ARTICLES

A Saussure-Bakhtin Encounter in the Episteme / *Um encontro Saussure-Bakhtin na episteme*

Luiz Eduardo Mendes Batista[*]
*Stefania Montes Henriques**

ABSTRACT

In this article, we intend to start from certain reinterpretations that have been made about the Saussurean construct on the *langue* object, taking as a basis mainly the relational notion of system, the *linguistic value*, to then create possibilities of dialogue with the axiological perspective of *langue* present in Mikhail Bakhtin. Such perspective in this author takes shape in the concept of *heteroglossia* and *discourse genres*, in which this object must be understood in terms of social and historical relations. Also, in the linguistic-textual elaboration of a genre, the statements operate in relation to each other, in order to bring together and/or confront different social and ideological voices. Starting from this *episteme*, which sees *langue* and the effects that result from it as a constitutively relational object, we believe that a convergence between the two authors is possible in order to re-signify ways of interpreting the world through the science of language.
KEYWORDS: Episteme; Saussure-Bakhtin dialogue; Value theory; Heteroglossia

RESUMO

Neste artigo, pretendemos partir de certas releituras que se têm feito a respeito do construto saussuriano sobre o objeto língua, tomando por base principalmente a noção relacional de sistema, o valor linguístico*, para, então, criar possibilidades de diálogo com a perspectiva axiológica de língua presente em Mikhail Bakhtin. Tal perspectiva, neste autor, ganha corpo na conceituação de* heterodiscurso *e de* gêneros do discurso*, em que este objeto deve ser compreendido em relações de ordem social e histórica. Além disso, na elaboração linguístico-textual de um gênero, os enunciados operam em relação uns com os outros, a fim de aproximar e/ou confrontar diferentes vozes sociais e ideológicas. Enfim, partindo dessa* episteme*, que enxerga a língua e os efeitos que dela decorrem como objeto constitutivamente relacional, acreditamos ser possível um encontro entre os dois autores a fim de se ressignificarem formas de interpretar o mundo por meio da ciência da língua(gem).*
PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Episteme; Diálogo Saussure-Bakhtin; Teoria do valor; Heterodiscurso

[*] Universidade Federal de Uberlândia – UFU, Instituto de Letras e Linguística, Programa de Pós-Graduação em Estudos Linguísticos, PhD in Linguistic Studies, Uberlândia, Minas Gerais, Brazil; https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4427-376X; luizedumb@yahoo.com.br

[**] Universidade do Estado de Minas Gerais - UEMG, Unidade Passos, Minas Gerais, Brazil; https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4517-0121; temontess@gmail.com

Introduction

As we enter the 21st century, we perceive a pressing need for contemporary man to revisit and re-signify the fundamentals that have been constituting him since the long 20th century. In our field, we have witnessed a "new" return to Saussurean theoretical bases on the foundation of Modern Linguistics amid the effervescence of current discursive theories. In this current process of resignification of linguistic science, there is no place for dichotomies that for so long have polarized notions such as language [langue] and speech [parole], text and discourse. We speak, rather, of approximations, singularities, differentiations, and, for this reason, this return needs to take place in a spiral, that is, it resumes in order to advance.

Therefore, it is not just about carrying out an epistemological review, in which each part of the structure of this object is broken down in search of essences. It is, rather, a contemplative return, in the philosophical sense of the term, in which we place ourselves in front of the object language [*langue*] not to break it down into forms displayed for usage, but to see the man in the language [*langue*]. This is the episteme, where we intend to place ourselves in this article, as we seek, in a sense, not to dwell on the concepts, the information deduced from the studies by Saussure and Bakhtin, the two scholars in dialogue in this study. We seek to unveil what is transversal to the two thinkers, in an effort to anticipate their conceptions of language [both *langage* and *langue*], in order to launch reflections on this important object that constitutes us as humans. It is, then, the same conceptual direction of episteme as stated by Foucault, as will be seen later.

Thus, we must return to some questions that will guide our investigation: would it be possible to have a reading that brings Saussure and Bakhtin closer together, giving new meaning to and even repositioning them in the field of linguistic studies? And if so, to what extent, and for what reasons, would seeking dialogue between these authors be relevant to linguistic research today? It is known that Saussure and Bakhtin have developed their theories in relatively close periods, despite the fact that the former had been unaware of the works of the latter. Between 1907 and 1911, the Genevan linguist teaches three courses on general linguistics at the University of Geneva. The notes taken by the students of these courses were then edited – together with autographical notes –

and published as the *Course in General Linguistics* (1916).[1] However, when the collection of Saussurean manuscripts is taken into consideration, it could be said that Ferdinand de Saussure had been elaborating his theory long before his lessons in Geneva.

M. Bakhtin, on his part, finds himself in a complicated period in Stalinist Russia in which both the country's cultural and intellectual production were censored by the dictates of the new regime. Therefore, there was complicity among Bakhtin and the authors of the Circle in the process of production and publication of the works, to the point that, in order to protect themselves from this vigilance, they would exchange the empirical authorship of certain works. Thus, we see him as a founder of discursiveness, in the Foucauldian sense of conceiving the author – and his authorship – having in mind, *a priori*, the voice of an author that resonates throughout the work, that crosses it. This transversality, as explained by by Arán (2014), permeates the production of the circle in the three periods of scientific production. In the first period, comprising the years of 1919 and 1929, works such as the book *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics* [2] and *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*[3] arise at a time of intense debate within the group, in the sense of deconstructing the romantic idea of searching for the mother tongue, for the national linguistic identity, against the very nationalist proposal of Stalin. The group therefore needed to fight against any purist idea of language that would lead this notion to an abstract objectivism. Following this path, in the second phase of production, which corresponds to the period from 1930 to 1959, when Bakhtin was exiled, important works emerge, such as *Discourse in the Novel*,[4] a text completed in 1936 but only published in 1975, and essays as *The Problem of Speech Genres*,[5] written between 1952 and 1953 but only published in 1978. In addition, the fight against the nationalist conception of language was being strengthened at a time when the Nazi rise gained ground in the world.

---

[1] SAUSSURE, F. *Course in General Linguistics*. Edited by Charles Bally and Albert Sechehaye. In collaboration with Albert Reidlinger. Translated from the French by Wade Baskin. New York: Philosophical Library, 2011 (Hereinafter *CGL*).

[2] BAKHTIN, M. *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. 8th printing. Translated by Caryl Emerson. Minneapolis, MN, University of Minnesota Press, 1984.

[3] VOLOŠINOV, V. N. *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*. Trad. Ladislav Matejka and R. Titunik. Translator's Preface. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973.

[4] BAKHTIN, M. M. Discourse in the Novel. *In*: BAKHTIN, M. *The Dialogic Imagination*: Four Essays. Translated by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981.

[5] BAKHTIN, M. The Problem of Speech Genres. *In*: BAKHTIN, M. *Speech Genres & Other Late Essays*. Translated by Vern W. McGee and Edited by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1986, pp.60-102.

In our point of view, this period corresponds to an important moment of the theoretical conceptions that outline the thinking of the Circle, but, following the idea of Arán (2014), in a third moment, from 1960 until his death in 1975, Bakhtin seems to have the clearest idea of a study field, Metalinguistics, to which his and his group's elaborations have converged, as can be seen in essays such as *The Problem of the Text*[6] first published in Russia in 1976.

If we take, then, the history of the reception of these authors during the 20th century, we will see that they were often considered to belong to opposite currents regarding the conception of *langue*: Saussure would divide *langage* into *langue* and *parole,*[7] prioritizing the study of the first and "excluding" the second of its elaborations. Bakhtin, in turn, would prioritize socio-ideological interaction, that is, precisely, the aspect that would have been excluded by Saussure.

Considering this distinction, why would it be pertinent to seek a dialogue between these two authors? Questions like these might not have been asked until the middle of the 20th century, when the *Course in General Linguistics* was the only known Saussurean work. However, as of the 1950s, a considerable number of the linguist's manuscripts began to appear. According to Marchese (2003), it happens in four moments: in January 1955, Saussure's family donates several manuscripts to the Geneva Library; in November of the same year, Mme. Bally donates the manuscripts that were in possession of Charles Bally; in 1968, Ferdinand de Saussure's sons sold some manuscripts, through Roman Jakobson, to Harvard; and, finally, in 1996 new manuscripts were found in Saussure's country house (see Marchese, 2003, p.338). The appearance of these documents provided a movement to re-read the CGL, aiming to complement the elaborations of the edition, or even to elucidate aspects that may have been obscure in the linguist's elaborations.

This re-reading movement led to, according to Pereira de Castro (2016), the publishing of critical editions of the CGL. In the 1950s, in possession of some Saussurean manuscripts, Robert Godel published *Les sources manuscrits du Cours de Linguistique Générale* (1957) [The Source Manuscripts of the Course in General Linguistics], in which

---

[6] BAKHTIN, M. The Problem of the Text in Linguistics, Philology and the Human Sciences: An Experiment in Philosophical Analysis. *In*: BAKHTIN, M. *Speech Genres & Other Late Essays*. Translated by Vern W. McGee and Edited by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1986, pp.103-131.

[7] Due to the lack of specific terms, in English, to differentiate *langue* and *langage*, we chose to use the terms in French.

he compared some handwritten notes to the content of the *CGL*. A few years later, in 1968, Rudolf Engler published his monumental critical edition, composed of more than 500 pages, and divided into two volumes, in which he confronts the *CGL* with the students' notes and with Saussurean manuscripts. Finally, in the 1970s, Tullio de Mauro published his critical edition, with more than 300 comments on the 1916 edition.

At the end of the 20th century and the beginning of the 21st century, a set of unpublished manuscripts was discovered and some of them were edited by Rudolf Engler and Simon Bouquet.[8] This resumption movement, at the same time historical and bibliographical, of the re-readings and editions of the Saussurean framework shows us that, besides the importance of the *CGL* in the foundation of modern linguistics, a return to Saussure is necessary - both to the 1916 edition and to autograph notes - to seek not only further clarification on this foundation, but also to revise the theory of the Genevan linguist without reducing it to dichotomies and their "exclusions."[9]

Furthermore, this return to Saussurean elaborations and access to new documents presuppose a resumption movement of the interpretations made by post-Saussurean scholars who, to some extent, have read the CGL and deduced its theoretical consequences. It is at this point that Mikhail Bakhtin takes a prominent place for us. It is known that the Russian thinker made little use of Saussurean elaborations, due to the political context in which Russia was inserted in the first decades of the 20th century.[10] In fact, the *Course* does not seem to have been a work intensely debated in the Bakhtin Circle and perhaps not even read. Regarding Saussure's reception in Russia, says Sériot (2010, pp.108-109):

> Saussure's *Course in General Linguistics* [CGL] is mentioned for the first time in Russia in 1917 by Segej Karcevskij during a lecture in a seminar at the Moscow University Dialectological Commission (…)
> The first copy arrived in Russia in 1923, in Leningrad; it was presented at the ILJaZV linguistics seminar by S. Bernstejn.

---

[8] The *Écrits de linguistique générale* [Writings in General Linguistics] is published in 2002, but it is not only composed by Saussure's unpublished notes. The editors have also used part of the notes edited by Engler in 1968.

[9] In Brazil, this movement of revisiting and investigating Saussurean elaborations, relating them to central issues of current linguistics, is found in the productions of the *Ferdinand de Saussure Research Group* (GPFdS / CNPq), involving researchers from various universities.

[10] The October Revolution, as it is called the process by which communism was established in Russia, takes place in 1917.

Rozalija Sor (1894-1939), author of the first annotated edition of the Saussure Course in 1933, presents Saussure as "the greatest exponent of the French school of social linguistics," which she considers a fundamental break with the past. In the same year, however, Saussure was already proclaimed "the most classic representative of bourgeois linguistics" by F. Filin (1808-1982) (…) L. Jakunbinskij, professor of linguistics at ILJaZV, disapproves in Saussure his inability to understand that a linguistic policy is possible.[11]

Discursivities about Saussure, therefore, were already launched and it seemed to prevail in Russia, especially in the Bakhtin Circle, the idea of a *positivist* bourgeois linguist, with an *abstract* conception of language, far removed from the social and cultural perspectives that had invaded the intellectual life of Russia. An example of this interpretation is found in *Marxism and Philosophy of Language,*[12] by Valentin Vološinov, published in 1929.

However, as we have said, in possession of the recent Saussurean documents and their theoretical contributions, there has been a return to Saussure's elaborations and, in this sense, it also affects the interpretations of the scholars of the Circle. Among the studies that contemplate this relationship, we can mention Sériot (2010), who takes a strong stance against Vološinov and Bakhtin, in order to denounce wrong readings about Saussure, in addition to calling into question aspects related to the authorship and biography of these authors. Brait (2016), for example, focuses on the construction of Bakhtin's ideas, emphasizing the influence or not of the Saussurean framework in his elaborations. In our case, we intend to discuss the Russian author's ideas and possibilities of relating them at some point to Saussure's. We do not intend to collaborate with the judgmental narrative according to which readings such as those Patrick Sériot or Jean-Paul Bronckart and Christian Bota have done on Mikhail Bakhtin, but to discuss his ideas and possibilities of relating them at some point to those of Saussure. However, we will

---

[11] In Portuguese: "O *Curso de linguística geral* [*CLG*] de Saussure é mencionado pela primeira vez na Rússia em 1917 por Segej Karcevskij durante uma palestra num seminário da Comissão Dialetológica da Universidade de Moscou (alguns membros que constituíram, desde 1915, o Círculo Linguístico de Moscou, ver Jakobson, 1970, pp. 97-98)." "(...) O primeiro exemplar chegou à Rússia em 1923, em Leningrado; foi apresentado no seminário de linguística do ILJaZV por S. Bernstejn." "(...) Rozalija Sor (1894-1939), autora da primeira edição anotada do Curso de Saussure em 1933, apresenta Saussure como "o maior expoente da escola francesa de linguística social", que ela considera uma ruptura fundamental com o passado. No mesmo ano, porém, Saussure já era proclamado "o representante mais clássico da linguística burguesa" por F. Filin (1808-1982)" "(...) L. Jakunbinskij, professor de linguística do ILJaZV, reprova em Saussure sua incapacidade de compreender que uma política linguística é possível."
[12] For reference, see footnote 3.

not go in search of how Bakhtin incorporates Saussure's ideas in his theoretical construction either, as Brait (2016) has already done. Instead, we specifically aim to read Bakhtin and Saussure in a dialogical perspective, seeking to highlight some metatheoretical, epistemological aspects of these authors, especially those who place them as authors who conceive *langue* and *langage* in a relational, axiological perspective.

Therefore, we will revisit the interpretations of authors like Brait (2016) about Bakhtin's theoretical appropriations of Saussure. Next, we will look at current possibilities that have been offered to us to revisit Saussure's ideas. Finally, we will seek to promote an encounter based on some epistemological aspects of these authors who, to a certain extent, will be able to collaborate with research that take *langue* as a human, social object.

1 How Has Bakhtin Read Saussure?

By following Brait's (2016) path, we have noted Bakhtin *reading* Saussure especially in two of his main texts, *Discourse in the Novel*[13] and *The Problem of Speech genres*.[14] Both texts follow a, let us say, more linguistic aspect of the Russian author and seek, fundamentally, to place *langue* as a social fact, as discourse. It is, in this sense, worth remembering that the author will define the utterance, as a social and ideological realization of *langue*. This takes him to the concept of dialogism, as a constitutive aspect of *langage* that refers to the necessary positioning of a speaker in front of the other(s) - constitutive alterity.

It is, therefore, in these texts that Bakhtin seems to understand the need to summon Saussure to, as Brait (2016) reinforces it, position himself before the concept of *langue* as a system of signs apparently without social resonances. Even by approaching Vološinov (1973),[15] for whom *langue* in Saussure would be abstract, and not concrete and social, as he believed that it should be understood, Bakhtin returns to the Genevan author, recognizing, in some way, his importance. In *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*,[16] published in 1929, the Russian thinker distinguishes *linguistics* from *metalinguistics*: the

---

[13] For reference, see footnote 4.
[14] For reference, see footnote 5.
[15] For reference, see footnote 3.
[16] For reference, see footnote 2.

former would be a purely grammatical study, while the latter would encompass the relationship between *langage* and social practices. "Linguistics and metalinguistics study one and the same concrete, highly complex, and multi-faceted phenomenon, namely, the word — but they study it from various sides and various points of view" (Bakhtin, 1984, p.181).[17]

It is observed that Bakhtin does not disregard Saussurean elaborations: metalinguistics dialogues in a certain respect with linguistics. Furthermore, it may be possible to state that the concept of discourse/*slovo* is quite similar to that of *langage*, as elaborated by Saussure. In the same direction if we take a look back at the *CGL*, for example, we will read that *langage* is defined as "many-sided and heterogeneous; straddling several areas simultaneously – physical, physiological, and psychological – it belongs both to the individual and to society (...)" (Saussure, 2011, p.11).[18]

Another similarity that stands out is the assertion of the existence of several points of view. For Bakhtin, due to its heterogeneity, discourse can be approached from several points of view, which would be related to either linguistics or metalinguistics. In this sense, in addition to theoretical similarities, it can be understood that Bakhtin considers the study of the internal functioning of *langue* - conceived as a system - as necessary and important for the study of *langage* and its relationship with social practices.

For Brait (2016), the Russian thinker does not use Saussurean elaborations as an object of rejection, but as a "necessary epistemological counterpoint for the constitution of Bakhtinian arguments" (Brait, 2016, p.96).[19] As an example, the author cites the reference made by Bakhtin to a linguistics of the *parole* as opposed to a linguistics of the *langue*, when dealing with stylistics, in his text *Discourse in the Novel*,[20]

> We have no need to follow where such an analysis of novelistic style leads, whether to a disclosing of the novelist's individual dialect (that is, his vocabulary, his syntax) or to a disclosing of the distinctive features of the work taken as a "complete speech act," an 'utterance'. Equally in both cases, style is understood in the spirit of Saussure: as an individualization of the general language (in the sense of a system of general language norms). Stylistics is transformed either into a curious

---

[17] For reference, see footnote 2.
[18] For reference, see footnote 1.
[19] In Portuguese: "contraponto epistemológico necessário à constituição da argumentação bakhtiniana."
[20] For reference, see footnote 4.

kind of linguistics treating individual languages, or into a linguistics of utterance (Bakhtin, 1981, p.264).[21]

It seems that style puts in relation the distinction between *langue* and *parole* in the sense that each novelist mobilizes the *langue* system in a unique way and, in this sense, style is an individualization of the general *langue*. For Brait (2016, p.100), it is necessary for Bakhtin to mention *parole* linguistics to present a "sociological, genre-based, discursive stylistics, which has the novel as its object."[22]

In the author's perspective, therefore, there does not seem to be an oppositional stance in Bakhtinian elaborations with regard to Saussure's theory, even if the reading that tries to defend this type of opposition is considered frivolous and impressionistic. We agree with her, but we still consider the fact that the Russian thinker had, mainly in the 1920s and 1930s, an indirect contact with the *CGL* without a more accurate reading of its content.[23] Besides, it was not until the 1950s that Saussurean manuscripts and critical editions of the *CGL* were widely disseminated, even considering that Saussure's ideas had already been the subject of discussions within the Circle, as stated above. In any case, these may have prevented more consistent approximations between the authors' thoughts.

Despite these "theoretical mismatches," based, in our view, much more on geopolitical configuration than theoretical matters, it can be inferred that the two authors, at different times and in different contexts, were facing the multifaceted nature of language and the need to adopt a point of view before embracing the object. Craig Brandist, in this regard, claims that:

> Perhaps it is best here simply to say Saussure was trying to outline the object domain of linguistics as a discipline, and Bakhtin an account of how the novel models and reprocesses language in the 1930s, as well as a theory of speech acts in the 1950s (Brandist, 2018, p.222).[24]

In other words, it is about realizing how much the two authors were engaged in understanding the object *langue* from the fissures of their specific contexts. That is why

---

[21] For reference, see footnote 4.

[22] In Portuguese: "*estilística do discurso, sociológica, do gênero, que tem como objeto o romance*."

[23] As already mentioned, the first Russian edition of the CGL was published in 1933 by Rozalija Sor (1894-1939), however the Swiss linguist was soon considered as a bourgeois thinker which, in the context of the USSR, contributed to his lack of popularity.

[24] BRANDIST, C. Interview: Craig Brandist (Bakhtin Centre). Interview to Patrícia Margarida Farias Coelho and Marcos Rogério Martins Costa. *Bakhtiniana*, São Paulo, 13 (2): 212-224, maio/ago. 2018.

it is a mistake to, unknowingly, try to affiliate Bakhtin to Saussure, or putting them in definitely opposite poles. This is not what it is about, but at least:

    a) Recognizing that Linguistics, as a science, becomes, in the 20th century, the subject of the so-called Human Sciences, with a strong recurrence by scholars of Anthropology, Psychoanalysis and the like.

    b) Understanding that, in this (meta)theoretical or epistemological place, the authors in question converge to the matters of *langage* as the place of man, of the speaker, alive, and no longer as a means of proceeding with the collection of *corpora* of ancient texts, for example, with the only intention of "preserving" a *langue*, in a purely romantic, philological and / or comparative attitude.

It is, therefore, in possession of these two aspects that we revisit below some elements of the Saussurean episteme, largely ignored by linguistic studies in the 20th century, and under intense investigation in the current century.

2 How is Ferdinand de Saussure Read, or Could He Be Read Today?

As stated in the introduction to this article, after the appearance of Saussurean manuscripts in the 1950s, a process of re-reading the Saussurean theoretical construct is initiated. At the end of the 20th century, this process was intensified, in view of the discovery of a new and extensive set of manuscripts and its popularization through the publication of the *Writings in General Linguistics* (*WGL*),[25] edited by Simon Bouquet and Rudolf Engler.

Studies carried out in this period point to the fact that, in most cases, the reception of Saussurean elaborations was reductionist, disregarding the complexity of a thought that already finds its core in the CGL itself. We say that there is a reductionism in that, not only in undergraduate courses, but also in well-established linguistic currents. Saussurean theory is placed as something outdated, being restricted to a dichotomized view of concepts: *langue* x *parole*, syntagmatic axis x associative axis, synchrony x diachrony etc. We cannot forget to also mention the famous thesis of "Saussurian exclusions,"

---

[25] SAUSSURE, F. de. *Writings in General Linguistics*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006, p.197.

widely defended among scholars - including Brazilian ones -, according to which Saussure would have "excluded" *parole*, history, the subject and the referent of Linguistics.

What can be seen in the manuscripts, and even in the *CGL*, is that there is really an attempt to define concepts, which constitutes a typical movement of those who worked hard in a complex emerging theoretical architecture. However, these concepts are not taken as unchangeable and can be considered more as an epistemological cut, than as, in fact, an exclusion.[26] It should also be emphasized that it is the delimitation of these concepts that allowed to reposition, not to say to revolutionize, the way of conceiving *langue* in its social functioning, as well as establishing it as an object of study and placing it at the center of the most recent scientific concerns.

In this perspective, Testenoire (2016) makes considerations that dethrone certain mistaken positions regarding the relationship between Saussurean linguistics and the so-called discourse studies. In showing the concern of current linguists, such as Jean-Michel Adam and Jean-Paul Bronckart, to attribute to the "Saussure of the manuscripts" the important role of starting discussions on the complex concept of discourse, some relevant aspects of Saussurean reception are presented. According to him, all current discourse theories "converge in making discourse no longer something to be found beyond Saussurean linguistics, but, rather, a fundamental element of its theoretical thinking" (Testenoire, 2016, p.107).[27]

Among the aspects presented by Testenoire (2016), there is the fact that these scholars, who are now adept at Saussurean elaborations on discourse, are mainly based on the discovery of new Saussurean documents in 1996 and, mainly, on the famous "Note on discourse," published in the *WGL*. The curious thing about this interest and the fact that Saussure would not have excluded the discourse of his elaborations comes from the fact that the "Note on discourse," published in the *WGL* as belonging to the new documents,[28] was already part of the old set of Saussure's documents, that is, it was known

---

[26] This is also the position defended by Normand (2009).

[27] In Portuguese: "convergem em fazerem do discurso não mais algo a ser encontrado além da linguística saussuriana, mas, antes, um elemento fundamental de seu pensamento teórico."

[28] Designation given by Engler and Bouquet to documents found in 1996.

before 1996, and had also been published in the 1980s by Jean Starobinski in *Words upon Words: The Anagrams by Ferdinand de Saussure.*[29]

It is interesting to notice, in this context, how the appearance of the manuscripts seems to provide a reinterpretation of the whole Saussurean work, which results in the adoption of different perspectives in relation to Ferdinand de Saussure's theoretical construct. We say this, because there is a movement, led by scholars like Simon Bouquet, which supports the idea that *CGL's* Saussure is falsified due to the work done by the editors, while the manuscripts' Saussure - and the one of publications in life - would be the true Saussure. The perspective defended by Testenoire (2016) and by other researchers, among whom we are inserted, dictates exactly the opposite: one should not search for the true Saussure, because the *CGL* and the autograph notes are complementary, not incompatible.

Still regarding the current readings of the Saussurean theoretical construct, in his article *Os manuscritos saussurianos nas teorias contemporâneas do texto e do discurso* [The Saussurean Manuscripts in Contemporary Theories of Text and Discourse], Driss Ablali investigates Saussure's influence, especially about the notion of discourse, in the elaborations of some contemporary linguists, including the aforementioned Jean-Michel Adam and Jean-Paul Bronckart.

The former, according to Ablali (2016), uses the idea of discourse present in the WGL, organized and edited by Simon Bouquet and Rudolf Engler, to establish - anachronistic - connections between the notion of *langue* in Saussure and the latest ideas of text and discourse. Moreover, Adam still says that the "Saussure of the Notes" seems to foreshadow the enunciative linguistics of Émile Benveniste, placing him, once again in the wrong way, as a forerunner to the current theories of text and discourse. Here, it is interesting to make an addendum: the assertion that Saussure foreshadows Benveniste's enunciation theory is, in a way, something common in language studies. Obviously, there are several points where these two linguists meet, besides the resumption of Saussurean concepts by Benveniste in his elaborations. However, we agree with Normand (2006, p.18), that there is no affiliation, but a theoretical encounter that concerns "intelligence and love, which is common to them, for *langue*."[30] In Bronckart, according to Ablali

---

[29] STAROBINSKY, J. *Words upon Words*: The Anagrams by Ferdinand de Saussure. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1980.
[30] In Portuguese: "à inteligência e ao amor, que lhes é comum, pela língua."

(2016, p.135), "*langue* always remains under social control and that all *langagières* productions are fundamentally social in nature. He states it based on his readings from 'On the Dual Essence of Language'."[31]

In short, unlike many readings like these, the manuscripts found do not invalidate the Course, and neither attest to its inferiority, but, rather, they allow us to see an intense process of authorial construction and elaboration, in a modern linguistic science emergency movement, as attested by Silveira et.al. (2019). For these authors, neither the manuscripts nor the *CGL*[32] should be read separately, but in a close connection to each other.

Following his considerations, which go against the immature appropriation of Saussure's ideas, Testenoire (2016) reveals that what authors, like those mentioned, use to support their arguments are located in a note belonging to a "set of anagram notebooks elaborated by Saussure, considered to its maximum extent"[33] (Testenoire, 2016, p.110). In other words, the attitude of Bouquet and Engler is even reprehensible when simply inserting this note at the end of the writings on the dual essence of language, without, at least, saying where it was originally taken from. It produces, in the *WGL*[34], an effect of continuity, a kind of corollary of what Saussure wanted to tell us about such a dual essence. It is also worth pointing out here that, for Testenoire (2016), there were stages of crystallization of this mistaken interpretation of Saussure's "discourse":

> The stages of crystallization of the phrase 'note on discourse' can be reconstructed: Starobinski (1980) speaks of an 'isolated text, [which] launches the problematic [of discourse]'; Amacker (1989) and Fehr (1995) speak of a 'note by F. de Saussure regarding the discourse'; Adam (2001) speaks of the 'so-called note on discourse'; and, finally, Engler and Bouquet (2002), in the WGL, choose to call it 'Note on discourse', without pointing out that it is their choice ... (Testenoire, 2016, p.110).[35]

---

[31] In Portuguese: "a língua permanece sempre sob o controle do social e que todas as produções linguageiras são de natureza fundamentalmente social. Isso ele diz com base em suas leituras a partir de 'O caráter duplo da linguagem'."

[32] For reference, see footnote 1.

[33] In Portuguese: "conjunto de cadernos de anagramas elaborados por Saussure, considerada em sua extensão máxima."

[34] For reference, see footnote 25.

[35] In Portuguese: "As etapas de cristalização da locução 'nota sobre o discurso' podem ser reconstituídas: Starobinski (1971) fala de um 'texto isolado, [que] lança a problemática [do discurso]'; Amacker (1989) e Fehr (1995) falam de uma 'nota de F. de Saussure referente ao discurso'; Adam (2001) fala da 'chamada nota sobre o discurso'; e, finalmente, Engler e Bouquet (2002), nos *ELG*, optam por intitulá-la 'Nota sobre o discurso', sem assinalar que se trata de uma escolha deles..."

But, after all, what does this note say that has been the source of so much interest? Here it is an interesting excerpt:

> *Langue* is created only with a view to discourse; but what separates discourse from language system, and what allows us to say that a language system enters into action as discourse at any given moment? (...) discourse consists, even if only in a rudimentary way, and in ways of which we are unaware, of confirming a link between two of the concepts that appear cloaked in a linguistic form, while the language system at first consists only of isolated concepts that are waiting to be put into relation with each other so that meaningful thought may be expressed (Saussure, 2006, p.197).[36]

Thus, if we look at the careful investigation undertaken by Testenoire (2016), it is not difficult to see that the note is about Saussure's long reflections on the object *langue* and *parole*, *parole*, taken here in its French meaning *discours* [*discourse*].

Now, if we deny such impressionist views that, in some way, try to revisit and reposition the readings on Saussure, detaching him from the supposed - fixed - dichotomies, what can we rely on to deny the unfounded views that still have some bearings today? At first, we can reaffirm that such readings, although prevalent, were not always alone. Albert Sechehaye, for example, one of the editors of the third Course, is one of those who shows us how much Saussure's ideas gain fruitful affiliations, as is the case with the Prague Linguistic Circle. In his *Les trois linguistiques saussuriennes* [The three Saussurean linguistics], the author points out possible ways to go to Saussure without reproducing impressionist readings like those of dichotomous pairs. It is interesting how much the author's angle teaches us in relation to the mature attitude of someone who claims to be a scientist - of *langue* - when dedicating himself to read the Course:

> In any case, the real criticism of the Course consists in collaborating with its author, either to dig deeper into the foundations of linguistic science before he has been able to do so, or to edit in a more definitive way the construction of which the Cours could only provide a first and imperfect outline (Sechehaye, 1940, p.3). [37]

---

[36] For reference, see footnote 25.

[37] In French: "De toutes façons, la vraie critique du *Cours* consiste à collaborer avec son auteur, soit pour creuser plus avant qu'il n'a pu le faire les assises de la science linguistique, soit pour éditer d'une façon plus définitive la construction dont le Cours n'a pu fournir qu'une première et imparfaite ébauche. "

That said, Albert Sechehaye takes the first route - that of deepening - and proposes the three Saussurean linguistics: a state of *langage* (static linguistics), the functions of this *langage* (organized *parole*) and the evolution of that *langage* (evolutionary linguistics). Organized *parole* linguistics is positioned between static linguistics and evolutionary linguistics and concerns the place of the creativity in *langue*, but always having the norm as the place of regularities. This view is in line with what, later, in the 1970s, Coseriu (1979) will define as system, norm and *parole*. For Coseriu (1992), the norm is the place of regularities, of the expression of users' textual competence.

3 A Saussure-Bakhtin Encounter in the Episteme: Which Resonances of this Encounter Would Be Possible Today?

> By episteme, we mean, in fact, the total set of relations that unite, at a given period, the discursive practices that give rise to epistemological figures, sciences, and possibly formalized systems; the way in which, in each of these discursive formations, the transitions to epistemologization, scientificity, and formalization are situated and operate; the distribution of these thresholds, which may coincide, be subordinated to one another, or be separated by shifts in time; the lateral relations that may exist between epistemological figures or sciences in so far as they belong to neighbouring, but distinct, discursive practices. The episteme is not a form of knowledge (connaissance) or type of rationality which, crossing the boundaries of the most varied sciences, manifests the sovereign unity of a subject, a spirit, or a period; it is the totality of relations that can be discovered, for a given period, between the sciences when one analyses them at the level of discursive regularities (Foucault, 2010, p.191).[38]

Foucault goes straight to the point when defining the episteme as a place of relationships and, therefore, of possible dialogues between sciences, highlighting *discursive regularities* that *weave* the different theoretical meshes at a given time. Another important characteristic refers to the fact that the episteme does not enshrine a specific author, but allows us to glimpse emerging theoretical outlines, their scope, and limitations. In this context, the episteme also points out gaps in theories that no longer respond to the demands they once held.

---

[38] FOUCAULT, M. *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. And The Discourse on Language. Translated from the French by A. M. Sherindan Smith. New York: Vintage Books, 2010.

It is in this sense, then, that we set out for our central reflection that considers the ideas of Saussure and Bakhtin, which can be revisited, at the same time, necessarily reframed. In other words, it is a *spiraling* resumption in which the return, when made, advances and never touches the same point, but somehow identifies with it. It is also important to reinforce that the episteme does not refer to theoretical currents or tendencies of a given time, but it does manage to delimit certain - theoretical - discursive practices that can, apparently, be considered either antagonistic or not and to show how such practices were placed in the order of discourse.

But how would we proceed to an epistemological analysis that could see, in our case, (meta) theoretical relations that would allow us to have a more fruitful approximation between Saussure and Bakhtin in order to allow the re-signification, to a certain extent, of our already established linguistic investigation parameters? The dimension of this question may not be answered here, but we have launched reflections that lead to a concrete possibility of resizing these parameters. Regarding the way in which we look at the episteme in order to shed light on certain discursive practices, Foucault states that:

> Lastly, we see that the analysis of the episteme is not a way of returning to the critical question ('given the existence of something like a science, what is its legitimacy?'); it is a questioning that accepts the fact of science only in order to ask the question what it is for that science to be a science. In the enigma of scientific discourse, what the analysis of the episteme questions is not its right to be a science, but the fact that it exists. And the point at which it separates itself off from all the philosophies of knowledge (connaissance) is that it relates this fact not to the authority of an original act of giving, which establishes in a transcendental subject the fact and the right, but to the processes of a historical practice (Foucault, 2010, p.192).[39]

In other words, the episteme allows us to look at scientific discourse in view of the broad historical process in which theoretical clashes and constructions are engendered. It is not, therefore, a mere historical reconstruction, or a bio (biblio) graphic inventory, "but it would try to explain the formation of a discursive practice and a body of revolutionary knowledge that are expressed in behaviour and strategies, which give

---

[39] For reference, see footnote 38.

rise to a theory of society, and which operate the interference and mutual transformation of that behaviour and those strategies" (Foucault, 2010, pp.195-6). [40]

It is the episteme, as the place of discursive strategies that seek to relate the functioning of the discursive practices in question, that allows us to deauthorize, in a certain sense, some interpretations, as the ones exposed above, that took shape and were crystallized in a given period, as is the case of the Saussurean dichotomies prevalent in the 20th century. Once these reductionist discourses were deconstructed, we are called to place, alongside the "new" perspectives of understanding about Saussure, other theoretical practices that constitute us as researchers. Now, if Saussure is seen as an author (see Silveira et.al., 2019) who, in the 20th century, deeply displaces the trail of *langage* studies in order to present the foundations of Modern Linguistics, and so we believe it, it is necessary to bring him closer to other *langage* scholars that come after him in order to understand possible dialogues. We briefly propose an entry in the writings of Saussure and Bakhtin, reinforcing here a metaphor common to both authors, the symphony / the orchestra. For Saussure:

> *Langue* is comparable to a *symphony* in that what the symphony actually is stands completely apart from how it is performed; the mistakes that musicians make in playing the symphony do not compromise this fact (Saussure, 2011, p.12; emphasis added).[41]

While for Bakhtin, through social heteroglossia and individual dissonance, that flourishes in the soil of this heteroglossia,

> The novel *orchestrates* all its themes, the totality of the world of objects and ideas depicted and expressed it, by means of the social diversity of speech types [*raznorecie*] and by the differing individual voices that flourish under such conditions. Authorial speech, the speeches of narrators, insert genres, the speech of characters are merely those fundamental compositional unities with whose help heteroglossia [*raznorecie*] can either the novel; each of them permits a multiplicity of social voices and a wide variety of their links and interrelationships (always more or less dialogized) (Bakhtin, 1981, p.263, emphasis added).[42]

---

[40] For reference, see footnote 38.
[41] For reference, see footnote 1.
[42] For reference, see footnote 4.

An unaware reader, uninterested in the dialogue we propose here, would reject "right away" any possible approach based on these quotes. On the contrary, he would reinforce evidently antagonistic positions even by taking these same quotes as basis. Well, if this is the case for any reader of this article, we suggest an interruption in this reading. But even though being suspicious of the possibilities discussed here, the reader would still "call our bluff" if there truly is any possibility of approximation between the authors mentioned, we invite you to the debate.

On the one hand, Saussure leads us to look internally at *langue* as a system of verbal signs. The linguistic system, as in a *symphony*, even before being executed - used - presupposes an operation already given a priori by the speaking mass. Thus, if there are execution errors, there is nothing to prevent such an error from being recognized and the systemic organization, already assumed, to be resumed. On the other hand, Bakhtin shows us the constitutively dialogical character of *langue* and reveals to us that, when materialized in some genre, in this case, the novel, always appears *orchestrating* different social voices. In other words, it is in *langue* realization, in the form of concrete utterances, that the speaker positions himself before the world and it always happens by relating either by approximation or refraction to other social positions.

Seen only from the perspective discussed above, which considers the theorizations of each author internally, we would continue to point out the profound differences between Saussure and Bakhtin and would even attest the interpretations of the Russian author himself, as Brait (2016) has enlightened us, walking away from Saussurean ideas. But that is not what we are talking about. Now, if we re-read Saussure's quote by repositioning it within its theoretical construct, we recover the idea that *langue* is indeed a system, but of what nature is such a system? The answer can be grasped when approaching the process of developing the concept of *value*. That is, language is a system of values. Such values, in turn, although referring to the functioning of language within the system, come from society, that is, they are collective, and not a cognitive product of an isolated individual: "The community is necessary if values that owe their existence solely to usage and general acceptance are to be set up; by himself the individual is incapable of fixing a single value" (Saussure, 2011, p.113).[43] Further on, Saussure still shows that the value, being relational, operates by similarity and dissimilarity between

---

[43] For reference, see footnote 10.

the linguistic elements that constitute it. In an intense investigation of the "Notes for the Third Course," in which the process of building the concept of value in the Saussurean theoretical elaboration is verified in the manuscripts, Coelho (2015) reaffirms precisely the idea that the notion of value is intrinsically related to notion of system and concludes:

> Thus, it is notable that there is a link between the process of elaborating the Theory of Value and the movement of developing the Saussurean notion of system. This link, in turn, is only made effective by the notion of relationship, which, according to what is exposed in the set of manuscripts, only exists due to the value, and can be seen in the existing bond between the system and the exchangeable character of the terms that compose it (Coelho, 2015, p.146).[44]

The author's reference to the idea of *relationship* as a theoretical contribution that appears in the foundation of two of the main Saussurean concepts, *langue* and system, draws our attention. The Prague Linguistic Circle, which, as we said, recognizes Saussurean ideas at its bases, has already shown us that a phoneme is only defined by a relationship of approximation and opposition with other phonemes in the system of a *langue*. It leads us, therefore, to accept the idea that the Genevan linguist directs his considerations to an axiological, relational perspective of *langage*, and never a dichotomous one.

And here comes the central point that emerges from our investigations on the matter: it is possible to say, to a large extent, that Saussure is profoundly influenced from the *neo-Kantian* ideas that, at the turn of the 19th century to the 20th century, emerged in Europe in response to the previous romantic view. If, in this case, *langue* scholars were concerned, as we have already said above, with a nationalist view of *langue*, as an instrument to be studied in order to be preserved and, perhaps, to find the supposed mother tongue that would have originated the others, after Saussure, language is seen as a system verifiable only in the collectivity, presentified in society. Thus, when studying a linguistic sign, it becomes possible to understand a good part of this system, since that element - sign - can only be defined in relation to others. This way, it would be the linguist's task to

---

[44] In Portuguese: "Desse modo, é notável a existência de um vínculo entre o processo de elaboração da Teoria do Valor e o movimento de construção da noção saussuriana de sistema. Esse vínculo, por sua vez, só pode ser efetivado pela noção de relação, a qual, segundo o que é exposto no conjunto de manuscritos, só existe devido ao valor, e pode ser notada no laço existente entre o sistema e o caráter trocável dos termos que o compõem."

describe such functioning in order to understand, to "make explicit the mechanism ignored by the 'speaking mass'" (Normand, 2009, p.47).[45] This mechanism, despite being ignored by the mass, is put to function at all times, and is essentially relational. This is the way the linguist proceeds because he refers to a speaker who is alive, circulating in society. This is the subject that emerges from Saussure's investigations, not that dead subject from the philological record:

> We start from this question: what does a linguist try to emphasize in his analysis of the *langue*? In each case, what makes a sequence mean to a speaker. Take the utterance 'Walk!': In itself, it does not mean, but in relation to 'we walked', 'he walks', 'I walk' ... (...) it depends on the choices allowed by the system, each one associating form and meaning in a specific way (Normand, 2009, pp.74-75).[46]

In the same vein as Normand's thought, we realize that Osvald Ducrot recognizes in his considerations the constitutive alterity of langue especially on the theory of value:

> The Course in General Linguistics, in the chapter on value, applies to the words of *langue* what Plato said about ideas. Opposition, for Saussure, is constitutive of the sign in the same way that alterity is, for Plato, constitutive of ideas. The value of a word - that is, its linguistic reality - is what opposes it to other words. Being is to be other (Ducrot, 2009, p.11).[47]

If it is relational, it is also subject to different views on the same object. Here, as stated by Craig Brandist (2018), a profoundly neo-Kantian vein by Saussure, whose maxim, *the point of view creates the object*, has become a paradigm for modern human sciences.

Obviously, we await a more in-depth study that recognizes Saussure's statement as part of a greater theoretical construct by the author, but there is no denying the epistemological place of encounter between the one who carries the weight of the

---

[45] In Portuguese: "explicitar o mecanismo ignorado pela 'massa falante'."

[46] In Portuguese: "Partimos desta interrogação: o que um linguista procura ressaltar em sua análise da língua? Em cada caso, o que faz que uma sequência signifique para um locutor. Tomemos o enunciado 'ande!': em si, ele não significa, e sim em relação a andem!, andemos!, eu ando... (...) depende das escolhas que o sistema irá permitir, cada uma delas associando forma e sentido de modo específico."

[47] In Portuguese: "O *Curso de linguística geral*, no capítulo sobre o valor, aplica às palavras da língua o que Platão disse sobre as ideias. A oposição, para Saussure, é constitutiva do signo da mesma forma que a alteridade é, para Platão, constitutiva das ideias. O valor de uma palavra – ou seja, sua realidade linguística – é o que a opõe às outras palavras. Seu ser é ser outro."

foundation of Modern Linguistics and Mikhail Bakhtin, who plays with the necessary dialogical *relationships* in the process of construction of the utterances by man. The axiological episteme, then, also crosses its conceptual elaboration:

> Bakhtin theorized the Kantian and Neo-Kantian sources in his texts, but the way he elaborated them reveals us his voice in a responsive dialogue with I. Kant and distinguishing himself from him and the voices of other philosophers. In the dialogical web, the overcoming of the Kantian a priori takes place by recovering the conception of the German philosopher E. Husserl who proposes the need for a social-historical apprehension that takes into account the real in its concreteness, in a constant trajectory of "returning to things in themselves" (Campos, 2015, pp.208-209).[48]

In this way, Bakhtin takes the Neo-Kantian principle of relations and, at the same time, anchors himself in a socio-historical aspect of man's action through *langage*. His theorizing about the genres of discourse, widely considered today as an object of *langage* studies is useful here as an example to illustrate this principle present in his conceptualization. At first, the classic definition of genres as "relatively stable types of these utterances" (Bakhtin, 1986, p.60) [49] elaborated in different spheres in society tells us a lot about the axiological character of this object, at least because it brings us to two characteristics of the genres:

a) that they only exist and can only be taken into account *in relation* to other genres that surround them in the same social sphere, or

b) that they only exist and can only be taken into account *in relation* to the genres that preceded them and that, in some way, feed them (back).

In other words, genres are the result of the complex social-ideological relationship between subjects in the same and at different times. The concept of *primary and secondary genres* can better clarify this complexity, since these, more complex and often mediated by writing, are, for the Russian author, the result of profound appropriations and mutations of those, more popular and from familial origin, and, therefore, usually of

---

[48] In Portuguese: "Bakhtin teorizou as fontes kantianas e neokantianas nos seus textos, mas a maneira como ele as elaborou nos revela a sua voz dialogando responsivamente com I. Kant e se distinguindo dele e das vozes dos outros filósofos. Na teia dialógica, a superação do a priori kantiano se faz recuperando a concepção do filósofo alemão E. Husserl que propõe a necessidade de uma apreensão histórico-social que leve em conta o real em sua concretude, numa trajetória constante de 'regresso às coisas em si'."
[49] For reference, see footnote 5.

an oral nature. It is possible, then, to recognize in a modern novel transmuted resonances of a more popular discourse, in the voice of a peasant character, for example, or even of a parodic discourse that deconstructs all the refinement of a bourgeois character, carnivalizing and ridiculing him.

The fragment below is a quote that Bakhtin makes from a novel by Turgenev, "Fathers and Sons," in order to illustrate this dissonant voice of the parody that deconstructs a bourgeois discourse:

> Pavel Petrovich sat down at the table. He was wearing an elegant suit cut in the English fashion, and a gay little fez graced his head. The fez and the carelessly knotted cravat carried a suggestion of the more free life in the country but the stiff collar of his shirt - not white, it is true, but striped as is correct for morning wear - stood up as inexorably as ever against his well-shaven chin (Turgenev *apud* Bakhtin, 1981, p.317).[50]

It is, therefore, evident a struggle of points of view, in Bakhtinian terms, in which, in opposition - and why not say, in *struggle* - with the bourgeois situation that is established in the scene in question ("He was wearing an elegant suit cut in the English fashion"), the marks of the peasant man are evident in the description made ("the stiff collar of his shirt ... stood up as inexorably as ever against his well-shaven chin"), downplaying the pompous style. Thus,

> Substantial masses of language are drawn into the battle between points of view, value judgements and emphases that the characters introduce into it; they are infected by mutually contradictory intentions and stratifications; words, sayings, expressions, definitions and epithets are scattered throughout it, infected with others intentions with the author is to some extend at odds, and through which his own personal intentions are refracted (Bakhtin, 1981, pp.315-6)[51]

As such, it is in alterity that the speaker's saying is produced. Whenever he *says* he does so in relation to the *other*: to the other with whom he speaks directly in the situation and to the distant other in time and space. And this is utterly relational in Mikhail Bakhtin. It is, then, in what we call here the *axiological episteme*, the Neo-Kantian vein, that we can speak of an encounter between Saussure and Bakhtin.

---

[50] For reference, see footnote 4.
[51] For reference, see footnote 4.

In a reinterpretation that we make here of Saussure, of Bakhtin about Saussure and, why not say, of Bakhtin himself, we would say that meaning and form would be, for both, in a dialogical relationship, by approximation and clash of meanings.[52] In addition, in time and space, *langue* would always acquire significant new contours under the constant (re) positioning of its subjects, that make use of its forms within the framework of a discursive genre, to signify. That is, there are always *langue* (re) updates, as Saussure states:

> Each time I say the word Gentlemen! I renew its substance; each utterance is a new phonic act and a new psychological act. The bond between the two uses of the same word depends neither on material identity nor on sameness in meaning but on elements which must be sought after and which will point up the true nature of linguistic units (Saussure, 2011, p.109).[53]

Thus, we never say the same word or the same statement in the same way, given the *relational* and, therefore, social nature of the elements of *langue*. And, even considering the local and temporal contexts of action of these two great authors who deeply influenced modern linguistics, there is no denying that episteme, as a meeting place for discursive practices, ends up bringing them together productively.

Final Considerations

We would again ask ourselves at the end of this text what the contributions of this possible Saussure-Bakhtin encounter for human sciences are, especially for Linguistics today. And we will go straight to the point by saying that the discursive genre (the novel, everyday genres etc.), an important Bakhtinian concept, could help us with this issue. It is because this *discursive structure* catalyzes social voices and puts them in relationship - heterodiscursivity -, in dialogue. Furthermore, as we said, genres would compose, in the

---

[52] However, we repeatedly will say that such an approximation can only occur in the episteme, that is, in that place where the relationships between discursive practices can occur, as Foucault (2010 [for reference, see footnote 38]) rightly said, by the resumption of certain discursivities that cross a determined time. This does not deprive one of considering the profound differences these theoretical practices present. That is, when we say that both authors see form and meaning in relation, we do it starting from a certain Neo-Kantian reading that, in a certain period of time, left marks in the processes of theorization and that, in contemporary times, undergoes resignifications.
[53] See footnote 1.

words of Todorov (2018), a kind of *genre system* (note here a reference to the Saussurean concept of system), in which a genre would be, in time and space, related by approximation and distancing with other genres.

It is also worth saying that a return to Saussure, as an author who constantly seeks to establish the bases of his concepts, can make us understand that meaning is relational, but not relativistic, as it always refers to a system that does not close in on itself, but points to the resignification by the speaker for each use he makes of it. Here, Bakhtin would be useful, then, with the conceptions of genre and its related concepts, since it is recognized as a place of "creative" action through *langage*, in which other meanings can be considered, although it functions under the constraints of a society that apparently acts to fix it.

We therefore lack researchers who, recognizing the (re) encounter as possible, produce new discursivities within the scope of human sciences, more specifically, of linguistic science. However, it seems certain that only those who take dialogism as a constitutive principle of *human life* will actually achieve it.

REFERENCES

ABLALI, D. Os manuscritos saussurianos nas teorias contemporâneas do texto e do discurso. *In*: CRUZ, M. A.; PIOVEZANI, C.; TESTENOIRE, P-Y. (Org.). *Saussure, o texto e o discurso*: cem anos de heranças e recepções. São Paulo: Parábola, 2016, p.125-148.

ARÁN, P. O. A questão do autor em Bakhtin. *Bakhtiniana*, São Paulo, Número Especial: 4-25, jan./jul. 2014. Disponível em: https://revistas.pucsp.br/index.php/bakhtiniana/article/view/17700. Acesso em: 16/10/2021.

BAKHTIN, Mikhail. *Teoria do romance I:* A estilística. Tradução, prefácio, notas e glossário Paulo Bezerra. Organização da edição russa Serguei Botcharov e Vadim Kójinov. São Paulo: Editora 34, 2015.

BAKHTIN, M. *Os gêneros do discurso*. Organização, tradução, posfácio e notas Paulo Bezerra. Notas da edição russa Serguei Botcharov. São Paulo: Editora 34, 2016.

BAKHTIN, M. *Problemas da poética de Dostoievski*. Tradução direta do russo, notas e prefácio Paulo Bezerra. 4. ed. rev. Rio de Janeiro: Forense, 2010.

BRAIT, B. A presença de Saussure em manuscritos de Mikhail Bakhtin. *In*: FARACO, Carlos A. (Org.). *O efeito Saussure*: cem anos do *Curso de linguística geral*. São Paulo: Parábola, 2016, p.91-109.

BRANDIST, C. Entrevista: Craig Brandist (Bakhtin Centre). Entrevista concedida a Patrícia Margarida Farias Coelho e Marcos Rogério Martins Costa. *Bakhtiniana*, São

Paulo, 13 (2), p.212-224, maio/ago. 2018. Disponível em: https://revistas.pucsp.br/index.php/bakhtiniana/article/view/32542/25433. Acesso em 16/08/2021.

CAMPOS, M. I. B. Compreensão sobre a arquitetônica em Bakhtin: fontes kantianas. *Organon*, Porto Alegre, v. 30, n. 59, p.199-210, jul/dez. 2015. Disponível em: https://seer.ufrgs.br/organon/article/view/56901 Acesso em 16/10/2021.

COELHO, M. P. Sistema e relação na teoria do valor de Ferdinand de Saussure. *Estudos Linguísticos*, São Paulo, 44, jan.-abr., 2015, p.135-147. Disponível em: https://revistas.gel.org.br/estudos-linguisticos/issue/view/26. Acesso em: 16/10/2021.

COSERIU, E. Sistema, norma e fala. *In*: COSERIU, E. *Teoria da linguagem e linguística geral*. Rio de Janeiro: Presença, 1979, p.13-85.

COSERIU, E. *Competencia linguística*: elementos de la teoría del hablar. Madrid: Editorial Gredos, 1992.

DUCROT, O. Prefácio. *In*: VOGT, C. *O intervalo semântico*. Campinas: Editora da Unicamp, 2009, p.11-20.

FARACO, C. A. *Linguagem & diálogo* – as ideias linguísticas do Círculo de Bakhtin. Curitiba: Criar Edições, 2003.

FOUCAULT, M. *A arqueologia do saber*. 7. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Forense Universitária, 2008.

MARCHESE, M. P. Une source retrouvée du *Cours de Linguistique Générale* de F. de Saussure. *Cahiers Ferdinand de Saussure. Revue suisse de linguistique générale*. Genève: Librairie Droz S.A, n. 56. p.333-339. Publicado por Cercle Ferdinand de Saussure, 2003.

NORMAND, C. Saussure-Benveniste. *Letras* – Revista do Programa de Pós-Graduação em Letras da Universidade Federal de Santa Maria, n. 33, dez. 2006, p.13-21. Santa Maria. Disponível em: https://periodicos.ufsm.br/letras/article/view/11920/7341. Acesso em 16/10/2021.

NORMAND, C. *Saussure*. Tradução de Ana de Alencar e Marcelo Diniz. São Paulo: Estação Liberdade, 2009.

NORMAND, C. Saussure: uma epistemologia da linguística. *In*: SILVEIRA, E. M. (ed.). *As bordas da linguagem.* Edufu: Uberlândia, 2011, p.11-30.

PEREIRA DE CASTRO, M. F. Ler os manuscritos saussurianos com o. *In*: FARACO, Carlos A. (Org.) *O efeito Saussure*: cem anos do *Curso de linguística geral*. São Paulo: Parábola, 2016, p.49-71.

SAUSSURE, F. *Curso de linguística geral.* Organização Charles Bally e Albert Sechehaye; com a colaboração de Albert Riedlingler; prefácio à edição brasileira de Isaac Nicolau Salum; tradução Antônio Chelini, José Paulo Paes e Izidoro Blikstein. 27. ed. São Paulo: Cultrix, 2006.

SAUSSURE, F. *Escritos de linguística geral*. Organizado por Simon Bouquet e Rudolf Engler. Tradução de Carlos Augusto L. Salum e Ana Lucia Franco. São Paulo: Cultrix, 2002.

SECHEHAYE, A. *Les trois linguistique saussuriennes*. Vox Romanica, 1940.

SÉRIOT, P. *Voloshinov e a filosofia da linguagem*. Tradução: Marcos Bagno. São Paulo: Parábola, 2010.

SILVEIRA, E. M.; SÁ, I.; FERNANDES, C. A. Problemas da autoria em Ferdinand de Saussure: do percurso intelectual à constituição da obra. *Leitura, Maceió*, v. 1, no 62, p. 235–254, 2018 Disponível em: https://www.seer.ufal.br/index.php/revistaleitura/article/view/5080. Acesso em 16/10/2021.

TESTENOIRE, P-Y. O que as teorias do discurso devem a Saussure. *In*: CRUZ, M. A.; PIOVEZANI, C; TESTENOIRE, P.-Y. (Org.). *Saussure, o texto e o discurso*: cem anos de heranças e recepções. São Paulo: Parábola, 2016.

TODOROV, T. *Os gêneros do discurso*. Tradução Nícia Adan Bonatti. São Paulo: Editora Unesp, 2018.

VOLÓCHINOV, V. (Círculo de Bakhtin). *Marxismo e filosofia da linguagem*. Problemas fundamentais do método sociológico na ciência da linguagem. Tradução, Notas e Glossário Sheila Grillo; Ekaterina V. Américo. Ensaio introdutório Sheila Grillo. São Paulo: Editora 34, 2017.

Statement of Authorship and Responsibility for Published Content

We declare, for due purposes, that we, the authors Luiz Eduardo Mendes Batista and Stefania Montes Henriques, actively participate – and equally – in the entire process of planning, writing and reviewing this article.

Translated by Bruno Turra – bruno.m.turra@gmail.com