

WILHELM VON HUMBOLDT: PARALLELISMS WITH THE BAKHTIN CIRCLE AND CONTRIBUTIONS TO LINGUISTIC DIVERSITY

Maria GLUSHKOVA*
Taciane DOMINGUES**

- **ABSTRACT:** Wilhelm von Humboldt was an important theorist in the formation of European and Russian linguistics. His thinking largely influenced the St. Petersburg School, the headquarters of the Bakhtin Circle. No wonder, Mikhail Bakhtin and Valentin Voloshinov central concepts dialogue with the thinking of the German theorist. In this article, we show this relationship through the parallel between the Humboldtian concepts ‘worldviews’ and ‘dualism’, on the one hand, and those applied by Bakhtin and Voloshinov – ‘behavioral ideology’ and ‘dialogism’, on the other. Our aim is to facilitate the reception of Humboldt’s ideas by the Brazilian public, already familiar with the Bakhtin Circle. After the theoretical presentation, we will quote the content of two conversations on the preservation of linguistic diversity to demonstrate that Humboldt’s conception of it as an intellectual wealth is presented in the speeches of both Russian and Brazilian specialists in the fields of Linguistics, Education and Sciences. We intend, with the article, to highlight the importance for Brazil receiving and deeper understanding Humboldt’s ideas.
- **KEYWORDS:** Wilhelm von Humboldt; Bakhtin Circle; dialogism; worldviews; linguistic diversity.

Introduction

Wilhelm von Humboldt is one of the cornerstones of European Linguistics. Many schools have started under the influence of his ideas; in Russia, he is considered the founder of General Linguistics. Humboldt has an essential influence on the Russian theoreticians studied in Brazil, such as Mikhail Bakhtin and Valentin Voloshinov. Nevertheless, in Brazil there is still a gap in the reception of his work: as to the present

* Universidade de São Paulo (USP). Faculdade de Filosofia, Letras e Ciências Humanas. São Paulo - SP - Brazil. Departamento de Letras Clássicas e Vernáculas. GP Diálogo. maria.glushkova@yahoo.com. ORCID: 0000-0002-1922-4448.

** Universidade de São Paulo (USP). Faculdade de Filosofia, Letras e Ciências Humanas. São Paulo - SP - Brazil. Departamento de Letras Clássicas e Vernáculas. GP Diálogo. tacionedomingues@gmail.com. ORCID: 0000-0001-5056-3512.

moment, there are just a few translations and studies about him; he is rarely mentioned in Brazilian academic Linguistic courses.

In the present article we aim to explore two Humboldtian ideas - “world views” and “dualism” (*Weltansichten* and *Dualis*) – while comparing them with Voloshinov and Bakhtin’s concepts “behavioral ideology” and “dialogism”. By establishing relations between them, we intend to increase awareness and interest in Humboldt in Brazil, especially due to the relevance of Humboldtian theory for sensitive topics to the country: the linguistic diversity and the preservation of endangered languages the same as to contribute to Bakhtinian studies.

We will describe Humboldt’s influence on the formation of Russian Linguistics and mention the context to which the members of the Bakhtin Circle were circumscribed, as to justify their proximity. Afterwards we will mention recent European publications that reaffirm the importance of this German theoretician, especially regarding his pioneering work in dialogism – the fundamental principle of the Circle. This will allow us to draw parallel perspectives between those Humboldtian concepts (“world views” and “dualism”) and the Circle’s “behavioral ideology” and “dialogism”.

Lastly, in order to assert the contemporary relevance of Humboldt’s ideas and their coherence for both Russian and Brazilian linguistic traditions, we will present and comment on excerpts of two interviews with specialists from these countries in the areas of Linguistics, Education and Science, in order to illustrate how the concepts from our theoretical exposition are applied in the aforementioned societies. The topic of those interviews is the preservation of endangered languages. Notwithstanding Russia and Brazil being geographically distant, their vast territories encompass lots of ethnically and linguistically different peoples, over whom their two official languages – Russian and Brazilian Portuguese – have exercised supremacy for many years. The specialists discuss the importance of preserving linguistic diversity in both nations; so the pertinence of Humboldt’s vision for contemporary Russia and Brazil, as well as the need to deepen the understanding of Humboldt in the latter, will be clear.

To summarize: this article aims to demonstrate that Humboldt’s concepts “world view” and “dualism” relate to Bakhtin’s and Voloshinov’s ideas and are relatable to current ideas in the Scientific speech of contemporary Russian and Brazilian linguists. Our work will stress Humboldt’s importance to Bakhtinian studies and to the studies of linguistic diversity and the preservation of endangered languages – topics that are as necessary as they are relevant for Russia and Brazil. In the next section, we are going to revisit part of Humboldt’s history in Europe and Russia in order to explore his influence on the Bakhtin Circle.

Wilhelm von Humboldt in Europe and Russia: diachronic and current overview

Humboldt was more than a linguist – he was also a pioneer statesman in the field of Education: Berlin’s first University was founded and directed by him. In consonance

with his studies on language, Humboldt founded the first department of comparative linguistics in Europe, directed by the famous linguist Franz Bopp.

According to Bernhard Hurch (2004), researcher of the Austrian Graz University, Humboldt did not only reflect about the linguistic phenomenon, but also systematized the study of languages. His work encompassed the areas of phonology, prosody, morphology, syntax, comparative historical (diachronic) studies, linguistic typology, changes and classification, grammaticalization and the relationship between language and culture; hence, he helped establish Modern Linguistics: “Humboldt was a linguist in the modern sense. He has played an essential role in constituting modern Linguistics”¹ (HURCH, 2004, p. 334).²

Whilst in Europe Humboldt is known as a statesman, diplomat and politics theoretician, in Russia he is widely regarded as a linguist. Humboldt is considered the founder of General Linguistics (*óbschieie iazykoznaníie*) and thus formed the ideas of two important Russian intellectuals: the linguist Aleksandr Potebniá³ and the philosopher Gustav Shpiet⁴ (both of them are mentioned in Bakhtin’s and Voloshinov’s works). In Brazil, the specialist and translator of the Bakhtin Circle Sheila Grillo revisited Humboldt’s influence on Potebniá and Shpiet, as well as on Russian General Linguistics and the Circle. In her introduction to Voloshinov’s *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language: fundamentals of a sociological method for the Science of Language*, Grillo (2017, p. 18) highlights that:

[...] the influence of Humboldtian thinking on language theories in Russia and the Soviet Union can be attested by reading the 2008 work *History of Linguistics (Istória iazykoznanía)*, in which Humboldt is pointed out as the founder of theoretical Linguistics, the creator of a system in the 19th century Philosophy of Language and the precursor of almost all of Ferdinand de Saussure’s positions in the *Course in General Linguistics*. Distinctively, in Brazil the exposition of the Saussurean principles that originated the synchronic studies practiced in the 20th century are recurrently mentioned in the introduction to Linguistics’ manuals (Lopes, 1995; Borba, 1998), in which Humboldt’s works are

¹ All translations in this article are ours.

² Original: *Humboldt war Linguist, im ganz modernen Sinne. Ja, er hat wesentlich beigetragen, die Linguistik im moderne Sinne zu konstituieren.* (HURCH, 2004, p. 334).

³ Aleksandr Potebniá (1835-1891) was one of the first language theoreticians in Russia (by the time, Ukraine was a part of the Russian Empire). Philosopher, folklorist and scholar; corresponding member of Saint Petersburg’s Russian Imperial Academy of Sciences. Potebniá applied Humboldt’s ideas in slavic *corpora*. He was a specialist in Philosophy of Language, Slavic Historical Phonetics and Etymology. His name became central in the aesthetic debate of the 20th century due to all the questioning addressed to him by Russian Formalists and Structuralists.

⁴ Gustav Shpiet (1879-1937) was a Ukrainian-Russian philosopher, psychologist, Art theoretician and interpreter (he knew 17 languages). Follower of Edmund Husserl, Shpiet introduced husserlian phenomenology in Russia.

not listed in the bibliography (...) with the exception of 2007 Faraco's "Pre-Saussurean studies"⁵.

Humboldt's "world views" inspired the 1930 Linguistic Relativity of the North Americans Sapir and Whorf, whose fundamental idea consists of a Linguistic image of the world as a big frame that varies from one person to the other, because such image should have its own forms and categories prescribed by each culture. Benjamin Whorf proposed that language's rules and cultural norms are developed in correspondence to each other, so they constantly and reciprocally affect one another.

Consonantly with those theoreticians, at the end of the 20th century Moscow and Saint Petersburg Universities developed the school of Linguoculturology⁶ – comparative analysis in socio and ethnolinguistic studies. The school investigates the mutual influence between language and culture, that is, how culture reflects and refracts itself in the language and how language is formed under the influence of the culture. Based on the aforementioned it is clear that Humboldt is considered a fundamental theoretician in Russia.

In Europe, generally speaking, there has been a revival of Humboldtian philosophy of language through the reissue of his works and the publication of new studies on the philosopher, by researchers of various nationalities. In this context, the German specialist Jürgen Trabant mentions the rebirth of Humboldt's ideas in Europe, especially from 2017 on. In 2017, for example, a symposium about Humboldt was held at the Queen Mary University of London, United Kingdom, followed by a special issue of the Scientific magazine *Forum for Modern Language Studies*. In this issue, specialists explore Humboldtian concepts regarding the discussion on linguistic variety, multiculturalism and neocolonialism; based on Humboldt, debating the importance of preserving national languages in the face of English's hegemony as the common tongue of globalized world, among other highlighted questions on immigration and linguistic policy in the European Union.

To illustrate Humboldt's popularity in many European countries, in 2017 article, "Vanishing Worldviews", Trabant cites a French enthusiast of Humboldtian ideas: the poet, translator and linguistics and literature professor in Paris Diderot University Henri Meschonnic (1932-2009), whose paper "Thinking Humboldt Today" ("Penser

⁵ Original: *a influência do pensamento humboldtiano sobre as teorias da linguagem na Rússia e na União Soviética pode ser atestada por meio da leitura da obra História iazikoznâia (História da linguística), de 2008, em que Humboldt é apontado como o fundador da linguística teórica, criador de um sistema da filosofia da linguagem no século XIX e precursor de quase todas as posições do Curso de linguística geral, de Ferdinand de Saussure. Diferentemente dessa visão, no Brasil, a exposição dos princípios saussurianos que originaram os estudos sincrônicos praticados no século XX costumam aparecer no início dos manuais de linguística (Lopes, 1995; Borba, 1998), nos quais os trabalhos de Humboldt não constam da bibliografia (...) com a exceção de "Estudos pré-saussurianos" de Faraco, 2007. (GRILLO, 2017, p. 18).*

⁶ There has been a recent presentation of Linguoculturology school in Brazil, made by Professor Daria Shiukina. She presented her speech in the I Brazilian-French-Russian Colloquium in Discourse Analysis (November 2017), which was supported by Diálogo Research Group (FFLCH-USP), from the University of São Paulo, and by The São Paulo Research Foundation (FAPESP). An article from the Professor is soon to be published by the event.

Humboldt aujourd'hui", 1995) addresses Humboldt's relevance in the end of the 20th century. Trabant affirms, based on Meschonnic, that the importance of Humboldtian philosophy of language has actually remained during the centuries: the concept "world views" is relevant for the correct approach of plurilingualism (the coexistence of multiple languages in a certain demographic) in the 21st century European Union. "World views" justify the isonomy of the 24 official languages of EU members; such languages mean access to the intellectual richness of the world (*der Reichtum der Welt*, another Humboldtian idea), as they constitute various cultural standpoints.

In the next section we will examine Humboldt's influence on the Saint Petersburg School and the affinities between his ideas and the Bakhtin Circle.

Humboldt's influence on the Saint Petersburg School and on the "dialogical paradigm" of the Bakhtin Circle

Mikhail Bakhtin's and Valentin Voloshinov's ideas must be considered in the historical context of Saint Petersburg Linguistic School (Petrograd or Leningrad back then), the headquarters of the Circle. Humboldt's reception in this school was solid, which reaffirms the parallelisms that can be drawn among him, Bakhtin and Voloshinov. It was under the influence of German linguists – Humboldt included – that the Saint Petersburg School developed its own dialogism.

According to Vermeulen (2002), since the 18th century the Saint Petersburg Academy of Sciences has been serving as a link among scientists of different nations and generations. German-Russian cooperation was established at that time. Founded by Peter the Great in 1724, the said academy became the heart of Western knowledge in Russia. It aimed to explore the Russian Empire; new visions on the Empire originated in the academy, including the idea of describing the peoples (*Völkerbeschreibung*), formulated in Leibniz's⁷ project⁸ and spread out by Humboldt.⁹

Humboldt led the linguists of Saint Petersburg towards a universal kind of research, that is, one that would not give preference to any language or linguistic group in particular. The pretension of Humboldtian studies was to approach the multiplicity of

⁷ German polymath and philosopher of the 17th/18th centuries. Leibniz's principle was that the lexical composition of a language contains facts that attest to the life of people. The objective was to illuminate the primitive history of nations through the study of their respective languages. The project accomplished two great challenges: the creation of a new Scientific discipline - the ethnography - and the beginning of comparative studies and comparative lexicography. (LOBANOVA, 2018).

⁸ According to Trabant, Leibniz indicated to Peter the Great the necessity of a study on the languages of the Russian Empire. Leibniz assumed that the former "proto-language" – before unrecognizably changing due to "mixture and deterioration" – spread through the Eurasian continent until reaching China (TRABANT, 1990). Thus, the Russian Empire was a fertile territory for comparative studies and for the attempt to reconstruct the proto-language.

⁹ As a theoretician of his time, Humboldt intended to grasp an "image" of each people (synonymous to nation for him) by recognizing specific cultural traits that would correspond to each nation (*Völkerbeschreibung* or "description of peoples"). Humboldt conceived this research as an anthropological project, to be developed through linguistic studies. For more on the subject, see Chabrolle-Cerretini (2014).

languages in the widest geographical and historical range possible – the opposite of Bopp and Grimm’s direction at the time, whose focus was almost exclusively Indo-European.

Notwithstanding Humboldt having never had directly referred to the linguistic school of Saint Petersburg, he was aware of its existence: in *On the Kawi Language of Java (Über die Kawi Sprache auf der Insel Java)*, he mentions 18 times the magazine *Notes of the Saint Petersburg Imperial Academy of Sciences (Mémoires de l’Académie Impériale des sciences de St.-Petersbourg / Zapiski Sankt-Pieiterbúrgskoy Impierátorskoi Akadiémii Nauk)* (LOBANOVA, 2018).

According to Andrea Karsten (2014), in this context of great influence by Humboldt’s ideas on the Saint Petersburg School, the fundamentals of the dialogical Linguistics of the Bakhtin Circle were laid. Karsten affirms that the Humboldtian definition of language as *energeia* (constant generative activity that encompasses discursive interaction, as per studies of Hilgert, 2012) was directly responsible for the development of the dialogical concept not only presented by Bakhtin and Voloshinov, but also by Lev S. Vygotsky, psychologist that proposed the Historical-Cultural Psychology, and Lev P. Yakubinsky, representative of Russian Formalism.

Humboldt (2006a, p. 98)¹⁰ states his opposition to the conception of language as a system of somewhat stable forms by affirming that “it [language] is itself not a product (*ergon*), but activity (*energeia*)”. He assumed language as a constant and continuous “weaver” of meanings; the search for the appropriate semantics would reflect itself in the creation or adaptation of grammatical and lexical forms. By the assimilation and reproduction of such forms by the otherness, they should enter the linguistic influx and become concrete elements of the linguistic system. The concept *energeia* presupposes the relevance of discursive interaction for the constitution of a language.

According to Karsten, just like Humboldt, the authors of the dialogical paradigm understand language not as a system (*Sprache* in German and *iazyk* in Russian), but as a discursive phenomenon (*Rede* in German and *rietch* in Russian). By defining language as *energeia*, Humboldt makes progress in the field of discursive interaction, which is a constant dialogical activity; for him, the whole idea of an already set linguistic system (*ergon*) could only be possible in an artificial frame that suspends just occasionally the incessant process of linguist creation and linguistic changes. Discursive interaction is fundamental for the dialogical paradigm applied to Linguistics.

In the next section, we will address the parallelism between Humboldt’s world views and Voloshinov’s behavioral ideology. The former is based on traits of the consciousness that, paired with discursive interaction, produce language as the greatest source of culture; the latter is defined as the daily verbal interaction, through which the link is formed between the individual and institutionalized ideologies of the sociopolitical situation and the spheres of science, art, religion, philosophy, the legal sphere etc. Both concepts presuppose that the various manifestations of the cultural sphere become real mainly by the embodiment in linguistic material.

¹⁰ Original: *Sie selbst ist kein Werk (Ergon), sondern eine Thätigkeit (Energeia)*. (HUMBOLDT, 2006a, p. 98).

According to Voloshinov, verbal interaction happens through ideological signs, especially the word. The sign is born from the contact of at least two socially organized organisms: it is the common ground of those organisms and the frontier between, at least, two sets of consciousness. Humboldt, on the other hand, conceives world views in Neo Kantian shades: categories of understanding and other traits of consciousness, through which it represents the contact between organism and experience.

The symbolizations produced by consciousness are embodied in language, according to Humboldt, and the discursive interaction makes this individual process of linguistic symbolization of experience (*energeia*) ratified by the understanding of the other. For this reason, Humboldt affirms that language standardizes the diversity of sensory experiences and internal individual representations under interchangeable concepts (words). As a consequence, a people unified by the same language shares the same “points of view” that, by their turn, are particular to that language; such points of view align individual representations of experience to one collective representation. Through the world views and the behavioral ideology (the material existence of an intermediate ideology between the economic basis and the superstructure), both Humboldt and Voloshinov converge to the fundamental role of language as the basis for social institutions.

Dualism and dialogism

In the idealistic tradition, Humboldt was developing the idea of language’s role in the process of representation of references from the world, carried out by consciousness – both individual (word creation) and collective (world views, the national conceptual-linguistic inventory) representations. According to the critics, Humboldt applied Kant’s Copernican revolution to the philosophy of language and thus applied Kantian mental faculties and categories of understanding to word creation. The products of such processes mediate the individual’s relation to the world. During his research on the manifestation of the dualism in several languages, the German philosopher of language theorized formulations that are expressly dialogical.

According to Humboldt (1963[1827], p. 137), “in the invisible organism of the spirit [mind], in the laws of thinking and the classification of its categories lies the roots of dualism” – a statement which specifies dualism as representation. Dualism is the conceptualization of the dichotomy “deeply and prototypically rooted in the sentence and the answer; in the sitting down and getting up; in being and not being; in the I and the World”.¹¹ For the theoretician, our interpretation is fundamentally structured by dichotomies.

In the text *On the Dualism* (1963[1827]), Humboldt describes three possible linguistic expressions of the dualism: in the name, in the substantive or in the pronoun

¹¹ Original: *In dem unsichtbaren Organismus des Geistes, den Gesetzen des Denkens, der Classification seiner Kategorien aber wurzelt der Begriff der Zweiheit noch auf eine viel tiefere und ursprünglichere Weise: in dem Satz und Gegensatz, dem Setzen und Aufheben, dem Sein und Nicht-Sein, dem Ich und der Welt.* (HUMBOLDT, 1963[1827], p. 137).

(he affirms that more than one might occur in the same language). There are languages in which names and substantives conceptualize a semantic dualism (e.g.: Upper and Lower Egypt) or a natural dualism (e.g.: body's symmetry - two eyes, ears, hands etc.). In personal pronouns, the dualism is expressed primarily in the first and second persons, who conceptualize the dichotomy between Me and the Other.

At this point, dualism implies dialogism. Humboldt (1963[1827], p. 138) affirms that the dualism is more decisive in language than anywhere else, because every utterance elicits an answer and the speaker always addresses a listener: "we always speak to another, even if only in thoughts; even when addressing ourselves, we address our own selves as a second person (...)"¹² Utterance and answer are rooted in the dualism Me versus the Other. All social connections are based, quoting Humboldt's (1963[1827]) words, in the dualism of the familiar (*Einheimische*, the I) versus the foreigner (*Fremde*, the Other).

According to the German philosopher of language, the dialogical unfolding of the dualism is in the very essence of language, as it is conditioned by my addressing to the Other and, likewise, from the Other to Me. Thinking has a social vision, according to Humboldt; humans long for Another that corresponds to their I. Only through my interlocutor's validation, a concept can gain sharpness of definition; only through Another, a concept can effectively enter the linguistic influx and, thus, thinking influx. What is uttered by me has to necessarily reach the 'foreign' understanding of the Other.

Although Humboldt (1963[1827], p. 138) never used the term "dialogism" in his writings, we can see it being contemplated in dualism's theorization: "in the essence of language there is an immutable dualism. The very possibility of an utterance is conditioned by the addressment and the answer to it"¹³ The dialogical responsiveness of language constitutes all kinds of relations: "between consciousnesses, there is no other way apart from language"¹⁴ (HUMBOLDT, 1963[1827], p. 139).

Voloshinov (1973[1929], p. 72) similarly theorizes that an utterance is conditioned by addressment and answer: "any utterance – the finished, written utterance not excepted – makes response to something and is calculated to be responded to in turn. (...) A word is a bridge thrown between myself and another". Alike Humboldt, Voloshinov states that the speaker, even if only in thoughts, addresses an utterance/answer and, consequently, all his or her thinking to a presumed interlocutor: "utterance, as we know, is constructed between two socially organized persons, and in the absence of a real addressee, an addressee is presupposed in the person, so to speak, of a normal representative of the social group to which the speaker belongs" (VOLOSHINOV,

¹² Original: *Der Mensch spricht, sogar im Gedanken, nur mit einem Andren, oder mit sich, wie mit einem Andren (...)* (HUMBOLDT, 1963[1827], p. 138).

¹³ Original: *Es liegt aber in dem ursprünglichen Wesen der Sprache ein unabänderlicher Dualismus, und die Möglichkeit des Sprechens selbst wird durch Anrede und Erwiederung bedingt.* (HUMBOLDT, 1963[1827], p. 138).

¹⁴ Original: *Zwischen Denkkraft und Denkkraft aber giebt es keine andre Vermittlerin, als die Sprache.* (HUMBOLDT, 1963[1827], p. 139).

1973[1929], p. 85). For Voloshinov the individual presumes a stable social auditory, based on which he or she forms their arguments, motivations and evaluations.

Dialogism is also presented in Voloshinov's theorization of the psyche. He claims that consciousness is a socio ideological fact: "I give myself verbal shape from another's point of view, ultimately, from the point of view of the community to which I belong" (VOLOSHINOV, 1973[1929], p. 86). Bakhtin (2003, p. 33) correspondingly implies dialogism in the constitution of individuality: "we have an absolute aesthetical necessity of the Other (...) the latter being the only one capable of creating, for us, an external, finished personality of ourselves; such personality is not possible if the other does not create it." Further in his theory, Bakhtin also affirms the relevance of dialogism to the recognition of biological life itself: the biological life of an organism becomes valuable "only in the sympathy and compassion that another feels for it" (BAKHTIN, 2003, p. 31).

For Bakhtin (2003), dialogical relations are a special kind of axiological semantics relations. He considers metalinguistics (sometimes also translated as translanguistics) to be the study of dialogical relations presented by utterances in their unity and among themselves: "a text may only come to life by the contact with another text or context (...) Behind the contact between texts there is the contact between individuals, not things" (BAKHTIN, 2003, p. 401).

Through dualism, Humboldt asserts dialogical formulations that are soundly close to those of the Bakhtin Circle – with the difference that, for Bakhtin and Voloshinov, consciousness takes shape through external, social relations; in other words, it is a socio ideological fact. Humboldt, on the other hand, conceives consciousness as a set of representation mechanisms (mental faculties and categories of understanding speculated by Kant, as we will expose in the sequence). Language and the constitution of self are thus theorized according to a dialectical mixture of dialogism and immanence of the spirit: "at the moment of its birth in the consciousness, the word is the equivalent of an object in its appearance. Language cannot arise from one individual; it can become reality only collectively – the means through which new connections are formed (HUMBOLDT, 1963[1827], p. 139).¹⁵

For Humboldt, each language creates a symbolic facet of reality. The disappearance of this language necessarily implies the loss of constituted knowledge. In the interviews about the preservation of endangered languages, we will see that most of the arguments presented relate to Humboldt's linguistic theory. The excerpts reflect both Russian and Brazilian realities, but the same discussion has also been happening in the European Union and its 24 official languages. In the next section, we will discuss the parallelism between the Humboldtian 'world views' and the Voloshinovic 'behavioral ideology'.

¹⁵ Original: (...) *das Wort gleicht, allein im Einzelnen geboren, so sehr einem blossen Scheinobject, die Sprache kann auch nicht vom Einzelnen, sie kann nur gesellschaftlich, nur indem an einen gewagten Versuch ein neuer sich anknüpft zur Wirklichkeit gebracht werden.* (HUMBOLDT, 1963[1827], p. 139).

The parallelism between world views and behavioral ideology: culture embodied in language

Humboldt was a pioneer in applying Kant's Copernican Revolution in linguistics (ANDRZEJEWSKI, 2015; CASSIRER, 1954). The Copernican Revolution was a movement in which Kant defined truth as being established between objects and their respective representations, that are formulated by the consciousness: the truth would be in the correspondence between representations (*Vorstellungen*) and objects-in-themselves, which have their existence independently of and exterior to consciousness. Kant admitted that the mechanical (materialistic) paradigm is indeed capable of explaining nature; nevertheless, he affirmed that not everything is in nature. The philosopher then established a distinction between the extended substance – that is actually found in nature – and the mental or thinking substance (BEISER, 2000).

According to Andrzejewski (2015, p. 19), Humboldt made a register of his engagement to Kantian metaphysics in his personal correspondence: "I am now focused on metaphysics. I have decided to undergo a serious review of my convictions and start over my studies on Kant's system from the very beginning".¹⁶ The idealistic philosopher Ernst Cassirer¹⁷ (1954, p. 102) highlights that Humboldt works with representations as the intermediate reality between the individual and the world in itself: "alike Kant, [to Humboldt] the empirical object, as an 'object in its appearance', does not constitute our knowledge as an external and objective fact; on the contrary, such object becomes possible, presupposed and is formed precisely through categories [of understanding]."¹⁸

Humboldt (1963[1827]) theorizes word creation inside the limits of a biological organism and through mechanisms of consciousness. In the inner language form (*Innere Sprachform*), he cites two Kantian mental faculties (capabilities): intuition (*Anschauung*), which is directly related to sensorial perception, and the concept (*Begriff*), which is a priori to experience (CRISTAUDO, 1990; GUYER, 2000). Human capability to create language – Humboldt's sense of articulation (*Articulationsinn*) – connects the representation generated by those faculties and their categories of understanding¹⁹ to a significant sound-form (*Lautform*). Such an internal and subjective process should

¹⁶ Original: "sietchás miená zani máiet priemúschiestviennó mietafizika. Riechíl snóva proviestí sierióznuiui rievíziiu svoikh sóbstviennykh ubiezhdénii I zánovo chudíruiiu sistému Kánta s sáмого nachála." (ANDRZEJEWSKI, 2015, p. 19).

¹⁷ Born in Wrocław (former German territory - currently Poland) on July 28th, 1874, and deceased in New York, USA, on April 13th, 1945. Cassirer was a member of the Neo Kantian Marburg school and one of the central figures in propelling idealism in the 20th century.

¹⁸ Original: "Wie bei Kant der Gegenstand, als "Gegenstand in der Erscheinung", der Erkenntnis nicht als ein Äußeres und Jenseitiges gegenübersteht, sondern durch deren eigene Kategorien erst "ermöglicht", erst bedingt und konstituiert wird." (CASSIRER, 1954, p. 102).

¹⁹ According to the Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, Kant distinguishes twelve categories, divided into four classes, in the Critique of Pure Reason (A80/B106): (1) Quantity: unity, plurality, totality; (2) Quality: reality, negation, limitation; (3) Relation: inherence and subsistence (substance and accident), causality and dependence (cause and effect), community (reciprocity); (4) Modality: possibility, existence, necessity. <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/categories/#KanCon>. Access in: 26 May 2020.

create a word, which is, in its turn, validated by the understanding and adherence of the interlocutor during verbal interaction.

The word that has already been incorporated in the language influx systematizes and brings a relative unity to individual sensations that were subjectively processed in the consciousness: “the word is nothing else than the complement to thinking; the effort to elevate internal impressions and those sensations that are still in obscurity up to clear concepts. It is also that connection between concepts that creates other concepts, every time anew.”²⁰ (HUMBOLDT, 2006b, p. 10). This passage indirectly addresses the faculty of intuition (connected to external impressions and internal sensations). The intuited perception of sensing is, on its turn, abstracted by the mind into general definitions that form the concept. The concepts are then connected to one another by the synthetic capability of the mind, to which Humboldt (2006b) refers as the pure intellectual part (*reiner intellektueller Theil*), for the sake of forming concepts anew.²¹ The *pure* intellectual part of the linguistic capability (not directly connected to the experience of sensing; this capability belongs to the faculty of conceptualization) should answer to the peculiar way in which each language synthesizes the experience under a particular concept, form and phonetics.

According to Humboldt, the way through which each synthesis is formed, already embodied in language and then incorporated to verbal interaction, reveals a unique point of view that becomes a *cultural heritage*. He explains that the word “elephant”, in Sanskrit, is designed by parts of the animal’s body, whilst in German the substantive refers to the idea of the animal as whole. These are thus rich cultural points of view over the same object or experience.

Notwithstanding Humboldt’s designation of Kantian representations as intrinsically linguistic concepts, Cassirer (1954, p. 105) highlights another level of Kantian metaphysics in Humboldt’s linguistic theory – the intellectual synthesis is expressed as judgment, which has to be embodied in the materiality of the linguistic sentence: “(...) in the sentence, the original power of synthesis manifests itself – power in which all speaking, as well as all hearing, is based (...) The finest expression of this point of view is given in the well-known Humboldtian proposition: language is not a product (*ergon*), but [generative] activity (*energeia*)”.²² According to Kant’s ideal, the synthesis is related to the aprioristic capability of judgment (GUYER, 2000).

²⁰ Original: *Die Sprache ist nicht anders, als das Complement des Denkens, das Bestreben, die äusseren Eindrücke und die noch dunkeln innere Empfindungen zu deutlichen Begriffe zu erheben, und diese zu Erzeugung neuer Begriffe mit einander zu verbinden.* (HUMBOLDT, 2006b, p. 10).

²¹ Guyer (2000) enlightens us about the dichotomy between concepts and intuitions, that form the basis of Kant’s philosophy.

²² Original: (...) *denn in ihm erst enthüllt sich die ursprüngliche Kraft der Synthesis, auf der alles Sprechen, wie alles Verstehen zuletzt beruht (...) Ihren knappsten und schärfsten Ausdruck erhält diese Gesamtansicht in der (...) denn in ihm erst enthüllt sich die ursprüngliche Kraft der Synthesis, auf der alles Sprechen, wie alles Verstehen zuletzt beruht (...) Ihren knappsten und schärfsten Ausdruck erhält diese Gesamtansicht in der bekannten Humboldtschen Formulierung, daß die Sprache kein Werk (Ergon), sondern eine Tätigkeit (Energeia) sei.* (CASSIRER, 1954, p. 105).

Humboldt (1963[1827]) assumes the origin of the word as being in the aforementioned creative and subjective process. As idealism theorizes the processing of experience subjectively, Humboldt points out that there could be no exact equivalent between concepts that were embodied under the same word: whoever pronounces “cloud” is not thinking necessarily in one and the same kind or form of cloud; nonetheless, under the sound-form of “cloud”, some of the general traits of the representative concept of a cloud are cohesively materialized together – enough to make the unity of the object possible. According to Humboldt, it is precisely the inaccuracy of the representation of a cloud that makes up creativity and plurality, and thus makes up the intellectual richness. The various facets that concepts can put together under one word, as well as the searching for (at least some) equivalence between words of different languages, also reveal varied points of view on reality. The unity of individual representations, brought about by language, allows all communication between individuals and their communities and, since language is a collective medium, relatively stable and uniform concepts become broad enough to be considered cultural point of views: they become world views (*Weltansichten*).

Besides introducing the creation of words based on Kantian representation mechanisms, Humboldt (1963[1827]) theorizes that the connection between individuals and their community is mainly “conducted” by the forms and structures made available by each language (in its grammar), in order to express the intellectual synthesis of judgment; we once again emphasize that, for Idealists, the judgment is given through the syntax of a sentence. While working in the translation of Aeschylus, Humboldt observed that each syntax implies a particular semantics, and thus came to the conclusion that linguistic forms, which are already resulting from the representations of the experience, actively produce more conceptualization and symbolization (THOUARD, 2016; CASSIRER, 1954).

According to Humboldt, language standardizes the subjectivity of experience and thus aligns individual understanding with the collective. One’s identity is, in a sense, dependent and determined by familiar, communal and national identities. Humboldt (2006b, p. 2) refers to those transcending identities that, through cultural alignment, are also manifested in the individuals, as the great character:

[...] only in the language can the ‘great character’ develop itself. Through language, as the communication medium of a people, isolated individualities submerge themselves in the manifestations of a collective. Practically speaking, an individual character manifests itself only by means of descendancy and language, via the character of a particular people.²³

²³ Original: “(...) da nur in der Sprache sich der ganze Charakter ausprägt, und zugleich in ihr, als dem allgemeinen Verständigungsvehikel des Volks, die einzelnen Individualitäten zur Sichtbarwerdung des Allgemeinen untergehen, In der That geht ein individueller Charakter nur durch zwei Mittel, durch Abstammung und durch Sprache, in einen Volkscharakter über”. (HUMBOLDT, 2006b, p. 2).

Humboldtian world views are collective representations that constitute a cultural identity, which is essentially linguistic-conceptual (*Bildung*). Humboldt establishes the mechanisms of consciousness idealized by Kant's theory of knowledge as the basis for such collective linguistic identity: the mental faculties and categories of understanding. Therefore, he argues that analyzing a language can reveal the creational motivation behind world views; differences in motivation could thus justify the particularities of every language and nation: "(...) the study of languages teaches us not only the usage of language as such, but also the analogy [representation] – that finds its expression in language – between humans and the world, generally speaking, and [between humans] and each nation, specifically (...)" (HUMBOLDT, 2006b, p. 8).²⁴

Humboldt studied language's role in the formation of the concept (the word), in the expression of judgment (grammatical sentence) and in the national representation (world views), that guide individuals throughout an intellectual inventory (*Bildung*). The bourgeois society from Humboldt's epoch had already established an institutionalized education system for intellectual cultivation; while serving as a statesman, Humboldt reformed the German educational system. The society of his own time had already established the cultural spheres known by us in the contemporary world: the arts, science, religion, philosophy, literature etc. Under an idealistic point of view, "each area of human activity is composed of a *symbolic sphere* such as, for example, science, religion, the myths, the arts, history and linguistics." (ANDRZEJEWSKI, 2015, p. 21, emphasis added).²⁵ The collective linguistic-conceptual representation/symbolization, that is, the *Bildung* embodied in world views, is therefore the cornerstone of intellectual and cultural education according to Humboldt.

To summarize, idealists conceive the contact between the individual and the experience as mediated by a phenomenon of representation, which is embodied in language. For Humboldt, individuals are permeated by the collective through the linguistic representation of world views, that build up their intellectual cultivation also by institutionalized spheres (*Bildung*). Voloshinov (1973[1929], p. 26), on the other hand, does not refer to representation phenomena but to ideological phenomena. Comparably to the idealistic concept (*Begriff*), ideology is embodied in signs, mostly in words; the sign is defined by Voloshinov as the contact between the organism and the world: "the organism and the outside world meet here in the sign. Psychic experience is the semiotic expression of the contact between the organism and the outside environment". Voloshinov follows a path that is diametrically opposed to Humboldt's – the latter speculates how the word is created in the consciousness and validated by verbal interaction; the first, that the word is created in the frontier between

²⁴ Original: (...) *das Sprachstudium lehrt daher, ausser dem Gebrauch der Sprache selbst, noch die Analogie zwischen dem Menschen und der Welt im Allgemeinen und jeder Nation insbesondere, die sich in der Sprache ausdrückt (...)* (HUMBOLDT, 2006b, p. 8).

²⁵ Original: *kázhdáia óblast' tchieloviétiéskoi diéiatelniosti obrazúiet sfiéru 'simvolitchieskoi' fórmu. Takim óbrazom, k simvolitchieskim fórmam prinadliezhát, naprimíer, náuka, rieligiia, mif, iskússtvo. Istóriia i iazyk.* (ANDRZEJEWSKI, 2015, p. 21).

two consciousnesses, precisely during verbal interaction. Nevertheless, both affirm the contact between individual and experience as being mediated by language and, therefore, societal organization itself is based on language.

According to Voloshinov (1973[1929], p. 10), any ideological product is not only part of the material reality, but it also reflects and refracts another reality, that is external – in other words, it is a sign: “everything ideological possesses semiotic value”. In the world of signs, the language stands out for a series of attributes: firstly, the word’s existence is wholly absorbed in its semiotic function of reflecting a reality that is external to it; it is a flexible sign that can be produced by the individual’s organism’s own means (by the vocal apparatus and consciousness) without recourse to any extra corporeal material; it is also a neutral sign, as it can carry out all the range of ideological functions: artistic, philosophical, political, religious etc. The word is omnipresent in the ideological phenomenon:

Every ideological refraction of existence in the process of generation, no matter what the nature of its significant material, is accompanied by ideological refraction in word as an obligatory concomitant phenomenon. Word is present in each and every act of understanding and in each and every act of interpretation. (VOLOSHINOV, (1973[1929], p. 15).

Voloshinov argues that the reality of the ideological phenomena coincides with the reality of the signs. The ideological laws are the laws of the semiotic communication, sphere to which language belongs. The existence of a sign, just like the existence of language in general, is the material existence of social communication. The laws of social communication (therefore, semiotic communication) are, in their turn, directly determined by the socio-economic laws: “(...) the actual dialectical generation of society, a process which emerges from the basis and comes to completion in the superstructures.” (VOLOSHINOV, 1973[1929], p. 18).

Voloshinov also affirms that the Marxist fundamentals of the relation between the economic basis and the superstructure is directly related to the questions addressed by the philosophy of language, due to the word being the ideological sign *par excellence*. He argues that the establishment of a connection between the basis and a phenomenon that has been taken out of its ideological context (in other words, of its refraction in the sign, especially in the word) implies the loss of the cognitive value of such a phenomenon. To analyze how the real existence (the economic basis) determines the sign and how the sign reflects and refracts the existence in formation, Voloshinov states that the most convenient path is in the language.

In the relation between basis and superstructure, the semiotic nature of the word is less important than its social ubiquity: “countless ideological threads running through all areas of social intercourse register effect in the word” (VOLOSHINOV, 1973[1929], p. 19). The word is the most sensitive index of social changes due to its suitability to individual consciousness as a semiotic material, as well as due to the word being the

medium of a transitional ideology between basis and the superstructure – the social psychology, which has its material existence in chance contacts of ordinary life, in the exchange of opinions at various types of social gatherings, in purely chance exchange of words, in one’s manner of verbal reaction to happenings in one’s daily existence, in one’s inner-word manner of identifying oneself and one’s position in society etc. In other words, it has its material existence in behavioral ideology. Voloshinov states that social changes transmit into changes in the word, including is those spheres that have not yet achieved the status of a new ideological quality: “social psychology exists primarily in a wide variety of forms of the ‘utterance’, of little speech genres of internal and external kinds – things left completely unstudied to the present day” (VOLOSHINOV, 1973[1929], p. 20).

According to Voloshinov, utterances and genres that compose speech performances of verbal interaction turn the behavioral ideology into the material link that registers the transition between the sociopolitical regimen and ideology in the narrow sense (religion, science, philosophy, arts, literature etc.). These spheres are defined by him as forms of ideological communication that have already been submitted to the scrutiny of a determined social accent and, thereby, have been institutionalized.

The parallelism between behavioral ideology as the material existence of social psychology (in other words, of those transitional ideologies between individuals and institutions) and the Humboldtian world views, is expressed in Voloshinov’s (1973[1929], p. 19) criticism to Idealism:

Removed from this actual process of verbal communication and interaction (of semiotic communication and interaction in general), social psychology would assume the guise of a metaphysical or mythic concept – the “collective soul” or “collective inner psyche” [world views], the “spirit of the people,” etc. Social psychology in fact is not located anywhere within (in the “souls” of communicating subjects) but entirely and completely without – in the word, the gesture, the act. There is nothing left unexpressed in it, nothing “inner” about it – it is wholly on the outside, wholly brought out in exchanges, wholly taken up in material, above all in the material of the word.

Voloshinov reckons Humboldt’s discussion to develop the Marxist point of view in the Philosophy of Language. He presents Marxism in its facet of dialectical synthesis between the elected antithesis – the Geneva School – and the elected thesis – Humboldt’s Idealism. The Voloshinovan synthesis does not design a mere compromise between thesis and antithesis, but it is stated as a refutation of both. From the refutation standpoint, Voloshinov expressly intended to advance the discussion beyond the so-far established theoretical limits of Linguistics. Regarding the context of Humboldt’s influence on the Saint Petersburg School, it is possible to carry out parallels between the world views and behavioral ideology: the first as a collective

system of linguistic-conceptual representation, which later becomes institutionalized; the second, as the link (which has its material existence in the utterances and behavioral genres of verbal interaction) between economic basis and the already institutionalized ideological superstructure.

The following interviews about linguistic diversity will state speakers' identity as a product of the cosmivision of their people, which is the Humboldtian point of view, as well as the arena for social changes, when relating it to the need for disputing specific institutionalized ideologies (superstructure of laws), which is the Voloshinovian point of view. In the next section, we will present excerpts of our collected *corpora* in order to illustrate Humboldtian ideas in contemporary society.

Linguistic diversity in the modern society as an illustration of Humboldtian ideas²⁶

We will now illustrate how current and relevant the theories of Humboldt, Bakhtin and Voloshinov are for the discussion of linguistic diversity and preservation of endangered languages both in Brazil and in Russia, as well as how the world views, in particular, appear in the contemporary world. The transcribed interviews deal with the preservation of linguistic variety in the aforementioned countries, which have in common the fact that their territories encompass a variety of peoples of different ethnicities and languages – over whom Portuguese and Russian, the respective official languages, have been imposed in some historical moments and, thereby, have been privileged over native tongues. Both countries are multilingual (Russia has 192 nationalities and 148 languages; Brazil, at least 240 known native languages, plus creole and languages of immigration)²⁷ and have the predominance of Russian and Brazilian Portuguese as official languages. Linguistic policies in these countries have been undergoing changes through time; in the 21st century, these nations show interest in the rescue and preservation of their multilingual status.

It is pertinent to present some information about the material we chose for analysis. On the Russian side, we chose an interview conducted by the program “Morning with the Province” (*Útro s gubiérniei*),²⁸ that aired on Gubernia TV, Khabárovsk, on December 11th, 2017. The program addressed the situation of minoritarian peoples in Siberia, in the North and in East Russia. On the Brazilian side, the topic was extended to the whole national territory and addressed native tongues, Brazilian sign

²⁶ The following *corpus* is available on the website: compdis.fflch.usp.br, access on: 31 May 2021. The Russian material was translated into Portuguese but following the Brazilian rules for transcription, as they are not applicable to Russian. Proper rules for the transcription of translations have not yet been established, so the Russian *corpus* is presented just as translated text. For additional information, please check the website following the aforementioned address.

²⁷ Source: Federal State Statistics Service / Fiedieralnaia Sluzhba Gosudarstviennoi Statistiki, 2010. Website: www.gks.ru. Access on: 31 May 2021
IPOL - Institute for Investigation and Development of Linguistic Policies (Instituto de Investigação e Desenvolvimento em Política Linguística). Website: <http://ipol.org.br>. Access on: 31 May 2021.

²⁸ Available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=W8dgyCRXmGs>. Access on: 31 May 2021.

language, immigration, creole and Afro-Brazilian languages. The interview²⁹ aired on UFSC (Federal University of Santa Catarina) TV Channel, with three IPOL members (Institute for Investigation and Development of Linguistic Policies, founded in 1999 in Florianópolis, Santa Catarina, Brazil). IPOL is a non-profitable institution, of cultural and educational aims and representative of civil society's interests. It is composed by specialists from various areas such as anthropology, sociology, linguistics, education and vernacular languages and literatures.

The interviewee of the Russian program was Victoria Antchukova,³⁰ chief specialist in the Ministry of Education and Science of the Khabarovsk State. She represents the development program of minority nations in the region: *Naródnaiia programma Korienn'vie 2021* (The People's Program: Indigenous 2021).³¹ The interview with IPOL aired on September 22nd, 2015, and addresses basically the same topic: the situation of the languages of minority nations in Brazil. The interviewees were three IPOL doctors in Linguistics. The parameters for comparison (*tertium comparationis*,³² as per CLESTHIA³³ terminology) are: 1) time proximity (2017 in Russia and 2015 in Brazil); 2) topic proximity (the preservation of languages and cultures of indigenous peoples in Russia and linguistic diversity in Brazil, respectively); 3) proximity in interviewees' status: specialists in linguistics, education and science in Brazil and Russia, hence, the genre.

In the Russian material, the interviewee does not directly cite Humboldt, but refers to his ideas as if they were of common sense and thus an introduction and further explanation was not necessary. We can identify passages that refer to world views: “*language is closely related to culture. They are inseparable. We see the world through language, words, expressions, metaphors*” (Show host, 00:00); “*All languages are unique (pause). And all languages are, for the people, the basis of their cosmivision, right? Perception of the world*” (Interviewee, 01:27); “*As we know, language is the spirit of the people*” (Interviewee, 01:46).

The presence of Humboldt's world views in the Russian material is threefold: 1) world views introduce the topic of the interview about the preservation of linguistic diversity: “*We have to talk about the loss of national identity, of whole nations*”; “*When connected to globalization, the most vulnerable are the languages of minoritarian ethnicities*” (Show host 1, 00:00); 2) describe the current situation: “*They all belong*

²⁹ Available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5_VrS0rf58g&t=56s; <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lt72CsKvkmge>; <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Hy-ggZQP7s&t=10s>. Access on: 31 May 2021.

³⁰ We made the decision to keep the real names of the participants, as the analysis does not evaluate their points of view or competence, but the data of their utterances that approach the Humboldtian philosophy of language.

³¹ This program is part of The Russian Association of Indigenous Peoples of the North (*Assotsiatsiia korienny'kh malotchislennykh naró+dov siéviera, Sibiri i Dálniego Vostóka Rossiiskoi Fiedieratsii*). Website: http://raipon.info/documents/Docs_RAIPON/HIP%202021+.pdf. Access on: 31 May 2021.

³² Latin term for the third part of comparison. Designates the common quality between two objects that are being compared.

³³ Center of Research on every day and specialized discourses. Website: <https://cediscor.revues.org/65>. Access on: 31 May 2021

to the same language family, to the Tungus-Manchu group, to the Altaic languages family. But all languages are unique (pause). All languages are, for the people, the basis of their cosmivision, right? Perception of the world” (Interviewee 1, 01:27).

In the Brazilian material, we can observe the same Humboldtian principles: *”first of all, when we realize that acknowledging linguistic plurality or linguistic diversity allows people to identify themselves also in their languages [and] to recognize that not always are they speaking the language that the other comprehends (...)”; “linguistic diversity as a political matter, as an important matter for the identity of the speaker”; “[so that] entire populations, a fraction of the Brazilian population and Brazilian citizens that do not have Portuguese as their first language can identify themselves in their language, can benefit from public policies for their own tongues” (Interviewee 1, 05’:30”); “I POL is about advising linguistic communities so that all citizens can identify themselves in Brazil” (Interviewee 2, 02’37”); “another countries have a much more solid tradition, they almost from the start realized how beneficial it is to speak more languages and that speaking languages is the richness of the country - one that the country should never, ever lose” (Interviewee 2, 05’53”, who emphasizes the Humboldtian idea of linguistic diversity as the intellectual richness of the world).*

From the interviews we can conclude that, even though there is no direct mention to Humboldt, arguments on the preservation of linguistic diversity in Brazil and Russia present the same justification from those of the German theoretician; we highlight that even the words used by the interviewees in their utterances are very close to those of Humboldt. Beyond the broad influence and the dialog between the Bakhtin Circle and the German philosopher of language, the interviews reveal the relevance that Humboldt has for the current multilingual scenario in both countries, both in their journey of pursuing rights for minoritarian languages and striving for language policies that fit this purpose.

Final considerations

The aim of this article was to demonstrate the relevance of the German linguist Wilhelm von Humboldt for western Linguistics: for the development of General Linguistics in Russia and Europe; for his influence on the Saint Petersburg School, the headquarters of Mikhail Bakhtin and Valentin Voloshinov; thus, for the theoretical affinity between the Humboldtian concepts “world views” and “dualism” and the “behavioral ideology” and “dialogism” of the Circle. By drawing parallelisms among Humboldt, Bakhtin and Voloshinov to the Brazilian public, we aimed to facilitate the reception of the first in Brazil, a country already familiarized with the Circle, task which was illustrated with a sensitive topic on the formation of individual and social identities through language: the role of dialogism, ideology and world views in the discussion of the preservation of linguistic diversity.

For Humboldt, Bakhtin and Voloshinov language is the element that constitutes consciousness. Humboldt states that language is the only medium between two

consciousness; Voloshinov – that the language is the bridge between individuals. Both theoreticians converge about language being dialogical, especially regarding the constitution of the linguistic meaning through discursive interaction. The social anchorage of language is the basis for a national linguistic-conceptual inventory (world views), which, by their turn, are the basis for institutions in society, according to Humboldt; Voloshinov answers to how the material existence in formation (economic basis) determines the ideological sign (the word), as well as how the sign reflects and refracts the material existence in formation. Voloshinov thus concludes that the intermediate ideology between superstructure and economic basis (the so-called social psychology) has its material existence in the utterances and speech genres of the behavioral ideology, that reflects and refracts that intermediate ideology in the individuals' life.

Humboldt comes to the theorization of dialogism by discussing the inherent dualism in language. According to him, the dualism is manifested in the dichotomy between Me and the Other and, consequently, in the responsiveness of that Other to Me, which motivates all discursive interaction. Bakhtin and Voloshinov advance in the consequences of responsiveness and theorize that the constitution of individuality and the value of the biological organism are, themselves, dependent on the Other view of Me; the Other provides the most objective facet that I can ever have of myself. Individual consciousness is a socio ideological fact for the Bakhtin Circle.

Interviews with specialists in linguistics, education and science about linguistic diversity in both contemporary Brazil and Russia illustrate the relevance of Humboldt's contribution to linguistics. The excerpts reveal the world views and other Humboldtian concepts in the speech of the interviewees, even if there is no direct citation of him. Russian has already incorporated Humboldt as a fundamental theoretician; in Brazil, the reception of his work means a significant contribution to the preservation of endangered languages and of pluri and multilingualism. We highlight the need for a deeper reception of Humboldt in Brazil.

Acknowledgements

Our many thanks to The São Paulo Research Foundation (FAPESP) for granting the studies that culminated in this paper, and to the Diálogo Research Group (USP/CNPq) for the interlocution.

GLUSHKOVA, M.; DOMINGUES, T. Wilhelm von Humboldt: paralelos com o Círculo de Bakhtin e contribuição para a questão da diversidade linguística. *Alfa*, São Paulo, v.66, 2022.

- *RESUMO: Wilhelm von Humboldt foi um teórico de peso na formação da linguística europeia e da russa. Seu pensamento influenciou amplamente a Escola de São Petersburgo, matriz do*

Círculo de Bakhtin. Não à toa, conceitos centrais para Mikhail Bakhtin e Valentin Voloshinov dialogam com o pensamento do teórico alemão. Neste artigo, expressamos essa relação através do paralelo entre os conceitos humboldtianos “visões de mundo” e “dualismo”, por um lado, e os aplicados por Bakhtin e Voloshinov “ideologia do cotidiano” e “dialogismo”, por outro. Nosso intuito é facilitar a recepção das ideias de Humboldt pelo público brasileiro, já familiarizado com o Círculo de Bakhtin. Após a exposição teórica, elencaremos excertos de duas conversas com especialistas russos e brasileiros da linguística, educação e ciência sobre a preservação da diversidade linguística, para demonstrar que a concepção de Humboldt sobre a mesma como sendo uma riqueza intelectual está presente nas falas desses especialistas – inclusive, dos brasileiros. Pretendemos, com o artigo, deixar apontada a importância de o Brasil receber mais ampla e aprofundadamente as ideias de Humboldt.

- **PALAVRAS-CHAVE:** Wilhelm von Humboldt; círculo de Bakhtin; dialogismo; visões de mundo; diversidade linguística.

REFERENCES

ANDRZEJEWSKI, B. Immanuël Kant i voprósy komunikativnogo konstruktivizma (Immanuel Kant e as questões do construtivismo comunicativo). **Tieorietíchtskaia filofsófia Kanta**, Kaliningrado, p.17-25, 2015.

BAKHTIN, M. **Estética da criação verbal**. Trad. P. Bezerra. 4. ed. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2003.

BEISER, F. The Enlightenment and idealism. *In*: BEISER, F. **German Idealism**. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000. p. 18-36.

CASSIRER, E. **Philosophie der Symbolischen Formen**. Oxford: Oxford, 1954.

CHABROLLE-CERRETINI, A. L'approche anthropologique du caractère national chez Wilhelm von Humboldt. **The Tocqueville Review/La revue Tocqueville**, Toronto, v. 35, n. 1, p. 55-71, 2014.

CRISTAUDO, W. Theorising Ideas: *Idee* and *Vorstellung* from Kant to Hegel to Marx. **History of European Ideas**, Abingdon, v. 12, n. 6, p. 813-825, 1990.

GRILLO, S. Marxismo e filosofia da linguagem: uma resposta à ciência da linguagem do século XIX e início do século XX. *In*: VOLOSHINOV, V. **Marxismo e filosofia da linguagem: problemas fundamentais do método sociológico na ciência da linguagem**. São Paulo: Editora 34, 2017. p. 7-79.

GUYER, P. Absolute idealism and the rejection of Kantian dualism. *In*: BEISER, F. **German Idealism**. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000. p. 38-56.

HILGERT, J. G. Die Gesprächskonstruktion nach dem Energie- Konzept von Humboldt. **Pandaemonium Germanicum**, São Paulo, v. 15, n. 20, p. 194-211, 2012.

HUMBOLDT, W. v. Form der Sprachen. *In*: HEIDERMANN, W.; WEININGER, M. J. (org.). **Humboldt: Linguagem, Literatura e Bildung**. Florianópolis: Ed. da UFSC, 2006a. p. 94-119.

HUMBOLDT, W. v. Über die Natur der Sprache im allgemeinen. In: HEIDERMANN, W.; WEININGER, M. J. (org.). **Humboldt: Linguagem, Literatura e Bildung**. Florianópolis: Ed. da UFSC, 2006b. p. 2-19.

HUMBOLDT, W. v. **Schriften zur Sprachphilosophie**: Werke in fünf Bänden III. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1963. [1827].

HURCH, B. Die Formierung der grammatischen Analyse: die Rolle des Baskischen auf dem Weg Humboldts als Grammatiker: Einige editorische Anmerkungen zu den frühen bascologischen Arbeiten. **ASJU**, XXXVIII-1, p. 333-351, 2004. Disponível em: <https://ojs.ehu.es/index.php/ASJU/article/view/8877/8189>. Acesso em: 10 mar. 2022.

LOBÁNOVA L.P. Proiekt óbschiego iazykoznánia V. von Gúmboldta v kontiékstie stanovliénia nóvoi naúki o iazykié v Giermánii XIX vieka. In: HUMBOLDT v. V. **Kontsiéptsiia óbschiego iazykoznánia**: tsiéli, sodierzhánii, struktúra. O projeto de linguística geral de Humboldt no conceito de formação de uma nova ciência da linguagem na Alemanha do século XIX. In: HUMBOLDT v. V. O conceito de linguística geral: objetivos, conteúdo, estrutura. Tradução, introdução e notas de L.P. Lobánova. Moscou: Lenand, 2018. p. 7-192.

KARSTEN, A. **Schreiben im Blick**: Schriftliche Formendersprachlichen Tätigkeit-audialogischer Perspektive. Berlin: Lehmanns Media Verlag, 2014.

MESCHONNIC, H. Penser Humboldt aujourd'hui. In: MESCHONNIC, H. (ed.). **La Pensée dans la langue**: Humboldt et après. Saint-Denis: Presses Universitaires de Vincennes, 1995. p. 13–50.

THOUARD, D. **Et toute langue est étrangère**: le projet de Humboldt. La Versanne: Encre Marine, 2016.

TRABANT, J. Vanishing Worldviews. **Forum for Modern Language Studies**, Oxford, n. 53, p. 1-14, 2017.

TRABANT, J. Humboldt et Leibniz: Le concept intérieur de la linguistique. In: MAURO, T.; FORMIGARI, L. (ed.). **Leibniz, Humboldt, and the Origins of Comparativism**. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1990. p. 135-157.

VERMEULEN, H.F. Ethnographie und Ethnologie in Mittel-und Osteuropa. Völkerbeschreibung und Völkerkunde in Russland, Deutschland und Österreich (1740-1845). In: DONNERT, H. (ed.). **Europa in der Frühen Neuzeit**. Band 6: Mittel-, Nord und Osteuropa. Köln: Böhlau Verlag, 2002. p. 397-409.

VOLOSHINOV, V. **Marxism and the philosophy of language**. Translated by Ladislav Matejka and I. R. Titunik. New York: Seminar Press, 1973. [1929].

Received on March 30, 2021

Approved on April 23, 2021