some of the ideas of the chapter present in the works of Bakhtin and Voloshinov.

I. On the functional diversity of speech

The essay begins with the "thesis" of the functional diversity of speech, which is determined by factors that consider speech as a function, arguing that linguistic activity is multifaceted, whether between languages, or within the same language. It addresses the author's point of view in relation to linguistics:

> without taking into account all these factors and without studying the multifarious manifestations of speech to which they functionally correspond, it is not possible to study a language as a phenomenon directly given to living perception neither to reveal its genesis and "history". (JAKUBINSKIJ 2015: 50)

For this Russian linguist, the functional diversity of language is conditioned by the variety of human behavior, which is a psychological and sociological fact, since it depends on the collective life of the human in interaction. He attributes the linguistic diversity inherent to languages to the "weight of psychological factors: normal speech, abnormal speech or speech under the influence of the emotional or intellectual element" (JAKUBINSKIJ, 2015: 50), which from his point of view, were not a focus of linguistics research. Ivanova (2015: 16) points out that Jakubinsky has a vast knowledge of the work of many psychologists such as V. Bekhterev, A. Vvedenskij, W. James, W. Watson, as well as the fundamentals of behaviorism, pragmatics, psychoanalysis, social psychology and reflexology.[14] He explains the behavior in a dialogue based on behaviorism and reflexology, as shall be discussed herein.

Seeking to address the complex functional determination of speech, Jakubinsky (2015) notes that there was no linguistic research on language phenomena due to the

---

14 According to Kyeng (2003), the pertinent elements of behaviorism are already presented in Jakubinsky, such as, for instance, the pair action-reaction (in Chapter 4), which is analogous to the pair stimulus-response that was introduced by Bloomfield's linguistics. This is not surprising to the author due to Jakubinsky's education in Baudouin de Courtenay's psychologism. Besides, in Soviet Russia, Pavlov's psychophysiology was the dominant psychology trend.

factors responsible for diversity. Among these factors, he points out the different types of emotional states and those of sociological nature[15]: (1) the communication conditions within a habitual medium (or media) and those of an interaction within an unusual medium (or media); (2) the forms of non-mediated or mediated communication, unilateral or alternating; (3) the purposes of verbal communication and the enunciation process.[16] These purposes can be practical or artistic, indifferent or convincing (suggestive), and in the latter case, have an intellectual or emotional influence.

Considering that verbal enunciation and verbal communication are determined, from the *psychological* and *morphological* point of view (in the broad sense of the term), by *the communication conditions in a specific habitual situation*, the theoretician therefore proposes the examination of language with regards to these communication conditions as an essential basis for a linguistics of his time.

In this first of Jakubinsky's arguments there are common ideas from Voloshinov and Bakhtin, and important differences from the epistemological point of view: the first difference is based on psychology; Voloshinov insists on the sociological basis of his work, as he had initially been a professor of sociology (Tylkowski, 2012; 2013); and Bakhtin's thought is rooted in different periods in philosophy, sociology, literary theory, linguistics, to cite only some of the fields. The argument of variation[17], plurality and heterodiscourse, which is the first "thesis" of Jakubinsky's essay is theorized by Bakhtin, in particular in *The Discourse of the Novel*, as illustrated by the quote:

> In any given historical moment of verbal-ideological life, each generation at each social level has its own language; moreover, every age group has as a matter of fact its own language, its own vocabulary, its own particular accentual system that, in their turn, vary depending on social level, academic institution (the language of the cadet, the high school student, the trade school student are all different languages) and other stratifying factors. All this is brought about by socially typifying languages, no matter how narrow the social circle in which they are spoken. (BAKHTIN, 1987:290)

One other important idea found in the three Russian authors' works is the determination of the diversity of linguistic forms by external factors. However, while Jakubinsky refers to the psychological and sociological factors, Voloshinov (1995) emphasizes the social factors[18] as shown in the following excerpt: "Indeed, from whichever aspect we

---

15 Ivanova (2015: 20) explains that the relationship between language, society and thought found in *On Dialogic Speech* was common in the years when social psychology and reflexology were established in Soviet Russia. In that context, issues of situation, thought, verbal expression occupied central place.

16 Ivanova (2015: 51) provides a relevant explanation to two Russian notions, often interpreted as similar to the French speech theories: "the word *vyskazyvanie* refers both to the fact that an interlocutor expresses a thought (translated, thus, as *enunciação/enunciation*) and to its result (we use, therefore, *enunciado/utterance*). In the following chapters, Jakubinsky uses *vyskazyvanie* in the sense of 'production process of an utterance' (translated as *ato de enunciação/speech act*). This translation of the term *vyskazyvanie* into *enunciado/utterance* and *enunciação/enunciation* does not correspond in any way to the difference that Benveniste makes of the two terms."

17 Voloshinov did not write about variation. According to Sériot (2015), unlike Jakubinsky, Voloshinov was not interested in the language of the proletariat, workers, peasants, etc. However, he talks consistently about the plurality of meanings: polysemy, plurivalence, pluriaccentuation of the word, as well as the plurivalence of the sign, as opposed to the univocity of the word.

18 Tylkowiski (2012) shows Voloshinov's epistemological context through the analysis of the authors cited in his oeuvre, as well as those he did not cite. She considers that they are all part of his "virtual library". The researcher reveals the authors that he may have read in order to elaborate his writings, based on the notions and themes addressed by Voloshinov.

consider it, expression-utterance is determined by the actual conditions of the given utterance—above all, by its *immediate social situation*." (VOLOSHINOV, 1986:85)

Bakhtin follows the same line of thought:

> Discourse lives, as it were, beyond itself, in a living impulse [**napravlennost'**] toward the object; if we detach ourselves completely from this impulse all we have left is the naked corpse of the word, from which we can learn nothing at all about the social situation or the fate of a given word in life. **To study the word as such, ignoring the impulse that reaches out beyond it, is just as senseless as to study psychological experience outside the context of that real life toward which it was directed and by which it is determined.** (BAKHTIN, 1987:92)

It can be argued that Jakubinsky used as his starting point the forms of verbal enunciation which are inseparable from the concrete interaction in the social context. It is worth noting that the notion of *purpose*, present in Bakhtin's essay *The Speech Genres* (2016), was introduced in Jakubinsky's first article, *On the Sounds of Versified Language*. As a Russian formalist, this idea was theorized to draw up the opposition between poetic language and practical language (Ivanova, 2012). In *On Dialogic Speech*, Jakubinsky criticizes linguistics for not having paid attention to the issue of the *purposes* of verbal enunciation and announces the difference of his approach of 1923 from that of the Moscow Linguistic Circle, which consigned the question of purpose (or as he puts it, "speech functionality")[19] to the background. In fact, as they are sociological factors responsible for the diversity of formal and functional speech, the purposes of *verbal communication* are linked to the process of enunciation and can be "practical or artistic, indifferent or convincing (suggestive), and in the latter case, have an intellectual or emotional influence" (JAKUBINSKIJ, 2015: 51).

What is striking is that Jakubinsky lived in a context in which a part of the linguists was made up of structuralists[20] and the issue of diversity is to a certain degree inconsistent with the analysis of language proposed by Saussure and his followers. According to Ageeva (2009: 73), Saussure's theory sparked debates: on the one hand, great enthusiasm, especially from the linguists of Moscow, and on the other, a lot of criticism and dismissal by Leningrad for being an "abstract"[21] theory. The Moscow linguists came across Saussure's theory in 1918 when they were presented by S.O. Karcevskij to the dialectologic com-

---

19 The concept of purpose as well as that of function introduced by Jakubinsky is not the same for the different formalist theoreticians. According to Ivanova (2012: 4-5), the notion of *intentional* purpose, proposed by Sklovskij for instance, aimed at the creation of an artistic work and generated formal difficulties to avoid an automatic perception of practical language. In previous articles, Jakubinsky opposes poetic and practical language based on purpose and on the attention principle. The first one gave great importance to sound aspects and the second one to the semantic aspects which has a communication intention. In four articles written before *On Dialogic Speech* analyzed by Ivanova (2012), Jakubinsky devotes himself to the specificities of the practical and poetic languages, and to the relations between the *objectives* of the language activities, *linguistic form* and *situation*. Ivanova (2012) affirms that the analysis of language facts makes Jakubinsky privilege practical language and its workings.

20 Volochinov quotes Russian colleagues that were situated within Saussure's line: "R. Šor's *Jazyk i obščestvo* [Language and Society] (Moscow, 1926), is entrenched in the spirit of the Geneva School. She also functions as an ardent apologist of Saussure's basic ideas in her article, "Krizis sovremennoj lingvistiki," already cited. The linguist V. V. Vinogradov may be regarded as a follower of the Geneva School. Two schools of Russian linguistics, the Fortunatov school and the so-called Kazan' school (Kruševskij and Baudouin de Courtenay), both of them vivid expressions of linguistic formalism, fit entirely within the framework we have mapped out as that of the second trend of thought in philosophy of language." (VOLOSHINOV, 1986:59)

21 Quotation marks used by the author.

mission of the Academy of Sciences in Moscow. The Petrograd linguists learned about the ideas of Swiss linguist S. Bernštejn in 1923, during a conference to the linguistic section of the Institute for the Comparative Studies of Western and Eastern Languages and Literatures (ILJaZV). However, according to Depretto (2007), Alexander Romm's translation of *Course in General Linguistics* (CGL) from 1922, but not authorized by Bally and Schehaye for publication, circulated and was part of the discussions of the Moscow linguistic circle. There is a record of a meeting devoted to the work on March 3rd, 1923. Depretto also reveals that there are references to the CGL in reviews, articles and communications of the Moscow linguistic circle members. Archaimbault (2010) also points out that the CGL was read and discussed quite critically in Russia in the 1920s: some thought that the language and speech distinction was very productive; others believed that the articulation of the two levels was not sufficiently thought through, that the process of living speech was paramount and had not been treated adequately or had been neglected. The fact is that, at the beginning of the twentieth century, many Russians authors believed that positivism was the science they should fight against, and in language sciences there was an anti-positivist reaction in all European countries to varying degrees (Seriot, 2015).

That said, Jakubinsky goes on to discuss other distinctions: the *means of information* in different variants and the *monologue* and *dialogue* as *verbal* phenomena.

II. On the forms of verbal utterance and
III. On the unmediated form

In a very didactic manner, Jakubinsky indicates three categories: the mediated monologue form that corresponds to writing; the unmediated monologue form, such as "an address at the time of a meeting or in court" (JAKUBINSKIJ, 2015: 64); and *unmediated dialogical form of human interaction*, which he describes as

> Fast and unorganized exchange in everyday life or at work: rapid exchange of speech, in which each element that makes up the exchange is a replica, each being highly conditioned by the other replica; the exchange that develops without any prior reflection; participants do not previously establish any particular purpose; there is no prior order in the construction of the replicas, which are extremely short. (JAKUBINSKIJ, 2015: 64)

Jakubinsky's innovative proposal of dialogue analysis also reveals the importance given to the visual and auditory perception of the interlocutor of nonverbal language, that is, to the expressions, gestures, body movements that can play the *replica* role in the dialogue, thereby replacing the verbal expression. "Often a replica through gestures gives the answer even before the verbal replica" (JAKUBINSKIJ, 2015: 68).

Furthermore, there is also the semantic weight of intonation:

> the same way that a sentence can have a different meaning depending on the intonation with which it is pronounced, a mimic (and gesture) compliment can provide another nuance often contrary to what is usually expected (JAKUBINSKIJ, 2015: 69).

To demonstrate the role of intonation, the linguist quotes an excerpt from Dostoyevsky's *Diary of a Writer* (which is later quoted by Voloshinov and Vygotyski). This is indeed a major element in the dialogic theory. Voloshinov shows the key role of expressive intonation and gestures already in his first writings. In *Word in Life and Word in Poet-*

ry, he argues that it is extra-verbal situation that gives rise and sense to speech, as well as to the judgments and evaluations. This extra-verbal context of enunciation consists of *shared spatial context*; the *knowledge and the common understanding of the situation*, also shared by the interlocutors; and the evaluations shared by them (Volochínov, 2013: 78). He points out two components of enunciation: the verbal and implied, the latter being where one can observe the common valuations expressed by intonation. Like Jakubinsky, Voloshinov (1976: 102) argues that "Intonation establishes a firm link between verbal discourse and the extraverbal context—genuine, living intonation moves verbal discourse beyond the border of the verbal, so to speak." Most of the time, this expressive intonation is determined by the immediate situation and often by ephemeral circumstances. "it threatens and rails against or adores and cherishes inanimate objects and phenomena" (VOLOSHINOV, 1976:104). It is the intonation that reveals the value accent, noting that for the author there is no utterance without *appreciative orientation*. Voloshinov (2013) also suggests that gestures (mime and facial gestures) have a kinship with intonation, i.e., they have the same semantic weight in dialogic interactions as the intonation and the verbal elements.

For Bakhtin, the expressive intonation is constitutive of meaning and is associated with the axiological component of language, which he indicated in his first philosophical and aesthetic texts. In *For a Philosophy of the Act*, the act is linked to intonation: "An emotional-volitional tone is an inalienable moment of the actually performed act, even of the most abstract thought, insofar as I am actually thinking it" (BAKHTIN, 1993:33). It is also constitutive of aesthetic enunciation, as shown in the following excerpt from *The Problem of Content, Material and Form*, published in 1924:

> Under the intonative aspect of the word, we understand its capacity to express all the diversity of the speaker's axiological attitudes toward the content of an utterance (on the psychological plane—the diversity of the speaker's emotional-volitional reactions). […] The author's activity becomes the activity of **expressed** valuation, which colors all aspects of the word: the word abuses, caresses, is indifferent, denigrates, embellishes, etc. (BAKHTIN, 1990b: 312)

In his *The Speech Genres*, a "linguistic" essay, Bakhtin contends that

> The second aspect of the utterance that determines its composition and style is the expressive aspect, that is, the speaker's subjective emotional evaluation of the referentially semantic content of his utterance. The expressive aspect has varying significance and varying degrees of force in various spheres of speech communication, but it exists everywhere. There can be no such thing as an absolutely neutral utterance. (BAKHTIN, 1999: 84)

Thus, intonation, gestures and mimicry are constitutive of the verbal utterance for the three authors. However, in Jakubinsky's case, reflection concerns the dialogue, while Voloshinov and Bakhtin look beyond and add to intonation the role of unveiling the appreciative orientation and axiological character of language, respectively.

IV. The natural character of the dialogue and artificial monologue
V. Observations on the dialogue in comparison with oral and written monologue

The opposition between dialogue and monologue is developed in two main sections of the essay and reveal the importance of Jakubinsky's work to "dialogue theory". He takes

up the study of his teacher L. V. Ščerba about *The Eastern Sorbian Dialect*, in which the latter stressed the importance of distinguishing the dialogic and monologic forms for the analysis of language phenomena. Ščerba (cited in JAKUBINSKIJ 2015) showed that there was a linguistic group who did not know the monologue, which therefore characterized it largely as a form of artificial language. Thus, true language is revealed in the dialogue, where the new words, phrases and forms are produced; it is the place where linguistic evolution factors act. Also according to Ščerba, the monologue is the normative dimension of language, while the dialogue is a dynamic force for innovation, so that linguists and especially dialectologists could not do without a "'theory' of dialogue and monologue" (JAKUBINSKIJ, 2015: 75).

From this thesis, Jakubinsky stresses the need to study the dialogical form as *universal*, since there is no verbal interaction without dialogue. It is visible that dialogue and interaction are inseparable, the latter being necessarily a bilateral and dialogic interaction (JAKUBINSKIJ, 2015: 76). However, as previously mentioned, Jakubinsky's notion of interaction is connected to psychology, biology and reflexology. He highlights three important elements in this process: the usual characteristic of the organism to react to each action oriented towards an interlocutor; the connection between our representations, our judgments, our emotions, etc., in reaction to something and their manifestations in speech; and the power that a *verbal* action has in provoking a verbal reaction, which, furthermore, often has an almost reflective character. The three elements are linked to the vision of action and reaction of thoughts and emotions, both in dialogue and in writing. Jakubinsky demonstrates the difficulty of learning to listen without interrupting, through examples, among which he points out what happens at meetings and assemblies where it is common to hear voices in the room, and the reactions of thought, aloud or in writing when we noted, underline etc., during the reading process.

Despite questioning Ščerba's natural and artificial terminology for dialogue and monologue, Jakubinsky argues that this dichotomy is conventional. For him, dialogue is a phenomenon of "culture" and "nature" (JAKUBINSKIJ, 2015: 79).

The author's description of the operation of dialogic speech shares common ideas with conversational studies, as mentioned: dialogue is characterized by the *phenomenon of replicas* alternating in the form of succession (one "starts" after the other "ends"), of *interruption*, so that all speech activity is *unfinished*. It is noteworthy that the author has observed the following aspects: the importance of linkages between the replica and not only the linguistic forms that constitute them; the pauses; the *original* character of the replicas, determined by the previous speaker's utterance and by an element of the speaker's *global* enunciation; the rapid pace of spontaneous conversations, characterizing them as simple as opposed to the monologue.

Here too the similarity of Jakubinsky's descriptions with Voloshinov's proposal is visible. At the beginning of *The Construction of the Utterance*, written in 1930, Voloshinov (2013: 158) announces: "the actual essence of language is represented by the social fact of verbal interaction, which is actualized by one or more utterances." In this essay, there is an item (2) on "the monologic and dialogic discourse" in which Voloshinov (2013: 163) emphasizes the relationship between interaction and dialogue: "it can be said that any communication, any verbal interaction, develops in the form of utterance exchange, i.e. in the form of dialogue." Based on Ščerba's and Jakubinsky's proposals, Voloshinov (2013: 163) suggests that face to face dialogue is the most natural form of language, defining it as "a reciprocal conversation between two people, unlike the monologue, i.e., prolonged

speech of only one person", which exists only in the external form, as the semantic and stylistic construction is dialogic. He adds an item on the interior language dialogicity, affirming "resolutely and categorically, that even these intimate verbal interventions are fully dialogic" (Volochínov, 2013: 163).

As one of the most quoted texts of the Russian linguist, one cannot forget that "verbal interaction is the basic reality of language" (VOLOSHINOV, 1986:94). Moreover, the notion of dialogue is a mainstay for many theses of *Marxism and Philosophy of Language* (published in 1929) in the strict and in the broad sense[22]: comprehension is a form of *dialogue*; paragraphs are analogous to replicas of a dialogue; the reported speech is a form of dialogue. It is worth remembering that for Voloshinov (1995) the research of speech citation forms would contribute to the study of the dialogue, which was beginning to draw the attention of linguists and at times became the center of concern in linguistics.[23]

For Bakhtin, "the category of dialogue prevails in his thought" (Bezerra: 2003: xi). It cannot be forgotten that he conceives the relationship between *the author and the character* based on the notion of interaction: "In this sense, we can say that the event of the author's and the hero's interrelationship with a particular, concrete work is often composed of several acts" ((BAKHTIN, 1990b:186). Later, in *The Speech Genres*, he returns to the idea that individual verbal experience of man takes shape and evolves under the effect of continuous and permanent interaction with the individual utterances of the other.

Bakhtin formulates proposals for the study of discourse in *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics* and *Discourse in the Novel*, both based on a dialogic notion inherent to the discourse: "The dialogic orientation of discourse is a phenomenon that is, of course, a property of *any* discourse. It is the natural orientation of any living discourse." (BAKHTIN, 1987:279). In particular, the author analyzes the interaction between voices in his works. Like Jakubinsky (2015), for whom dialogue replica is simultaneously determined by the previous interlocutor's utterance and by a global thought, i.e. a general strategy of the speaker, Bakhtin (1997) argues that the discourse in dialogue, in the *skaz*, in the stylization, is geared towards the discourse object and towards an *other speech*, that is, to the *speech of an other*.

Although Jakubinsky discusses elements that advance a theory of genres in Chapter 7, the characterization of spontaneous dialogue and written monologue can be compared to the dichotomy between practical language and poetic language, instead of the diversity of primary genres (linked to the situation and not to the speech) and secondary (complex genres resulting from the transmutation of the primary ones) (Bakhtin, 2016).

VI. The Apperception in the perception of speech

Jakubinsky discusses a matter of utmost importance from the perspective of language studies, related to the interpretation process: the *apperceptive mass* of the listener, a notion used in Russia in the nineteenth and early twentieth century (ARCHAIMBAULT, 2010) and by Jakubinsky in the sense of "the group of all the previous experience and knowledge necessary for the comprehension and interpretation of an action or an utterance" (JAKUBINSKIJ, 2015: 88).

---

22 It is always worth remembering that Voloshinov conceives that the dialogue is not only an oral communication between two people in a face to face situation, but "verbal communication of any type whatsoever", including the speech act under the form of a book that responds, refutes, confirms, etc., functioning as a dialogue replica. (VOLOSHINOV, 1986:95)

23 Here is where the reference to Jakubinsky appears, cited in footnote 3.

This notion is inseparable from that of the understanding of the other's speech, which, like perception, is *apperceptive*. Didactically Jakubinsky (2015: 89) introduces several examples to "prove" that the process of interpretation is based on "ideas, emotions and desires, which, for different reasons, predominate in our psyche at any given time (in an expressed manner or dissimulated in consciousness)". Thus, the author notes that

> there is a greater understanding of the discourse of the speaker by the interlocutor when their apperceptive masses have much in common, which provides a greater use of allusions and incomplete utterances. Conversely, the less the apperceptive masses have in common, the greater the difficulty of mutual understanding (JAKUBINKIJ, 2015: 97)

Furthermore, Jakubinsky (2015) highlights the importance of apperceptive character of perception to the dialogue and monologue composition. In the latter, the speaker is unable to discover the reader's reactions, what he does and where. In the dialogue, if there is a convergence of apperceptive mass, the verbal composition of the utterance is simplified: each replica reinforces this community and contains fewer words.

Bakhtin (2015: 54) uses the notion of apperceptive background and apperceptive field in *The Discourse in the Novel*, when discussing the issue of the current meaning of the utterance and its active interpretation in the dialogic perspective, as opposed to linguistic meaning and passive interpretation, which in his view is not a comprehension. For the author, "[the] actual meaning is understood against the background of other concrete utterances on the same theme, a background made up of contradictory opinions, points of view and value judgements" (BAKHTIN, 1987:281). Once the concept of active interpretation is developed, he adds that the speaker builds his enunciation in a territory of an other, in the apperceptive field of the listener.

In *The Speech Genres*, Bakhtin (2016) highlights once again the relevance of this concept:

> When speaking I always take into account the apperceptive background of the addressee's perception of my speech: the extent to which he is familiar with the situation, whether he has special knowledge of the given cultural area of communication, his views and convictions, his prejudices (from my viewpoint), his sympathies and antipathies—because all this will determine his active responsive understanding of my utterance. (BAKHTIN, 1999: 95-6)

The concept does not appear to be used in Voloshinov's Brazilian translations (1995), but it can be argued that it is present in his writings, more evidently in *Word in Life and Word in Poetry*, written in 1926. When he discusses the three aspects of the extra-verbal context, the Russian linguist points out "the interlocutors' common *knowledge and understanding* of the situation", shared by speakers (VOLOSHINOV, 1976:99), which together with the spatial horizon and valuation shared by the interlocutors, allow us to understand the overall sense of a concrete utterance.

It is possible to draw a parallel between the notion of apperceptive mass or field with that of shared knowledge and background, used in studies of enunciation, speech, text and dialogue in Western linguistics. It is not the aim of this article to discuss the concepts in current works, but it will mention, as an example, the view of François (2015) for whom the comprehension process of a text works according to several factors: our ability to seize it as a movement and not as a succession of sentences; the diversity of *background[24]*,

---

24 In French, Frédéric François elaborated the notion of *arrière-fond*, whose literal translation is *background*

the style of understanding with regards to the other and the specificity of the partially shared background, from which our comprehension is responsive.

VII. Everyday stereotypes and dialogue

Jakubinsky points out the existence of everyday stereotypes and stereotypes of speech. This is a key element of verbal communication, which determines the perception of speech and therefore, the process of speech itself. The author associates situations with types of utterances and gives examples of stereotypical utterances in situations such as buying a newspaper, a conversation between neighbors returning from the market, and in situations of privacy, which are *carriers of information*. Our everyday life is full of *repeated and stereotyped situations* that generate stereotyped sentences:

> Due to their constant use in repetitive everyday life instances, these sentences become *petrified*, they transform into kinds of *complex syntactic stereotypes*. The sentence segmentation significantly erases itself, and the speaker practically decomposes it into its constituent parts. The reproduction, the use of such a sentence is just the reproduction of a habitual stereotype, which can be compared to the reproduction of a current word or a "talking head". [...] I thought, however, that it was necessary to highlight this case, to the extent that such a stereotypical sentence appears in the dialogue when speech develops in the conditions of the stereotypes of everyday life. (Jakubinsky, 2015: 104)

Along with some scholars, this article regards that this association of enunciation situations and stereotypical sentences shares common ideas with the notion of genre proposed by Voloshinov and Bakhtin. Voloshinov (Bakhtin / Volochínov 1995: 42) refers to *different modes of discourse*, forms of verbal interaction closely related to the conditions of a social situation. He cites the hallway conversations, exchanges of opinion at the theater and concert, in different social gatherings, the exchanges of pure chance, the form of verbal reaction faced with the realities of life and the day-to-day events, the interior speech and the self-referential consciousness, social regulation, etc.

In *The Construction of Enunciation*, Voloshinov (2013) states that each type of communicative exchange organizes, builds and completes the grammatical and stylistic form of enunciation, its structure type, which will be referred to as *genre*. The relationship between situation, genre and theme is the starting point of Bakhtin's formulation on speech genres.

> The wealth and diversity of speech genres are boundless because the various possibilities of human activity are inexhaustible, and because each sphere of activity contains an entire repertoire of speech genres that differentiate and grow as the particular sphere develops and becomes more complex. (BAKHTIN, 1999: 60)

Final considerations

On Dialogic Speech dialogically develops questions and trends of Russian philological, dialectological, linguistic and literary studies of the late nineteenth and early twen-

---

and which can be defined as the group of competences and experiences responsible for the comprehension or active interpretation of the verbal and non-verbal elements. This notion seems to be analogous to those of apperceptive mass or field.

tieth century. It is located in the debate of its time and emerged in response to some voices whilst echoing others. However, this essay has a pioneering character, electing the dialogue as its linguistic object, whilst also discussing external conditions that restrict it.

In this work, Jakubinsky places dialogue as the main element of language activity. He describes the factors that determine its production and its perception-reception, that is, he considers the external and internal, psychological and social aspects, and connects the diversity of language activities to that of the linguistic material. He chooses the living language, which is linked to history and inseparable from speech, and describes the operation of dialogue and monologue, the stereotypical enunciations related to stereotypical interactions of everyday life, among other topics.

This article attempts to locate Jakubinsky's views and demonstrates some similarities and differences between his proposals and those of Bakhtin and Voloshinov. Instead of identifying all of them, the article highlights those that appear to be most relevant, since it would be difficult to show all ideas that have been elaborated in the dialogic theory from the notion of dialogue. Voloshinov and Bakhtin adopted burgeoning themes, issues and notions of philosophy and the humanities from the Russian and German epistemological context of the early twentieth century, where interdisciplinarity was common at the time. However, they assimilate the *given* and transformed it into the *new*, according to their interests, their issues, their values, their encyclopedic knowledge, etc. Differences and singularities can therefore be attributed to the weight of the main theoretical sources of each one: Jakubinsky's psychology; Voloshinov's sociology (Marxist and non-Marxist); and Bakhtin's literary theory, philosophy and history, sociology, linguistics (in different periods).

To conclude, this article returns to Romashko (2000) who illustrates the issue of determining the language activity by the conditions of communication: with the introduction of Stalinism, he says, the dialogue disappeared; consequently, dialogic research was diminished.

Translated by Patrick Bushell.

References

AGEEVA, Inna, La critique de F. de Saussure dans Marxisme et philosophie du langage de V.N. Vološinov et le contexte de la réception des idées saussuriennes dans les années 1920-1930 en Russie. *Cahiers de l'ILSL*, n° 26, 2009, pp. 73-84

ALPATOV, Wladimir M. La linguistique marxiste en URSS dans les années 1920-1930. *Cahiers de l'ILSL*, N°14, 2003, pp. 5-22.

ARCHAIMBAUT, Sylvie, Aperception et dialogue chez Lev Jakubinskij (1892-1945). |*Revue d'Histoire des Sciences Humaines*, 2009/2 - n° 21 pages 69 à 82.

_____. Un texte fondateur pour l'étude du dialogue : De la parole dialogale (L. Jakubinskij). *Histoire Épistémologie Langage*. Tome 22, fascicule 1, 2000. pp. 99-115.

BAKHTIN, M. "The problem of content, material, and form in verbal art". Translated by K. Brostrom. In: BAKHTIN, M. *Art and answerability*: early philosophical essays by M. M. Bakhtin. Translation and notes by V. Liapunov. Edited by V. Liapunov & M. Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1990b. p. 257-325.

_____. *Problems of Dostoievsky's Poetics*. Edited and Translated by Caryl Emerson. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2011 [1963].

_____. "Author and hero in aesthetic activity". Translated by V. Liapunov. In: BAKHTIN, M. *Art and answerability*: early philosophical essays by M. M. Bakhtin. Translation and notes by V. Liapunov. Edited by V. Liapunov & M. Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1990a. p. 4-256.

_____. *Toward a philosophy of the act.* Translation and notes by V. Liapunov. Edited by V. Liapunov & M. Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1993.

_____. "Discourse in the novel". In: BAKHTIN, M. *The dialogic imagination*: four essays by M. M. Bakhtin. Translated by C. Emerson & M. Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1987. p. 259-422.

_____. "The problem of speech genres". In: BAKHTIN, M. *Speech genres and other late essays*. Translated by Vern W. McGee. Edited by C. Emerson & M. Holquist. 7 ed. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1999. p. 60-102.

_____. Diálogos II. In: *Os gêneros do discurso*. São Paulo, Editora 34, 2016, 125-170.

BERTAU, Marie-Cécile, Le vécu de la langue dans la forme et la voix. Une approche avec Iakoubinski et Volochinov. *Slavica Occitania*, 25, 2007, p. 417-435.

BEZERRA, Paulo. Introdução. In: BAKHTIN, M. *Estética da criação verbal*. 4a ed. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2003, p. IX-XII.

BRANDIST, Craig. *Repensando o Círculo de Bakhtin.* São Paulo: Editora Contexto, 2012, 181 p.

BRAIT, Beth, Tradição, permanência e subversão de conceitos nos Estudos da linguagem, *Revista da Anpoll* nº 34, 2013, p. 91-121.

CUNHA, Dóris de Arruda C. Dialogismo em Bakhtin e Iakubinskii. *Investigações: Lingüística e Teoria Literária.* Vol**.** 18, no. 2, 2005, p. 103-114.

DEPRETTO, Catherine. Alexandre Romm (1898-1943), lecteur du *Marxisme et philosophie du langage*. *Slavica Occitania*, 25, 2007, p. 399-416.

GARDIN, Bernard. Volochinov ou Bakhtine. *La Pensée* 197, 1978, p. 87-100.

IVANOVA, Irina. Spécificités de l'étude du dialogue dans la linguistique russe. *Histoire Épistémologie Langage*. Tome 22, fascicule 1, 2000, p. 117-129.

_____.Les sources de la conception du dialogue chez L. Jakubinskij », *Texto! Textes & Cultures,* 2003, vol. VIII, № 4 (http://www.revue-texto.net/Inedits/Ivanova_Jakubinskij.html

_____.*Un dialecte sorabe oriental* de Ščerba, premier essai de linguistique de la parole. *Slavica occitania,* Toulouse, 20, 2005, p. 113-129.

_____. La notion de "langue" dans la linguistique russe (deuxième moitié du XIXe - début du XXe siècle). *Etudes de Lettres,* n.4, 2009a, p. 81-100.

_____. L'opposition « langue poétique / langue pratique » dans la conception linguistique de Lev Jakubinskij. *Cahiers de l'ILSL*, N° 26, 2009b, pp. 113-128.

_____. O diálogo na linguística soviética dos anos 1920-1930. Tradução Dóris de Arruda C. da Cunha e Heber Costa e Silva. *Bakhtiniana, 6 (1): 239-267, Ago./Dez. 2011.*

_____. Le problème de la nature de la langue et du langage chez les formalistes russes. *Cahiers de l'ILSL*, № 37, 2013, p. 213-228.

_____. Prefácio. In: Lev Jakubinskij *Sobre a fala dialogal*. São Paulo: Parábola Editorial, 2015a, p 7-28.

_____. Apresentação. In: Lev Jakubinskij *Sobre a fala dialogal*. São Paulo: Parábola Editorial, 2015b, p 20-43.

JAKUBINSKIJ Lev, *Sobre a fala dialogal*. Textos editados e apresentados por Irina Ivanova. Tradução Dóris de Arruda C. da Cunha e Suzana Leite Cortez. São Paulo: Parábola Editorail, 2015, 123 p.

JAKUBINSKIJ Lev, *Une linguistique de la parole (URSS, 1920-1930)*. Textes édités et présentés par Irina Ivanova, traductions Irina Ivanova et Patrick Sériot. Limoges: Lambert-Lucas, 2012, 332 p.

KYHENG Rossitza Aux origines du principe dialogique. L'étude de Jakubinskij : une présentation critique aux origines du principe dialogique. *Texto! Textes & Cultures,* 2003, vol. VIII, № 4. http://www.revue-texto.net/Inedits/Kyheng/Kyheng_Jakubinskij.html

LÄHTEENMÄKÏ, Mika. Estratificação social da linguagem no "Discurso no romance": o contexto soviético oculto. In ZANDWAIS, Ana (org.) *Mikhaïl Bakhtin: contribuições para a filosofia da linguagem e estudos discursivos*. Porto Alegre: Editora Sagra Luzzatto, 2005, p. 41-58.

ROMASHKO Sergej A. Vers l'analyse du dialogue en Russie. In: *Histoire Épistémologie Langage*. Tome 22, fascicule 1, 2000, p. 83-98. doi : 10.3406/hel.2000.2767 http://www.persee.fr/doc/hel_0750-8069_2000_num_22_1_2767

SERIOT, Patrick, Bakhtin no contexto: diálogo de vozes e hibridação das línguas (o problema dos limites). In ZANDWAIS, Ana (org.). *Mikhaïl Bakhtin: contribuições para a filosofia da linguagem e estudos discursivos*. Porto Alegre: Editora Sagra Luzzatto, 2005, p. 59-72.

_____. Vološinov e a filosofia da linguagem. São Paulo Parábola, 2015, 127 p.

TYLKOWSKYI, Inna. *V.N. Vološinov em contexte*. Essai d'épistémologie historique. Limoges: Lambert-Lucas, 2012.

_____. Les conceptions du dialogue et leurs sources chez Lev Jakubinskij et Valentin Vološinov. *Cahiers de l'ILSL*, № 37, 2013, p. 171-185.

_____. *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*. Translated by Ladislav Matejka and I. R. Titunik. Cambridge/London: Harvard University Press, 1986.

ZANDWAIS, Ana (org), Mikhail Bakhtin: contributions to the philosophy of language and discourse studies. Porto Alegre: Sagra Luzzatto, 2005.

_____. History of ideas. Dialogues between language, culture and history. Passo Fundo: Publisher of the University of Passo Fundo, 2012, 312 p.