

## NEWS

OF THE NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES OF THE REPUBLIC OF KAZAKHSTAN  
SERIES OF SOCIAL AND HUMAN SCIENCES

ISSN 2224-5294

<https://doi.org/10.32014/2019.2224-5294.85>

Volume 2, Number 324 (2019), 301 – 305

УДК: 141.8 10(09)

**D. Adizbayeva<sup>1</sup>, A. Shoibekova<sup>2</sup>, B. Shoibek<sup>3</sup>**<sup>1</sup>Kazakh National agrarian university, Almaty, Kazakhstan;<sup>2</sup>Asfendiyarov Kazakh National Medical university, Almaty, Kazakhstan;<sup>3</sup>al-Farabi Kazakh National university, Almaty, Kazakhstan,  
dilbar-zh@mail.ru; alima-almaty@mail.ru; becksbm001@gmail.com**DIALOGISM OF M.M. BAKHTIN AND DISCOVERY OF  
PHENOMENOLOGICAL DIALOGUE IN PHILOSOPHY**

**Abstract.** The article shows that throughout his life M. M. Bakhtin developed methodological problems of the Humanities. He constantly drew attention to the irreducibility of the Humanities to the natural Sciences, repeatedly stressed that the method of research used by him is phenomenological. Comparing personality as a speaking being and a mute voiceless thing, M. M. Bakhtin concluded that the cognition of personality can't be carried out by the same method as the study of things. M. M. Bakhtin research, carried out in the phenomenological style, allowed him to clarify a number of new and fundamentally important mental phenomena as his own speech, polyphony and dialogue. At present, the idea of dialogue, under the names of the dialogics and dialog-science, which continues its movement forward is in the center of philosophical attention and discussion. Playing not the last role in the formation and development of philosophical thinking, dialogue only in our time "found its own voice": became the subject of philosophical discussion. Dialogism is not just a part of the world where dialogues are conducted. It is possible to characterize that side of the world in which the person is comprehended. This is the essence of the universal and philosophical importance of the dialogue.

**Keywords:** phenomenological method, personality, dialogue, knowledge, logic.

**Introduction.** The centuries-old philosophical tradition, reflected in other spheres of human activity, implies understanding of dialogue as a dispute, as a result of which one of the parties convinces another in the correctness of a certain statement: "The truth is born in a dispute".

So, if logic is a regulator, deductive proof is an object of regulation, the flow of statements is the input of an object, and the significance of statements is its output, then the logical "control system" obeys the law of necessary diversity, within which only polymorphic logical conclusion allows to successfully regulate the homeostasis of the system of conceivable proofs. If the purpose of the proof is to minimize the uncertainty of the provable at an acceptable time, i.e. maximizing the information content per unit of resource costs, then it is achievable in the implementation of the principles of code selection and code matching, taking into account the principles of interference objectivity and signal uncertainty, and most importantly, when oriented on the law of information expansion as a hermeneutic installation of the proof. From this, that the traditional proof as ("costly") information and energy management in modern conditions should give way to proof as understanding - a purely information energy - saving process. So modern - philosophical knowledge justifies the inevitability of transition in the process of management from "one" logical dialogue to "multidimensional" phenomenological. Thus, the dialogue is a special form of communication interaction of intellectual, behavioral, subject, a number of intermediate actions that create some kind of chain. It involves at least two parties: in which, after a certain action by one party, the action of the other.

The relationship of these actions can be defined in different ways - in terms of action and reaction, question and answer, attack and defense or counterattack, proof and rebuttal or criticism, challenge and defense, and a variety of other terms. And the dialogue itself can be constructive or destructive, an expression of partnership or hostility, have a pronounced cognitive interest and a certain purpose. Dialogue is twofold in that it combines form, mode of existence and content. But whatever the possible points of reference, it is impossible to deny a) - the universality of dialogue as the basis of human

interaction, the universality of dialogism and dialogical relations and b) -the existence of certain rules (conditions for the emergence) of dialogue, without which it is impossible

Main part. In M. M. Bakhtin's interpretation, dialogue becomes a universal concept, «penetrating all human speech and all relations and manifestations of human life, in general, everything that has meaning and significance."

In particular, this concept becomes applicable both to the analysis of the General relations of language and text specifically to anthropology and ontology. «To be», he writes, «is to communicate dialogically. When the dialogue ends, everything ends. Therefore, the dialogue, in essence, cannot and should not end. Everything is a means, dialogue is a goal. One Voice ends nothing and resolves nothing. Two voices-a minimum of life, a minimum of being» [1]. Thus, dialogue is a condition of any existence, a pledge of this existence. Only the presence of dialogue can indicate the existence of the subject, the concept of dialogue almost duplicates and organically complements the meaning of the category of coexistence, namely the idea of collective communication. Moreover, dialogue, and only it, can become a way of cognition, since it is the objectification of personal knowledge, as well as a way of reuniting the subjects of dialogue, and not just a way of relations of the subject of the object of knowledge, if we use the terminology of new European philosophy.

In the book «Aesthetics of verbal creativity» M.M. Bakhtin openly says the idea of the way of cognition, that is, does not separate the subject from the object, contrasting it with the analytical method of the new European philosophy.

"Understanding as the opening of cash by beholding (contemplation ) and by adding in creation". The meaning in its interpretation cannot be isolated from the General context of the world and acquires universal characteristics "the Content of the true symbol through the mediated semantic links is correlated with the idea of world integrity, with the fullness of the cosmic and human universe".

Thus, cognition is not only a dialogue with an individual subject, it is necessary to take into account the dialogical relationships of the second kind, which connect all things, in the limit there is unity and «the fullness of the cosmic and human universe». "The observer has no position outside the observed world, and his observation enters as an integral part of the observed object," he writes in another work. In the new European paradigm, the subject also enters and affects the object of research in a certain way, in subjective idealism Berkeley generally forms it, however, traditionally European philosophy and science sought to exclude this influence from the sphere of scientific research, sought to perceive the world objectively, forgetting that the study involved specific subjects - scientists, tried to exclude the personal principle of both science and philosophy, and if in philosophical works you can still find the pronoun of the first person singular, then in scientific treatises it is simply excluded. However, modern science has largely abandoned these principles. M.M. Bakhtin in this case, based on the historical tradition of domestic thought, formulates one of the principles of modern research. He writes: "there is real or possible text everywhere. Research becomes a question and a conversation, that is, a dialogue." Science in this case is no longer a monologue dissection of the "dead" object, but an interaction with it. Based on this statement, we can assume the value of metaphysical and even mystical experience for research, but not only rational knowledge. This appeal to the metaphysical experience of the researcher M. Bakhtin calls "going beyond the understood".

In Bakhtin's understanding and presentation, the dialogue is revealed as a meaning - forming and meaning-analytical procedure. How do we know what we are? And why would we know that? Our being is made certain by the existence of others. This is due to the assessments of others, due to the attitude of others, we get some certainty. And these assessments by others are not indifferent to us. We agree with them or reject them.

*Assessments express the attitude of people, hinder or contribute to the existence, implementation of goals. Another person's assessment delineates the limits of our capabilities. Thus, being among other people, communicating with them dialogically, entering into certain relations with them, we become ourselves, something certain, "taking place" in being. «To be is to communicate dialogically. When the dialogue ends, everything ends. Two voices-a minimum of life, a minimum of being» [2]. Bakhtin attaches universal importance to the phenomenon of dialogue. Dialogical relations of people are not just "one of" manifestations of their being, but the phenomenon penetrating all human speech, (and consciousness), all relations and manifestations of human life, everything that has sense and value.*

Bakhtin develops his dialogical concept of being based on the literary works of F.M. Dostoevsky. This writer created, according to definitely Bakhtin, a fundamentally new-polyphonic - form of the novel. Dostoevsky presents his characters to the reader in a not very special way: the writer manipulates them as objects, does not judge his characters, using his privilege of the author (as if "God" towering over the world created by him), and gives the heroes to Express themselves, their truth about the world, their vision of other people and themselves among people. The word of the hero here does not serve as a mouthpiece of the author's voice. The consciousness of each hero is opposed by the consciousness of the other heroes; no one has the privilege of the only truth, which man is the bearer of his own truth. The reader does not so much "see" the characters (Dostoevsky usually does not give an unambiguous and complete image of the characters) as he hears their "voices", as if listening to the dialogues between them and their inner speech ("micro - dialogues") [3].

Thus, Dostoevsky creates a polyphony (polyphony), and his task is not to judge the characters with the only correct", the author's point of view, but to bring the characters together in a "great dialogue" in the world of the work. That is why M.M. Bakhtin found in Dostoevsky's works the most suitable models for philosophical understanding of the phenomenon of dialogue. Bakhtin characterizes Dostoevsky's work the word "dialog- science", but we can see that the writer rather, was simulated by means of art a dialogue and research ("doing") they as a subject of scientific analysis carried out M.M. Bakhtin; thus, the term " dialog- science " is more suited to the work of Bakhtin himself.

A person from within himself cannot understand himself or even become himself. My spirit from within itself does not «see» its borders, does not have an image of itself. Only other I see as objects-in-General and among other objects, i.e. I see their borders, I have their images. I can't be an object to myself. I'm not in my own mind. Even when I look at myself in the mirror, I am amazed at the Ghost, the unreality of the visible, I feel a split, a mismatch of me visible in the mirror, and I experienced from within. Only other people see me in one piece. To embrace the personality as a whole, one needs an out-of-place position. I see the world, I see others in the world, but not myself in the world; the other sees me in the world and thus has an excess of vision compared to me. When I meet others, my spirit (and the spirit of the other) reveals its boundaries and thereby becomes condensed into the soul. The inside of my own soul as a whole is not. I enter the world as the main character, I cause others surprise, admiration, fright, love, I see in others the expression of these relations to me, but I do not see myself. We catch the reflection of our lives in the minds of others. You can say that others give me as something whole and certain.

But how from the perspective of unengagement you know the identity, especially its inner life? M. M. Bakhtin shows the failure of two typical approaches to the knowledge of personality. One of them suggests that the soul of another person can be understood by "feeling", "implanting" in it. This path, characteristic of the "philosophy of life", leads the knower to "merge" with the experiences of the other, but at the same time the knower "I" must forget, lose him, "drown" in the other. As a result, the «I» lose the position of non-occurrence and the ability to see the other as a whole. "Pure implantation" is untenable, - Bakhtin notes, - it should act in unity with objectification, i.e. separation of other individual from itself and a look at it from the outside as an object. The second method of cognition of personality criticized by Bakhtin is precisely one-sided objectification, " objectification» of man, and one - sided-objective cognition of him. This approach is typical for mechanistic psychology. Bakhtin sees the flaws of the "object" indifferent analysis of man in two aspects [4].

First, this method passes by the most essential in man-his freedom, incompleteness, discrepancy with himself. At any moment of its existence, a person has in itself, in addition to what we "objectively" see in it, also the possibility (what is not yet objectively there: something desirable, supposed, imaginary), he seems to live his future (moment), hidden from our view and judgment. Therefore, a person never coincides with himself, with what he "already" is, he is able to refute the characteristic given to him by others or by himself "While a person is alive, he lives by what has not yet been completed and has not yet said his last word. Therefore, «the true life of the personality is accomplished as if at the point of this discrepancy between man and himself, at the point of his going beyond all that he is as a material being, which can be peeped, determined and predicted in spite of his will, "in absentia" [5]. An example of such a "real" approach is the scene of the investigation and trial of Dmitry Karamazov in Dostoevsky's novel: the investigator, the Prosecutor, the judges see Dmitry already "ready", quite certain, as a thing, while his true identity is always on the threshold of internal decisions and crises, and the hero himself will be judged by a real court.

Secondly, the adherents of mechanistic psychology try to consider a person not from the point of view of another living concrete personality, but from the position of an indifferent, dispassionate "consciousness in General". Such attempts are both false and unproductive. The difficulty is that an indifferent "consciousness in General" is impossible. Any researcher (including a supporter of mechanistic psychology) is a "living person", subject to his preferences and antipathies, firmly connected with his actual, unique and inimitable individual existence. To qualify for the disinterested vision of the world and the other person can pour in the abstract, i.e., abstracted from the fact that each of us can see the world on their own, participants in the world's eyes. "No one can take a neutral position towards me and the other..." "Every person is a center from which only the vision of the world is possible; and "consciousness in General", not tied to the personality – center, is impossible. The low productivity of "indifferent" psychology is that it, relying only on "objective data", neglects the revelations of the individual about itself. Dostoevsky, as Bakhtin emphasizes, such "indifferent" psychology is fundamentally alien. "...Other people's consciousnesses cannot be contemplated, analyzed, defined as objects, as things – they can only be dialogically communicated with. To think of them is to talk to them; otherwise they immediately turn to us with their object side: they fall silent, close and freeze into completed object images [6].

**Conclusion.** Thus, the "inner man" can't be revealed either as an object of indifferent neutral analysis or through feeling; he himself must be revealed in dialogue through communication with him. "And it is possible to depict the inner man, as Dostoevsky understood him, only by depicting his communication with another" [7].

M. M. Bakhtin rightly emphasizes the idea that dialogue is not a means, but an end in itself and a value in itself. The understanding of the Humanities and thinking proposed by the thinker forms a different way of approaching different styles of thinking, the slogan of which is dialogue as a way of being a person in the world, and at the same time as a way of knowing humanistic, filled with meanings of reality. Thus, the dialogue described by M. M. Bakhtin can be considered as a method of phenomenological study of personality. Just as the phenomenological tendency in psychology opposes the natural-science-oriented tendency, and the personality necessarily forms an opposition to the thing, so the phenomenological dialogue opposes various manipulative approaches, techniques on all considered points. According to M.M. Bakhtin, dialogue is not only a way of knowing the personality and expressing its inner world, its attitudes and ideas, but also a condition for the very existence of ideas in individuals. "The idea does not live in the isolated individual consciousness of man – remaining only in it, it degenerates and dies. The idea begins to live, that is, to form, develop, find and update its verbal expression, generate new ideas, only entering into significant dialogical relations with other people's ideas." "The idea – as the artist Dostoevsky saw it – is not a subjective individual psychological education with a 'permanent place' in a person's head; no, the idea is interindividual and intersubjective, the sphere of its existence is not an individual consciousness, but a dialogical communication between consciousnesses. An idea is a living event played out at the point of a dialogical meeting of two or more consciousnesses." Speaking about the dialogical way of existence of the idea, M.M. Bakhtin argues with the monological «ideology» of the new time, which is expressed, in particular, in Hegel's philosophy. May not be ideas that would have existed and evolved «by itself» and would have been a true «in itself», outside the specific existence of the individual living among other specific individuals, in other words, may not be ideas outside the events of human individuals.

**Д.Ж. Адизбаева<sup>1</sup>, А.Ж. Шойбекова<sup>2</sup>, Б.М. Шойбек<sup>3</sup>**

<sup>1</sup> Қазақ ұлттық аграрлық университеті, Алматы, Қазақстан;

<sup>2</sup> Қазақ ұлттық медицина университеті С. Ж. Асфендияров, Алматы, Қазақстан;

<sup>3</sup> әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ Ұлттық университеті Алматы, Қазақстан.

#### **М. М. БАХТИННІҢ ДИАЛОГЫ ЖӘНЕ ФИЛОСОФИЯДАҒЫ ФЕНОМЕНОЛОГИЯЛЫҚ ДИАЛОГТЫҢ АШЫЛУЫ**

**Аннотация.** Мақалада М.М. Бахтин бүкіл өмір бойы гуманитарлық ғылымдардың әдіснамалық мәселелерін әзірлегені көрсетілген. Ол үнемі гуманитарлық ғылымдардың жаратылыстану ғылымдарына қосылмағандығына назар аударды, ол пайдаланатын зерттеу әдісі феноменологиялық болып табылатынын



бірнеше рет атап өтті. Тұлғаны сөйлеуші болмыс және жасырын нәрсе ретінде салыстыра отырып, М. М. Бахтин тұлғаны тану затты зерттеу сияқты әдіспен жүзеге асырыла алмайтындығы туралы қорытынды жасады. М.М. Бахтиннің феноменологиялық стильде орындалған зерттеулері оған жана және принципті маңызды психикалық феномендерді өз тілі, көп дауысты және диалог ретінде анықтауға мүмкіндік берді. Қазіргі уақытта диалог идеясы, диалог және диалогтанудың есімімен өзінің алға жылжуын жалғастырушы, философиялық зейіннің және талқылаудың ортасында орналасқан. Философиялық ойлаудың қалыптасуы мен дамуындағы соңғы емес рөлді ойнай отырып, диалог тек біздің заманымызда ғана "өз дауысына ие болды": философиялық талқылау тақырыбына айналды. Диалогизм-бұл диалог жүргізілетін әлемнің бір бөлігі ғана емес, оларға адам түсінетін әлемнің жағын сипаттауға болады. Бұл диалогтың әмбебап философиялық мәнінің мәні.

**Түйінді сөздер:** феноменологиялық әдіс, тұлға, диалог, таным, логика.

**Д.Ж. Адизбаева<sup>1</sup>, А.Ж. Шойбекова<sup>2</sup>, Б. Шойбек<sup>3</sup>**

<sup>1</sup> Казахский Национальный аграрный университет, Алматы, Казахстан;

<sup>2</sup> Казахский Национальный медицинский университет им.С.Д.Асфендиярова, Алматы, Казахстан;

<sup>3</sup> Казахский Национальный университет имени Аль-Фараби, Алматы, Казахстан

### **ДИАЛОГИЗМ М.М. БАХТИНА И ОТКРЫТИЕ ФЕНОМЕНОЛОГИЧЕСКОГО ДИАЛОГА В ФИЛОСОФИИ**

**Аннотация.** В статье показано, что в течение всей жизни М.М. Бахтин разрабатывал методологические проблемы гуманитарных наук. Он постоянно обращал внимание на несводимость гуманитарных наук к естественным, многократно подчеркивал, что используемый им метод исследования является феноменологическим. Сопоставляя личность как говорящее бытие и немую безгласную вещь, М.М. Бахтин сделал вывод о том, что познание личности не может осуществляться таким же методом, как и исследование вещи. Исследования М.М. Бахтина, выполненные в феноменологическом стиле, позволили ему прояснить целый ряд новых и принципиально важных психических феноменов как собственная речь, многоголосье и диалог. *В настоящее время идея диалога, под именами диалогии и диалоговедения продолжающая свое движение вперед, находится в центре философского внимания и обсуждения.* Играя далеко не последнюю роль в становлении и развитии философского мышления, диалог только в наше время «обрел собственный голос»: стал темой философского обсуждения. Диалогизм – это не просто та часть мира, где ведутся диалоги, им можно охарактеризовать ту сторону мира, в которой постигается человек. В этом суть универсального философского значения диалога.

**Ключевые слова:** феноменологический метод, личность, диалог, познание, логика.

#### **Information about authors:**

Adizbaeva D. Zh., doctor of philosophy sciences, professor, Kazakh national agrarian university, Almaty, Kazakhstan; dilbar-zh@mail.ru;

Shoibekova A. Zh., senior teacher, Kazakh national medicine university, Almaty, Kazakhstan; alima-almaty@mail.ru;

Shoibek B.M., undergraduate, al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty, Kazakhstan; becksbm001@gmail.com

#### **REFERENCES**

- [1] Bakhtin M. M. Problems of Dostoevsky's poetics. M.: 1972. P. 434.
- [2] Bakhtin M. M. Aesthetics of verbal creativity . M. : "Art" , 1979 ;
- [3] Bakhtin M. M. Author and hero in aesthetic activity. M.: Art, 1979. P. 7-180.
- [4] Bakhtin M. M. Problems of Dostoevsky's poetics. M: Thin. lit.1972. P. 101.
- [5] Bakhtin M. M. Author and hero in aesthetic activity. P. 191.
- [6] Bakhtin M. M. Problems of Dostoevsky's poetics. P. 116.
- [7] Martemyanov Yu. S. To formalize the ways of speech influence || Logic of situations . The structure of the text . Terminology of words. M.,2004.
- [8] Koshbayeva N. A., Abdreimova K., Koshberba G., Anuarbek A. Synthesis of achievements of world mankind in humanity pedagogy. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences 89, 2013. P.886-889. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.08.950>