

Bakhtin's Dialogue as Supply Chain Value of the Contemporary Humanities

Somkin Alexander A., Somkina Alla N.

National Research Ogarev Mordovia State University 68, Bolshevistskaya Str., Saransk, 430005, Russian Federation

Abstract The article gives a short review on fundamentally new ideas, which were advanced by Mikhail Bakhtin in different spheres of socially humanitarian cognition based on the supply chain strategy. It is about the supply chain strategy in philosophical anthropology and ethics. The idea of the integrated approach to the study of human; in social philosophy and axiology – the priority of universal humanistic values. In cultural studies – the unity and diversity of world culture and the importance of a constructive dialogue between nations; the theoretical foundations of the “laughter and carnival culture”; in literary criticism – a dialogic understanding of an author and a hero of a narration; in stylistics – the problems of modern speech genres and the meta-language of texts. In the given article we consider the principle of “dialogic thinking” as the main methodological discovery made by M. Bakhtin. Based on the method of logical extrapolation, the authors put forward the provisions on the further development of Bakhtin’s principle of “dialogical thinking” in its relation to the current humanitarian problems.

Keywords: Bakhtin, supply chain values, dialogism, cultural studies, paradigm

1. Introduction

to the efficient supply, are prior to the market mediation functions, i.e. supply and demand matching [1]; and 2) these echelons can have convergent and divergent interactions [2], and are characterized by a value-adding process, information inputs, disturbances, and a decision-making process. At present days it is impossible to imagine the contemporary humanities without the works of Mikhail M. Bakhtin, the prominent Russian thinker of the last century, who made the invaluable contribution to the development of various areas of socio-humanitarian knowledge. It is striking the diversity of fundamentally new ideas he put forward, which have overtaken their time for many decades. M. Bakhtin is a bright representative of that cohort of Russian intellectuals, authors and forerunners of the anthropological turn, whose works marked the emergence of an influential philosophical trend, united under the general name of the Third (Slav-ic) Renaissance. The new humanitarian paradigm developed by this generation of thinkers differed both from the Western European rationalist tradition, which was being overcome, and from the Russian philosophy of absolute unity [3]. At the same time, this humanitarian paradigm meant, on the one hand, the positive overcoming of the classical ideal of rationality, and on the other hand, the anticlassical (destructive) modernism of the 20th century [4-6]. This

“Russian counterfeit” involves the removal of the abstract contrast between the natural science and humanitarian approaches to the understanding of human and suggests the search for another universal truth about him already in the framework of a new anthropological construct “personality – dialogue – world”.

2. Method

In the sphere of philosophical anthropology and ethics, Bakhtin was one of the first to apply the integrated approach and the principle of “mutual complementarity” in the study of human and personality. He inspired consistently the idea of the moral antinomy of human existence – Life and Death, Good and Evil, Love and Hate, Joy and Suffering and etc. The philosopher proposed a special, global understanding of the responsibility of every individual for everything that was happening in the world (“non-alibi-in-being”).

In social philosophy and axiology during the period of political repression in our country and the “irreconcilable ideological struggle” (from which he suffered severely), M. Bakhtin stoically defended the position on the priority of humanistic values instead of the party-classed, national, elite and other interests and values.

He contrasted the conception of “the constructive dialogue” with different philosophical trends (with the aim of better mutual understanding and mutual enrichment) based on the principle of “responsible alienability” of a scientist against traditional in the Soviet period understanding of the “two struggling parties in philosophy” – dialectical materialism and bourgeois idealism [3].

Bakhtin developed the original theory of “the philosophy of act” based on the integrated approach to the study of “the integrated personality”. He investigated the problem of the architectonics of value experience in social life and in artistic creation as a unity of emotions, images, symbols, their understanding and appreciation.

The thinker introduced a number of new methodological approaches into modern cultural studies – the integrated approach to world culture taking into account the diversity of its national manifestations; an orientation towards a productive dialogue of cultures and civilizations in the modern world; the principle of polyphony in the study of culture, etc. He was the founder of three new areas of knowledge: the theory of “laughter culture”, the theory of “carnival culture” and the theory of “festive culture”.

The most significant Bakhtin’s achievements are in the modern literary criticism. He is considered as a prominent representative of literary hermeneutics. He suggested the original approach to solving the problem of interpretation and understanding of texts. Besides that, he is the leading theorist of the European novel – its history, typology and methodology of study. His works on the problems of space,

time and chronoscope in a work of art (i.e. truthfulness of the image of the event “here and now”) are widely known. Bakhtin’s methodology, which is based on the specifics of studying of “expressive and speaking being”, “co-being” in reality and “co-being” in humanitarian knowledge, has received worldwide recognition. The principle of the “moral responsibility of the writer” developed by him is gaining the greater actuality at present days [3], as well as the usage of the dialogical approach for correct interpretation of the content of the novel – the spiritual dialogue between a reader, heroes and an author of a work, between the epochs of its creation and reading), repeated and cultivated further by him in his many manuscripts [4-6].

In this sense the philosophical heritage of M. Bakhtin in the field of the methodology of social and humanitarian epistemology is especially important. His main methodological discovery, in our opinion, is the “principle of dialogical thinking”. This principle in its broad interpretation requires a social subject to avoid destructive confrontation (ideological, political, military, etc.) with other subjects, and strive for constructive dialogue on the basis of partnership equality, respect for each other’s interests and values for the purpose of the best mutual understanding, spiritual mutual enrichment and mutually beneficial cooperation.

3. Results

Supply chain management becomes highly complex. A discipline that can aid in the overcoming of these issues is SC design: according to [1], the optimal platform provided by a proper SC design can improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the SCM practice. This principle was most clearly formulated by M. Bakhtin in the article “On the Methodology of the Humanities”. In particular, he wrote: “The dialectic was born out of dialogue in order to return to dialogue at the highest level (to the dialogue of personalities) again” ([7]. In this case, the dialogue can never be completed. Studying the text (an artistic or a scientific work), each reader (researcher) always reaches his own new understanding. There is “an understanding as correlation with other texts and rethinking in a new context (in mine, in modern, in the future). ...The stages of the dialogical movement of understanding: the starting point is the given text, the movement back is past contexts, the movement forward is anticipation (and the beginning) of the future context”.

He repeatedly returned to this issue in other works, especially in the aspect of the dialogue of cultures: “A foreign culture reveals itself more fully and deeper only in the eyes of another culture. ...We put new questions to an alien culture, which it did not raise to itself, we look for answer these new questions in it, and an alien culture answers us, opening up new sides for us, new se-mantic depths [8].

Here we should dwell at least briefly on the most important theoretical sources of the teachings by M. Bakhtin which influenced on the formation of his world view as a whole, as well as on his conception of “dialogical thinking”. As it is known the peak of his creative activity falls on the 1920s, when he lived in Petrograd. Speaking fluently five foreign languages, he intensively studied the latest trends in Western European philosophical thoughts.

He paid the most attention to the study of the works of German philosophers: [9-12].

In Petrograd he wrote his first philosophical and methodological work “The Problem of Content, Material and Form in Verbal Artwork” in 1924, the critical monograph “Freudianism” in 1927, a series of theoretical works on linguistics and literary criticism in 1928, two articles on creativity by L. N. Tolstoy in 1929, the large monograph “Problems of Dostoevsky’s creativity” in 1929.

M. Bakhtin foregrounded the religious and moral issues. He attached particular importance to the teachings by I. Kant. Kant’s “categorical imperative” which gives priority to universal moral values is the basis of Christian interpersonal understanding, harmony and equal dialogue. The well-known moral requirement of I. Kant (“Act in relation to others as you would like them to act in relation to you”) is clearly traced in the “dialogism” of M. Bakhtin on the issue “Me and the Other”.

Two other factors, apparently, had a significant influence on the formation of the dialogical style of thinking of Mikhail Bakhtin himself. First, the process of mastering in many foreign languages, which is impossible without “the dialogue method” of learning. Secondly, the “dialogue form of presentation” of conceptual ideas, which for centuries was traditional method for many philosophers, beginning from the dialogues of Plato.

It should be noted that in the twentieth century in European philosophy besides M. Bakhtin the dialogical principle was developed by the famous religious philosopher Martin Buber [13]. In this regard it seems to us necessary to distinguish three fundamental differences between Buber’s and Bakhtin’s notions of the essence of dialogue:

1) alternativeness of Buber’s dialogue to Christian morality in content (unlike Bakhtin);

2) a weak connection with other methodological principles of cognition (for M. Bakhtin the following principles are organically connected: “constructive dialogue”, “global responsibility”, “responsible [ideological] out being”, “integrity”, “inter-complementarity”, “the priority of universal supply chain values”, cultural and value “polyphony”, “moral antinomy of being” of a per-son, etc.);

3) limited scope of application (for M. Bakhtin the “principle of dialogue” tends to extend not only to epistemology, philosophical anthropology and national psychology, but also to literary criticism [theory of the novel], linguistics, international ethics and aesthetics, axiology, social philosophy, history of philosophy, history, sociology, political sciences and real politics).

Some authors find in Bakhtin’s dialogue theory a significant influence of E. Husserl’s phenomenological teaching. In particular, they pay special attention to anticipation in Bakhtin’s conception of the idea of intersubjectivity by “late Husserl” (who put the question about the transcendent sources of human consciousness). According to S. Schultz, Bakhtin carried out the construction of correlating theories of “act”, “dialogue” and “polyphony”, trying to overcome the excessive disunion of three spheres: personality, science and art [14].

In our opinion, taking into account the influence on the formation of M. Bakhtin’s “principle of dialogue” from the side of conceptions of I. Kant, E. Husserl, M. Buber and others, we should nevertheless recognize uniqueness and

universality of Bakhtin's ideas. Bakhtin's dialogue is not only the basis and mode of existence of an individual. This is simultaneously a philosophical mega paradigm, as well as a universal methodological principle in the modern social and humanitarian cognition.

It should be emphasized that M. Bakhtin put forward the fundamental propositions of a radically new way of "dialogical thinking" as an alternative to the "monologue one-party system" that was dominant in the Soviet society. Hereby he prepared a revolutionary change in the paradigm of thinking in our society which began in the mid-1980s.

4. Discussion

In other words, creating and delivering value to the customer and in turn creating sustainable value for all its stakeholders. For these reasons, the demand for achievement of 'overall value-adding performance' requires putting special attention to the concept of 'value' within the SC. Using the method of logical extrapolation, we try to reconstruct not only what Mikhail Bakhtin said (what he wrote about), but also what he would like (or could) tell us today. And also, how one can apply this universal principle effectively in the sphere of modern philosophical knowledge.

There are four philosophical aspects of this methodological principle of M. Bakhtin (according to its application in various branches of philosophical knowledge).

1. In the field of epistemology and the methodology of science it can be considered as the principle of dialogism in the process of discovering the human nature. Here it can be put on a par with other initial principles of modern epistemology: the cognition of the world, the interrelationship of the main sources of knowledge (natural, social, individual and cosmic), the subjective reflecting nature of the cognitive image and symbol, active creative knowledge, the complex criterion of truth, etc.

There are three types of epistemological (cognitive) dialogue:

a. Educational dialogue of a student with a teacher (or with a textbook). It should be noted that the dialogical method of teaching is one of the most promising in the system of modern university education (along with system-methodological, computer, and many others [4]).

b. Critical dialogue of the researcher (scientist) with other researchers (or the old, outdated theories). A critical approach is especially productive in justifying fundamentally new concepts. In philosophy this approach is called the "principle of philosophical doubt". It means not taking on faith any new (or old) philosophical concept, but its detailed verification with the latest methods and means of scientific research. An outdated theory can completely lose its positive significance for social actors. Then it is rejected and the dialogue stops with it.

The principle of "critical dialogue" (or "philosophical doubt") was used by such outstanding thinkers as Aristotle, I. Kant, F. Bacon, R. Descartes, K. Marx, and etc. As it is known, Aristotle, giving a critical analysis of the views of his beloved teacher Plato, said "winged words": "Amicus Plato, sed magis amica veritas". I. Kant began his three of the most important philosophical works with the word "critique": "Critique of Pure Reason", "Critique of Practical Reason", "Critique of the Power of Judgment". F. Bacon, criticizing the preceding philosophies, showed the

negative role of prejudice in scientific understanding. He defined four kinds of prejudices from which it was necessary to free a scientist. He figuratively called these prejudices "ghosts" (or "idols"): "ghosts of the clan", "ghosts of the cave", "ghosts of the market" and "ghosts of the theater". K. Marx, as the motto of his life as a scientist, formulated an expression that has become famous: "Cast doubt on everything!"

c. An objective dialogue of a scientist (most often a representative of the natural sciences) with the results of his research (especially experiments). In contrast to the humanities where a scientist is dealing, according to M. Bakhtin with "the speaking being" of different social subjects, in natural sciences a researcher is faced with a "dumb thing" (a natural object). The thing [natural object] and personality [social subject], according to M. Bakhtin, are "limits of cognition", i.e., peculiar opposites on the specifics of their research. "Precise sciences are a monological form of knowledge: the intellect contemplates a thing and speaks about it".

Here Mikhail Bakhtin means the absence of verbal speech of a natural object. Therefore, he absolutizes its voicelessness to a certain degree. Nature also speaks, but in a different form, effecting on the senses of a person observing it (a naturalist, an art worker or a scientist).

Further M. Bakhtin writes: "The task is to make the material environment which acts mechanically on an individual, to speak, that is, to uncover the potential word and tone in it, to turn it into a semantic context...". The representative of natural sciences has an entire arsenal of tools (methods and technical tools) for this.

In order to force a studied natural object to discover itself (in any properties and characteristics), a natural scientist artificially acts on it, placing it in special conditions. He makes an experiment. The results of the experiment are a kind of "wordless response" of a natural object to the questions of a scientist.

2. In the field of metaphilosophy (theory and methodology of philosophical knowledge) and history of philosophy M. Bakhtin's new methodological approach can be interpreted as a principle of constructive dialogue between different philosophical directions and conceptions (with a view to their better understanding and mutual enrichment). It is a modern alternative to the Engels' principle of the "two struggling parties" in philosophy.

F. Engels in his work "Ludwig Feuerbach and the end of classical German philosophy" substantiated this position. He wrote that depending on how philosophers responded to the first side of the basic question of philosophy ("What is primary?"), they were divided into two large camps: the materialists (recognizing the natural world as the primary matter) and the idealists (who consider consciousness, spiritual world as the first principle). Thus, in philosophy two main directions appeared – materialism and idealism [15].

As a result, a centuries-old irreconcilable struggle arose between these two areas ("two fighting parties in philosophy"). It was as reflection of the class struggle. As if materialism always expressed the interests of the working masses and was closer to a correct, scientific understanding of the world. And idealism (together with religion) represented the interests of the ruling classes, the exploiters and was a pseudoscientific doctrine.

This is a rude simplification of the philosophical problem. The confrontation of any two trends in philosophical thought could prevail (i.e., lightly outstand in the relationship of different teachings) only at a certain historical stage. It is a well-known fact, for example, that Plato tried to buy all copies of manuscripts with the teaching of Democritus in order to burn them. Fortunately, he could not do that. Otherwise between these doctrines would end a scientific dispute (a variant of the dialogue in which “the truth is born”).

In fact, a whole range of alternative lines and directions has already existed in the ancient Greece: 1) materialism – idealism, 2) Gnosticism – skepticism, 3) dialectics – sophistry, etc. In modern world philosophy the number of alternative directions has increased significantly: 1) materialism – idealism, 2) rationalism – irrationalism, 3) gnosticism – agnosticism, 4) scientism – anti-scientism, 5) technocracy – anti-technocracy, 6) Marxism – positivism (empirical criticism), etc.

However, the position of F. Engels about the two fighting parties in philosophy was developed and strengthened by V. Lenin in his article “On the Meaning of Militant Materialism”. He applied it in connection of the party literature, formulating it as the principle of “communist partisanship”. V. Lenin stated that Marxism was the “only true” scientific doctrine, reflecting the interests of the most advanced class – the proletariat. He spoke of the need for an “irreconcilable ideological struggle” against bourgeois (idealistic, unscientific and reactionary) philosophy. In fact, the “monologue” of the Marxist doctrine, its isolation on itself, immutability and self-isolation from other teachings was postulated.

This led the head of the Russian proletariat (the book “Imperialism as the Highest Stage of Capitalism” and in other works) to the idea of the possibility of building socialism in one particular country [16], and later to artificially create an ideological “iron curtain” in the Soviet Russia.

The utopian nature of such an approach showed the natural course of the world process in the twentieth century which led to a gradual decrease in the rate of development of the country (the famous “stagnation period”) and its economic lag behind the leading world states.

As an alternative to the erroneous principle of “communist partisanship,” M. Bakhtin put forward the principle of “responsible [ideological] outbeing” of a scientist and an art worker (i.e., his independence from belonging to any political party).

The principle of “constructive dialogue” by M. Bakhtin does not mean the complete denial of any forms of social struggle. “The fact is that within the framework of the traditional understanding of power, the process of power realization cannot be implemented in the full symmetry between parties, because in the case of symmetry of the relationship between the subject and the power object, according to American representative of the theory of social exchange P. Blau, the interaction of equal forces depicts the absence of power”. Such a struggle has been and will continue to exist, but mainly in the political sphere of society when it comes to the struggle for power in the country (during the election campaign). The election is always won by one party (or its representative). Here there can be a question only about the civilized forms of such

(competitive) struggle (without slandering political opponents, without falsifying voting results, etc.).

In this sense M. Bakhtin spoke only against excessive exaggeration of the role of political confrontation and against its extension to other areas of life (especially science and art). And modern Russia to a certain extent has moved towards a more democratic solution to this issue. A multiparty political system has been created (at least formally).

In one-party dictatorial society (for example, in the former USSR) all other parties (except for one – communist) are prohibited. The dictatorship can be “hard”, cruel (as under Stalin) or “soft” (as under Brezhnev). But its essence is always the same – the suppression of any dissent.

The situation is completely different in a civilized, democratic and multi-party society. It presupposes “healthy” equal competitive struggle during the election campaign period and post-election cooperation. During the pre-election period each party conducts its agitation and propaganda dialogue with the population. Which party or candidate has the best development program of the country and explains it more clearly to the population that should win the election (unless, of course, it is used “dirty methods” of working with voters, based on deception, bribery and intimidation).

After the election the political struggle for power ends till the next election. The elected President of the country becomes non-partisan as an independent “arbiter” over the parties. And between the parties (and the certain fractions in the Parliament), constructive dialogue and cooperation is being established (with the aim of solving practical issues of the life and development of the country).

However, the principle of partisanship cannot be extended categorically to the field of science and art. The universal aesthetic principles always prevail in art over the social and group ones. In the natural sciences there is a methodological principle of objectivity of a researcher demanding his independence from personal utilitarian interests, desires and moods. In the humanities and, especially, in the social sciences, it should be complemented by Bakhtin’s principle of responsible scientist out being (by demanding his independence from class party affiliation and, accordingly, social group interests).

3. In axiology the considered statement by M. Bakhtin can be represented as the principle of the polyphonic axiogenic dialogue of different social subjects. The content and ultimate goal of such a dialogue is the formation of four subsystems of spiritual values: 1) “universal” (humanistic) moral values (based on Kant’s “categorical imperative”); 2) “alternative” personal values associated with the free choice of life-meaning priorities (profession, religion, party affiliation, etc.); 3) “state ideological” values prevailing in a particular country in a particular period of time; 4) the highest integrative values of humankind at the current crisis stage of development.

The discrepancy of European axiological conceptions with Marxism in its Soviet dogmatized version manifested itself in three main aspects. Firstly, European thinkers recognize the priority of universal supply chain values as opposed to the party-class approach. Secondly, they postulate the pluralism of value systems and, accordingly, the possibility of free choice by an individual of the relevant

landmarks in one's life. Thirdly, an important place is given to religious value systems, which are incompatible with "militant materialism" and atheism of Marxism-Leninism doctrine.

4. In modern social philosophy Bakhtin's dialogical approach is a methodological basis for substantiating the principle of the equal partnership dialogue in interstate relations which implies the rejection of the use of military force.

Developing this position, the famous Austrian philosopher of the end of the twentieth century, [5], concluded that the global partnership integration of all countries in the future into a single global community is inevitably. According to his conception this integration process began in the late 1980s and will last for several decades. It is a decisive trend in the world development of states and the main content of the current epoch.

Consequently, such alternative processes as "expansion", "self-isolation", "monopolistic globalization" and "multi-polarity", which are observed at the same time in different parts of the world, are dead-end trends in world development. According to the laws of the science of synergetics "multi-polarity" in global world development has short duration. It symbolizes the period of chaos and restructuring of the world system – from the bipolar world to global partner integration.

5. Conclusion

In conclusion it is again necessary to note one feature of supply chain is providing value for human and culture of the work. The ideas were significantly ahead of their time, probably in a century. Living in the conditions of a "monologue" totalitarian regime and suffering severely from it, nevertheless he found the strength to intellectually oppose it. The courageously de-fended the priority of universal humanistic values and called for a general constructive dialogue: between authority and people, between state and church, between classes and parties, between nations and states, between cultures and civilizations, etc. In his thoughts and aspirations, the outstanding Russian thinker already would have lived in a completely new era: "the post-Soviet", "the post-capitalist" and "the post-oligarchic". As organizations form part of supply chains, value becomes a more complex and multidimensional characteristic.

References

- [1] Bakhtin, M. M. (1986). *K metodologii gumanitarnykh nauk = On the Methodology of the Humanities*, Bakhtin, M. M. *Aesthetics of the Autumnal Creativity*, 2nd ed. Moscow, pp. 381–393. (in Russ.)
- [2] Bakhtin, M. M. (2002). *Otvét na voprosy redaktsii "Novogo mira" = Answer to the Questions of the Editorial Board of the "New World"*, Bakhtin, M. M. *Collected Works*. In 7 v. Vol. 6. Moscow, pp. 451–457. (in Russ.)
- [3] Bakhtin, M. M. (2003a). *Iskusstvo i otvetstvennost' = Art and Responsibility*, Bakhtin, M. M. *Collected Works*. In 7 v. Vol. 1. Moscow, pp. 5–6. (in Russ.)
- [4] Bakhtin, M. M. (2003b). *Avtor i geroj v ehsteticheskoy deyatel'nosti = The Author and Hero in Aesthetic Activity*, Bakhtin, M. M. *Collected Works*. In 7 v. Vol. 1. Moscow, pp. 69–263. (in Russ.)
- [5] Bakhtin, M. M. (2016). *Problemy poehtiki Dostoevskogo = Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, St. Petersburg, 416 p. (in Russ.)
- [6] Dlugach, T. B. (2015). *Dialog v sovremennom mire: M. Buber – M. Bakhtin – V. Bibler = Dialogue in the modern world: M. Buber – M. Bakhtin – V. Bibler*. *Historical and Philosophical Yearbook*. Retrieved from: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/dialog-v-sovremennom-mire-m-buber-m-bahtin-v-bibler>. (in Russ.)
- [7] Engels, F. (1961). *Lyudvig Fejrbakh i konets klassicheskoy nemetskoj filosofii = Ludwig Feuerbach and the End of Classical German Philosophy*, Marx, K., Engels, F. *Works: in 50 v., Vol. 21*. 2nd ed., Moscow, pp. 269–317. (in Russ.)
- [8] Galstyan, Kh. S. (2019). *A dialogical paradigm of power: From marginal theory to political reality*. *Vestnik of Saint Petersburg University. Philosophy and Conflict Studies*, vol. 35, issue 4, pp. 626–633. <https://doi.org/10.21638/spbu17.2019.408>. (in Eng.)
- [9] Günzl, Ch. (1992). *Bewältigungen der Vergangenheit und der Zukunft durch "Newes Denken"*. Linz, 190 S. (in Germ.)
- [10] Lenin, V. I. (1968). *Partijnaya organizatsiya i partijnaya literatura = Party Organization and Party Literature*, Lenin V. I. *Full Collected Works*. 5th ed., in 50 vol. Vol 12. Moscow, pp. 99–105. (in Russ.)
- [11] Lenin, V. I. (1990). *O znachenii voinstvuyushhego materializma = On the significance of militant materialism*, *At the turning point. Philosophical discussions of the 20s: Philosophy and worldview*, comp. by P.V. Alekseev, Politizdat, Moscow, p. 30–37. (in Russ.)
- [12] Lenin, V. I. (2020). *Imperializm, kak vysshaya stadiya kapitalizma = Imperialism, as the highest stage of capitalism*, Eksmo, Moscow, 160 p. (in Russ.)
- [13] Pape, C. (2016). *Husserl, Bakhtin, and the Other I. or: Mikhail M. Bakhtin – a Husserlian? HORIZON 5(2)*, 2016: 271–289. DOI: 10.18199/2226-5260-2016-5-2-271-289 (in Eng.)
- [14] Schulz, S. A. (1998). *Bakhtinskaya teoriya dialoga: kriticheskaya ili fenomenologicheskaya = Bakhtin's Theory of Dialogue: Critical or Phenomenological? Bakhtin and Time: Abstracts of the Reports. IV Bakhtin's Readings*. Saransk, p. 121. (in Russ.)
- [15] Smirnov, S. A. (2017). *Antropologicheskij povorot: ego smysl i uroki = Anthropological Turn: Its Meaning and Lessons*, *Philosophy and Culture*. 2017. No. 2. p. 23–35. DOI: 10.7256/2454-0757.2017.2.22058. (in Russ.)
- [16] Somkin, A. A. (2019). *Lichnostno orientirovannyj podkhod v sisteme sovremennogo gumanitar-nogo obrazovaniya: ot monologizma k dialogicheskoy modeli obucheniya = Personally-Oriented Approach in the System of Education in the Humanities: From Monologism to Dialogical Model of Teaching*. *The Education and Science Journal*. Vol. 21, no. 2. pp. 9–28. (in Russ.)