

**IN SEARCH OF THE KEYS OF NEW HUMANISM: BAKHTIN, THE  
KEYMAKER OF THE 21.<sup>ST</sup> CENTURY<sup>1</sup>**

**EM BUSCA DAS CHAVES DO NOVO HUMANISMO: BAKHTIN, O  
CHAVEIRO DO SÉCULO XXI**

**EN BUSCA DE LAS LLAVES DEL NUEVO HUMANISMO: BAKHTIN, EL  
LLAVERO DEL SIGLO XXI**

Valdemir Miotello<sup>2</sup>  
Ivo di Camargo Junior<sup>3</sup>  
Fábio Marques de Souza<sup>4</sup>

**Abstract:** In *Matrix reloaded* a very emblematic figure appears to give meaning to the plot: the Keymaker. In this essay we bring Mikhail Bakhtin as this Keymaker, a man whose philosophy leads us to new ways of thinking and to the constitution of a new human being, full of alterity and surplus of seeing the others. Just like the Matrix Keymaker, who had a key for every situation that appeared to himself, he was held prisoner by a character who brought evil together or the monologic discourse, the Merovingian, and in the end, he is released by Neo to help saving humanity, a similar path to the one who Bakhtin follows. Bakhtin's works reveal a deep sensitivity to the issues inherent to the human being. They, like their author, were kept prisoners of systems by means of which individual freedom was persecuted. Fortunately, the dialogue rescued Bakhtin, and his thoughts have also been appropriated and disseminated, so that we are incited to think about new ways of constituting men and worlds, senses and signs, languages, and structures. Comparisons and abstractions aside, what we have to say, to conclude, is that Bakhtin's contribution to a new humanism is unmistakable. His thoughts help us formulate a more equal and different human being at the same time. If the language unites us, Bakhtin used it to propose a new human being, in a relationship in which, the differences are constituting and in contrast, the similarities and inequalities are the uneven ones.

**Keywords:** Mikhail Bakhtin. Humanism. Alterity. Surplus of seeing.

**Resumo:** No filme *The Matrix reloaded* (Dirigido por Lana Wachowski Lilly Wachowski, 2003) uma figura muito emblemática surge para dar um sentido à trama: o chaveiro. Neste ensaio, apresentamos o filósofo russo da linguagem, Bakhtin, como esse chaveiro, um homem cuja filosofia nos leva a novas formas de pensamento e constituição de um novo ser humano, pleno de alteridade e de excedente visão sobre o outro. Assim como o chaveiro da Matrix, que tinha uma chave para cada situação que se apresentava, era mantido prisioneiro por um personagem que reunia em si o mal ou o discurso monológico, o Merovíngio, e no fim é libertado por Neo para ajudar a salvar a humanidade, Bakhtin percorre percurso semelhante. As obras de Bakhtin revelam uma profunda sensibilidade para as questões inerentes ao ser humano; elas, à

---

<sup>1</sup> A preliminary version of this text was published, in Portuguese, at *Revista de Letras Norte@mentos*, in 2012.

<sup>2</sup> PhD in Linguistics (UNICAMP). Universidade Federal de São Carlos - Brazil, [miotello@terra.com.br](mailto:miotello@terra.com.br)

<sup>3</sup> PhD in Linguistics (UFSCar). Universidade Federal de São Carlos - Brazil, [santacrocce@gmail.com](mailto:santacrocce@gmail.com)

<sup>4</sup> PhD in Education (USP). Universidade Estadual da Paraíba - Brazil, [fabiohispanista@gmail.com](mailto:fabiohispanista@gmail.com)



semelhança de seu autor, foram mantidas prisioneiras de sistemas onde as liberdades individuais eram perseguidas; felizmente a dialogia resgatou Bakhtin, e seus pensamentos também foram sendo apropriados e divulgados, de modo que somos instigados a pensar sobre novos caminhos constituidores de homens e de mundos, de sentidos e de signos, de linguagens e de estruturas. Comparações e abstrações à parte, o que temos a dizer, para concluir, é que a contribuição de Bakhtin para um novo humanismo é latente. Seus pensamentos nos ajudam a formular um ser humano mais igual e diferente ao mesmo tempo. Se a linguagem nos une, Bakhtin utilizou-se disso para propor um novo ser humano, numa relação na qual as diferenças é que são constituidoras e as semelhanças e as desigualdades é que são deformadoras.

**Palavras-chave:** Mikhail Bakhtin. Humanismo. Alteridade. Excedente de visão.

**Resumen:** En *Matrix reloaded* aparece una figura muy emblemática para dar sentido a la trama: el llavero. En este ensayo presentamos Bajtín como este llavero, un hombre cuya filosofía nos lleva a nuevas formas de pensar y de constituir un nuevo ser humano, lleno de alteridad y de un exceso de mirada sobre el otro. Al igual que el personaje del llavero en Matrix, quien tenía una llave para cada situación que se presentaba y fue retenido prisionero por el Merovingio, un personaje con un discurso maligno y monológico, Bajtín también sigue un camino similar. Sus obras revelan una profunda sensibilidad hacia cuestiones inherentes al ser humano. Al igual que su autor, Bajtín fue recluido en sistemas donde se perseguían las libertades individuales, pero afortunadamente la dialogía lo rescató y sus pensamientos fueron apropiados y difundidos para instigarnos a pensar nuevas formas de construir hombres y mundos, significados y signos, lenguajes y estructuras. Dejando de lado comparaciones y abstracciones, en conclusión, podemos decir que la contribución de Bajtín a un nuevo humanismo está latente. Sus pensamientos nos ayudan a formular una concepción de ser humano que sea igual y diferente al mismo tiempo. Si el lenguaje nos une, Bajtín lo usó para proponer una nueva concepción de ser humano basada en una relación en la que las diferencias son constitutivas y las similitudes y desigualdades son deformantes.

**Palabras-clave:** Mijaíl Bajtín. Humanismo. Alteridad. Exceso de visión.

In *Matrix reloaded* a very emblematic figure appears to give meaning to the plot: the Keymaker. To save Zion, or we could better say, to save the human, Neo, Trinity and Morpheus need to find the Keymaker. They must open the right door. But which door should they choose? The door that opens to the insistent opposition between humans and machines, which sets humans as machine gears, which turns them into threats to humanity and which considers them responsible for the negative dehumanization of man? It does not seem to take Neo and his friends to the end of the war. Or should they open the door that can possibly take the man to a new phase of coexistence and harmony with the other whoever this other might be? In this text we bring Bakhtin as this Keymaker, a man whose philosophy leads us to new ways of thinking and to the constitution of a new human being, full of alterity and surplus of seeing the others. A thinker who insists on the constitutive action of the language.

How can we infer that Bakhtin had thought of a new humanism, if this is not present in the works of the circle in a clear and direct way? Bakhtin, in one of his first writings, stated that *Art and life are not one, but they must become united in myself — in the unity of my answerability*. We believe that only when the person decides to insert art as a philosophical conception in his/her life is when a new humanism begins inside this person. But how can this person bring together life and art in him/herself, think dialogically, respect the alterity, maintain polyphonic discourses in him/herself and, finally, participate in the world as a new human being full of new contributions to give to others? To answer these questions, we will have to dive deeper into Mikhail Bakhtin's work.

In his article *Discourse on life and discourse on art* (1926), the Russian theorist engages in clarifying the difference between verbal communication in art and in everyday life. Therefore, we think there is a great contribution to a new humanism. In this essay, the author claims that art is an act of communication. Language, for the author, is not a finished process but a process to be. After all, the man is not born getting a tongue which is ready, finished and closed in itself. On the contrary, it enters his life trajectory in the middle of verbal communications that have existed, and still will exist, in the game of verbal interaction. Hence, we go back a long way in time, more precisely to the Greeks.

*Everything is on fire. Everything is water. No man baths twice in the same river.* Since the first philosophers asked themselves about the origin of things and about the meanings of the world, in fact, it began a real odyssey for the Language and, therefore, for the man himself. In addition, in the history of the study of language, Ferdinand de Saussure gained a significant role in the consolidation of this study as a science. Theoretically, there was a need to exclude from his project the referent, the world, the subject and the history. As he established the studies of language in a status of science, many theorists have, during the 20<sup>th</sup> century, returned to Saussure, either to complement him or to deny him.

However, other historical pathways show that man and language are inseparable, and they state that there is no science more anthropological than Linguistics. Thus, reflecting on linguistic phenomena is to meet with man in his essence because if only we could make a single statement about the world, we would say that the reality is entirely apprehended by the language and that only through it man becomes aware of himself and others.

For a while, the world has been silenced by various philosophical conceptions that put the human being in the limelight of their own existence. Capitalism and their Machiavellian gimmicks, the socialism of some more equal than others, the Marxism have not been understood or poorly studied, the philosophies that nothing explained and so on. We can say that these theories governed this human being who was normally silenced by dictatorships of controversial and monological thoughts. Even nowadays, we can see in the Linguistics academic field, our area of study, that diverse linguistic thoughts are known to many, but one does not yet see the libertarian beam of light that should lead language scholars to produce thoughts that connect life to language. The yoke of linguistic studies developed from systemic, normative views should end, so that language can be seen as the constituting of the human in a man.

Some scholars wonder: ‘what does a student from another field do in our area?’ Or they also might say: ‘my theory does not hold that kind of thought’; ‘a student who does not study this or that author, cannot be advised by me’. Or even, ‘if you have no experience in the field you will not be able to work competently with me’. Unfortunately, these are examples of many erroneous thoughts that only lead to the closure of new ideas of the future, and they also silence the voice of those who arise to try to see different paths.

To think of the new, we can seek in Bakhtin’s works ways not yet traced in language studies. It is possible that his deep respect for the human being may constitute different proposals for the study of language and life. Into his architectonic model, Bakhtin launched certain thoughts that help us see life itself and language from other angles. For instance, the aesthetic surplus of seeing is an important category and we should use it more often, so that we can better understand the relations of proximity and difference that we have with each other. This reinforces the understanding that we are emanated by the other, with whom we keep intimate relationships, but we also divide sets of the other that he/she is not aware of. In the same way, the other dominates constituent parts of me that I myself do not know. In fact, I am truly incomplete, so is the other; we both dominate each other's parts unknown to us; and this prevents the possibility of one being swallowed by the other; one cannot dominate entirely the other one; such wanted completeness is not possible. Then, the pursuit of completeness is founded and enduring.

Dialogism and alterity are important pillars in Bakhtinian architectonic view. Bakhtin understands and defines them in his works, not as concepts restricted to the



work of analyzing language elements, but as concepts to refer to a specific way of life. These categories also allow the construction of a way to relate to each other, to understand each other and to produce knowledge about the relationships and experiences that are formed in the act and in the context of human relations. This particular act of investigating, researching or interacting with the Other already presupposes and mobilizes relations of alterity, established between the researcher and the reality, between me and the other. Or even among other people we get to know in the future, open to the diversity of places and points of view, who meet and confront the trajectory of knowledge building. We can only understand identity, whatever it might be, in alterity relations. In conclusion, identity is relational, and it is the difference that tells who I am.

It is, therefore, in the *sphere of discourses* woven into social relations that we begin to perceive this new humanism indicated by Bakhtin. Matches and mismatches of values and worldviews happen and open us up to the possibilities for the knowledge of social life and subjective experience. Researching and trying to understand the human being, and its interfaces with cultural life, does not refer to an act of cognition and discourse under the exclusivity of the one you propose to meet. The subject, “object” of the knowledge, does not pose as a silent thing (BAKHTIN, 2000, p. 403), but as a subject who also speaks and responds, changing the course of events during the interaction. Here we can see a great contribution or a key from Bakhtin for a new humanism. We are here in the realm of studies and the experiences of a subject who speaks with another-subject-who-speaks. This minor dialogue, planted in the daily life of the human beings, expands to include in its boundaries a wide range of contexts. It is the man humanizing around him, making things in others, with whom he interacts, changing them continuously and being modified by others in an endless circle. Mediation is the language.

In this way, the dialogue is inexhaustible and does not only appear in the established process of verbal interaction, but it also goes through the discourses woven into the act of understanding and the various experiences and relations that give life to that process and that occur in life. Life is a braid. A braid that is made with thousands of relations. In each interaction a few available threads are taken to constitute the braid in that more immediate and precise context, which gives the tones and the appraisal intonations in that interaction. Thus, dialogism and alterity make the construction of sense in human relations, a shared event that only survives in relationship with the other.



Bakhtin also presses this new humanism, putting the philosophy of the dialogue or of the relation as the base of the dialogic principle. The word is stated as dialogic and it establishes relationships between human beings and finds the experience of the intersection of the interaction. For this philosophy, the man is not an individual being, but formed in a dialogical relation to the *Other*. The other is the condition of existence of the self because the reality of a man is the reality of the difference between himself and another man. The self does not exist individually, but as an opening to the other. It originates there from the constitution of the *founding pair* Me - Other.

The man, in search of his improvement, seeking for completeness in his own existence, ends in a true saga with or through the language and finds himself and the other in *the world of signs*. These form the creative spark. It is like the sacred fire that one builds with the other. It does not pass from one to the other, but it happens in the same relation. They constitute a bridge between Me and The Other. This bridge connects and moves away. It keeps heads apart and together; singular. The sign is a modified world. It is the *materiality* full of our history and with my perspectives. Inside them, there are my *points of view* and the way I see things. They are my *ideologies*.

Nevertheless, when we think of a dialogic universe, we can only perceive the language as a process and not as a product. The sign, then, in no way would only present a single, precise sense, because in it there is a crowd of voices, from the past, present, and even from the future to come. Given that a sense, whatever it is or has been, it cannot simply be erased because it merges with the substance onto which it was grafted. We would still point out, like Bakhtin, that every sense can one day be revived in a totally new socio-historical context. Nothing is lost forever, and nothing is guaranteed forever. In fact, it depends on the individuals at stake in precise situations.

It is also by means of reflecting on this constant movement of the human, the world and the language, that we can understand the close relation between the ethical and aesthetic world. As we take Bakhtin's studies and his circle as basis for our thoughts, we admit the great difficulty in looking at our object so that life and art can walk together in a mutual constitution in a way that they can be reciprocally liable or guilty of the sterility of the art or the trivial conversation of everyday life. Wherever there is an aesthetic process going on, there is also an ethical process accompanying it. What I say corresponds to what I am. My words come out of me completely and entirely bathed in myself. As I have already received them bathed in other selves, the sounds, the voices,

the values they constitute are *collective* ethical values, materializing the memory of us all, saying who we are. I am oblivious and proper. I am the Others and I am Myself.

The *ideological* aspect of the sign is a socio-historical product formed in the constant activity in the relation between the man and another man, mediated by or with the world. We cannot separate man and language, language and social, ethical and aesthetic, official ideology and everyday ideology. What we find in Bakhtin is a field of very sophisticated studies, composed of the changeable and the becoming. Like life itself, the language is always in a constant process of *re-signification*. If we stop the object or even if we make a very restrictive approach, it jeopardizes studying and living. Therefore, conceiving the language as non-ideological or a conscience able to be free from ideologies and social relations creates an abstract, non-real individual, living in an abstract, non-real world.

Upon sharpening our gaze, we will realize that the language, while presenting a certain degree of determination in its realization, in its essence is indeterminate. We can explain it: in each enunciative situation, the signs re-signify and are re-interpreted by the subjects participating in the verbal interaction. But if so, how can we communicate? We remember a question asked to Sofia, in *Sophie's World* (1991), by Jostein Gaarder: *why are all horses the same?* The answer seems to move towards a diachronic thinking that considers the situations in which that sign appeared, the meanings it acquired and which senses were more frequent in a given group of subjects. Therefore, all horses are the same because they have a certain idea for each natural genre determined by history. But all horses are different at the same time because they consist of precise contexts. Thus, the language is: *equal and different*, replicant and singular. We cannot reproduce the same context twice; bathing twice in the same river has still been impossible. And not only on the account of the river, but also on the account of the bather who is never the same, and the margins that always change, and the singing of the birds, always different, as well as the breeze and the light of the day and the fast or dark clouds.

For Bakhtin, the understanding of the ideological process takes place in the game between the *Official Ideology* and the *Everyday Life Ideology*. While the former indicates thoughts, visions, points of view, thinking and sayings already rooted in our society (the discourse of the church, politics, etc.), the latter would be the one that we see in everyday life and still does not have enough strength to become official and hegemonic. Both are in constant contact. While the Everyday Life Ideology feeds on the

Official Ideology, the Official one also feeds on the Everyday Life Ideology, to which it responds and refers. Therefore, we can see they live in human interactions and in signs exchanged at each event.

Now, we are going to think a little more deeply, sub thinking - beyond and below structural perspectives - thinking about this Bakhtin's humanism and put his reflections into a level closer to reality. To produce and build senses in the architecture of the Russian theorist is something that we eagerly intend. To look at Bakhtin with Bakhtinian glasses is to see the *ideology* that permeated the discussions of his circle to emerge in our everyday gaze before an official speech. What we call by language philosophy, discourse analysis, theory of literature, productions and fields of knowledge are so vast and dynamic, all of these can be gathered in this Bakhtin's humanism. Since he owns such vast work and vision of the world, he can dialogue with the different knowledge of the humanities and go into each other's entrails with one extra look, a surgical look that sees not only the other, but also the multitude of others who appear in front of us.

It's practically impossible to mark Bakhtin with a rating. As the poet Carlos Drummond says about love and we will contextualize here in Bakhtin, *Love escapes dictionaries and various regulations*. We think here, keeping the themes and the appropriate proportions, that Bakhtin runs away from dictionaries and various regulations, classifications, standards, and regencies. Bakhtin is kind of unclassifiable, as Professor Luciane de Paula would say (PAULA, 2013). We would kill his conceptions if we did. His philosophical, divine, language, aesthetic, and life conceptions would be thrown in the trash can. Classic thinkers like Kant (who influenced Bakhtin), Thomas Hobbes, Émile Durkheim, Max Weber among others, discussed and have made several studies about humanism, about the term *individual*, a subject about which there is a lot of arguing. Bakhtin shows that the basis of the most fruitful social relations is not in this *Me*, but it can be found in the relations between this *Me* and the *Other*. Nowadays the human being lives blindly faced with new orders of power that no one knows where it comes from or what role one will have in this new reality. The future is happening, as always, on the curve of history and events. It is hard to see much further. The distance is close. And the certainties are reduced.

Nowadays, Biology defends and affirms that the human being is his or her genome, which does not flee from a scientifically accurate truth. Man is the totality of his genes mapped and known in their proper functions, but Philosophy still raises questions over the biological explanation: would man be just that? Was the ontological,





theological, and social human being reduced to a biological challenge? Bakhtin comes to disprove this. He claims in *Freudism* (BAKHTIN, 2004) that it is not enough to be born but it is also necessary a second birth, the social one, which will place that individual and his or her speeches in a socio-historical context. We were not born to a self; we were born to be We.

This conflict between the Science that tries to explain man from inside to outside and the thoughts that deal with human relations and explain the man from outside to inside, all of these, remind us of Bakhtin's unquestionable insight in defining the centrifugal and centripetal forces as forming ideological human relations, and finally, the subject himself. At the beginning of the 20th century, Max Scheller wrote almost concomitantly with Bakhtin's works that in the history of more than 10,000 years, for the first time, man has become problematic for himself. *The man does not know who he is anymore, and he is not even aware of it*<sup>5</sup>.

In the face of this framework of widespread uncertainty and stubborn searches, we must take care of our *collective garden*, inventing a new way of acting in solidarity, to avoid the predictable path of social disruption as well as self-destruction. We are not talking about cultivating the garden as in Voltaire's *Candido*, that is, that each one takes care of his own private small business individually. It is about strengthening the awareness that man shares the same common home, which today is the Planet itself. The marked tendency to self-centeredness must balance itself with the idea that there is a common good to be built. Not only me, but we are the subjects of action and life on Earth. Therefore, a reform of the knowledge is necessary to make man able to understand the complexity of the universe and to overcome the stage of underdevelopment of the spirit in which he is imprisoned. We only apprehend partial and fragmentary aspects of reality, while vital problems escape from our field of vision. It is, in essence, to reunite humanist knowledge and scientific knowledge, giving way to a richer, but more complex way of thinking that provides us better solutions than those that tend to prevail today. It is in this context that we insert Bakhtin's thought.

Albert Einstein, Bakhtin's imminent contemporary physicist and thinker, had also stated in a letter to his friend Robert Marcus this search for the new human being. He said:

A human being is a part of the whole, called by us "Universe," a part limited in time and space. He experiences himself, his thoughts and

---

<sup>5</sup> A posição do homem no cosmos. Trad. Marco A. Casanova. Rio de Janeiro: Forense Universitária, 2003

feelings as something separate from the rest—a kind of optical delusion of his consciousness. The striving to free oneself from this delusion is the one issue of true religion. Not to nourish it but to try to overcome it is the way to reach the attainable measure of peace of mind. (CALAPRICE, 2011, p. 339-340).

Another fundamental view to deepen the understanding of processes of humanization concerns Bakhtin's contributions towards thinking of the learning process as a construction of meanings which presupposes incorporating, on one hand, the historical and cultural contexts and, on the other hand, the mental functions of the individual. The meanings would always be based on group life. That way, we reject the idea that a subject can hold a meaning in an individualized way. In the Bakhtinian view, social life defines the construction of the meanings. Life experiences and learning reflect our way of being in the community. Thus, the inner world and the reflection have a social audience, in the saying of Bakhtin *Through the word, I define myself in relation to the other, that is, ultimately analysis, in relation to the collectivity. The word is a kind of a bridge thrown between me and the other* (1997, p. 113).

This bridge, the word, has two faces: it comes from someone, and it is addressed to someone, characterizing itself as a link in a chain of meaning. It is therefore loaded with an ideological or experiential content or sense. Within this context, the author defines what he calls enunciation as the product of the interaction of two (or more) subjects. Deepening the social concept, Bakhtin alerts us to the fact that the text (understood here as any spoken or written statement) is dominated by several voices, i.e., by several talking subjects, who occupy a social place. It has two basic functions: to convey meanings and to generate new meanings. To this end, it introduces two fundamental concepts for the understanding of the discursive dynamics: the unambiguous and the dialogical functions. In the unambiguous function, in the transmission of meanings, the speaker and the listener coincide. It would be a text with a single voice, a text of authority. The dialogic function, in contrast, searches and manages to generate new meanings, as well as it presents itself as a device for thinking. This seesaw between different and inseparable poles manages to produce the new, starting from the already-given, already-said, already-lived, in junction with the not-yet given, said, or lived. That is the time and the accurate context of the present, fleeting time, moving experience in union with another moving experience.

The classroom can be identified as a favorable place to be analyzed from the Bakhtinian point of view in this process of searching for the new human being, since



the central objective is the construction of meanings in this new man, through speech. Within this perspective, we can identify, at least, two discursive genres: the everyday discourse (which is almost always presented in the student's voice) and the scientific discourse (presented almost always through the teacher's voice). Therefore, learning will take place in the clash held by these kinds of speeches. Building meaning in this little arena, the image coined by Bakhtin, requires an awareness in the Vygotskian sense both by the teacher and by the student, and of his social role and the goals you want to achieve.

The scientific context, generated in the history of ideas of the men and in the history of men from the old times, presents itself in the classroom after, as an authoritative text, tending towards singularity. In return, to build meanings about this same text it is necessary to incorporate the voices of the students that bring, in the turn, the everyday discourse, built on social practices and, thus, forming the basis of a new humanism and new understandings. In this way, the scientific discourse is deconstructed in the voices of the students, who use the text as an instrument of thinking and elaboration to create new meanings. As students start acquiring scientific knowledge in a process of understanding, their voices start becoming singular, stabilizing meanings. Hence, we can say that it is in a movement of alternation between singularity and dialogicity, expressed in the discursive tension of the search for meanings, that learning is being built and this new human is being formed.

Here, we are inferring more and more how we can define a new human being from Mikhail Bakhtin's theory. In this last example, we try to expose how it arises in the classrooms and better explanations can be researched in the texts of one of Bakhtin's greatest scholars in Brazil, João Wanderley Geraldi. But going back to the beginning of our text, when we contextualize Bakhtin and the Matrix Keymaker, what we try to expose throughout this text is that as the character in the film, who was constantly building keys to each situation that appeared, we see Bakhtin as an author whose theories appear in opportune moment when official speeches want to monologize the word. A key to each different situation is what we always realize. Marina Yaguello, in her Introduction to the book *Marxism and Philosophy of Language*, states that Bakhtin anticipated in over 50 years the discussions about the studies of language in humanity. This is a considerable achievement that is questioned by many, but there is no way that it can be minimized. Bakhtin had already been introduced to Structuralist France of the 1960s, when the structures, as it was said, didn't take to the streets. And it also



considered the action of the subject in and by language; he insisted that language was a constitutive activity. And that the subject is the subject of an action.

But, just like the Matrix Keymaker, who had a key for every situation that appeared to himself, he was held prisoner by a character who brought evil together or the monologic discourse, the Merovingian, and in the end, he is released by Neo to help saving humanity, a similar path to the one who Bakhtin follows.

Bakhtin's works reveal a deep sensitivity to the issues inherent to the human being. They, like their author, were kept prisoners of systems by means of which individual freedom was persecuted. Fortunately, the dialogue rescued Bakhtin, and his thoughts have also been appropriated and disseminated, so that we are incited to think about new ways of constituting men and worlds, senses and signs, languages and structures.

Comparisons and abstractions aside, what we have to say, to conclude, is that Bakhtin's contribution to a new humanism is unmistakable. His thoughts help us formulate a more equal and different human being at the same time. If the language unites us, Bakhtin used it to propose a new human being, in a relationship in which, as Geraldi would say, the differences are constituting and in contrast, the similarities and inequalities are the uneven ones. We want to close this article with a small excerpt from Bakhtin's work that we believe it supports our thoughts about this new humanism. *The text itself is not inert: if starting from any text, sometimes going through a long series of intermediaries' links, in the end we will always reach the human voice, so to speak, we will lean on man.* (BAKHTIN, 1998).

## REFERENCES

BAKHTIN, M. **Problemas da Poética de Dostoievski**. Rio de Janeiro: Forense Universitária, 1981.

BAKHTIN, M. **Estética da criação verbal**. 3. ed. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2000.

BAKHTIN, M. **Marxismo e Filosofia da Linguagem**. 8. ed. São Paulo: Hucitec, 1997.

BAKHTIN, M. **O Freudismo**. Um esboço crítico. Trad. de Paulo Bezerra. São Paulo, Perspectiva, 2004.

BAKHTIN, M. **A cultura popular na Idade Média e no Renascimento**: o contexto de François Rabelais. São Paulo - Brasília: Hucitec-EdUNB, 1996.



BAKHTIN, M. **Questões de literatura e estética**. A teoria do romance. 4. ed. São Paulo: UNESP, 1998.

BAKHTIN, M. (1926). **Discourse in life and discourse in art** – concerning sociological poetics. Publicada em *Freudism*, New York. Academic Press, 1976. (Discurso na vida e Discurso na arte – sobre poética sociológica. Trad. para uso didático de Carlos Alberto Faraco e Cristovão Tezza).

CALAPRICE, Alice (ed.). **The Ultimate Quotable Einstein**. Princeton; Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2011.

DI CAMARGO, I.; SOUZA, F. M.; SILVA, V. A. Possible paths for understanding human sciences with Mikhail Bakhtin. **Open Minds International Journal**, [S. l.], v. 1, n. 1, p. 1–7, 2020. DOI: 10.47180/omij.v1i1.13. Disponível em: <https://www.openmindsjournal.com/openminds/article/view/13> Acesso em: 27 dez. 2022.

PAULA, L. de. Círculo de Bakhtin: uma análise dialógica de discurso. **Revista de Estudos da Linguagem**, v. 21, n. 1, p.239-257, 2013. Disponível em: <http://hdl.handle.net/11449/125169>. Acesso em: 09 set. 2022.

*Submetido em: 30/12/2022*

*Aceito em: 24/03/2023*