Language and knowledge through images: Conversations between Benjamin, Bakhtin and Pasolini

Introduction

This article aims to produce thoughts about language’s place in knowledge production, more specifically technical images language. Therefore, it aims to theoretically comprehend how movies universe can offer subsidies to an academic production through images.

It is assumed that the use of technical images in research makes it possible to establish another density relation in the self and the other encounter, which ends up, in last instance, in a knowledge production completely affected by technical apparatus. Therefore, we intend to comprehend how research in human science can benefit from other methodological resources, in this case, video recording, to allow an incarnate knowledge production, that beyond written text, also presents imaging narratives.

To give concreteness to listed goals, we will see how Walter Benjamin (1892-1940) and Mikhail Bakhtin (1895-1975) thoughts about language can help Pier Paolo Pasolini in theoretical and cinematographic production analysis, so that we can think of an academic writing through images. This last one work is used as a reference that helps us answer questions previously made, since Pasolini have been present in both universes that specially interest us, theoretical production and movies universe. Therefore, this author’s reflections help us to understand how academic research can benefit from imagery production.

To start, we will define which technical image we are affiliated. In this case, we will count on Vilém Flusser (1920-1991) understanding from his Walter Benjamin's legacy reading. The authors show us the importance of not naturalizing technical images, remembering that technical images
are cultural products, being, therefore, dependent on ways of seeing, feeling and interpreting reality, mediating this to how we experience the word.

Such author’s study orientates us on reflection about how important it is to carefully analyze technical images thoughtless reflection appropriation, a common habit in our society. Taken as ready or finished, images capture and seduce us to a dangerous passive behavior. We are, then, subject to its condition surface, without paying attention to series of signs/concepts that are in its deepest layers. This way, against a dangerous alienation that we often subject to when it comes to technical images, we must discuss its appropriation by the human being so we do not allow it to control our wants and desire in a thoughtless way.

It is especially interest that this reflection starts from a technical images’ incorporation, its use and discussion in academic research, and not denying its transformative potential. Technical images bring with themselves a wide and varied range of senses, a series of meanings that ask for our attention. Such fact incites us to explore its potential incorporating in research practice, intending with that a way of knowledge production that proposes not only being textual, but also imagery. We will see, then, how a dialogue among Benjamin, Bakhtin and Pasolini offer us elements to reflect about this discussion.

Language Metaphysics in Walter Benjamin: a look over Technical Images Ontology

It is necessary to discourse here about Benjamin’s (1992) conception on language. Such reflections are welcome in the means that the author, after bringing language metaphysics dimension, also weaves criticism to man’s alienation and scission between life and culture. It is in this sense that thinking language in Benjamin helps us to review human science’s place, inquiring if human science potentializes scission between the word and the thing – from the way knowledge is produced -, or if enables approximation between this dimensions.

After analyzing how language is appropriated and configures itself in relations among subjects, Benjamin (1992) realizes that there is a real schizophrenia between speech and life, so present in his time linguistic formalism, that he considered language just in its partiality communicator. To weave criticism to this linguistic utilitarianism, the author, instead of opposing to language in a conception that it just incarcerate life, believes that it is through it and in it, that there is the capacity of reversing linguistic formalism that emptied our experience.
To support his propose, Benjamin resorts to language origins constitution, aiming to
denaturalize this monolithic place occupied by it nowadays. With this movement, the author makes
feasible the process that made language to be taken as just an instrument, so we can find in it
subterfuges to this linguistic oppression tool. Benjamin (1992) uses Bible metaphors to express such
reflection, as we will see next.

Language in the beginning of time was not used to dialogue among men. Much more than a
communicability instrument, pure language was absolute, used to express its own essence and
existed independent of human beings. The name, therefore, had potential cope with the thing total
essence and create it, name it (adamic language).

With the fall of man imputed by original sin, language lost its totalizing force and the word
became human, that is, the man was then condemned to always give sense to things trough
language. It is in this scission between the words and the things that language suffered a mutation
because the sacred language became profane, that is, limited to only communicate. This way, the
word does not express, just communicate something exterior to itself (BENJAMIN, 1992).

To run away from vicious circle of language and subject instrumentalization, Benjamin drives
us to think on how to subvert this logic, in recovery possibility of a language lost essence. It is this
essence rescue that will make it possible that the man becomes free again and do not perpetuate
the prison of incessant production of senses about life through instrumentalized language. As a way
of imploding linguistic utilitarianism and potentialize language nominate capacity, Benjamin
investigates, most deep layers of sense, extra sensitive similarities (BENJAMIN, 1992).

Benjamin's invite trough language metaphor would be a return to this lost mimetic energy, as
a possibility of getting in touch with deepest meaning of the own things. We realize that, even though
the author maps the existence of language utilitarian bias, he also notices it as potency capable of
subvert pragmatic logic. Although the word and the thing divorce, recovers pure expression,
something that it’s asleep in language, is a way of move away from linguistic utilitarianism and its
semantic limitations that will always be partial when aiming to give meaning to life.

We must consider that, if with the fall of man, we received punishment of always having to
offer meaning to things, this meaning will always be precarious. On the other hand, such as
Benjamin claim to us, it is on the language itself that we can subvert this limitation, if we distance
ourselves from canonized senses and make it possible the life itself narrates its own process.
Therefore, we can subvert this logic providing that academic knowledge reinvent itself through technical images, without losing scientific precision and rigor.

But, inside this discussion context, what would be, after all, technical images? How they differ from other type of images to a point of being able to enrich knowledge production from a diverse perspective?

Philosopher known as thinker of *new media* and direct heir of Walter Benjamin’s lineage of thought, Flusser (2008) coined the term *abstraction escalade* to design how technical images reproducibility can affect every day sociocultural in post modernity context. According to the author giddy production of images programmed by gadgets inaugurated another order relation with the world, in which written lines in plans give places to imagined dots in the form of scenes.

Opposing technical images or tech-images to traditional images, Flusser (2008) resorts to Chemistry and Physics to demonstrate how such images differ from ontological point of view: while traditional images are produced from volumes, that is, abstractions made from matter, technical images are flat surfaces produced from dots, photons beams and electrons that get together making abstractions materialize in images.

It is from this reflexive scheme that Flusser (2008) calls upon necessary critical awareness about magical behavior assumed by us, this behavior being disseminated by technical images fascination exercised on contemporary world. The effect of these gadgets presence more and more intense in our daily life, makes the author observe a new way of experience, more ethereal and less material, more mental and less corporal, getting concentrated in both imagination and imagery medias users “fingertips”.

On this sense, the author draws attention to “a new level of consciousness emergence”, in which our daily habits and values has been organized around technical images, although there is on our part a complete process disinterest from which images are formed, which implies profound changes in our experiences field. This is what Flusser (2008) calls “emerging utopia on which we can say invades our environment’s essence and all of our pores” (p.13). To this utopia Flusser draws his critical analysis, underscoring the importance of trying “to capture how we move currently in the word, so we can comprehend how we take consciousness of the world and ourselves” (p.30).

On the opposite way of a simplistic speech about intense use and presence of technical images in contemporary, Flusser (2008) points out the fact that this can be much more used well if we assume other position about it, transposing its representation “surface” to get in a “profound”
level in which all semiotics reveals itself. Technical images are language, meaning they are human production, cultural artifacts supported by ways of seeing, feeling and interpreting reality, mediating how we experience the word.

Inside this perspective, technical images are not unambiguous, given beforehand, capture from a real that prescinds man’s significative look, such images are, therefore, signs responsible for mediating relations between the man and the world, a way of language.

Bakhtin: Language and Knowledge production in Human Science

Still reflecting about language, with arguments presents in Flusser and Benjamin, Mikhail Bakhtin tells us an instigating reflection about its decisive character while critical activity capable of destabilize paradigms of true present in Human Science’s knowledge production field. Bakhtin’s (1992) criticism is on means of knowledge production inside human science, that aims at all means incorporate paradigms of truth used in Natural Science field, with that disregarding specificity of its own epistemic field, this specificity comes from the fact that the man himself is its analysis subject.

Human science it is not about a mute object or a natural phenomenon, it is about the man in his specificity. The man has the specificity of always express (speak), that is, create a text (even if potentially). When the man is studied outside the text and independently of the text, it is no longer about human science (but about anatomy, human physiology, etc) (BAKHTIN, 1992, p. 334).

In this sense, discussion proposed by Bakhtin aims to tense up questions that are made when knowledge production emphasis falls on the man himself, object that has by excellence an inherent indeterminacy. This point out the impossibility of adopting universal theories that claim to absolutely cope with actions practiced in life, for they happen in unpredictable ways.

What we intend getting in Bakhtin’s complex thoughts, is that life extrapolates judgments that arrogate to itself a last truth statute universally valid. As search for knowledge will always exists, it can be said that we are beings in eternal unfinished state, always willing more and more to establish bonds with each other and with nature. If, therefore, life is infinity and open by constitution, how can language prison it and transform it knowledge that can be transmitted?

According to Bakhtin (1992) aesthetic activity (culture) and life are two distinct fields that do not mix but keep important relations with each other. That is, the world of life is the right here and right now experience, now the world of culture is the attempt to portray the act of living, shaping it in an object’s form. In this sense, the author ponders the world of culture limits in its pretense to
apprehend the world of life, since this one is always is permanent become, being, therefore inapprehensible. This way, Bakhtin considers that senses about life production, done through aesthetic production – either by art or science – it is a project that will necessarily always be unfinished, just like the man remains unfinished from birth to moment of death.

However, Bakhtin considers that this scission between world of culture and world of life can be repaired by the responsibility from each one assumes its own unique and irreplaceable place in the world. The singular and unrepeatable act practiced here and now of an existence is what transforms experimented content in a aesthetic activity entirely original (BAKHTIN, 1992).

What guarantees intern nexus among individual elements? Only unity responsibility. From what I experienced and understood in art, I must answer with my life so that all experienced and understood on it do not remain inactive. (...) Art and life are not the same, but must become something singular in me, in my responsibility unity. (BAKHTIN, 1992, p. XXXIII).

According to the author, responsibility act from each one resides in the singularity in which is practiced, because no act is repeatable, which makes every gesture brings with itself a whole creative potential. Next, we will see how this discussion about language and aesthetic activity proposed by Benjamin and Bakhtin, goes through reflections present in the work of Pasolini.

**Pasolini: Cinema as language written in Reality**

On this topic, we will reflect how Pasolini, with his work, aimed strengthen the lines that regenerate lost intimacy between experience lived in reality and what is produced about this experience, either through written language or imagery production. Pier Paolo Pasolini (1922-1975) was born in Bologna, he was a poet, editor, painter, semiologist, essayist, literary critic, film critic, journalist and filmmaker. He dedicated his work to weave criticism to totalitarian regimes and consumer fascism, to homogenization of pleasures, desires and happiness and all means of oppression that that were present in Italy at that time (SILVA, 2007).

The first instigating consideration about Pasolini’s work refers to how the author connected to the word of the men and the things. To Pasolini, the objects of the world are not mute, but have a language, a pedagogical communicability and evoke senses (PASOLINI, 1990). Now about human beings, Pasolini did not work with abstract conceptions. On the contrary, the author, after diagnosing a reality observed by him, worried about placing subjects of speaking, contextualizing and embodying them to an experience and culture.
If I seek "describing" the terrible aspect of a whole new generation, that suffered all imbalances due to an atrocious and stupid development, and I seek "describing" it on this young man, this factory worker, I'm certainly not comprehended. Because to professional sociologists and politicians nothing personally matters on this young man, this factory worker. On the contrary, to me is personally the only thing that matters (LAHUD *apud* PASOLINI, 1990, p. 11).

Pasolini presented on his trajectory a concern that is similar to what motivated us doing the reflection on this article. The author started his work producing texts, essays and poems, therefore using written language to express his reflections and criticism. However, it was noticed that spoken and written language by itself was weakened, because it only evoked reality, but did not truly represent it. Besides that, language at that historical moment was tyrannized by fascist culture, that used it to impose a values-system. After paying attention to these questions, Pasolini started to defend the use of *friulian* in literary production, due to the official Italian language’s detriment, a dialect spoken by peasants that, according to the author, was endangering in Italy. The choice of this type of writing, an almost Benjamin type choice, was the belief that, in this peasant’s language, resided the only possible freedom at that moment, therefore escaping from State’s control (SILVA, 2007).

Still on arguments above, Pasolini diagnoses that is an increasing instrumentalization of language by culture, that after draining it out of meaning, becomes without any involvement with life, inexpressive, and, therefore, apolitical. This criticism links to scission between life and culture previously presented by Bakhtin and linguistic impoverishment notion proposed by Benjamin. We will see, then, how Pasolini seems to indirectly answer to these two author’s worries.

Passionate about reality, Pasolini resented about distance created between written production about life and life itself and, he sought then, to understand how this language apathy could be subverted. This way, glimpsed to produce an aesthetic object that was not a tool of reality evocation, but that would show it, presenting it without ornaments, so that he could effectively and directly concretize denunciations about injustice that were around him. In this sense, Pasolini counted on cinematographic resource, because it turned out a passport to deadlock resolution. He started to comprehend, then, that cinematographic language is reality’s written language that solves uniformity of inexpressive language showing reality through reality itself (LAHUD, 1993).

Inside this context, Pasolini questioned cinematographic theory until then current, affiliating to *Italian Neorealism*, one of the main movements of artistic vanguard occurred in the second half of the XX century. *Italian Neorealism* had as a basic premise to show reality experienced by working
class in postwar Europe context. Produced movies inside this proposal had the political commitment of giving the viewer the opportunity of seeing how reality is by itself a human production, being, for that very reason, necessarily language. Pasolini contributed on this journey seeing in cinema the possibility of reality presentation just like it is, that is, he had been during his carrier as a director, entirely committed with the use of movies language as way of approximating to reality, based in what he considered *semiology reality* (SILVA, 2007).

We must clarify, this way, what Pasolini considers as reality. To the author, this the only language that could be considered as truly language, since that, all the others are just recoding of this first (and primitive) language. Verbal signs, therefore, would be the translation of nonverbal signs, that is, languages (written and spoken) just translate signs of Reality Language. It is on this track that Pasolini aims to retranslate reality faithfully, using cinema’s expressive potency that presents alive language of the things. Now, if cinema reproduces reality in a more trustworthy way, then reality itself is *a movie in natural state*, the real *cinema in natura*. This way reality, to the author, it’s already a sign in itself, itself pure expression (LAHUD, 1993), expression which several ways of representation, such like literary and pictorial, for example, try to get close to, aiming to represent it, cinema, therefore, would be according to Pasolini, not a way of representing reality, but presenting it. Cinematographic production comes up as a single tool of reality apprehension that does not need to disguise it, potency capable of directly making to express the things of the word itself.

Cinema, on the contrary of other means of expression, also does not represent reality, once it does not constitute a mean in itself, an instrument in which the subject present to the viewer an external and pre-existing word. Cinema “reproduces” reality: image and sound, that is, it produces again, the space, the time, relations; and to make it possible it is used the same material and physical reality: the bodies, gestures, objects and even temporality that intends reproducing. The difference from other means of expression is that, when retranslating to the world they distance from language of actions and its original code, cinema has the particularity of reproducing it faithfully. Cinema, this way, allows being inside reality without never really leaving it: allowing express it through itself most hidden aspects, its “sacred” dimension, not naturalized (SILVA, 2007, p. 32).

It is important to stand out that cinema to Pasolini, more than direct access instrument, for excellence, to reality, it is a language, being then, *a reality sign system* (SILVA, 2007). Still on this question, Pasolini asks himself: if cinema is reality written language, it must, therefore, get close to reality through it nearest mean of temporal logic, for example, in infinite sequence plane? Well, if cinema makes rapprochement possible between world of life and world of culture, just like Bakhtin points out, wouldn’t the best way of destabilizing this divorce reproducing life just like it is, that it is, launching movies without cuts and edition?
Pasolini considers that cinema gets closest to reality not when presenting it in sequence plane aiming to imitate real life temporality, because time while continuity is a illusion to the director; on the contrary, he evaluates as more trustworthy movies that work with several cuts, editing and presenting different planes, under the assumption that in life we are all the time operating a selection of what we want to highlight, that is, our view necessarily skewed, editing and making scenes, without completely realizing what is around us. With that, Pasolini demystify non edition paradise, arguing it does not exist even in real life.

We must notice, however, that Pasolini when talking about mounting and editing, refers to a moment in cinema, that is, a movie production. On this point, we must comprehend that to the author there is a difference between cinema (language) and movie (product of this language), because if the first one directly corresponds to life, in the second one this coincide does not apply.

Even though cinema is a Language of Reality by excellence that can capture reality in its purest expressiveness, the movie on the other hand would be a possible cutout to life starting from mounting. The movie would be synthesis that holds uninterrupted flow of time to offer a moral objectification of facts and relations, that is, a meaning altogether. In other words, while editing, concomitantly is operated a death and birth process: sequence plane possibility is killed, excluding several images, but gives birth to a reading and meaning about life, the movie itself. The challenge would be, therefore, not running from edition, but enable that the life that is born with the movie, produces deep feelings about what it intends to show and presents the subjective of the whole material that did not entered final edition, because even though Pasolini believes in cinema, he considers that movies not always appropriate potency that cinema holds (SILVA, 2007).

In summary, we can consider that Pasolini, when worrying throughout his production about getting close to reality, offered an answer to the concern presented by Bakhtin in the begging of this article. Besides finding potency in cinema to face impenetrability between two worlds (life and culture), he assumed in his existence of man and director the responsibility for his actions, when sharing in a incarnate way how he sees the world in his volitional-emotional point of view, weavning criticism to any attempt of naturalization and homogenization of life by totalitarian regimes (LAHUD, 1993).

Bakhtin and Pasolini’s worries seems to us highly sophisticated insofar as we consider that in academic production there is a movement of abstraction and constant conceptualization of life, disconnected from practice and from concrete relations. We noticed that the search for a universal
scientific rigor, imprison distinct sciences in theoretical-methodological models, that if respond to academic requirements, become each time more apart from human life. Therefore, if we consider that what is produced about life (aesthetic object, academic production, among others), also actively participates of construction of life itself, in case we adopt a disembodied production, we will be also allowing the creation of an uninteresting and empty life, something already announced in complaint about linguistic utilitarianism made by Benjamin.

Pasolini inspire us to think in a knowledge production in which the researcher finds themselves in a inside without outside (from life) and which is, at the same time, affected and does not affects, not being able to be neutral outside of the reality that theorizes. Not despite, if Pasolini’s reflection invites the researcher to participate actively in what he produces and If we consider that cinema is the written language of reality it requires from the director (or in our case, researcher) responsibility for the worlds he creates with his movies (and researches).

In last instance, still inspired by Pasolini’s reflections, we consider that just like the director (researcher) finds himself in life not impartially, also instrument used by him, in this case the screen, the camera, it is a technical apparatus that not only captures reality, but is a part of reality itself. Such device cannot be merely assumed as a register instrument, staying in backstage, but must be comprehended as a third interlocutor that sums up to research subjects, an interlocutor that acts and produces meaning in the field. Therefore, what makes it possible to do the research, methods and tools, must be included and become visible. When it comes to knowledge production that uses technical images, we are considering the importance of making the done research seen, besides including camera as an actor that affects, because it is also reflected in reality mirror that we aim to capture.

Pasolini’s ethical commitment to reality is on the fact that he made his work to be produced full of senses highly linked to life and its unfinished multiplicity, in which subjects express singularity of their existence, making them unique subjects (BAKHTIN, 1992). In the next topic we will see how theoretical contributions about language and cinema inspire us to think in a knowledge production specifically about technical images use.
Imagery Narratives in Knowledge Production

We aim with the present work to propose a reflection about methodology research that can discuss the use of imagery narratives in human science research. For this purpose, we will develop, next, a discussion about implications on the use of video recording mediating the encounter between the research and the other in knowledge production, having the work of Pasolini as an inspiration.

The bet on use of video recording prodigality in academic research comes from the idea that means of knowledge production cannot be unlinked social practices and everyday culture and, therefore, it’s up to the researcher to create investigations strategies more befitting and integrated with the contemporary subject experience of seeing and being seen from mediations provided by technical images.

Technical image resource emerges as a way of constructing a research methodology that contemplates sensible experience, and that in the form of imagery text lights up knowledge gap. Precisely for being from this order that imagery narrative deeply investigates everyday material; overlaying it with a comprehension that runs away from simplistic analyzes, technical images have the potential of lighting up contradictions and vicissitudes from a certain time, contemplating its idiosyncrasy.

Inside this perspective, we can think of a imagery narrative entirely full of senses that reveals the truth in the moment of a shared event between the researcher and the other, producing imagery echoes which the tension is felt for a very long time. The text-image works as register of the world’s sensible experiences, which in the encounter researcher and subject’s research inaugurates the possibility of restoring image potential while privileged locus of senses to be explored by those who establish a dialogue with it.

It’s on this context of sensible experience transmission lived on the encounter with the other through technical images that we defend the use of such images not only inside academic field, but also with a wider collective tradition that can use these images, exploring its language character. This allows readings to be permanently reupdated through time, with this, transforming knowledge. Therefore, bringing up such images and confronting them in a wider society, means elevate them to authenticity and legitimacy of their becoming.

Pasolini’s reflections are not expensive, because, even tough we aim to amplify the look on ways of producing knowledge, attempting to make sure life pulsates in our academic production
through other routes – like imagery, for example – we cannot lose sight of how science today is necessarily composed by written texts. This way we do not aim to substitute this narrative by imagery, but we aim to verify existing possibilities to, in academic production, approximate life and culture (BAKHTIN, 1992) because we comprehend that is possible to think in terms of a academic production that doesn’t run out of written text, but creates narratives from another order.

To adopt this posture implies in reviewing methodological instruments that we frequently use in research field, which take us to reproduce the same questions and receive, consequently, the same answers. This way, we assume that research field (therefore, life) is open to offer other answers, but this also requires from the researcher to inaugurate other means to interpret it, being camera a powerful ally on this project.

Lastly, we propose to reflect about the following inquiries, in the sense of reinvent another way of being in field mediated using technical image: why search with images? What is the innovation/revolution that technical image brings to knowledge production?

In foreground, is needed to ponder that use or not use of technical images is a decision that must negotiated between researcher and research subjects, without consent and the other involvement, there is no possible knowledge to be produced. In research with images, camera apparatus must be accepted as an actor that affect subject’s relation with the researcher and, therefore, what is produced will always be shaped by its presence. Besides, we must remember that there are two aspects that must be considered on this discussion’s ambit, which are: secrecy impossibility and image and speech eternalization.

Still trying to answer questions above, is needed to place that when we are speaking about using technical images in research, we are not referring to any imagery narrative production. We comprehend that documentary is a tool that offers us subsides to present reality by itself, just like Pasolini claimed to us. Differently from fiction movies, the absence of a script given beforehand and the comprehension necessarily that the other that participates of the research is coproducer of the presented plot, is the nodal point that connects academic research universe and academic production. Search with the other, anchored in cinematographic technique, concretizes in its radicality through and in this way of specific imagery production.

In documentary there is a specificity that concerns the existent duality between, in one hand, being in life while participating of a research and, on the other hand, being aware that everything that is experienced on this frame is inevitably being mediated by a technical device that captures...
and gives eternity to what is expressed. Therefore, it is the making it remain propitiated by video recording that implies in another way the participant subjects, intervening in what they choose to democratize in front of camera. Even though in documentary subjects construct characters of themselves to be acted, there is, therefore, a good dose of invention, there is no alibi to what is said and what is shown, because, the person summoned to answer for character that they created. The subject, while participating of the documentary, does not stops occupying their place in the world. To assume this singular and particular place for it is unshared as a whole (BAKHTIN, 1992), requires signing bellow what is said and presented.

Image imposes to participants the conflict with their own acts, making possible for them to see a surplus of vision (BAKHTIN, 1992) about themselves, surplus which they would not have access if it were not for technical mediation. This question’s unfolding is about the fact that while watching themselves, participants have the opportunity of reframing what they lived at the time of filming, intervening in final image to be produced. The refusal and, at the same time, the desire to be filmed (a situation that occurred in several researches made by us¹), it has to do with it, since the character knows that speaking directly to look-camera implies in accessing something of themselves that is not as whole given to their conscience. This aspect also points out the challenge of creating a representation of themselves in the few minutes in front of the camera, which in many moments causes fear in the participants. However, paradoxically, the desire of presenting and eternalizing themselves, shows in several moments in the way how they connect with the look-camera.

Regardless of, what on one hand is accountability for the spoken, on the other hand, it is the desire that the spoken is a perfect synthesis of the experienced. Therefore, it is on the editing that responsibility about what is said and eternalized, as well as the desire of corresponding the experienced and the spoken about the experienced, comes true. Thus, if edition is a moment that closely concerns to subject research, we comprehend that it must be invited to participate, because we do not conceive the moment of cinematographic montage apart from doing research. In the use of technical images, doing research with the other implies being also together in the moment of death and birth experienced by edition (SILVA, 2007).

The methodological proposal of using camera technical mediation along the lines we now present, has as principle a reflection and discussion about how we have related with this mediation

¹ Bellow links that present part of this production:  https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCpu2BEiHdc4I4Apm3fI4InApG;  https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=szO57C6Hd3E.
in contemporary context. In this sense, Jobim and Souza (2008) guide this discussion pointing out that transformations operated by new ways of experimenting reality due to more and more constant presence of technical images in our lives, demands recognition inscribed codes in the core of social relations, deciphering how we culturally create the world on and through image.

The author show us how much we relate with technical mediation as mere instrument, which points out to a uprooting of man with history, or even more, with the man’s inability of recognizing themselves as subject that participates of historical construction (BENJAMIN, 1992). This aspect becomes evident the destruction of our capacity of narrating our sensible impressions of the world, that that somehow stays as a mark or memory of what we experienced, to share with each other, in language field.

The emptied look of narrative sense, which contemplates technical images while naturalized products, which should not be given greater importance in what concerns in its means of production and appropriation, it’s inside out to sensible experience of the look, that means image in its peculiarity, on what makes it political powerful, reflection and constant discussion about what is being imagined.

It is important to point out that, therefore, the urgent of adopting in academic research, mainly in human science field, a reflection about multiples means of sense production that are behind technical images; or said in a different way, of a whole aesthetic, which accomplishes oppose an ethics, so that shape and content make of experience with images a sensible experience in which real is imagined, and not captured as ultimate and absolute truth. It is in this sense that Jobim and Souza (2008) defends an aesthetic education look.

Just like Pasolini saw in cinema the possibility of erecting criticism to his time culture, counting on technical image potential, we believe that the use of such image in academic research is promising in the sense of creating conditions so that knowledge spreads beyond academic field. It is about, therefore, the fight for aesthetic education of look capable of refunding re-creative potential to contemporary subject.

Final Considerations

If with Benjamin (1992) we understood that we live in a language emptying and with Bakhtin (1992) we learned that the object of human sciences is by excellence the expressive and speaking
being, with Pasolini we comprehend that technical image can be a resource that vivifies language, expanding it through technical images. In academic field crossed by technical apparatus of video recording, the participant becomes able to say about themselves and the world not only from their speech, became written, but also from communicated pantomime by their body, and reproduced by technical image, opening new possibilities of thinking in linguistic potential.

Besides that, documentary occupies place of creation, therefore, from art while possibility of materializing through aesthetic activity what we experience in life, therefore, on this type of research that technical image is used, participants are not only present in the moment of field activity, but also in the possibility of lending finishing to what was experienced during research process, setting a practice that values co-authorship through the whole knowledge production process.

According to clues offered by Benjamin, Bakhtin and Pasolini’s reflection, we end up rewarded, holders of a rich legacy capable of orientate other ways of being with the other in research practice, as well as producing knowledge in human science field. The most conscientious researcher makes the ethical and aesthetic commitment of allying method and knowledge, shape and content, aiming that their vision about the things of the world lights up important aspects present in a determined society. In this sense, we want to construct an aesthetic education of look to expand academic discussion, because technical image produced in academy can help in the construction of another relation of the subject with the image of the contemporary world.

Lastly, we consider that imagery narratives can provide surplus of vision (BAKHTIN, 1992) to life, because presents through other angles experienced reality, its negotiations, conflicts and tensions. The use of technical image in research aims to lead to the last consequences this producing potential of surplus of vision, when bringing to the research’s participant a foreigner look about themselves and, to viewers, a look to themselves from encounter with the foreigner. If, for that, the purpose of knowledge production in human sciences is to make critically thinking of life, imagery narratives seem to offer a reflective density from another order, more organic and direct, just like Pasolini counted on.
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Abstract

This article approach the presence of technical images in the production of knowledge, discussing the usage of video recording, in the academic research. It takes into consideration the reflection articulation about the language, developed by Walter Benjamin (1892-1940) and Mikhail Bakhtin (1895-1975) to the analysis of the theoretical and movies production by Pier Paolo Pasolini. It is noted that the movies universe offers subsidies to the utilization of technical image in the human sciences research, making a way to the creation of imagery narratives.
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Resumo

O artigo aborda a presença das imagens técnicas na produção do conhecimento, problematizando o uso do recurso da videogravação em pesquisa acadêmica. Vale-se, para tanto, da articulação das reflexões acerca da linguagem desenvolvidas por Walter Benjamin (1892-1940) e Mikhail Bakhtin (1895-1975) à análise da produção teórica e cinematográfica de Pier Paolo Pasolini. Constata-se que o universo cinematográfico oferece subsídios para a utilização da imagem técnica na pesquisa em ciências humanas, ensejando a criação de narrativas imagéticas.


Resumen

El artículo aborda la presencia de imágenes técnicas en la producción de conocimiento, problematizando el uso de la grabación de video en la investigación académica. Para este propósito, la articulación de las reflexiones sobre el lenguaje desarrolladas por Walter Benjamin (1892-1940) y Mikhail Bakhtin (1895-1975) hace uso del análisis de la producción teórica y cinematográfica de Pier Paolo Pasolini. Parece que el universo cinematográfico ofrece subsidios para el uso de la imagen técnica en la investigación en ciencias humanas, dando lugar a la creación de narrativas de imágenes.