

**90 Years of *Problems of Dostoevsky's Art* (1921-2019): The Text in its Time and in our Own / 90 anos de Problemas da criação de Dostoiévski (1929-2019): o texto em seu e em nosso tempo**

The Russian thinker Mikhail Bakhtin published his first book in 1929 under the title *Проблемы творчества Достоевского* [*Problems of Dostoevsky's Art*], a book which, despite the marginal situation experienced by the author in the soviet academia in the 1920s, gave rise to a series of reviews both inside and outside the Soviet Union.<sup>1</sup> The subtlety and the depth of the stylistically analysis conducted by Bakhtin had immediate effect on the soviet and even on the foreign literary criticism at the end of the 1920s – although severe criticism was also directed to his thesis on the creation of the polyphonic novel by Fyodor Dostoevsky, seen as “an ideology that determines its artistic form, its novelistic construction exceptionally complex and entirely new”<sup>2</sup> (БАХТИН, 1929, p. 4). *Problems of Dostoevsky's Art* was considerably expanded and published in 1963 under *Проблемы поэтики Достоевского* [*Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*]. This edition was translated in several countries, into many languages, including Brazil in the beginning of the 1980s by the well-known translator and Slavist Paulo Bezerra.

In 2018, Sheila Grillo conducted a research internship at the Maxim Gorky Literature Institute in Moscow, sponsored by FAPESP and supervised by Andrei Kofman, to collect materials for her translation and the introductory essay of *Проблемы творчества Достоевского* [*Problemas da criação de Dostoiévski/Problems of Dostoevsky's Creation*] (1929). The translation, assisted by Ekaterina Vólkova Américo (UFF), started in January 2018 when it was also proposed the organization of an International Colloquium dedicated to Bakhtin's 1929 work on Dostoevsky. The event took place from 26 to 28th November 2019 at Universidade de São Paulo [University of São Paulo], sponsored by FAPESP and USP, attended by researchers, undergraduate and graduate students from Brazilian and Russian universities. The event title “90 anos de *Problemas da obra de Dostoiévski*” [*90 years of Problems of Dostoevsky's work*] (1929-

---

<sup>1</sup> Grillo (2019) published analyses, full and partial translations of said reviews.

<sup>2</sup> In Portuguese: “a ideologia que determinou sua forma artística, sua construção romanesca excepcionalmente complexa e totalmente nova.” In Russian: “идеология, которая определила его художественную форму, его исключительно сложное и совершенно новое романное построение.”

2019) reveals that, at the time, the translators planned to translate the Russian word *творчество*, noun derived from the Russian verb *творить* [create] according to the only translation available until then: the Italian version *Problemi dell'opera di Dostoevskij* (1997). Despite the possibility of translating the term as “work/obra”, discussions with Russian, Brazilian scholars and even one Spanish Slavist led the translators to choose “creation/criação” based on the morphology of the word in Russian and on the meaning of the word as an author’s active process, which completely agrees with the Bakhtinian approach to Dostoevsky’s short stories, novellas and novels. *Problemas da criação de Dostoiévski [Problems of Dostoevsky’s creation]* is in the final pre-publication stage at Editora 34, with release estimated to March 2021.

During the Colloquium, two books were released: a translated compilation of essays, articles, reviews and poems by Valentin Voloshinov: *A palavra na vida e a palavra na poesia [The word in life and the word in poetry]* (2019) and the collection *Linguagem e conhecimento [Language and Knowledge] (Bakhtin, Voloshinov, Medvedev)* (BRAIT; PISTORI; FRANCELINO, 2019),<sup>3</sup> two works that state the presence and relevance of the concepts, ideas and methods developed by Bakhtin and the Circle. The collection of Voloshinov’s works is reviewed in the present issue by Heber de Oliveira Costa e Silva (Universidade Federal de Pernambuco), who conducts a careful critical and well-supported analysis in the light of authors such as Faraco, Sériot and Geraldi.

In addition to round tables with Russians and Brazilian researchers, the Colloquium also promoted oral presentations of professors, researchers, graduate and undergraduate students from several Brazilian and foreign universities, a number of which were submitted as articles to the journal *Linha d'Água* and, after due review, composed the issue 33 (3), 2020.<sup>4</sup>

The works presented during the round tables in the Colloquium by researchers from several regions in Brazil and Moscow (Andrei Kofman, vice-director and researcher at the Maxim Gorky Literature Institute, where Bakhtin defended his thesis on Rabelais in 1946; Svetlana Dubrovskaya and Nikolai Vasiliev, both professors at the State University of Saransk, where Bakhtin worked from the second half of the 1940s until the

---

<sup>3</sup> A review of the book can be read in Barbosa (2020).

<sup>4</sup> See Editorial at <https://www.revistas.usp.br/linhadagua/issue/view/11597/1904> Access on 27/01/2021.

beginning of the 1960s) were submitted to reviewers at *Bakhtiniana, Revista de Estudos do Discurso* and after meticulous peer-review, were edited to compose the present issue.

The articles gathered here revolve around four axis:

1) The critical reception of *PDA* and *PDP* in the Soviet Union, Russia and abroad. The works on this axis focus on the collection, systematization and discussion of critical reviews, analyses and citation of these works in bibliographies in different parts of the globe, with highlights to Brazil and to the Soviet Union, Russia.

This first axis comprehends the article entitled “Бахтин почти мой товарищ...: специфике последней волны русской рецепции “Проблем творчества Достоевского”[ “Bakhtin and I Had Almost Been Colleagues...”: on the Specificity of the Last Wave of the First Russian Reception of *Problems of Dostoevsky’s Art*], in which Svetlana Dubrovskaya (Ogarev Mordovia State University – Saransk, Russia) divides the reception of that work into two stages: the first, from 1929 to 1930, consists of the reviews published immediately after the publication; and the second, from 1940 to 2010, which received more of Dubrovskaya’s attention. By connecting these two stages or “waves” (“волны”, the author’s word), Dubrovskaya argues that the article-review by Lunacharsky (1929) played a key role in the reception of *Problems of Dostoevsky Art* since his academic and political prestige (he was appointed member of the People's Commissariat for Education, the soviet Ministry of Education) made the article-review be reedited in collections of Lunacharsky’s works and become regularly cited by specialists who analyzed the contribution of Bakhtin’s work on Dostoevsky.

Dubrovskaya sets the beginning of the second wave of reception in the process of defense of Bakhtin’s thesis on Rabelais, in 1946, when his book on Dostoevsky is cited by members of the thesis committee at the Maxim Gorky Literature Institute in Moscow and by Viktor Vinogradov, a prominent linguist and soviet literature theorist, member of the Higher Attestation Commission (Высшая аттестационная комиссия).<sup>5</sup> Throughout the 1950s, Bakhtin’s work on Dostoevsky is cited several times and often remembered due to the growing interest in Fyodor Dostoevsky’s work, although his thesis on polyphony and on the role of the author in Dostoevsky’s novels generated disagreement among literature theorists who mention Bakhtin, among who Viktor Shklovsky, the famous pioneer of the Russian formalism, still deserves attention. Dubrovskaya

---

<sup>5</sup> Higher Attestation Commission is a name of a national government agency in Russia. It exists since Soviet Union until nowadays and oversees awarding of advanced academic degrees.

summarizes the relevance of his work at the end of her article: “when taken in their entirety, the responses to *Problems of Dostoevsky’s Art* allow for the elucidation and clarification of details, completing and detailing episodes of the dialogue between Bakhtin and his opponents.”

Also on this first axis is the memorialist approach of the awarded fiction writer, literature theorist and professor Cristovão Tezza (Universidade Federal do Paraná). In his article, *Bakhtin – a Personal Memoir*, recalls that in the passage from the 1970s to the 1980s, the Brazilian academic setting, both in language and literature studies, was dominated by a formal-rational trend that decreed as main guideline for the literary theory “extract , as irrelevant, anything from the text that is not literature, and then you will arrive at the essence of the aesthetic object” and announced the death of the novel. By revealing his discomfort and disagreement with this notion of literature, Tezza narrates his first contact with Bakhtin’s work: the reading of the second chapter of *Discourse in the Novel*. In the hands of the fiction writer and language and literature scholar, the chapter dislocated the conception of the essence of prose as analysis of the compositional construction onto another field: “when writing, what do I do with the voice of the other?”. The writer and literature theorist also mentions the many dimensions of Mikhail Bakhtin’s works – the philosophical, political-Marxist, mystical, religious, linguistic and the literature theory – to end his memories with the presentation of his own conception of literature elaborated in dialogue with Mikhail Bakhtin’s texts, in which the complex notions of dialogism and polyphony are central.

In the article *Bakhtin and Lunacharsky: A Dialogue*, João Vianney Cavalcanti Nuto (Universidade Nacional de Brasília) investigates the dialogue between Bakhtin and Lunacharsky not exclusively but mostly through the review *О многоголоности Достоевского* [On Dostoevsky’s “Multivoicedness”] (1929). This article-review was important for the 1963 re-elaboration of Bakhtin’s book on Dostoevsky and – due to the author’s political and academic prestige and his overall positive critique of Bakhtin’s work –, in the reduction of Bakhtin’s sentence in 1930 and in the defense of his doctoral thesis on Rabelais in 1946. In these two situations, Lunacharsky’s review is cited in documents as proof of the work’s quality and Bakhtin’s scientific recognition. João Vianney’s analysis is great and he points the major aspects of the dialogue between Bakhtin and Lunacharsky, between Lunacharsky and the said Russian formalists and futurists, between Bakhtin/Medvedev/Voloshinov and Lunacharsky, on the one hand, and

the formalists on the other. This provides a better understanding of the specificity of the Bakhtinian thought and the Circle.

2) Analysis of translations of *PDA* and *PDP* in several languages with highlights to the translators' choices, the several peri-textual elements (forewords, glossaries, notes etc.), the translations theories employed etc.

This axis presents the article by Beth Brait (Pontifícia Universidade Católica de São Paulo/Universidade de São Paulo and CNPq) *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics: Reception in Brazil*. Based upon the concept of "retranslation," the author analyzes what she calls framing texts (forewords, afterwords, leaf, etc.) of Bakhtin's works on Dostoevsky, the first to be translated directly from the Russian in Brazil, published in 1981, by the translator and renowned Slavist, Paulo Bezerra. Brait aims to investigate how the retranslations have modified the access to the knowledge produced in the source-language in a certain time-space by looking at target-language translations from different time-spaces and cultures. Taking the five Brazilian Editions of *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, Brait describes and analyzes how these frame-texts reposition, reinterpret and reformulate Bakhtin's works and concepts, as they reveal the ever-growing presence – in these frame-texts – of the translator's voice: at once individual and social, subjective and representative of a scientific community in a given time and space.

In the article *The Concept of Hidden Polemic in Two Editions of Bakhtin's Work on Dostoevsky*, Maria Inês Batista Campos (Universidade de São Paulo) pertinently compares the Italian translation of *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics* [Problemi dell'opera di Dostoevskij, 1929/1997] to the Brazilian translation [*Problemas da poética de Dostoiévski*, 2015/1963]. She concentrates on the analysis of *Notes from the Underground* [1984] to explore the polemic in the protagonists' inner discourse. At first, the author exposes the changes in the organization and in the epistemological focus (the passage from the sociological method to metalinguistics, among others) between the editions, 34 years apart. Then, Campos compares the Bakhtinian analysis of the hidden polemic in Dostoevsky's novel *Notes from the Underground*, conceived as an active type of double-voiced word that unfolds in the protagonist's inner discourse as well as in the several dimensions of social life of his time.

3) The discussion of concepts formulated in that work: polyphony, voice, dialogism, dialogue, dialogic relationships, word/discourse, monologic novel, polyphonic novel, parody, stylization, open and hidden polemic, etc.

This axis embraces the article by Andrei Kofman (Maxim Gorky Literature Institute) Следуя путями Бахтина... [Following the paths of Bakhtin...], in which the Bakhtinian concepts of “пороговое пространство” [threshold space] and “кризисное время” [crisis time] clarify the development by Kofman of two opposite pairs “замкнутое пространство” [closed space] and “открытое пространство” [open space] to operate an analysis of the first and probably the most popular of Dostoevsky’s novels *Преступление и наказание* [*Crime and Punishment*]. It is enriching to observe how Andrei Kofman, a notorious Russian literature theorist and Hispanist, understands the specificity of the works of Mikhail Bakhtin: (i) His thought is at once accurate and open to complement and development; (ii) In the works *Problem of Dostoevsky’s Art/Poetics* (1929/1963), the open nature of Bakhtin’s ideas correspond to the nature of Dostoevsky’s characters, that is, their inner unfinishedness and capacity to resist any external conclusive determination; (iii) The anti-dogmatism as basic principle, that is, Bakhtin does not wish to claim the ultimate truth, but to point ways through which it is possible and necessary to continue discovering; this principle can explain the global publicization of his works around the world. Analyses of excerpts of the novel allow Andrei Kofman to show how Dostoevsky intentionally builds the novel based on the opposite pairs cited above to reach the Biblical text that supports the novel: a paraphrasis of Lazarus resurrection, in the sense of the metaphorical reproduction of the plot or some of its basic elements. Although he does not use the concept of “dialogic relationship,” Kofman demonstrates originally how to come to the genetic relation between utterances of distinct genres.

In her article, The Concept of the Ideologeme in the Artistic Creation of Dostoevsky’s Work, Irene Machado (Universidade de São Paulo) develops and formulates one of the concepts that we have already mentioned which is, in our perspective, little elaborated in the whole of Bakhtin’s, Medvedev’s and Voloshinov’s works: The ideologeme. The author proposes, with originality and consistency, that the ideologeme is conceived as “movement of ideas in which ideology manifests as a potential source of forms,” that is, it concerns the creative aspect without which ideology cannot occur. Excerpts of Fyodor Dostoevsky’s *Crime and Punishment*, *The idiot* and *Karamazov Brothers* are analyzed to counterpose the ideology that generates forms of representation guided by monologue to the ideology that generates forms according to the dialogical-polyphonic principle – the latter of which leads the creation of the Russian novel. According to Machado, in the ideology that generates forms of the dialogical-

polyphonic composition, the idea is embodied in positioned intonations of discursive subjects whose ideologemes, generated in the process of discursive interaction between consciousness, consecrate them as ideologues. Ideologemes that generate forms in Dostoevsky novels answer not only to their time and space, but dialogue with the great time to reveal new layers of meaning.

In the article *Comparative Discourse Analysis in Brazil: A Reflection from the Notion of Category*, Daniela Nienkötter Sardá (FAPESP-Diálogo-USP) develops a reflection of fundamental epistemological nature on the notion of “category” – a word that is frequently employed in analyses but, as we see it, not very clearly – in the Bakhtinian metalinguistics and *Comparative Discourse Analysis (CLESTHIA - axe sens et discours*, Paris III). The author shows the polyphony – sometimes contradictory, in our opinion – in the use of the word by French and Brazilian researchers, allowing for a more conscious and controlled use of “category,” which is of great relevance for *Comparative Discourse Analysis*, *Dialogic Discourse Analysis* and *Discourse Analyses* of several types (French, critical, Anglo, etc.).

The introduction of the concepts of “dialogic relationships” and “double-voiced discourse” and their re-elaboration in the analysis of written interactions between author and proofreader are the focus of the article by Vanessa Fonseca Barbosa - *Dialogic Relationships and Double-voiced Discourse in the Working Activity of the Proofreader in Academic Thesis: Tensions and/in Meaning Making* (Universidade de São Paulo). That activity, which is increasingly more present in the scientific sphere is also little investigated, and Vanessa’s article brings examples and analyses of the tensions and compromises between author and proofreader. It also shows that the proofreader’s work goes beyond the grammar check of texts.

The concepts of open and hidden polemic as an active type of word or double-voiced discourse guide the analyses of Pedro Farias Francelino (Universidade Federal da Paraíba) in *In the (Mis/Re)Encounter of Voices: The Dialogical Construction of the Polemic in Utterances with a Political-Religious Theme*. By analyzing two political-religious Facebook posts, the author shows the relevance of the concepts aforementioned to describe, understand and interpret contemporary utterances; he also identifies clearly and accurately the founding axiological positions of the current Brazilian debate that occurs in the crossing of the political, religious and mediatic ideologic spheres (or spheres of human activity).

4) The recovery of the production contexts for *PDA* (1929) and *PDP* (1963), with highlights to the Russian, Soviet and European academic setting, constituted by philosophers, literature theorists, psychologists and linguists whose works joined the founding dialogue of the Bakhtinian thought.

In this direction, Nikolai Vasiliev (Ogarev Mordovia State University), in the article Читательские заметки по поводу книги М. М. Бахтина *Проблемы творчества /поэтики Достоевского* [Readers' Notes on the Book by M. M. Bakhtin *Problems of Dostoevsky's Creation/Poetics*] defends that, currently in Russia, this book represents a fact in the history of knowledge for Humanities in the Soviet Union regarding: (i) The veiled interaction between philosophy, philology and theology, in part; and (ii) The innovative approach of Dostoevsky's artistic system whose work was under ideological prohibition in the middle of the 20<sup>th</sup> century in the Soviet Union. By observing these two aspects, Vasiliev aims to highlight the circumstances that are implied, not explicit, in Bakhtin's book on Dostoevsky published in 1929.

The first implied circumstance is the impossibility – stated by Bakhtin during an interview to Kojinov and Botcharov (Soviet literature theorists responsible for publishing Bakhtin's works since the 1960s) – of approaching philosophical and religious themes in Dostoevsky's work, due to the Soviet atheism and Marxism. The second is the “eclectic” (Vasiliev's word) articulation between Marxist and religious foundations to the conception of human consciousness. The third is the influence of structuralism on Bakhtin's late method through binary categories present in the carnival: face and back, youth and old age, life and death, wisdom and stupidity, etc. Still regarding Carnival, Vasiliev highlights his absence in *Problems of Dostoevsky's Art* (1929) and his active presence in *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics* (1963). Next, Nikolai cites three circumstances related to the proposition of metalinguistics: the claim by Bakhtin that one of the origins of the discipline is found in the German thinker Karl Vossler and his disciples; the distinction between philosophy of language and metalinguistics; and an older origin for the discipline proposed by Bakhtin set in the ancient Greco-Latin thought. Then, the rise and crystallization of the notion of “большое время” [great time] in Bakhtin's works since the 1940s is highlighted. Further on, the change from “творчество” [Art] (1929) to “поэтика” [Poetics] (1963) in Dostoevsky's books reveals Bakhtin's intention of placing literary and stylistic issues on a primary level, rather than biographical and contextual aspects of the author's production. It is important to conclude



with some of Vasiliev's final words on the multiple scientific "voices" with which the Bakhtinian thought has dialogued with: the ancient Greco-Roman, the Christianity, Western Europe, the Pre-Revolutionary, the Soviet and, in part, even the Structuralist.

The article by Ekaterina Vólkova Américo (Universidade Federal Fluminense), *The Religious Subtext in Problems of Dostoevsky's Creation: from the Union of All Mankind to Polyphony*, brings forth an important aspect of Bakhtin's text on Dostoevsky still unacknowledged and little explored in Brazil: its veiled dialogue with Russian religious philosophers. This dialogue leads the way to new dimensions of the difficult Bakhtinian notion of polyphony:

the ideal of the universal union of Solovyov, Merezhkovsky, Volynsky and Ivanov confronted with the observation of the dark depths of the human soul in the work of Mikhaylovsky and Shestov; the primacy of individuality and its unfinished character, highlighted by Rozanov; the author's contemplative position, observed by Ivanov, as well as the method of penetrating the alien self; the freedom of choice that Dostoevsky attributes to the characters and which, in Berdyaev's conception, manifests itself in their split character; the idea of extending the musical concept of polyphony to the entire artistic sphere, suggested by Ivanov (p.277).

Volkova ends her article by citing paintings of famous Russian artists (*The Appearance of Christ before the People*, 1957) by Aleksandr Ivanov; and *A Religious Procession in Kursk Gubernia*, 1883 by Ilya Repin) to demonstrate how we can understand the Bakhtinian concept of polyphony better and more deeply if we consider the great questions of the Russian culture in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, particularly the religious themes, such as: the crisis of faith and isolation and the conflict between individualism and the ideal of *sobornost* (universal fraternity)

Finally, this axis also includes the article *Problems of Dostoevsky's Creation* (1929): *Genesis of the Text and Bibliographic Sources*, in which Sheila Grillo (Universidade de São Paulo and CNPq) deepens the understanding of the polyphonic novel, proposed by Bakhtin for the first time in *PDA* (1929), by investigating the genesis of the text as well as Russian and Soviet interlocutors from two fields: literary criticism/theory and philosophy. An essential development in the article is the verification that, despite the fact that Bakhtin was not the first to propose that polyphony, the counterpoint of voices and the relation I/Other were the guiding principles of Dostoevsky's art, his polyphony theory demonstrated, through stylistic and metalinguistic

analysis supported by concrete examples from Dostoevsky's novels, how these philosophic, ideological, anthropological and political principles acquired or, as formulated above by Irene Machado, generated an artistic form.

In addition to the articles, many of which refer to the Bakhtinian works originally published in Russian, below are the works and essays of the Bakhtin Circle published in each of the Russian volumes of the Collected Works, with the respective translation in Portuguese and English versions (see Grillo, 2009, pp.170-174).

Editor Year	Volume	Titles in Portuguese	Titles in English
BOTCHARÓV, S. G.; GOGOMÍCHVILI, L.C. 1997	Vol. 5	Por uma metodologia das ciências humanas, <i>Questões de estilística no ensino de língua</i> ; Os gêneros do discurso; O texto na linguística, na filologia e em outras ciências humanas.	Toward a methodology for the Human Sciences Dialogic Origin and Dialogic Pedagogy of Grammar. Stylistics in Teaching Russian Language in Secondary School The Problem of Speech Genres The Problem of the Text in Linguistics, Philology and the Human Sciences: An Experiment in Philosophical Analysis
BOTCHARÓV, S. G.; MIÉLIKHOVA, L.C. 2000	Vol. 2	<i>Problemas da criação de Dostoiévski</i> (1929) Anotações de aulas de literatura russa e os prefácios de Bakhtin para edições russas de Tolstói, escritos e publicados nos anos 1920.	Comments and notes on Dostoevsky  No English translation
BOTCHAROV, S. G.; GOGOMÍCHVILI, L. C. 2002	Vol. 6	<i>Problemas da poética de Dostoiévski</i> (1963), Trabalhos dos anos 1960-1970 e anotações de cadernos sobre o livro de Dostoiévski.	<i>Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics</i>
BOTCHARÓV, S. G.; NIKOLÁIEV, N.I. 2003	Vol. 1	Arte e responsabilidade <i>Por uma filosofia do ato responsável</i> O autor e o personagem na atividade estética O problema da forma, do conteúdo e do material na criação artística verbal Notas de aulas e cursos ministrados por Bakhtin na primeira metade dos anos 1920.	Art and Answerability Author and Hero in Aesthetic Activity The Problem of Content, Material, and Form in Verbal Art
POPOVA, I. L. (Org.) 2008	Vol. 4 (01)	François Rabelais na história do realismo (1940), Materiais para o livro sobre Rabelais (1930- 1950) - Comentários e anexos para a defesa: pareceres de membros da banca, estenograma da defesa, cartas etc.	Comments and notes on the thesis about Rabelais and his world
POPOVA, I. L. 2010	Vol. 4 (02)	<i>A cultura popular na Idade Média e no Renascimento</i> . O contexto de François Rabelais (1965) Comentários e anexos	<i>Rabelais and His World</i>
BOTCHAROV, S. G.; KOJINOV, V. V.	Vol.3	A teoria do romance: O discurso no romance; As formas do tempo e do cronotopo no romance; Sobre a pré-história do discurso romanesco; O romance como gênero literário. Neste volume, estão os textos traduzidos para o português sobre a teoria do romance.	Discourse in the Novel From the Prehistory of Novelistic Discourse Epic and Novel Forms of Time and of the Chronotope in the Novel

*M. M. Bakhtin: Sobránie sotchinienií - Obras reunidas – Collected Works*

As the readers can attest, this is a very special issue that, to celebrate the 90 years of the important *Problems of Dostoevsky's Art*, gathers Brazilian researchers of seven

different universities (USP, PUC-SP, UFPR, UNB, UFF, UFPB, UFPE) and two Russian universities (Maxim Gorky Literature Institute in Moscow and Ogarev Mordovia State University – Saransk, Russia). We invite all readers to savor and include in their research this set which, once again, grants *Bakhtiniana* the opportunity of actively engaging in the cultural and academic lives, both from Brazil and abroad. The number of submissions, as well as their rigorous selection, carried out by competent and collaborative Editorial Board and *ad hoc* peer-reviewers, has allowed for this excellent result to be achieved: *Bakhtiniana* remains steadfast in its commitment to always promoting dialogical possibilities among research devoted to language studies.

Finally, in this issue, we should especially thank Jennifer Sarah Cooper (UFRN), Larissa de Pinho Cavalcanti (UFRPE), Paulo Rogério Stella (UFAL), Ubiratã Kickhöfel Alves (UFRGS) and Valéria Silveira Brisolará (UniRitter), Foreign Language Assistant Editors, as well as Carlos Júnior Gontijo Rosa (postdoc/FAPESP/PUC-SP). In a difficult moment, these editors and the researcher gave us a prompt, efficient and invaluable collaboration, without which this issue would not have been published. And our gratitude, once again, is also directed to the invaluable and constant support, assistance and recognition from PUC-SP, through their Plano de Incentivo à Pesquisa (PIPEq) [Research Incentive Plan] (PIPEq) / Publicação de Periódicos [Journal Publication] (PubPerPUCSP) – 2021, Request 18.937. And, we deeply regret, as well as the entire academic and scientific community, the extinction of support from CAPES and CNPq to Brazilian journals of excellence. This shows the current government disregards for science. Were it not for experts graceful help, this issue, which in addition to being bilingual (Portuguese-English) brings three trilingual articles, would not be possible.

## REFERENCES

- БАХТИН, М. М. М. *Проблемы творчества Достоевского* [*Problemas da criação de Dostoiévski*]. Ленинград: Прибой, 1929.
- BACHTIN, M. M. *Problemi dell'opera di Dostoevskij*. Tradução Margherita de Michiel e Augusto Ponzio. Bari: Edizioni dal Sud, 1997.
- БАХТИН, М. *Problemas da poética de Dostoiévski*. Tradução Paulo Bezerra. 5. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Forense Universitária, 2010.
- BARBOSA, V. F. Resenha: BRAIT, B.; PISTORI, M. H. C.; FRANCELINO, P. F. (Orgs.). *Linguagem e conhecimento (Bakhtin, Volóchinov, Medviédev)*. Campinas, SP:

Pontes Editores, 2019, 327p. *Linha D'Água* (Online), São Paulo, v. 33, n. 3, p.267-276, set.-dez. 2020.

BRAIT, B.; PISTORI, M. H. C.; FRANCELENO, P. F. *Linguagem e conhecimento (Bakhtin, Volóchinov, Medviédev)*. Campinas: Pontes, 2019.

DOSTOIÉVSKI, F. Memórias do subsolo. Tradução e prefácio de Boris Schnaiderman. 3. ed. São Paulo: Editora 34, 2000.

GRILLO, S. V. C. *Problemas da obra de Dostoiévski no espelho da crítica soviética e estrangeira. Revista da Anpoll* (Online), v. 1, p.176-196, 2019.

GRILLO, S. V. C. ; GUEDES-PINTO, A. L.; CAMPOS, M. I. B. (Eds.). Editorial. O autor e o ser humano por trás de *Problemas da criação de Dostoiévski* (1929). *Linha d'Água*, 33(3), p.1-23, set./ dez. 2020.

<https://www.revistas.usp.br/linhadagua/article/view/178177/165328> acesso em 27/01/2020.

ЛУНАЧАРСКИЙ [LUNATCHÁRSKI], A. B. О многоголонности Достоевского [Sobre a multivocalidade de Dostoiévski], *Новый мир*, n. 10, c.195-209, Москва, 1929.

MEDVIÉDEV, P. N. *O método formal nos estudos literários*. Introdução crítica a uma poética sociológica. Tradução Sheila de Camargo Grillo e Ekaterina Vólkova Américo. São Paulo: Contexto, 2012. [1928]

VOLÓCHINOV, V. N. (Círculo de Bakhtin). *Marxismo e filosofia da linguagem*. Problemas fundamentais do método sociológico na ciência da linguagem. Tradução Sheila Grillo e Ekaterina e Vólkova Américo. 2. ed. São Paulo: Editora 34, 2018. [1929]

VOLÓCHINOV, V. (Círculo de Bakhtin). *A palavra na vida e a palavra na poesia: ensaios, artigos, resenhas e poemas*. Organização, tradução, ensaio introdutório e notas S. Grillo e E. V. Américo). São Paulo: Editora 34, 2019.

Sheila Vieira de Camargo Grillo\*

Beth Brait\*\*

Maria Helena Cruz Pistori\*\*\*

Bruna Lopes-Duganani\*\*\*\*

Renata Philippov\*\*\*\*\*

Translated by Larissa de Pinho Cavalcanti - [laracvanti@gmail.com](mailto:laracvanti@gmail.com);  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3087-1881>

---

\* Universidade de São Paulo (USP), Departamento de Letras Clássicas e Vernáculas (DLCV), São Paulo, Brazil; CNPq Researcher; <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0480-2660>; [sheilagrillo@uol.com.br](mailto:sheilagrillo@uol.com.br)

\*\* Pontifícia Universidade Católica de São Paulo – PUCSP, São Paulo, São Paulo, Brasil; Faculdade de Filosofia, Comunicação e Artes - FAFICLA, Departamento de Ciências da Linguagem e Filosofia; Universidade de São Paulo - USP, São Paulo, São Paulo, Brazil; CNPq/Proc. 307028/2018-6 (Coordinator); <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1421-0848>; [bbrait@uol.com.br](mailto:bbrait@uol.com.br)

\*\*\* Associate Editor of *Bakhtiniana*. Revista de Estudos do Discurso, PUC-SP, São Paulo, São Paulo, Brazil; CNPq/Proc. 307028/2018-6 (Collaborator); <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0751-3178>; [mhcpist@uol.com.br](mailto:mhcpist@uol.com.br)

\*\*\*\* Universidade Federal Rural de Pernambuco – UFRPE, Unidade Acadêmica de Serra Talhada, Serra Talhada, Pernambuco, Brazil; <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9440-779X>; [blopesduganani@gmail.com](mailto:blopesduganani@gmail.com)

\*\*\*\*\* Universidade Federal de São Paulo – UNIFESP, Escola de Filosofia, Letras e Ciências Humanas, EFLCH, Departamento de Letras, Guarulhos, São Paulo, Brazil; <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3344-9034>; [renata.philippov@unifesp.br](mailto:renata.philippov@unifesp.br)